

**Minutes**  
**Campus Planning Steering Committee**  
**Room 260, Bascom Hall**  
**September 14, 2005**

Committee Members – Present

<b>Name</b>	<b>Department Represented</b>
Mary Behan	University Committee
Connie Brachman	Space and Remodeling Policies Committee
John Chadima	Athletics
Alan Fish	Facilities Planning and Management
Sandra Guthrie	Recreational Sports Committee
David Hogg	CALS, Chancellor's Appointee (replacing Dean Elton Aberle)
Ann Hoyt	Social Studies Division
Dean Michael Knetter	School of Business, Chancellor's Appointee
Frank Kooistra	Academic Staff
Robert McMahon	Physical Sciences Division
Cyrena Pondrom	Humanities Division
Ken Potter	Environmental Representative
Terri Reda	University of Wisconsin System
Chris Richards	University of Wisconsin Foundation
Dean Gary Sandefur	Letters & Science, Chancellor's Appointee
Provost Peter Spear	Chair, Chancellor's Designee
Brenda Spychalla	Information Technology Committee
Troy Vosseller	Associated Students of Madison
Mark Wells	Medical School
Terry Wilkerson	UW Hospital and Clinics

Committee Members – Absent

\*=**Absence indicated in advance**

Michael Gould	Biological Sciences Division
Evelyn Howell*	Arboretum Committee (potential absence indicated in advance)
Anne Lundin	Library Committee
Brian Ohm	Transportation Board

Observers

Teresa Adams	FP&M – Capital Budget
Tara Baxter	WI Department of Administration/Division of State Facilities
Gary Brown	FP&M – Planning and Landscape Architecture
Chris Bruhn	Letters & Science
Sam Calvin	WI Department of Administration/Division of State Facilities
Dawn B. Crim	Chancellor's Office
Lynn Edlefson	Campus Child Care
Steve Harman	FP&M – Major Projects
Ann Hayes	FP&M – Major Projects
Pete Heaslett	FP&M – Major Projects
Dan Okoli	FP&M – Major Projects
Kathy Poi	University Health Services
Doug Rose	FP&M – Space Management
John M. Smith	Division of Information Technology
Dorothy Steele	FP&M – Business and Staff Services

**Provost Peter Spear** called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

The July 14, 2005 CPSC meeting minutes were approved as distributed.

**Spear** reminded us that this is a meeting of the Campus Planning *Steering* Committee, not the Campus Planning Committee. We have held over the members of last year's CPSC committee, so that we won't have a different committee membership to finish the final tasks of the committee. After the CPSC process and tasks are completed, those who are due to cycle off of the CPC committee will be released. (The new appointees to the regular Campus Planning Committee will commence their appointments in October.)

**Spear** pointed out that the meeting today is scheduled to run until 11:45 am. If necessary, we can continue later in this room. We will hold onto the tentatively scheduled meeting on September 30<sup>th</sup> just in case there is not enough time today.

**Fish** said that last week we sent the CPSC the draft text of the gatefold brochure and the draft executive summary, as well as an assortment of pictures. Copies of the latest Campus Master Plan map were provided on the table at each seat. Staff in FP&M and Ayers Saint Gross are also working on a very large, detailed, technical document whose contents will be assembled over the next 3 months.

**Adam Gross**, from Ayers Saint Gross, will present the final plan. We want to make sure that people are comfortable with how we have characterized the Campus Master Plan. We want to get the committee's concurrence on the two documents we've presented today. If there is a difference in opinion, we do have the tentative meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> available. There is no rush. This is not a *fait accompli*. The action we'd like to take today or on the 30<sup>th</sup>, is a vote for approval to move forward on these two documents. We can even divide them, if you approve of one but want to keep working on the other.

**Adam Gross** said that this is somewhat of a sad day, in that it ends Ayers Saint Gross' formal contact with the UW committees. They have really enjoyed it. It has been a great engagement with the people here, who they have found to be smart, fun and humane. This is one of the least dysfunctional places they've worked. **Gross** thanked the UW for the chance to work together.

He hopes that the ideas shown on the map seem "obvious." It wasn't easy to get to reach that goal. He will show a final draft of the plan today – but it's never too late to do the right thing. He will also show the draft format of the Design Guidelines today, and what the final deliverables will look like.

**Gross** said that this process considered three things: what's the capacity of the land, how can it be efficient & functional, and what it should look like.

The process involved looking at utilities systems, transportation systems, buildings and open space. We established a series of planning principles that everyone has seen. They

started with a concept plan that said that we need to better connect the campus east to west, to take better advantage of the lake and to connect north-south. This was the basis of the hard work. The concept plan involved what they call “paper dolls,” meaning that the concepts are highly moveable and changeable. When they got to the preferred arrangements, they compared them to our principles.

**Gross** showed the existing plan, and then showed the proposed buildings in red. He pointed out that a couple of challenges were the health sciences area, the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences area, and the residence halls. The Health Sciences campus needed a sense of arrival and a plan for future growth. The CALS area has been the most complicated and time consuming. Residence Halls needed to add 700 beds. A couple of basic big moves, like moving the track and putting Lot 60 in a structured ramp, gives this land back to the Health Sciences campus for future growth, while adding to the green space along the lake.

**Gross** described the physical plan. He showed the before and after of the Health Sciences area – with the graphic illustration from Anderson Illustrations. He showed the massing drawing for the proposed residence hall quadrangle along the lakeshore. He showed a current aerial photo of the east campus, and the rendering of the proposed redevelopment. He moved to the South campus (Urban Collegiate) and showed the rendering of the Wisconsin Institute for Discovery and Union South blocks, but explained that it’s an outdated illustration and needs to be updated to catch up with the Campus Master Plan’s progress.

**Gross** explained that we will be removing a significant amount of space over time, but we are always in a net gain situation over each of the three six-year phases. About seven million gross square feet will be added to the eighteen million we already have. This new space will be comprised of more efficient floor-plates in buildings; seventy two acres of new and improved open spaces; and roughly seven miles of streetscape improvements. Transit, transportation and parking improvements are planned. There is also a Utilities Master Plan that is tied into the phasing of the Campus Master Plan.

**Gross** then shifted to the topic of design guidelines, asking, “What is all of this going to look like?” He noted that they started by respecting what’s already here: the campus design neighborhoods already in place, specific programs and specific design themes.

**Gross** said that great design feels coherent. There are commonly shared ethics among the buildings. The purposes of design guidelines are 1) to establish consistency and quality for the entire campus 2) to focus on sustainability 3) to establish themes while not limiting architects’ expressiveness.

Two major design concepts can be developed on this campus: we’re calling them Urban Collegiate and Traditional Collegiate. Both of these area concepts are based on the idea that the creation of the civic realm is the most important. The floor plans should be simple, and the buildings should define the open space. The buildings should be comprehensible and fit into small, medium, large and extra large building typologies.

**Gross** showed an edge diagram. Diagrams like these will indicate the “build to” lines. These edges will help to define the open spaces to make them more active and vital. He showed the design matrix as well as a slide indicating that the design guidelines are intended to be “style-independent,” meaning that buildings will not be required to be traditional style buildings – contemporary styles will work within the design matrix.

**Gross** highlighted that there are also open space guidelines, and that these incorporate the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and the findings of the Cultural Landscape Project.

**Gross** showed a slide of what the gatefold brochure will look like. He showed what the executive summary will look like and that it will be about 18 pages and bound, much like the executive summary from the 1995 master plan. He described the technical report, and that it will fill a very thick binder. (NOTE: web and CD versions will also be available.) He covered the schedule for wrapping up the process, and then turned the meeting back over to Provost **Spear**, who opened up the floor for comments and suggestions.

**McMahon** had a question on the gatefold brochure. There were 2 things. First, he was unclear about the text shown on the brochure. **Gary Brown** indicated that the PDF of the brochure was included only to show the layout of the brochure, the text shown was just included as a placeholder, to indicate where text would be located.

**McMahon** stated that he liked the text shown on the gatefold PDF better than the text shown on the Word document. He feels that it needs some wordsmithing, since this brochure will be handed out like candy. **McMahon** stated that he liked the text for the executive summary. He suggested that **Dennis Chaptman** or someone from University Communications write the text for the gatefold.

**Alan Fish** said that we have been working with **Dennis Chaptman**, and we’ll give him the feedback that the brochure needs further editing.

**Cyrena Pondrom** said that earlier in the process we had a map which showed an overhead connection over University Avenue, at the corner with Charter Street, at second floor height. She hates to see that go, though she knows that there is another one farther west. She thinks that second floor connection is especially important at that intersection. There is too much pedestrian traffic there. It could relieve the traffic if there are good connections to desired locations via the overhead bridge.

**Fish** said that the pedestrian bridge over Charter Street at Linden Drive will connect. **Pondrom** would still like to make the observation that it doesn’t solve the Charter Street/University Avenue intersection problem. **Fish** acknowledged that there is congestion there (1500 pedestrians per hour), but thinks it will be ameliorated by some of the other mid-block crossing lights that are proposed, like that at Orchard Street. They are trying to create multiple pedestrian options to take the pressure off of that intersection.

**Pondrom** agrees that the mid-block crossing at Orchard will help. She doesn't think the other at-grade crossings will be as helpful as **Fish** thinks. She says that the bus lane is not a good idea. If you want to have a bike lane, you need to be able to "get back" as well as be able to "get there". She knows there will be turning traffic issues. If there were to be a two-way bus [*note taker believes Pondrom meant to say bike*] lane at the site of the current bike lane, you'd have a better set up. Rob Kennedy spoke about the changes they have considered with the City. He acknowledged that there are a lot of people who don't like to be in the bike lane near the buses. The city traffic engineers thought that a two-way bike lane on University Avenue was too dangerous, mainly due to the number of different turning directions that cyclists would need to be able to make at intersections. **Pondrom** said that there are a lot of people who won't use the bike lanes west bound on the north side of University Avenue.

**Fish** said that the new street trees and design elements may help calm the traffic. The city is very concerned that they will be able to keep putting their 34,000 cars a day through this corridor. It's the city's street. **Pondrom** asked if it's too expensive to do bike underpasses. **Kennedy** said it's really the underground utilities corridors that prohibit it.

**Frank Kooistra** asked if the city has bought into the idea of creating a "T" shaped intersection at the end of Campus Drive. He also wanted to know if an exit into west campus from Campus Drive is still being considered. **Fish** said that it is what we will propose, but that doesn't mean that the city has bought into it. **Fish** showed the area on the map indicating Campus Drive. We've already made proposals to the Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization for exits at both sites: Walnut and Highland.

**Kooistra** wanted to know about a potential crossing at Babcock. **Kennedy** said that the city, the railroad and the WISDOT are all opposed to the idea.

**Hoyt** asked whether Charter is the only way you can enter the campus from the west. **Fish** pointed out on the map the potential exits from Campus Drive into the campus, and confirmed that for now, Charter is it.

**Mark Wells** said that everyone in the Medical School agrees with the statement he's about to make. He thinks the Forest Products property really should be a part of the University. **Fish** said that we've had a conversation with the Forest Products Laboratory about the area where their new pole barn is currently. FPL has a plan for an FPL nanotech research building. There will be a joint proposal (FPL & UW) for this research building, which will face onto Observatory Drive. FPL is actually building another research facility next to WARF as well.

**Wells** said that when he looks at the west campus as a clinical sciences campus, and thinks about other urban, clinical sciences campuses...and when he thinks about the kinds of interaction the faculty have there, it brings to mind that there has been a lot of talk about physical connections to the Waisman Center. He'd also like to see overhead connections from Pharmacy over to the Lot 76 ramp.

**Fish** said that we don't believe it serves the campus well to have above-ground skyways when what we want is to activate the street level and make it a friendlier feeling campus, rather than try to mimic Minneapolis – their street level is a dead zone. These connections are very expensive and divert money from program space. We are trying to establish a certain collegiate character and population circulation that increases safety.

**Gross** acknowledged that there are bench-to-bed issues that come up in every Medical School program. Maybe in this case, an at-grade covered colonnade is the answer. Overhead passes are very expensive and when they aren't used, they are a big waste. Wells says that everybody he works with says that the connection to Waisman wants to happen. **Fish** said that this is not all set in stone. It's a guideline for what fits on the site. The accoutrements and amenities will be figured out during each project. University Ave. will eventually have to be re-built. We want to have the principles (connectivity) in place so that the discussions can happen at that time.

**Spear** asked for any other comments or concerns.

**McMahon** pointed out that the aerial photo of the campus in the brochure layout is pretty old. **Gary Brown** said there are some new aerials that we can use.

**Spear** said we're at a point where we can take a vote as to whether the Committee recommends that the Chancellor approve the plan, or we can decide to come back at the end of September. **Fish** added that we'll ask **Dennis Chaptman** to polish up the text for the brochure.

*Mary Behan moved that CPSC recommend approval. Ken Potter seconded. Spear asked if there was any further discussion. Seeing none, Spear called for a vote. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.*

**Spear** asked for a review of the remaining schedule, which **Fish** then presented. **Brown** asked **Fish** to discuss the Design Guideline schedule. **Fish** described that the Design Guidelines and Design Review Board processes will be fleshed out over the course of this year, now that we have **Dan Okoli** on board. The job for this year's CPC will be to empanel a Design Review Board and figure out what the procedures will be for intervening with the design process with the Design Guidelines.

The Technical Report will be done roughly around January. When the CPC gets through all of the 2007-2009 Capital Budget program requirement reviews, we'll circle back and go through the Technical Report with the new CPC members. **Spear** said everyone can read the rest of the schedule.

**Spear** talked about his upcoming retirement. The Provost is the Chancellor's designee to chair the CPC, but not always. For **Spear's** first year, Dean Certain chaired the CPC. For this year academic year, **Dean Sandefur** will chair the CPC. **Interim Provost Sapiro** will be a member of the committee for this academic year.

**Spear** thanked Ayers Saint Gross and said it's been incredibly smooth process, and that we had very positive interactions with the Madison community and all of the various constituents.

**Spear** adjourned the meeting at 11:46 am.

Minutes taken by Gwen Drury.