

**University of Wisconsin-Madison
Campus Master Plan**

**CAMPUS PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE
September 30, 2004 Minutes
8:00 – 9:30 a.m.
5120 Grainger Hall**

Committee Members - Present

Name	Department Represented
Dean Elton Aberle	CALS -Chancellor's Appointee
Connie Brachman	Space & Remodeling Policies Committee
John Chadima	Intercollegiate Athletics
Gwen Drury	Associated Students of Madison representative
Alan Fish	Facilities Planning and Management
Michael Gould	Biological Sciences Division
Sandy Guthrie	Recreational Sports Committee
Ann Hoyt	Social Studies Division
Frank Kooistra	Academic Staff
Bob McMahon	Physical Sciences Division
Cyrena Pondrom	Humanities Division
Ken Potter	Environmental Representative
Terri Reda	UW System
Chris Richards	UW Foundation
Provost Peter Spear	Chair, Chancellor's Designee
Mark Wells	Medical School

Committee Members – Absent

Mary Behan	University Committee
Evelyn Howell	Arboretum Committee
Dean Michael Knetter	School of Business - Chancellor's Appointee
Brian Ohm	Transportation Board
Dean Gary Sandefur	Letters & Science – Chancellor's Appointee
Anne Lundin	Library Committee
Terry Wilkerson	UW Hospital and Clinics
TBA	University Committee rep. to fill in for Daniel Pekarsky, who is on sabbatical

Consultants in Attendance

Karla Aghajanian	Ayers Saint Gross
George Alexiou	Martin/Alexiou/Bryson
Amelle Cardone	Ayers Saint Gross
Luanne Greene	Ayers Saint Gross
Adam Gross	Ayers Saint Gross
Chris Rice	Ayers Saint Gross
Karla Aghanjanian	Ayers Saint Gross

Also in Attendance

Teresa Adams	FP&M-Capital Budget
Melissa Amos-Landgraf	Business (for Dean Michael Knetter)
Rose Barroilhet	FP&M-Capital Budget

Alan Bessey	FP&M-Planning
Gail Bliss	DOA-DSF
Gary Brown	FP&M-Planning & Landscape Architecture
Chris Bruhn	Letters & Science
Sam Calvin	DOA-Department of State Facilities
Daniel Einstein	FP&M-Physical Plant
John Harrod	FP&M-Physical Plant
Ann Hayes	FP&M-Major Projects
Pete Heaslett	FP&M-Major Projects
Bryan Hoefl	FP&M-Capital Budget
Todd Kuscher	UW Police
Lance Lunsway	F&M-Transportation Services
Sheila Matusiewicz	FP&M-Major Projects
Sue Riseling	UW Police
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

8:00 am **Peter Spear** called the meeting to order. August 4, 2004 Minutes were approved as distributed.

Spear said that this meeting will be a status report, in that it will be a discussion about the planning principles and the preliminary findings from the first study-area.

Fish said that procedurally, this group will be directing the process. Today, we'll be touching on the history of the process, getting input on the planning principles (though we won't finalize them today), and we will hear about the initial looks at the planning areas.

Gould asked who the other 3 groups are that are participating in this process.

Fish said there is the Executive Leadership Team, the Technical Coordinating Committee, and a group composed of Campus & Community Constituents.

Gross asked everyone around the table to introduce themselves and state who they represent. He then introduced the consultant teams and presented an overview of the Campus Master Planning timeline/process.

Gross explained that this month, we are starting to take a look at the details, through the precinct walks. We walked the west part of campus (Study Area #1) yesterday, and will present findings in the Study Area #1 Workshop in October. We should be producing the Design Guidelines in may-July, 2005. The rest of the presentation will cover some of the history of the campus, campus natural systems and peer institution comparisons.

Greene began a presentation on the history of the campus:

- Prehistory-1836. She discussed the geography of the campus and the initial foundations of the college on the hill.
- Land Grant Status. She discussed the change in the amount and location of property owned by the university. Organizationally, there was gridding for agriculture.
- Shift from College to University. There was an expansion to our full mission. Separate pieces need separate identities. Campus plans of this period use a lot of malls and axes as the chief organizing principle. **Gross** interjected that they had found new information on the Cret/Peabody plans. In them, open space defines intellectual components and indicates the connections between the sciences.

- **Greene** continued. Post War Growth. Characterized by expansion at a high rate of speed. The campus was dominated by in-fill, especially in the suburban =style planning of the 1960s.
- Evolution of the traffic arterials of University Avenue & Johnson Street.
- 1996 Master Plan. Main idea was “renewal in place” rather than expansion. Stressed facilities renewal.

Gross pointed out that the planning principles of the original plan fade as campus growth moves west. He presented an overview of natural systems: campus topography, vegetation, views and watersheds. This was followed by an overview of built systems: the quality of existing buildings, the possibility of removal of buildings, circulation issues, service & loading docks.

Gross pointed out that UW is acknowledged as a leader in alternative modes of transportation, but we need to improve access, safety and convenience. He pointed out that the existing surface parking all around campus is made up of small, inefficient lots. There are 98 acres of surface parking. If it were in the form of 3 floor parking decks, we would have the same amount of parking spaces, but could effectively “buy back” 65 acres of our own land.

Gross indicated that the consultants have heard that connections need to be better, between people, disciplines, physical sense of community, neighbors. This brings up edges.

Greene summarized observations.

- We have a powerful setting and heritage
- Our facilities must match the level of research and teaching
- Our outmoded facilities are a challenge
- We’re not well physically connected
- We won’t have any significant boundary growth – we will “reinvent in place.”

Gross said that he doesn’t feel that boundary growth is even needed here, because a lot of capacity exists within our existing boundary. He moved on to a discussion of the planning principles.

Principle 1: Spectacular Setting. We must be cognizant of the power of this setting. **Greene** said that though she doesn’t like the term “branding,” she does think that we should link our national identity more strongly with the setting we have.

- **Spear:** there is a lake interface at the Memorial Union, but there is almost a barrier otherwise.
- **Gould:** the geography on central campus, the way it drops off, is a real barrier to the lake. The area on top of Observatory Hill provides a panorama, but otherwise there is no sense of the lake from the hill.
- **Fish:** Madison always had its back to the lakes, according to Mollenhoff’s new book. Our campus is part of that civic structure.
- **Pondrum:** an example is the Helen C. White building. Students are “walled off” from the lake.
- **Fish:** notice that behind the Education building, the vista is now much better, now that the Quonset hut is gone. We should be able to create 2 front doors for the Education building.
- **Brown:** Evelyn Howell talked about creating a separate Environmental Planning Principal. We need to discuss that more. He will check with her to see what she has in mind.
- **Drury:** In everything we do, we need to think of the ways in which the setting affects the kinds of social connections that people can easily make. This is especially important for students.
- **Gould:** we do need amenities to draw people together.

Planning Principle 2: Experience of Place. We need to create a hierarchy of “good spaces.” We need to decide where they should be. “Not one place, but many places.”

- **Gould:** Faculty need ways to meet and form relationships with people who are in other disciplines, so that they can collaborate. Right now, it’s very difficult for the natural sciences and the social sciences to get together, since their buildings are all so separate. We should develop another gathering spot to accomplish this cross-boundary interaction. We should start with a map of the faculty and where they are.
- **Fish:** We’re already working on it
- **Drury:** Dean Certain has previously pointed out, in a Campus Planning Committee meeting, that Rogers Hollingsworth’s research on organizations that produce the most breakthroughs in medical research have several things in common. A surprising one is that they have food venues set up in specific ways to encourage interaction across disciplines.
- **Gould:** Music is another thing that brings people together.
- **Spear:** Library Mall is a crossroads that’s very active. We need similar sorts of things in other places on campus.

Planning Principle 3: Connections. Our challenge now is to get down to the nuances. The consultants have already considered topography and weather.

- **Gould:** Johnson St./University Ave. divides the campus. It functions as an artificial boundary that cuts off the south campus.
- **Spear:** How do you make it practical?
- **Alexiou:** the issues involve how you connect all the pieces. The way to get around the pieces is to make transit really convenient and fast. How do you get to campus? What tips the balance for you to make the decision not to bring your car? We need to provide incentives for not driving rather than disincentives for driving.

Planning Principle 4: Edges & Boundaries. They should be clearer, but be porous. They should express the welcoming nature of the campus. For instance, how does the community access the campus for events?

- **McMahon:** getting around in winter is completely different
- **Spear:** signage on major arterials...what are the groups’ feelings?
- **Richards:** definable gates and entry points are a good thing
- **Potter:** Likes invisible boundaries better.
- **Drury:** combine two of our challenges. Make beautiful campus entries out of pedestrian bridges that alleviate traffic conflicts. The bridges shouldn’t look just austere & functional like the one between Vilas and Humanities. An example of combining these already exists between Bascom Hill and Humanities. Combine function, beauty, identity, arrival.
- **Gross:** campus edges can be defined in different ways.

Planning Principle 5: Regional Community. There are partnerships with the city regarding transit and culture. There should be additional ways to reach out to our local community.

- **Gould:** The State Street Development group may be a good group to talk to.

Planning Principle 6: The World Beyond. The Wisconsin Idea and beyond fall under this principle. What are the impressions of visitors? What is the “brand” of the University?

- **Fish:** There are practical implications for international students; hospital visitors and sports visitors. We need to be welcoming and help them find their way. This piece is the culmination of all of the others.

Fish said to give all of your thoughts on the planning principles by email to either **Gwen Drury or Gary Brown**. Though there is a website and it includes a form for giving input, CPSC members should give their input directly, so that it doesn’t just get combined with all of the other comments, and we can discuss it separately.

Gould asked that someone send out an email to the committee, giving them **Gary and Gwen’s** contact info.

Gross talked about the walk we did the day before, of Study Area #1. We started at WARF and headed east. Some impressions they had of the walk:

- Natural systems are more evident on the west campus
- There are distinct access issues for the Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine areas (patient access)
- There are large parking lots
- There are beautiful, historic Agriculture campus structures, but they are no longer evident or well connected.
- The Lakeshore Path has access to the lake, but you can’t really see the water. Could it be opened up somewhat?
- Concerned about the aesthetics and scale of the medical center area
 - **Gould:** Clinical Science Center/Hospital culture is dominating all building out there.
 - **Spear:** most of those buildings are ours.
 - **Wells:** there are always challenges, but we’re trying to coordinate on spaces inside the ring road.
 - **Gross:** could we improve the entrance to the hospital?
 - **Wells:** there is a “Percent for Art” artist hired for the Interdisciplinary Research Complex. Will be looking at art possibilities throughout the area.
- Eagle Heights is a vibrant community. Need to discuss the character of the housing. There is Faculty/Staff housing too...is there more room there?
- Extension of Observatory Ave. will reinforce a better East/West connection.
- Should bring the Ag buildings more into campus
- We need better north/south connections
- Need better visibility for the entrance to the Clinical Science Center
- Rethinking the idea of streets as “quads” – eliminating streets and traffic
- Consider some new building locations. Should have some options at the next meeting.
 - **Pondrom:** Don’t forget bikes if Observatory is east/west. Especially the farther you go.

Fish said that we could consider Observatory Drive and Linden Drive as a pair. One has to work for cars; one for transit. Bikes and pedestrians have to be accommodated on one or both. UC-Boulder has a good bike system and pedestrian tunnels.

Gould said that bikes and pedestrians are issues only 2/3 of the academic year. Will a plan that works in September also work in January & February? We need a plan that works for both. We need to make a campus that works in winter.

Kooistra asked about the status of the “no-build” policy north of campus. What are the consultants’ thoughts?

Gross said there are buildings that would work in that area.

Greene said that we can test that with different scenarios.

Wells brought up the idea of changing asphalt for something better. What about Lot 60?

Gould said that that area is not physically suited for a building and should be a green space, due to its former status as a marsh. Maybe we really do need 20 story buildings. We need to have a discussion of open space versus tall buildings.

Reda said that the city is moving toward fast rail/light rail. How does that integrate with UW plans?

Alexiou said that commuter rail stays in a corridor, so it’s a little easier to plan for. The other issue is using streets for rail systems. How does that work with other plans? How much credence do we give that? Do we design for that? If so, how do we design for that?

Potter mentioned a slide that we saw earlier in the meeting of University Bay. When it was shown, it was described as campus “scenery.” He pointed out that the scene shown was actually an example of degradations to the natural areas, (the bay being filled in by sediment) and asked that we be mindful of that in future presentations.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.