

# DRAFT

## University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus Master Plan

### CAMPUS PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

August 4, 2004  
8:00 – 9:30 a.m.  
5120 Grainger Hall

#### Committee Members - Present

<b>Name</b>	<b>Department Represented</b>
Dean Elton Aberle	CALS -Chancellor's Appointee
Mary Behan	University Committee
Connie Brachman	Space & Remodeling Policies Committee
John Chadima	Intercollegiate Athletics
Alan Fish	Facilities Planning and Management
Evelyn Howell	Arboretum Committee
Ann Hoyt	Social Studies Division
Dean Michael Knetter	School of Business - Chancellor's Appointee
Rob Kohlhepp	Information Technology Committee
Frank Kooistra	Academic Staff
Bob McMahon	Physical Sciences Division
Brian Ohm	Transportation Board
Cyrena Pondrom	Humanities Division
Ken Potter	Environmental Representative
Dean Charles Read	School of Education - Chancellor's Appointee
Terri Reda	UW System
Chris Richards	UW Foundation
Provost Peter Spear	Chair
Mark Wells	Medical School
Terry Wilkerson	UW Hospital and Clinics

#### Committee Members - Absent

Michael Gould	Biological Sciences Division
Sandy Guthrie	Recreational Sports Committee
Anne Lundin	Library Committee
TBA	University Committee rep. to fill in for Daniel Pekarsky, who is on sabbatical

#### Consultants in Attendance

George Alexiou	Martin/Alexiou/Bryson
Luanne Greene	Ayers Saint Gross
Ken Saiki	Ken Saiki Design

#### Also in Attendance

Teresa Adams	FP&M-Capital Budget
Rose Barroilhet	FP&M-Capital Budget
Gail Bliss	DOA-DSF
Gary Brown	FP&M-Planning & Landscape Architecture
Dave Drummond	F&M-Safety

Gwen Drury	FP&M-Planning & Landscape Architecture
Daniel Einstein	FP&M-Physical Plant
Julie Grove	FP&M-Major Projects
Pete Heaslett	FP&M-Major Projects
Bryan Hoeft	FP&M-Capital Budget
Andrew Howick	UW Hospital & Clinics
Doug Rose	FP&M-Space Management
Dwayne Sackman	University Health Services
John M. Smith	Division of Information Technology
Dorothy Steele	FP&M-Business and Staff Services
Lindsey Stoddard-Cameron	Office of the Secretary of the Faculty (for University Child Care Committee)

**Spear** called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m. He began by specifying that this is NOT the Campus Planning Committee meeting. This is the Campus Planning *Steering* Committee, which is comprised of the Campus Planning Committee plus four others: the Medical School, UW Foundation, Intercollegiate Athletics, and the UW Hospital and Clinics. Everyone around the table introduced themselves.

**Fish** opened by explaining the why and how of the master plan review process, along with the CPC+4 role. **WHY.** In 1996, a new master plan was created, and it has been used regularly. 70-80% of the projects indicated in it are now underway. The university needs to get ready for the next wave of building. UW Foundation is undertaking the “Create the Future” fundraising campaign (\$1.5 billion is the target amount), and much of that money is targeted toward capital building projects.

Other pieces of background are already underway. There is a utilities review process; a transportation review process; and a cultural heritage review process. The new East Campus Development plan is in place. West Campus development is well underway. The university needs to plan out at least the next 10 years. The City of Madison is currently undertaking a master planning process now. All of these pieces came together. It’s a good time to re-evaluate.

Last time our campus did the master plan, the State funded the whole project. This time, it is mostly being funded by the campus. This should give a better feeling of ownership on campus.

**Ayers Saint Gross** was selected this time as the master planning consultant, based on their excellent qualifications. Their work concentrates on campus planning and design. They have done 30-40 campus master plan projects, many of which were for schools in our range.

Process will be very important. There is a detailed committee structure that was designed to engage a broad representation of campus. We want a sense of direction in all major elements of the plan. This approach is new. A focus on green space is new. Connection to the campus via improved transportation systems will be a focus. Instead of defaulting to the old love-hate relationship with cars – or to just saying “we hate cars” and doing nothing about it, we will develop attractive alternatives to car use, to and from campus. We’ve already done the free bus passes for employees, and made it more bike-friendly. We need to expand this effort.

Utilities are the great, un-discussed thing. People don’t understand how/why this works on campus. We need a much more comprehensive approach than ever before.

There are 2 models of how consultants typically develop a master plan. In one, the consultants do the plan, and then present it to us, the client. We will use a different approach, in which we tell the consultants who we are and what we need. They help us achieve our goals. Therefore, broad input and engagement are critical.

**Spear** reminded us of the biennial budget cycle, and that this is an “off” year. In the “off” years, we step back and take a look at the bigger picture. This year, the campus master plan review process fits right in to that biennial cycle.

**Greene** said that **Ayers Saint Gross (ASG)** and the collaborators on their team felt at home very quickly on our campus; more quickly than at most campuses where they’ve worked. They are based in Baltimore, Maryland. She introduced the various consultants involved. **Martin/Alexiou/Bryson (MAB)** does about a quarter of their work with campuses, but they also do city and regional transportation planning. They are from Raleigh, North Carolina. ASG and MAB have worked together extensively, on other campus projects. **Ken Saiki**, of **Ken Saiki Design**, is a Madison-based landscape architect, who has

done many projects on our campus, and also worked on the 1996 Campus master Plan. He brings an excellent sense of history and depth to the team.

Attention to process is important because a process with broad-based involvement sustains implementation of the plan in the future. ASG doesn't want to do projects just so they can produce books. They want to do projects to actually improve the lives of people, so they want to be sure that they are implemented. This makes input critical. **Greene** reviewed the committee structure. There needs to be a balance between aiming high and being "Blue Sky" visionary, and being day-to-day realistic. You need BOTH. She showed the planning schedule. In general, the four components of our plan include:

1. Buildings
2. Open Space
3. Transportation
4. Utilities

**Greene** showed a sampling of the kinds of drawings/mapping processes they're working on. **Greene** reviewed graphically the 20-year-development-increment "snap-shot" idea, and how it helps chart growth in the past on the Madison campus. Periods of rampant growth (nationally) have resulted in a lot of aging architecture that is all reaching the need for renewal at the same time. **Greene** showed slides of the many maps they are making of different aspects of the campus. One indicates land use zones (academic, housing, athletic, etc.) **Greene** said that this slide will need a lot of tweaking, especially to reflect how off-campus student housing affects the surrounding community. Topography map: topography has influenced our building patterns, movement and connections in the past, and will in the future. Vegetation map: the tree cover on our campus really clings to the water's edge. Major drainage slide. Circulation slide: Pedestrians & bikes. They also want to understand the more qualitative aspects. Parking. Roadways. Service points. How do they interact? Points of conflict map: they have identified areas of pedestrian/bike/vehicular conflict as well. Need to include a map that shows bus stops.

**Alexiou** mentioned that there are 2 major challenges: 1) getting people TO campus, and 2) getting people AROUND campus once they're here. This will be the focus of our long range transportation component of this master plan.

**Greene's** slides demonstrated the gross square footage (GSF) of asphalt surface parking currently on campus. The next slide showed that GSF of asphalt superimposed over, and covering, the core of east campus. They will be able to show us comparisons with peer campuses, in terms of GSF of building per person. The campus will have to "grow without growth." By that, she means that our campus will not be experiencing enrollment growth, and will honor our current campus boundaries. Our campus needs to "recreate ourselves in place," within our boundaries.

They have created 3 "study" areas to help divide up the campus into sections that can be studied during each of 3 site visits by the consultants. The process of covering these "study areas" will involve large group "walks" of a specific area, to collect data. On the consultants' next visit, there will be a workshop about the study area reviewed the last time, followed by a "walk" of the next study area. They will have a workshop about that study piece the next time they come to campus. Through this process, they will refine the drafts of the "PLANNING PRINCIPLES" they presented next. They want input on these today as well. The master plan principle concepts are:

1. Spectacular setting
2. Good Places
3. Connections
4. Edges and Boundaries
5. Regional Community
6. World Beyond

**Brown** spoke next, and emphasized the importance of process. He covered the handouts distributed at this meeting. 1) a one-page overview of the process and project goals. He asked that people share this with colleagues 2) the sheet with color printing that outlines the timeline graphically, from start to finish 3) Committee Structure sheet 4) Discussion Questions. **Brown** asked for input, and stated that he wants this committee's fingerprints to be all over everything in this process.

**Kooistra** asked how many years out this plan will be projecting. **Greene** said roughly 10 years, and that we need to define the responsible capacity of the land. Longer is possible when you're only looking at building patterns. **Kooistra** asked about the red line boundary. **Fish** said that the campus development plan boundaries are established by the Board of Regents, and in general, we will not be significantly changing our boundaries.

**Howell** asked whether there will be an environmental impact planning principle in the plan. **Greene** asked whether she meant something separate from the other study maps that had already been presented, in which environmental issues were embedded. **Howell** recommends it as a stand-alone planning focus. She thinks it's a separate principle. **Spear** and **Fish** agreed.

**Brown** mentioned that sustainability has been on our minds throughout.

**Howell** noted that labels on the land use map show "athletic" zones that actually encompass much of the Campus Natural Areas. This should be changed to better reflect the fact that there are also recreation and athletic spaces.

**Greene** noted that lots of the land use maps overlap. **Spear** noted that the summary maps cannot be "correct" because in reality, it all overlaps. **Greene** said that these maps are just to help us understand general patterns of land use. These will continue to be refined. **Howell** suggested that the "Vegetation" map be called the "Tree Cover" map instead. **Greene** agreed. **Spear** suggested including off-campus housing, a food service map and a health sciences area map.

**Read** pointed out that the CPC has been thinking of the campus in regions, and different design principles apply to each. He is concerned that right now, the "Precincts" don't really match how the CPC has been conceptualizing the areas. **Fish** agreed that these don't match, but pointed out that they aren't meant to be the same. When we get to the issue of designing visually consistent "neighborhoods", the new Design Review Board will help define these areas. **Greene** suggested that it would be helpful to change the name to "Study Area".

**Behan** said that interdisciplinary, collaborative research has grown and is the wave of the future. Moving between zones and around campus needs to be made easier, in order to support this growing need. It needs to be made easier to get around campus during class change times especially. **Spear** agrees, and makes the point to the consultants that during the change of classes, they will see that there is not merely congestion; there is total clogging of traffic.

**Pondrum** said that she agrees with **Read's** point about sectioning of campus into neighborhoods. She thinks that four units is really more the way campus users see it than three. **Fish** said that the three study area break down is really more tied to the budget for the master plan, reflecting the number of site visits we could afford for the consultants, than it is tied to the neighborhoods themselves. We will define the campus neighborhoods later in the planning process.

**Aberle** said he realized that we are focused on the main campus. We should note that many faculty are moving back and forth daily to satellite sites like the Research Park, the Arboretum, and the Ag. Research stations state-wide. If we look at a 50-year time horizon, we will likely see even more satellite site development. How does this fit into the web of planning? This needs to be considered. **Spear** said that we need to think of transportation to these areas. He gave the example of the greenhouse moves and Charmany Farms. **Greene** noted that the short term may be different, but we will be looking at the transportation needs of those satellite sites.

**Knetter** said that this is his first meeting, so he may have missed some conversations. He'd like to know whether the academic vision/mission/growth areas had already been discussed. Did he miss this? What is the planned disciplinary growth? **Spear** said these issues have been discussed in other meetings. **Fish** suggested that they be re-iterated in this setting, since the academic mission will continue to direct growth and development.

**Kohlhepp** asked whether there were any obvious physical deficiencies that should be thought of heavily. **Fish** mentioned green space protection. Building evaluation. Heritage building protection. An overview of what needs to be torn down. Transportation. Utilities. The campus is maxed out in some areas. The university needs to build capacity (water pressure, chilled water, IT, etc.) The master plan should help us create logical, biennial budgets.

**Greene** said that we need to articulate the "underlying story," especially things like **Knetter's** comments. **Fish** said that we need to articulate one vision too. The university needs people to know where we're going and why.

**Greene** noted that we don't want to radically change our boundary.

**Brown** noted that we have met with the Chancellor and the Academic Planners. Our goal to be one of the top three public institutions in the nation needs to be articulated. Brown also made a point of clarification. He asserts that we don't have a parking problem on our campus; we have a parking attitude problem. We need to respond with good Traffic Demand Management.

**Spear** suggested that the Director of the Memorial Union should put in a transient boat parking area so people could arrive to campus via the lake.

**Hoyt** mentioned that another constituency to consider is the older adult student. They are different learners and have different needs for getting to and from campus. **Spear** added that the same needs are reflected in Continuing Education and Extension as well.

**Read** said that the CPC Steering Committee needs to make the effort to see the campus the way that undergraduates see it. Students need to be included.

**Brown** mentioned that FP&M is developing a Master Plan website, and will also solicit input through the website. The website should be available by September. A complete PR outreach program will help people get involved and give input.

**Spear** adjourned the meeting at 9:22 a.m.