

2015 UW-Madison Campus Master Plan Update

Technical Coordinating Committee - All Members

First	Last	Title	Representing
Kris	Ackerbauer	Director	FP&M Physical Plant Services
Ellen	Agnew	Superintendent	FP&M Environmental Services-Grounds
Jonathan	Bronk	Landscape Architect	FP&M Campus Planning
Gary	Brown	Director	FP&M Campus Planning
Matt	Collins	Project Manager	FP&M Capital Planning & Development
Sam	Dennis	Associate Professor	UW Dept of Landscape Architecture
Dan	Dudley	Engineering Group	FP&M Physical Plant
Bill	Elvey	Associate Vice Chancellor	FP&M
Chris	Gluesing	Senior Architect	Capital Planning & Budget
Julie	Grove	Project Manager	FP&M Capital Planning & Development
John	Harrington	Professor	UW Dept of Landscape Architecture
Pete	Heaslett	AE Supervisor	FP&M Capital Planning & Development
Rhonda	James	Landscape Architect	FP&M Campus Planning
Kurt	Johnson	Electric Shop	FP&M Physical Plant
Patrick	Kass	Director	FP&M Transportation Services
Rob	Kennedy	Transportation Planner	FP&M Transportation Services
Jeanette	Kowalik	Director	University Health Services Wellness Program
Jim	LaGro	Professor	UW Dept of Urban & Regional Planning
Robert	Lamppa	Director	FP&M Physical Plant
David	Liebl	Faculty Associate	UW Dept of Engineering Professional Development
Harmony	Makovec	Landscape Architect	FP&M Grounds
David	Marcouiller	Professor	Urban & Regional Planning Dept.
Casey	Newman	Associate Director	FP&M Transportation Services
David	Noyce	Professor	UW Dept of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Daniel	Okoli	Director/University Architect	FP&M Capital Planning & Development
Marcella	Otter	Plumbing Shop	FP&M Physical Plant
Jeff	Pollei	Utilities Engineer	FP&M Physical Plant
Ken	Potter	Professor	UW Dept of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Doug	Rose	Director	FP&M Space Management
Daniel	Stephans	Project Manager	WI-DOA
Anita	Thompson	Associate Professor	UW Dept of Biological Systems Engineering
Rick	Werre	Engineering Group	FP&M Physical Plant
Aaron	Williams	Asst. Campus Planner	FP&M



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Room 159, Education,
UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, March 26, 2015,
10:30AM-Noon

Re: Campus Visit #1, TCC #1
Administrative Work Group
Landscape Work Group
GI/Stormwater Work Group
Transportation Work Group
Utilities Work Group

Notes By: Mary Jukuri (SGJJR)
Stan Szwalik (HS)
Aaron Williams (FP&M)
Brian Smalkoski (KH)
Kevin Krause (AEI)

Attendees:

Faculty: Jeanette Kowalik (UHS), Jim LaGro, David Marcouiller (URPL), David Noyce (CEE), Neil Mack (Dolt), Anita Thompson (BSE)

FP&M: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Ellen Agnew, Jonathan Bronk, Matt Collins, Dan Dudley, Chris Gluesing, Julie Grove, Pete Heaslett, Rhonda James, Kurt Johnson, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Robert Lamppa, Harmony Makovec, Casey Newman, Dan Okoli, Marcella Otter, Jeff Pollei, Doug Rose, Rick Werre, Aaron Williams, (FP&M), Dan Stephans (DOA)

Consultants: Cassie Goodwin, John Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Neal Kessler, Bill Patek, Eric Schuchardt, David Wolmutt (SGJJR), Paul Huettl, Kevin Krause (AEI), Emily Moser, Brian Smalkoski, William Reynolds (KH), Peter Schaudt, Stan Szwalek (HS)

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK GROUP TCC#1*****

FP&M: Bill Elvey (AVC FP&M), Gary Brown, Doug Rose, Chris Gluesing (FP&M), Dan Stephans (DOA)

Consultants: Bill Patek, Mary Jukuri (SGJJR)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee-Administration Work Group meeting #1 (TCC#1) of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project. Introductions were made around the table. The following are observations/thoughts transcribed during the work group meeting.

The group determined its focus to be one of synthesis and coordination for all TCC Working Group recommendations, and to help set priorities across the four Working Groups. Group members agreed that they may not need to meet as a separate group during each TCC meeting.

Overall, this group described the master plan focus should be as an update and that it is complementary to the 2005 master plan. There are four core areas of focus: infrastructure, storm water, landscape and transportation/parking. The master plan update is more like a zoning ordinance, it guides by defining the philosophy, intent, vision and goals, not by prescribing specific projects.

We discussed “What would make this a successful master plan” from the perspective of each member:

The 2005 Master Plan as a Building plan was successful; the 2015 master plan needs to emphasize landscape, open space and circulation. Create new open space; don’t build on every square foot of campus. There needs to be workable, technical details for landscape elements. The DOA (and the city of Madison) process evaluates any capital project against the campus master plan. Don’t make the master plan just a list of proposed projects. Define the philosophy, vision and goals to allow flexibility for future projects to demonstrate how they meet the vision and goals of the master plan.

Define the issues, knowing there could be multiple future solutions. FP&M’s role is to understand and help articulate the rationale, help advocate for the plan. The plan should define how the individual college master plans fit into this update, knowing they are on different planning cycles.

The master plan update will be successful if it acknowledges the context and principles behind recommendations. Change is constant, it needs to be adaptable. We can’t predict future changes in learning and research. Set the structure of campus. Space planning always looks first at existing space.

Sustainability should be woven into every aspect. Sustainability is the process by which we manage campus. This is what drove the four areas of focus on campus infrastructure for this update. More is not always better, fewer can be better.

There is a new emphasis on Health and Well-Being on campus as part of Student Life and Recreation.

Goals discussion focused on making sure goals are timeless principles, not a list of actionable items.

LANDSCAPE WORK GROUP TCC#1*****

Faculty: Jeanette Kowalik (UHS),

FP&M: Gary Brown, Ellen Agnew, Jonathan Bronk, Julie Grove, Harmony Makovec, Dan Okoli (FP&M)

Consultants: Neal Kessler, Eric Schuchardt (SGJJR), Peter Schaudt, Stan Szwalek (HS)

NOTE: See marked-up base map PDF for further information from this meeting.

- Enhance Street Corridors and open space linkages
- Which open spaces to enhance
 - o Hardscape plazas
 - Disconnection
 - Un-useable
 - Unknown
- Enhance Connectivity
- Enhance the near west campus with quality open spaces
 - o Uninspired
 - o Provide amenities
 - o Create quality open spaces
- UWell-Wellness focus
 - o Rec/Social/health
 - o Partnership for Healthy America
 - o Safety
- Buildings that create open space, rather than occupy open space

- Landscape should help dictate architectural solutions
- Flip the traditional figure-ground to be ground-figure. The landscape establishes standards and guidelines for the building envelope.
- Enhance north-south connections
 - o Physically and visually
- The landscape master plan should establish standards to guide and dictate architectural solutions
- Use landscape to unify the different campus areas (east to west, north to south, etc)
- Landscape as infrastructure, i.e. stormwater management
- Holistic planning approach; consider wildlife and human wellness in planning
- Enhance street corridors and open space linkages
- Enhance connection to Lake Mendota, real or perceived visual connections
- Many unknown courtyard spaces exist on campus. Improve visibility and connectivity of these spaces.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE (GI)/STORMWATER WORK GROUP TCC#1*****

Faculty: Jim LaGro (URPL)

FP&M: Matt Collins, Rhonda James, Aaron Williams, (FP&M)

Consultants: Cassie Goodwin, David Wolmutt (SGJR)

Mission:

- How do our recommendations support the UW mission and goals set forth in 2005?
- Went over “The Master Plan will be successful if...” statements
- 2005 plan is viewed successful from building/space management perspective
- 2005 lacked the interstitial outdoor space awareness that 2015 needs to address
- 2015 plan needs to be complimentary to 2005 and focus on the interstitial space
- ***B. Elvey, sustainability is the very process by which we manage the campus; goals need to be less about items we check off from a list.***

Discussion:

- Need to understand where stormwater is coming from and characteristics of that water
 - o Separate dirty from clean water...we can do different things with each type
- Lot 34 as a stormwater feature area...where does replacement parking go?
- How do we balance maintenance (commitment and skill level) with proposed features?
- What are the requirements we need to meet (per building/per area)?
- Stormwater should be an outward expression of the UW Mission, Research, Aesthetic
- UWM-Jim Wasley is doing great stuff in Milwaukee
- ***Get LaGro study “Assessment of Green Infrastructure Potential”
- ***UW Sustainability Plan-understand it!
- ***Andy Reese article-check it out
- Portland State is doing good stormwater things

How do we make policy actionable...we’re good at policy, the follow thru kills us

- Make stormwater/green infrastructure part of the check list provided to architects
- Stormwater needs to have a research component that is visible

- Currently we are only required to meet quality (sediment) reduction; what about quantity and infiltration/groundwater recharge?
- Use 21st Century stormwater management paradigms
- Great to have goals, what are the institutional barriers?

New DNR TMDL requirements are strict...80% reduced sediment is the goal...currently UW is at 33%

- Adaptive Management is the strategy; UW will be one group in the watershed. The chain of lakes and Rock River basin will be monitored regularly to see if sediment is reduced. Can meet requirements off site, by purchasing sediment reduction credits or installing on other lands.
- City of Madison is leading this watershed basin strategy

Does this new requirement mean more \$ for green infrastructure? Will fines induce investment?

TRANSPORTATION WORK GROUP TCC#1*****

Faculty: David Marcouiller (URPL), David Noyce (CEE)

FP&M: Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Casey Newman (FP&M)

Consultants: John Hoffman (SGJJR), Emily Moser, Brian Smalkoski, William Reynolds (KH)

Provide alternatives to single occupancy vehicles

13,000 vehicle stall cap currently exists; Transportation Services wants this to be raised to 15,000 vehicle stalls; current inventory includes:

- 9,000 permitted spaces
- 2,000 visitor spaces
- 2,000 university vehicle spaces
 - o Oversell 30-40%
- UW lacks visitor parking currently
- UW lacks swing space for parking

Data Provision, Review, and Collection:

- Kimley-Horn has requested parking occupancy and permit data as well as data from other agencies
- Transportation Services to provide the following parking information:
 - o Hourly in/out data from revenue control equipment for each garage
 - o Most recent available occupancy studies for each parking facility
 - o Sales information regarding permits and waiting lists for each parking facility
 - o Available visitor occupancy studies for special events
 - o Park and ride data (ridership, permits, etc.)
- Kimley-Horn to set up a call with Rob Kennedy to discuss data needed from outside agencies such as City of Madison, Madison Metro, and the MPO

Built Environment Confirmation:

- Detailed information regarding potential future parking and transportation network changes was provided during the campus tour

Goals, Objectives, and Priorities Review:

- Provide attractive alternatives to traveling by single occupancy vehicles
 - o Examine areas where they do not have transit service
 - o Determine ways to get those who must drive to carpool
 - o Compare 2005 address geocoding to 2015

- Address parking cap of 13,000 spaces
 - o 9,000 permits; 2,000 visitors; and 2,000 campus vehicles
 - o Visitor parking is one of the University's biggest parking issues; some of the visitor parking is being used by students who do not have access to annual parking permits
 - o Daily events – visitors coming for small conferences are unable to find parking (e.g., Union South)
 - o Large special events (i.e. WIAA high school athletic events) – University must ask 3,000 permit holders to move their vehicles and park elsewhere for the day
 - o "Swing space" would be helpful for accommodating special events, building construction, etc.
 - o There is some latent demand for permit spaces in certain areas
 - o The University typically oversells permits by 30%-40%

The University has made significant improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network since 2005

- o Bicycle parking supply/demand should be addressed
- o Bicycle parking should be incorporated into future building plans
- o The private apartment buildings being constructed are not providing enough (or convenient enough) bicycle parking, so some of these students are using UW parking rather than parking at their residence

Work with City of Madison to provide complementary regulations

- o Moped parking
- o Intercity bus depot and charter bus staging
- o Parking adjacent to campus
- o Ownership of streets within campus area

Spot improvements:

- o Transit flow and reliability near Charter and Linden intersection
- o Traffic flow and access around Lot 46 and other existing parking facilities
- o Examine cross section for University Avenue

Park and Ride

- o Currently providing at WisDOT Hill Farms site and a minimal number of spaces at the University Research Park (no dedicated shuttle at URP)
- o University-run dedicated shuttles
- o Lower cost alternative to parking on campus
- o Consider examining zones of how far away they can locate park and ride facilities while keeping shuttle travel time within reasonable threshold
- o The University previously operated a park and bike facility next to the bicycle path, but it was eliminated after a year due to low usage (10-12 people)

Efficient parking

- o Not all buildings may be suited for underground parking
- o Who pays when parking is displaced for building construction?

UTILITIES WORK GROUP TCC#1 *****

Faculty/Staff: Neil Mack (Dolt)

FP&M: Dan Dudley, Pete Heaslett, Kurt Johnson, Robert Lamppa, Marcella Otter, Jeff Pollei, Rick Werre, (FP&M)

Consultants: Cassie Goodwin (SGJJR), Paul Huettl, Kevin Krause (AEI)

- All attendees listed above are considered part of the Utilities Technical Coordinating Subcommittee Work Group.

- 30% of the future buildings proposed in the 2005 Master Plan have been constructed
- The 2015 Master Plan project is an 18-24 month process. It is an update of the 2005 Master Plan.
- Due to recent zoning changes by the City of Madison, the UW Master Plan must go to the city for approval at the end of the process.
- The outlook of the 2015 Master Plan Update is 20 years.
- There is a current parking cap of 13,000 spaces on campus. This will be evaluated and tested as part of this process.
- UW-Madison has recently completed a Strategic Framework for the campus. The 2015 Master Plan needs to align with this framework. Copies of the framework were handed out at the meeting.
- A summary of campus feedback regarding what campus participants feel will make the Campus Master Plan successful was provided to all attendees. *That summary is listed below.*
- Jeff Pollei is the campus lead for the Utilities Technical Coordinating Sub-committee.
- Sustainability does not have its own Technical Coordinating Sub-committee. It should be part of all work groups.
- The work of each sub-committee should include considerations regarding flexibility and phasing into their master plan development.
- The Utilities Technical Coordinating Sub-committee discussed what items are in and out of current 2015 Master Plan scope.
- Items discussed by the Utilities Technical Coordinating Sub-committee that are currently not in AEI's scope include:
 - o *Compressed Air*
 - o *Domestic Water*
 - o *Sanitary Sewer*
 - o *Lake Water*
 - o *Update of Fire & Ice Chart*
 - o *Information Technology/Signal*
 - o *Identification of new utility plants*
 - o *Ownership of utility plants*
 - o *Buildings or facilities off campus*
 - o *Chilled water coil condensate recovery*
 - o *Renewable energy sources*
 - o *Survey assessment or documentation of electrical manhole and ductbanks*
 - o *Metasys system analysis/Energy optimization*

The following items are discussions related to scope that is not currently part of the 2015 Master Plan.

- a) The team discussed domestic water and sanitary sewer. Cassie from SGJJR joined the discussion to represent these civil utilities. There is aging campus infrastructure that should be evaluated (e.g. lift stations). Also there is concern with potential changes to city water pricing that could have a large impact on campus operating budgets. There was a domestic water model put together in the 2005 Master Plan.
- b) There are dirty domestic water issues in the Langdon St. Memorial Union area. The team discussed the needs for a flushing plan to aid in maintenance of this issue.
- c) Dan Dudley mentioned that other large campuses around the country have recovered condensate from chilled water coils. He is interested in investigating that at UW.
- d) Dan Dudley discussed lake water concerns with respect to EPA regulation 316B. He suggested that at a minimum, the 2015 Master Plan should identify the need for a project to address this system.

- e) IT Network super nodes were discussed. There are power redundancy deficiencies on campus that are a risk to system operation. Also the super node on east campus mall is subject to the flooding and an addition item of concern.
- f) There are certain communication duct banks on campus that do not provide diversified paths/geographic separation between redundant lines thus do not provide idea redundancy for buildings.
- g) There is a need to identify a location for a new south east campus chilled water plant. The 2005 Master Plan had identified a below ground plant at the site that has now become LaBahn Arena.
- Chilled water model will be updated as part of the 2015 Master Plan with current metered loads, where available. An update to the Fire and Ice chart was discussed, but is not currently in the scope of 2015 Master Plan.
- The 2015 Master Plan will update deficiency lists from the 2005 Master Plan for steam, chilled water and electrical utilities work that has been completed or for new deficiencies identified by the Utilities Technical Coordinating Sub-committee.
- The Utilities Technical Coordinating Sub-committee discussed the need to be conscious of what utilities material is posted on the 2015 Master Plan public website due to vulnerability of assets.
- The next Technical Coordinating Committee meeting is scheduled for April 15th, 2015, Rm 1420 WARF.

2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Campus Visit #1 – Responses: “*The Campus Master Plan will be successful if...*”

The consultants would like you to think about the following statement, Please provide a bulleted list of items that you think will make the master plan update process successful based on the scope of the project below:

- *Confirm and update planning principals, goals & recommendations from 2005 Master Plan*
- *Develop a comprehensive Landscape Master Plan*
- *Develop a Stormwater Management Plan*
- *Update the 2005 Long Range Transportation Plan*
- *Update the 2005 Utilities Master Plan*

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Maintaining the integrity of historic buildings and landscapes on Campus is a priority throughout the planning process
- Future projects can be maintained without excessive use of resources
- -Stormwater generated on Campus can be managed within Campus boundaries
- Transportation and parking options on Campus continue to meet the needs of students and staff but do not dictate the planning process
- Existing utilities can be upgraded in a timely fashion to accommodate increasing needs on Campus
- A network of greenspaces is maintained throughout Campus
- New projects maintain the character and “sense of place” of the surrounding Campus
- If it includes planning for a range of instructional spaces including a few large lecture rooms and plentiful space that has flexible seating and technology resources that will be able to meet the changing instructional needs over the next several years
- If it takes into account the needs across the range of academic programs and supports what looks like a long term shift to STEM disciplines
- Includes social/academic spaces for people to come together in convivial environments for their academic work and scholarship
- The potential for surface parking lots as future building sites should be reviewed.
- Per goal #2 of the 2005 plan, research laboratory needs in aging buildings needs to be addressed in a systematic manner. Modern scientific research is compromised in old buildings with insufficient utility services and safety issues.
- Many historic buildings on campus require external preservation work to minimize long term damage from the elements, per goal #4 of the 2005 Master Plan.
- Future building sites need to be confirmed and expanded from the 2005 plan if possible.
- Campus boundary should be reviewed as it relates to building site development
- Privately owned parcels within the campus boundary should be confirmed and goals set to obtain those properties if they relate to future building sites.
- We clearly articulate our goals
- We demonstrate how these goals translate into innovation, vision, and concepts
- The plan allows for a flexible blueprint and framework
- Our near term projects match our long term goals

CENTRAL PLANTS

- Identify optimum locations and capacity for future central steam and chilled water plants.
- Analyze existing Metasys system operations, identifying means to improve building automation system to optimize campus energy consumption
- Update expected increase of lake water consumption estimates vs. availability of lake water per the new EPA 316b regulation

- Analyze CSHP lakewater treatment quality/costs vs lakewater intake location and alternatives. Update future loads spreadsheets

STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

- Update campus central steam distribution system AFT Arrow flow model
- Update locations of utility corridors
- Update existing estimated building loads(steam/compressed air)
Identify future steam loads
- Identify optimum means to manage utility (energy) use through campus metering or alternate means.

CHILLED WATER SYSTEM

- Update campus central chilled water system AFT Fathom flow model.
- Update locations of utility corridors
- Update existing estimated building loads(chilled water)
- Identify future chilled water loads
- Identify optimum means to manage utility (energy) use through campus metering or alternate means.

CONFIRM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2005 MASTER PLAN

- Provide a list with the status of each 2005 recommendation for improvement for sanitary, storm, water distribution, road, and building exteriors.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Provide a detailed report on the current status of the campus compliance with the WPDES MS4 permit.
- Provide specific project recommendations for achieving compliance with WPDES MS4 permit. Include project budgets for each recommendation.
- Provide a critique, evaluation, recommendation, and 10 year action plan for participating in Adaptive Management program to meet MS4 permit requirements.
- Provide a map showing the boundary of the UW's MS4 permit limits. (the limits are known we just need a map)
- Verify and update the SLAMM model to demonstrate existing level of compliance with MS4 permit.
- Provide a working SLAMM model of so that campus can update the model from time to time as changes are made.
- Provide a specific comprehensive inspection and maintenance plan for routine / annual maintenance of each stormwater BPM. Designate which UW entity provides inspections and maintenance.
- Update the Campus Utility ACAD map to show each stormwater BMP with identifying information.
Coordinate this with the maintenance plan.
- Identify locations that require shoreline stabilization, outfall stabilization, and permanent erosion control.

UTILITY PLAN

- Provide prioritized list of all needed repairs and replacement of storm sewer, water distribution, sanitary sewers, and lift stations.
- Model the water distribution system to Identify current and future deficiencies in the capacity.
- Provide a working computer model of the campus water distribution so that proposed changes can be easily modeled.
- Update the Campus Utility ACAD file to show the age of sanitary and water mains.
- Update the Campus Utility ACAD to show the missing fiber optic lines, especially in Univ Houses and Eagle Heights.
- Sustainability is a priority throughout the planning process
- Improve reliability and redundancy of campus utilities, particularly those that serve buildings with significant research activity.



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Room 1420 WARF,
UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, April 15, 2015,
2:00-4:00PM CDT - Webinar

Re: Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting #2

Notes By: Aaron Williams (FP&M)
Cassie Goodwin (SGJJR)

Attendees:

on-call: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri (SGJJR), Stan Szwalek, Shuangshuang Wu, Mike Skowlan (HS), Brian Smalkoski, William Reynolds, Emily Moser (KH)

in-person: Bill Patek, Cassie Goodwin, Dave Wolmutter (SGJJR), Scott Moll, Paul Huettl (AEI), Gary Brown, Jeff Pollei, Aaron Williams, Rhonda James, Rob Kennedy (FP&M)

joined briefly: Troy Ruland, Betsy Bussan (FP&M)

Project Admin

Purpose of the TCC Leaders meeting is to have a prep meeting for the upcoming TCC with all members. JJR would like to get initial approval from the Leaders group prior to releasing at the all TCC meetings. A work group leader's responsibility is to integrate and understand what is happening in all the other workgroups to keep their specific workgroup on task. .

FPM staff will be responsible (not in the consultants' scope) for taking meeting minutes. Work group leaders would help take meeting minutes from each TCC subgroup. A. Williams will collect all meeting minutes, review with G. Brown and forward to J. Hoffman. G. Brown currently reviewing TCC #1 meeting minutes and will send to JJR week of April 13, 2015. Will forward to TCC members and post on website after G. Brown and J. Hoffman approval.

Everyone will be working off a single basemap (SGJJR is master map keeper - Eric Schuchardt). Existing and future buildings map – the consultant team needs to understand all of the spaces between buildings that are available for open space options. The basemap needs to be updated with buildings that have been constructed, future buildings that have been determined/programmed through other master planning efforts, and future unprogrammed buildings, along with buildings to be removed. Ultimately this will coordinate with our existing campus base map. Draft in progress, but still has some questions. How do we nail down footprints from the buildings from 2005 MP? The master plan process should discover new opportunities for buildings and spaces between buildings, continue to massage this as we go along (begin with draft as a starting point). Future buildings will always have to be a work in progress - looking at the spaces between the buildings, so building footprints will continue to shift as a result. "Buildings to be Removed" should not be listed on a public document, and dates for potential shouldn't be specified. We'll just take those buildings off. Only two categories: existing and proposed.

Task: G. Brown and A. Williams to review draft master plan and send to JJR.

At this point stakeholder meetings during Campus Visit #2 should use aerial basemaps. Bring draft master plan base map to TCC #3 meeting as a handout (JJR), do not email out to participants.

ADMIN WORKGROUP TCC #2*****

- The admin group will not meet every time...their role is to ensure there is full integration amongst all the groups. Toward the end of the process, the admin group will provide a significant amount of information.
- Prior to next time the steering committee meets (July), the Admin group will be reviewing a set of master planning principles (via email, over the month of May).

Task SGJJR will prepare the draft set of master planning principles after the next campus visit.

LANDSCAPE WORKGROUP TCC #2*****

- The consultants have started to develop some diagrams that respond to the comments received from the first campus visit, including: Unify different areas of campus. Improve east-west connections. Enhance connections to Lake Mendota. Organizing campus character (West, East, South). West - glacial topography, low density, car-oriented; South - urban grid, density; etc.
- Campus Organization
 - o Historic campus "east campus"
 - o West campus is from Willow Creek west
 - o South campus, urban grid, lack of quality open spaces
 - o Disconnect between the east and west campus; west campus is more car oriented
- Landscape Framework Map
 - o The map looks at open spaces on campus, green corridors, how to connect and unify campus character corridors.
- Willow Creek (example analysis mapping)
 - o Circulation
 - o Tree Inventory, impact of tree canopy over time. Missing data has been supplemented with aerial photography
 - o Viewsheds, views to lake, views from adjacent buildings
 - o View area as a hidden amenity
 - o Photo analysis before/after graphic
- The consultants will have map boards up at the next TCC meeting for interaction. They will have approx. 1 hour with the landscape group.
- Should we include projected projects into each of the focus areas (i.e. Vet med and how that impacts the Willow Creek)? Concept plans have been done but this is an opportunity to get out ahead. The proposed Nat Redevelopment project didn't think about Willow Creek views, etc. Next step site analysis (put the future down on paper). Underscores our need to get a campus basemap that incorporates the future. Needs to include the vision.
- UWell meeting on April 21st JJR to bring questions, JJR to coordinate Q's from HS
- Future TCC meetings will have opportunities for overlap (face-to-face) between Green Infrastructure and Landscape, Transportation and Green Infrastructure, and Transportation and Landscape (streetscape).

TRANS WORKGROUP TCC #2*****

- Brian Smalkoski noted that data continues to come in from UW and MPO. They are lacking on parking data, but hopefully receive more later this week.
- Data that is needed for the ParkPlus model includes:

- Need parking data on utilization occupancy by lot.
 - How many permits sold per lot; how many and what types per academic year
 - Since Dec 2015, FP&M has done counts to create data indicating which lots and what types of parking (accessible, service, permit, etc) exist
 - Provide permit information from the year the counts were done.
- What is the existing peak occupancy per lot?
- Any recent occupancy data that the university has would be helpful.
- Hourly data for parking ramps; Shelly working on access control information
- Troy Ruland, Betsy Bussan (parking permits). Space allocation and use. Parking utilization, occupancy data available. Size of lots for each lot (peak occupancy counts). Hourly in/out data for garages (demand profile for larger structures). Shelly (another person) will be working on this for Rob, will get reports from the system. Permits sold per lot, how many and types of permits for each lot. Actual field count would be better. Last complete study, last year fall. Used to do 2 weeks in fall and 2 weeks in spring (staff drives a route every hour and counts number of open stalls). Reserved/service, accessible, annual, etc. Since December its by stall type. 200 meters on campus.
- Transportation Services has a combined map of all improvements since the 2005 plan, this should be placed on a board at TCC#3
- Transportation Services has limited data on pedestrian counts. Kimley Horn needs to get counts prior to summer break, prior to finals. Kimley Horn to hire a counting firm to do that before finals week (first week of May).

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE WORKGROUP TCC #2*****

Data Gathering/Review (Completed):

1. Reviewed all background materials, reports, figures, as-builts as provided
2. Walked key BMP sites with FP&M and Grounds staff
3. Ground-truth verified and photo documented existing above-ground BMPs on campus such as rain gardens and bioswales and permeable pavements (and a few green roofs)
4. Compiled an updated basemap with all existing BMPs, outfalls, sewersheds
5. Reviewed SLAMM models that were received
6. Requesting data from City to compare with existing sewer network mapping
7. Discussed Green Infrastructure goals/objectives for the Master Plan with the TCC group, need to finalize/formalize
8. Discussed UW's permitting requirements with the WDNR and attended WDNR's TMDL Implementation Guidance webinar

Analysis (on-going or next steps):

1. Verifying/modifying the Strand and Mead&Hunt SLAMM models to reflect correct boundaries and current conditions for the Baseline and Existing Case models
2. Identifying a list of potential BMP locations and strategies for achieving TSS removal (will coordinate with Hoerr Schaudt for open space and landscape)
3. TSS/TP Modeling scenarios:
 - a. Baseline (not changing other than some tweaks to ensure boundaries are correct)
 - b. Existing Conditions (to see where we currently sit, only modifications will be to input any new BMPs, verify basins, etc)
 - c. Scenario 1: Meeting 40% on campus (understand what it will take to achieve 40%% TSS reduction per current permit requirement)
 - d. Scenario 2: Meeting 73% all on campus (understand what it would take to achieve 73% TSS reduction per new TMDL)

- e. Scenario 3: Meeting a portion of TSS on campus and using Adaptive Management for remaining waste load
- Snow pile discussion about its location, effectiveness of BMPs around the pile location.
- SLAMM model will pinpoint the largest offending TSS contributors and identify where the university can get its biggest bang for your buck.

UTILITIES WORKGROUP TCC #2*****

- Taking the 2005 data and making it current has been the most recent push.
- AEI has been updating the 'ex. Cooling load estimate by buildings' from the 2005 plan. Need to confirm with building facilities people (both chilled and steam)
- AEI - What do people see as deficiencies on campus? Ed and Jeff. Look inside the plants and outside the buildings. Electrical - Rick and/or Kurt. Distribution underground - Rick (conduits).
- JJR doing the civil utility update. Scope from a water and sanitary standpoint are to do a cursory review and find holes that might not be updated from past years.
 - o Pressure, quality, replacement issues
 - o Scope does not include modeling, field observations, or assessments

Task: The whole utility group scope was discussed this morning to make sure they are all on the same page for scope. Gary/Jeff will be putting together a formal response regarding the Utilities scope. IT piece and compressed air (potential change orders for AEI). Suggest future studies (i.e. the heating/cooling plants are to be sold).

Master Plan Coordination

- The TCC may not have enough time allotted at each meeting to get into all the issues in any kind of detail. Should we have additional time for the TCC meetings during the process? Agreed to let it play out and will address going forward.
- We'll need to balance the technical with the overlapping implications among different TCC subgroups. They need more lead time. July and September meetings may need more time.

Next Steps

- Next TCC is during Campus Visit #2, April 28th, 1-3PM. Memorial Union
- ***Task: JJR + Consultants to prepare agendas, FP&M to distribute to each TCC prior to CV#2***

End of Minutes

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise we will assume the comments to be correct.

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Room 957F WARF, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, July 16, 2015, 9:00-11:00AM

Re: Technical Coordinating Committee Leaders Meeting #3.5

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

Attendees:

on-call: Mary Jukuri, Jon Hoffman, Bill Pateck (SGJR), Shuangshuang Wu, Stan Szwalek (HS), Jeff Pollei (FP&M), Emily Moser, Brian Smalkoski (KH)

In person: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Patrick Kass, Dan Okoli, Rob Kennedy, Rhonda James, Aaron Williams (FP&M), Eric Schuchardt, Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin (SGJR), Scott Moll, Paul Huettl (AEI)

Introductions:

TCC #3.5 meeting is to present draft materials in preparation for TCC #4 on July 30, 2015. SGJR to share in-progress work to date, meeting attendees to understand what each workgroup has been producing. Questions and comments should be kept brief, with the intention that SGJR will contact each TCC Lead prior to TCC #4 to discuss comments.

TCC#4: similar format to TCC #3. Break out rooms for each workgroup with an all group recap at the end of the meeting. NOTE: This meeting is a three (3) hour meeting.

NOTE: Presented exhibits are identified under each workgroup topic, with bullet points representing discussion that occurred, questions to be answered, or general comment.

Buildings:

- Although the master plan is not focused on buildings, SGJR wants to set the stage with building changes that are coming to inform workgroup planning.
- Existing Base Map
- Campus Districts (4)
 - o Doing analysis on floor area ratios and other data to inform the story
 - o The south campus does not include the Kohl center or Athletic facilities...they will become their own subset. To create a comparative land use study it was necessary to remove these...potential to remove the hospital in the 'West Campus'
 - o Existing Campus Building Use
 - Predominant building uses listed and defined by district
 - o Campus Edge Land Use Relationships

- Many different edge relationships with the city/village
- Existing on Campus vs. Planned off-Campus Beds
 - Showing beds since the 2005 master plan
- Existing Buildings Potentially Removed w/Phasing
- Future Campus Net Building Gains...rename to "Future Capacity"
 - Also indicates the amount of GSF per district
- Floor Area Ratio: Existing vs. Future
- Future Campus Capacity Building Use
 - Will be required from the City of Madison zoning standpoint
- Off Campus Uses
 - Show proposed changes in the Triangle Plan, University Ave Plan, Regent Plan

Landscape:

- Landscape master plan goals have been updated from the TCC #3 meeting
- *****G. Brown to review Landscape Goals**
 - The overall master plan will have overarching goals which will go to the Admin Workgroup July 16, 2015
 - Draft goals will be presented as DRAFT to the TCC on July 30, 2015
- Campus Context Exhibit
 - Town/Gown relationship, including the arboretum
- Topography Exhibit
- Watershed Exhibit
- Campus Tree Canopy
 - Categorizing the canopy into natural, campus trees, street trees
 - Indicated significant tree species on campus
 - Biodiversity of existing trees on campus
 - Ash tree canopy-projected tree loss (discrepancy, 8 or 15% ash?)
- Historical Growth of Campus
 - Speaks to the open spaces on campus
- Historic Campus Landscape (unique from cultural landscapes?)
- Campus Native American Effigy Mounds
 - Diagrams visual relationships between mounds and context
- Existing Open Space
- Campus Views and Access
- Open Space Ratio
 - Green space relative to building/roads/parking (impervious)
 - Want to understand as growth occurs, what is the appropriate amount of open space to sustain the type of open space desired-to match program, aesthetic, usage, etc.?
 - D. Okoli: define 'Open Space'
- Focus Areas
 - Observatory Hill
 - Analysis, sections
 - Willow Creek
 - How can we increase the creek corridor
 - Disconnect between the lakeshore path and the creek
 - Linden Drive
 - HS to only look at proposed condition of this area...since so much of it is set
 - University Avenue
 - Existing analysis, limited street trees/furnishings/pedestrian street lighting

- North side, buildings are set back, but pedestrians are shoved against the streets
- Charter Street
 - Nothing shared today

Green Infrastructure:

- Agenda for July 30th meeting presented
 - Update the workgroup on meetings and coordination since the April (CoM, MMSD, CLA)
 - UW already pays into the Adaptive Management Resources...UW is held responsible for what we generate.
 - Existing Conditions Analysis Update
 - Natural features
 - Shoreline
 - Watershed, storm sewer network
 - Where they daylight and how it gets there.
 - Impervious surfaces
 - Indicates watersheds overlaid with a figure ground graphic
 - Impervious drivable surface
 - These surfaces produce more runoff with increased loading
 - Stormwater management issues
 - Infrastructure concerns
 - Maintenance and Operations
 - That impact of stormwater runoff, snowpile, material storage areas
 - Update Stormwater and Pollutant Runoff Analysis
 - Stormwater BMP's
 - Existing practices on campus, graphics, etc.
 - TSS Loading by Area No BMPs
 - Useful to overlap with the landscape group to identify priority areas
 - TSS Loading by Area with Existing BMPs
 - WINSLMM modeling numbers, basis for metrics
 - Currently at 32%
 - State requires us at 40%
 - Future 73%
 - Peak Discharge Rates (existing vs. native)
 - Analysis and Opportunities Discussion
 - MDL Targets requirements for 40%
 - TMDL Targets requirements for 73%
 - On Campus BMP/GRIN Opportunities
 - Adaptive Management vs. On-Campus BMP Discussion
 - *****B. Elvey: Key to know what is reasonably achievable...there are limits to what we can do. Need to clearly present the Ah-Ha moment.**
 - *****P. Kass: Make sure we accommodate our current parking deck street sweeping practices.**
 - *****G. Brown: we own land off campus in the watershed. Can UW take credit for these practices? SGJIR to address with CoM. Currently the CoM and UW take credit for the same thing, or no one takes credit for some things.**
 - *****UW to get SGJIR all UW outlying lands (ag lands/natural areas) and where they are located within the watershed.**

- ***Is the URP part of UW? The BOR owns some of it, the research park owns some of it
- ***Is the Emmons Blaine Dairy Cattle Research Center (Arlington Dairy) doing TSS removal, can UW get credit? Center is located in the Lower Rock River Basin Watershed.

Transportation/Parking:

- Trip Distribution into Campus
 - o Based on surveys that were received from UW
- Heat Map of where UW Faculty/staff are coming from
- Heat Map of where the UW Hospital staff are coming from
- Vehicle Congestion Areas
 - o KH to look closer at Highland
 - o *****R. Kennedy: What LOS do these relate to? AB above, CD below?**
 - o *****UW send loading dock map to KH**
- Non-Motorized Connectivity
- Walking Network
 - o Path environment, not sidewalks.
- Bicycling Network and Facilities
- Non-Motorized Issues
 - o Bike and pedestrian current conflicts
- Transit Boardings
 - o Identifies existing boarding locations and average daily quantities
- Peak Transit Service
 - o Very limited street network in campus, very little redundancy, which adds to congestion on campus
- Evening Transit Service
- Parking Supply
 - o Park+ meeting notes distributed, goal of July 30 meeting is to have the calibrated model
 - o *****B. Elvey to discuss Park+ offline with P. Kass, to understand how the modeling interfaces/integrates with TDM studies, etc.**
 - o *****R. Kennedy, can KH differentiate between 'Intra' and 'Inter' campus transit?**

Utilities:

- Chilled Water Vintage maps (red is oldest-switch)
 - o Mapping is set up to be color coded, to identify the oldest to newest infrastructure
 - o Foot notes will be added where newer upgrades have been updated in older tunnels
- Loading updates are currently being reviewed
- 2005 plan, list of deficiencies
- Electrical one-line has been updated (100% complete)
 - o Shows voltage (medium/high?), circuits, routing around campus
 - o *****Yellow highlights need to be confirmed by UW (buildings planned to go away in the 2005 master plan)**
- Campus Building Cooling Load Estimate
 - o Energy conservation projects have made peak loads moving targets. They have reduced (a majority of it is energy conservation), but the seasonal temperature also plays into this scenario which has been highly variable.
- System Description/Deficiencies
 - o Based on 2005 plan.
 - o Updating flow modeling

- *****B. Elvey: wants a list of unresolved deficiencies with a ranking of priorities**
 - Want to sequence these priorities with a ball park number placed on these
 - The state has zero'd all funding for UW going forward
 - Steam, Chilled Water, Electrical will be looked at closely
 - Sanitary and Storm Sewer and Water will not be looked at from AEI
 - SGJJR will be looking at this. These items are currently not being prioritized.
 - **B. Elvey: lift stations is the big issue, UW is responding proactively**
 - Water side: AEI past study, capacity is fine, age is the concern
- Solar/Wind/PV discussion
 - AEI is looking at this with their sustainability group
 - UW gets 'help' suggestions from the public and the master plan needs to address these issues or point to data that confirms/denies their applicability

Next Steps

- *****A. Williams to send out consultant presentation materials to all meeting attendees**
- July 30 meeting is analysis based, be patient at this point. After TCC#4 we jump into alternatives.

Distribution:

Meeting Attendees
Consultant Team

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Rooms 159, 198, 245, 290
School of Education, UW-
Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, July 30, 2015,
1:00-4:00PM

Re: Campus Visit #3, TCC #4
Landscape Work Group
GI/Stormwater Work Group
Transportation Work Group
Utility Work Group

Notes By: Gary Brown, FP&M, CPLA
Rhonda James, FP&M, CPLA
Rob Kennedy, FP&M, Trans
Jeff Pollei, FP&M, Utilities
Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

Faculty/Guests: Jim LaGro (URPL), David Noyce (CEE), Dave Liebl (CEE), John Harrington (DLA), John Krogman (DoIT), Drew Beck, Kate Christopherson (CoM),

FP&M Staff: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Rob Lamppa, Dan Okoli, Julie Grove, Jeff Pollei, Jonathan Bronk, Rob Kennedy, Aaron Williams, Rhonda James, Matt Collins, Marcella Otter, Patrick Kass, Kurt Johnson, Ellen Agnew, Rick Werre, Dan Dudley, Pete Heaslett, Marisa Trapp (FP&M), Beth Reid (DOA), Alex Roe, Randy Mattison (System),

Consultants: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Neal Kessler, David King, Eric Schuchardt, Bill Patek, Dave Wolmutter, Cassie Goodwin (SGJR), Mike Skowlund, Stan Szwalek (HS), Kevin Krause, Paul Huettl, Scott Moll (AEI), Brian Smalkoski, Emily Moser, Jeffrey Smith

Excused/Absent: Sam Dennis (DLA), Jeanette Kowalik (UHS), David Marcouiller (URPL), Ken Potter (CEE), Casey Newman, Kris Ackerbauer, Harmony Makovec (FP&M), Anita Thompson (BSE)

LANDSCAPE WORK GROUP-TCC #4*****

Faculty: John Harrington (DLA)

FP&M/DOA/UWSA: Gary Brown, Dan Okoli, Julie Grove, Jonathan Bronk, Ellen Agnew, Beth Reid (DOA), Alex Roe (UWSA)

Consultants: Eric Schuchardt, Neal Kessler (SGJR), Mike Skowlund, Stan Szwalek (HS)

Excused/Absent: Sam Dennis (DLA)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Landscape/Open Space Work Group meeting #4 (TCC#4) of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project.

S. Szwalek provided an overview presentation of the materials from the stakeholder meetings include:

What did we hear?

- honor the 12,000 year human history
- provide visual cues
- increase biodiversity on campus
- preserve critical views to and from the lake

Review Landscape Master Plan goals

- S. Szwalek presented the draft goals for the landscape master plan (see presentation).
- Discussion:
 - o Need to add “recreation” into the goals somehow; #5 and or #6
 - o J. Harrington
 - Sustainability needs to be weaved into the system
 - “Stormwater aware”
 - Landscape needs to be multifunctional
 - A “working landscape”
 - Stronger streetscapes with large trees
 - Mowed turf reduction and areas with a more naturalized landscape
 - Need to have some detailed objectives under each goals
- J. Grove – need to include a discussion of maintenance guidelines; salt damage in street terraces, etc. standards for terrace sizes, etc.
- D. Okoli – need to add aesthetic and beauty into the landscape
 - o Need a bigger goal that talks about design and a beautiful landscape
 - o The landscape should contribute to the overall aesthetic of the campus.
- J. Grove – landscape and site furnishings standards have already been established on campus; we need to promote their use and then discuss if and when we can deviate from those standards
- J. Bronk – family of design materials; cohesive landscape materials; etc. retaining walls, paving;
- J. Harrington – need something about protecting large trees and spaces for large trees;
- J. Bronk – need to define utility corridors; protecting existing trees and coordinating with utility projects.
- B. Reid – use the tree inventory to help define where our big trees are today and in future
- N. Kessler – maybe we need a rating of trees and level of protection
- E. Schuchardt – need something about maintenance of the entire landscape, maybe under #2
- J. Harrington – should areas of the campus have landscape “themes”
- N. Kessler – there still needs to be a unifier that ties it all together from a landscape perspective or a hierarchy of spaces
- Jonathan B. – select list of plants for neighborhoods for focal points or features
- M. Skowlund – use the streetscape as a unifying feature
- J. Harrington – landscape structure as a unifying features; use a landscape ecosystem as a structure to define options
 - o Savannah landscape
 - o Mesic woodland
- A. Roe – knitting the landscape together; treat different parts of the campus for a variety of maintenance levels; prioritize neighborhoods; etc.
- E. Agnew – we have that now (that map needs to be shared with CPLA staff and the consultant teams)
- J. Grove - enhancing the brand with more red things in the landscape; can we do this with particular plantings that provide a pop of red color throughout the seasons

- N. Kessler – can we use the landscape master plan that provides a statement of value to the landscape to preserve the open space from future development; do we need to program the landscape to give it more emphasis for protection
- D. Okoli – there needs to be some discussion of ties between indoor and outdoor spaces. Buildings need to be in the context of the landscape and vice versa. They need to related to each other.
- J.Harrington – buildings sit on the landscape; not vice versa
- E. Agnew – most of our historic landscapes are not “programmable” or reserve able for programs in order to protect their long term integrity and not damaged by over use.
- N. Kessler – historic landscape is a “program”
- J. Grove – are we missing any programmable space that could be used for campus events?
- J. Bronk – Peter Schaudt mentioned earlier that we need a space that is a natural space that is more interactive; a sort of adult “playground” in a native landscape
- N. Kessler – Lot 34 for discussed as this potential living laboratory
- E. Agnew – subset of #4, defined irrigated spaces and the ability to irrigate in the future
- J. Harrington – need a design build landscape for LA students; hands on learning spaces; makerspace for horticulture and landscape architecture students
- E. Agnew – continue to think about snow removal and snow storage as we design our future campus landscapes

- **Review campus wide landscape analysis**
S. Szwalek provided an overview of their site analysis presentation, including:
- Site analysis maps reviewed (see PPT slides)
 - o Reviewed natural features
 - o Reviewed cultural features
- J. Bronk – need to also make sure you look at views within campus to other major buildings; need to include views of greenroofs, etc.; hidden viewsheds
- S. Szwalek – maybe we need a set of maps that show a variety of viewshed studies
- J. Bronk – for major projects, we may need to look at a viewshed analysis
- G. Bronk – need to include a soils analysis to help with ecosystem studies
- M. Skowlund – how does the railroad impact the land use and safety of crossings?
- B. Reid – central campus nomenclature seems a misnomer (this is a historic reference to the main quad around Bascom Hill which has always been called the “central campus”
- B. Reid – living, learning landscape laboratory; “glacial timeline” teaching feature; how can we make the landscape a learning tool
- J. Grove – can we do some interpretation at the overall at Observatory Drive?

- **Landscape Focus Areas Site Analysis Review**
S. Szwalek provided an overview and site analysis for the five focus areas in the landscape master plan.

- Willow Creek
 - o Add a bridge at Linden and remove Easterday Drive to give more room for landscape around the creek
 - o Look at enhancing the bridge crossings

- Observatory Drive
 - o Add stormwater management features
 - o Reduce mowed lawn and change to meadow

- Remove parking from Observatory Drive in a consolidated ramp to minimize the roadway width;
- Open the views to the lake better
- Orchard remnants
- Creating a living, learning landscape; a working landscape
- Linden Drive Streetscape & adjoining landscapes
 - Dead-ending the street can allow us to narrow the street, expand the sidewalks; creating a larger scale landscape; shared use mall
 - Do we need Linden in this section of campus
 - Can we do a new bridge over Willow Creek to help with access to Vet Med?
 - Can we do something better with the Horse Barn as a new public space and really create a new public gathering space
- N. Charter Street Streetscape
 - 6 city blocks
 - Lack of street furnishings
 - Naturalized setting from the north; need better engagement with the lake
 - Increase accessibility
 - Undefined pedestrian space at Social Science and Liz Waters
 - Charter & Linden intersection; conflicts with vehicular; lots of pedestrians
 - Combination of solutions to increase safety
 - Need to organize the bike parking better
 - Transition to more urban area south of University Avenue; character changes
 - Noise issues from heating plant
 - Transition to residential areas to the South
 - John – can we close off some of the branches of the street intersection? Can there be an overhead land bridge
- University Avenue Streetscape
 - 10 city blocks
 - Major transportation arterial
 - 24 street trees
 - 1 bench, 5 bus shelters; few street furnishings
 - No pedestrian lighting except at Fluno
 - Opportunities for arrival and entry on the east end of campus
 - Chazen, Fluno, U Square as entry buildings for the campus
 - Lack of traffic calming on the street Three vehicle lanes, two bike lanes & a bus lane
 - West end pedestrian crossings; passing through not arriving to campus

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE (GI)/STORMWATER WORK GROUP-TCC #4*****

Faculty: Jim LaGro (URPL), Dave Liebl (CEE), Marisa Trapp (EHS)

FP&M Staff: Aaron Williams, Rhonda James, Matt Collins, Marcella Otter,

Consultants: Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin (SGJJR)

Excused/Absent: Ken Potter (CEE), Anita Thompson (BSE)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Stormwater Work Group meeting #4 (TCC#4) of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project. Introductions were made around the table.

Status Update:

- Dave and Cassie presented a summary of the stakeholder meetings with the City of Madison, Clean Lakes Alliance and Yahara WINS; the stormwater analysis diagrams; facilitated a discussion of the goals and objectives; and covered a quick discussion of opportunities.

Discussion:

- Meeting with the City of Madison clarified the UW's responsibility for regulations regarding Total Suspended Solids (TSS) applies to the original land grant area.
- James Tye of the Clean Lakes Alliance encourages greater connections to the lake as a feature of campus and to use the UW's shoreline as a place for innovative shoreline stabilization as needed.
- From the Yahara WINS presentation we took away the potential cost savings they presented is likely low compared to our recent projects. Costs for the most recent projects will be pulled and an updated comparison can be made.
- Analysis Diagrams – general comments
 - o There is a distinction to be made between the area regulated and the entire campus.
 - o South of University Avenue, the roads are the city responsibility and have been left out of the calculations – they need to be left out of the graphic as well.
 - o Developed Features diagram – the blue area will be redefined and re named to reflect recent discussions with the City.
 - o Maintenance & Operations diagram – everyone in the group will look at this map and add items they are aware of.
- Modeling Update
 - o Consultants still need the street sweeping map from UW (Rhonda will get from Grounds)
 - o Green roofs do not get credit for TSS removal, **if** they are intensive they are considered impervious.
 - o The TSS loading diagrams show the west, near west and central to have the greatest loading.
 - o Modeling scenarios were discussed and agreed that the minimum amount to treat on campus is 40% but more than that is desired. To determine the actual best level of TSS removal on campus the team will look at a balance between, initial cost, maintenance cost, additional benefits of GI areas, amount of benefit the dollars spent can accomplish for the overall good of the Rock River water quality.
 - o The runoff quantity discussion resulted in adding a future condition to the comparison graph.
- Goals and Objectives
 - o Discussion lead to three potential goals in an intentional order.
 - Implement green infrastructure practices to achieve water quality goals and regulations.
 - Choose green infrastructure practices that also provide ecosystem services.
 - Integrate research, teaching and outreach into green infrastructure practices.
 - o Cassie and Dave will reorganize the current objectives to realign to the goal suggested and send it around to the team to comment on via email.
- Opportunities
 - o Green Street opportunities were described and discussed.
 - o Shoreline opportunities were mentioned.

- Willow Creek is an opportunity.
- Observatory Hill is an opportunity.

TRANSPORTATION WORK GROUP-TCC #4*****

Faculty/City: David Noyce (CEE), Drew Beck, Kate Christopherson (CoM)

FP&M Staff: Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy,

Consultants: Brian Smalkoski, Emily Moser (KH)

Excused/Absent: David Marcouiller (URPL)

Discussion

- Specify that the “Campus Transportation by the Numbers” is everything within campus boundary (not just University owned).
- Add # of bicycle “spaces” in the 286 racks.
- R. Kennedy: Route 38 does serve the campus and actually ends at the hospital – it goes on Linden, and anecdotally it has heavy loading at the hospital. Many students board to go to hospital or Bassett Street.
- Metro does not actually have Park and Ride lots. They have five routes that serve park and ride lots.
- Is there a way to compare differences between where Hospital staff and UW faculty/staff are coming from? E.g., one is X% more distributed than the other. Can we also compare to what it was like in 2005?
- P. Kass: Suggests combining the heat map for Hospital and UW faculty/staff to help identify areas for Park and Ride, etc.
- We don’t have a count for Observatory just east of the roundabout. R. Kennedy surmised that the vast majority of traffic continues for the rest of that length (maybe 6900 of the 7100).
- Aside from the qualitative graphic of bike/ped activity areas, we should have a table showing our numerical data. D. Noyce suggested we should have Observatory and Charter shown as a high activity node as well.
 - B. Smalkoski’s observation is that Charter and Linden is much higher priority.
- Walking Network map—Clymer Place was a roadway that was vacated and now functions only as a sidewalk (change to ped only walking path).
 - R. Kennedy has some additional edits; he will review the PDF in detail.
- May want to tweak our “Transportation by the Numbers” slide since it says 7 B-cycle stations, but there are 10 shown on the map (KH to confirm that the 7 are within the campus boundaries).
- Bike parking locations—the challenge for them is getting space dedicated on building sites for the bike racks without negatively impacted function and aesthetics of building.
- Non-Motorized Issues Map—should add Charter and University node and Campus and University Bay node (both of these are also bus issues and Campus/University Bay is emergency vehicle access for hospital)
- Non-Motorized Issues Map, Item A—we should be encouraging bikes/peds to use the East Campus Mall underpass to cross, not this location
- Transit Boardings—map will be helpful in potentially identifying key stops for potential express routes and for identifying locations where additional bus shelters may be needed
- Transit Routes—should show Route 38 and any other route that goes on Linden. Route 27 is very minor, so if we are excluding some, that should be one that is excluded.

- Transit Routes—important to note where the data is from to understand whether Langdon was open, whether other construction was going on, etc.
 - o D. Noyce said they just collected new data with Cambridge Systematics.
- Park-and-Ride—change label to say “Park-and-Ride Lots Served by Metro Transit” or “Regional Park-and-Ride Lots”.
- “What’s Working” slide—should show a University-designed bus shelter rather than one on State Street.
- Transit Improvements—if considering limited stop service, consider the dwell time at that those stops to load/unload.
- Are we going to discuss mopeds?
- B. Elvey would like KH to develop a campus standard for crosswalks. B. Elvey says we have tried many different types over the years. They want the lowest life-cycle cost. Can we document types, pros/cons, and make our recommendation?
- Charter/Linden – do we consider closing to general traffic and just allowing transit? D. Noyce suggests making Charter a bus and pedestrian mall between Linden and Observatory.
- Parking—we need to think about actual demand (how many would like to use the parking, not just how many actually are). Many people attempt to enter a ramp, see a full sign, and then have to go hunt somewhere else.
- Parking: Patrick and Rob think the occupancies described in the table and graph are too low and possibly inaccurate.
 - o Trans Services will check and confirm graph data
- Starting in September, Transportation Services will keep the gates down at least 24/5 and will get better parking occupancy data.
- There is an opportunity to manage parking differently when school is not in session.
- Transportation Services feels the occupancy as shown is low—they will review.
- Should keep visitors and staff/faculty separate in UW Hospital area—Hospital Visitor (Lots 63 and 75)
- Transportation Services will review next week and get us some notes.
- Noted that Lot 17 and Lot 80 should be 100%.
- Patrick has some data on where Lot 34 users work—he will provide that to transportation work group.
- Disabled parking may need to be split into the different user groups based on ratios.
- Brian will provide the TCC presentation and plots to Rob.
- Biggest issues is visitor parking in the right places.
- Current waitlist is 200 people who don’t have parking.

Interdisciplinary Takeaways

- Shift in building density and activity intensity to South, Near West, and West.
- Increased need for Open Space in South.
- Increased pedestrians on limited urban sidewalk network.
- Changing demands for parking.
- Stronger streetscapes with larger trees.
- Opportunities in five focus areas: Willow Creek, Charter, University, Observatory, etc.
- Can we add a bridge at Linden and remove Easterday?
- Do we need Linden west of Elm?
- Opportunity to reduce road widths?

- Note turning radii requirements and gutter pan water quantity handling (12" vs. 24")
- Location of parking demand needs to be taken into account with parking relocations/eliminations.
- Pedestrian and vehicle interactions at key spots.
- Service and parking entrance locations need to be taken into account as we look at repurposing roads.
- Bike parking needs to be more of a component of the design of new buildings—convenience is very important to reduce bike locking to non-rack items.
- More visitor parking is needed.
- Site small utilities plant on campus.
- Impervious reduction.
- Open space increase.
- Green streets.

UTILITIES WORK GROUP-TCC #4*****

Faculty/System: John Krogman (DoIT), Randy Mattison (System)

FP&M Staff: Bill Elvey, Jeff Pollei, Marcella Otter, Kurt Johnson, Rick Werre, Dan Dudley, Pete Heaslett, Rob Lamppa,

Consultants: Kevin Krause, Paul Huettl, Scott Moll, Brian Stiklestad (AEI),

Excused/Absent: Neil Mack (DoIT)

1. AEI (Paul and Brian) provided an update on the current status of the utility work, including:
 - a. Vintage maps for chilled water and steam are nearly complete
 - b. Calibration of building loads, diversity to the current peak plant loads is ongoing
 - c. One-line electric diagram has been updated
 - d. Project lists from 2005 Master Plan are being updated for chilled water and steam. A future meeting will be scheduled to discuss the electric projects.
 - e. Flow modeling of chilled water and steam is just beginning and will be discussed further at the next TCC meeting.
2. UW noted there are a number of "data centers" on campus that use city water for cooling. These are not included in the chilled water modeling. It would be beneficial to convert to campus chilled water. That currently is not part of the scope of the Master Plan. UW suggested that a study, potentially as a change order, should be funded to identify once through cooling installations on campus. (UW)
3. Rob Lamppa indicated that there are opportunities to include renewable energy systems on existing and future buildings through performance contracting. UW's performance contractor on the Madison campus is Johnson Controls. The proposed intent should be shared with AEI. (UW - Rob L.)
4. Current renewable systems on and off campus include:

a. Solar hot water	WID, Dejope, Leopold
b. PV	WEI
c. Geo-exchange	WID
d. Off campus	Wind purchase
5. UW FPM to flag deficiency list items to be completed in next 3 biennia. (UW)
6. UW to look at economics of switching out a steam absorber in Charter to electric to give them the option to use steam during the day/electric at night. (Absorber was installed in 2000, and

hasn't operated in a couple of years due to energy costs.) UW to provide data for inclusion in Master Plan, as this is not part of AEI's scope of work. (UW)

7. UW to look at feasibility of providing steam pressure reduction turbine generators at major lab buildings. UW to provide data for inclusion in Master Plan. (UW)
8. City water rate increase. City can read water meters every 15 minutes and are going to demand-based pricing model.
9. Add MGE electrical meters to one-line diagram. [19 meters: 3 off campus (1 at WARF, 1 at Fluno, 1 at East Campus Mall)] (AEI - Brian)
10. Add legend to electrical one-line diagram. (What do colors mean?) (AEI – Brian)
11. Dayton Street Substation on electrical one-line diagram needs to be expanded. Rick W. to provide information. (UW - Rick)
12. Steam Map: Update to show new steam piping by Union South. (AEI – Paul)

End of Minutes

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise comments are assumed to be correct.

Presentation:

See weblink on www.masterplan.wisc.edu under the tab 'Current Information'

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Room 957F WARF, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, September 3, 2015, 2:00-4:00PM

Re: Technical Coordinating Committee Leaders Meeting #5

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

on-call: Mary Jukuri, Jon Hoffman, Bill Pateck (SGJJR), Wu Shuang, Stan Szwalek (HS), Emily Moser, Brian Smalkoski (KH), Alex Roe (SWA),

In person: Gary Brown, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Rhonda James, Aaron Williams (FP&M), Eric Schuchardt, Dave Wolmutter (SGJJR)

Excused/Absent: Dan Okoli, Jeff Pollei, Scott Moll, Paul Huettl (AEI), Beth Reid (DOA)

Meeting to present draft materials for TCC #6 on September 16, 2015. SGJJR to share alternative work for review and comment.

Agenda:

1. Project Administration
 - a. Landscape Campus Framework
 - b. Stormwater 2005 Plan Assessment
 - c. Parking 2005 Plan Assessment
 - d. West Campus
 - e. Near West Campus
 - f. Central Campus
 - g. South Campus
2. Review of draft-in progress master plan alternatives

G. Brown and A. Williams to combine comments into 1 document. Due to SGJJR by Tuesday, September 8, 2015.

Overall Landscape Framework:

- Framework plan at the end of CV#3 was more of a summary of the analysis, really looking at the opportunities for future open spaces and how they might be linked together to create a more cohesive whole.
- How can a more contiguous system be created with the central campus open spaces, that spread out throughout the entire campus.
- Greenspace out to the lake from the hospital as a more deliberate move.
- Charter/Dayton should have a strong identity to organize the campus

- East Campus Mall and Henry Mall are the bookends of the openspace on campus.
- Smaller side streets between University and Dayton should appear more a part of the campus fabric. Reducing or eliminating traffic potential .
- Charter should become a 2-way street from Regent all the way to the Lake.
- Green circles indicate vehicular entry nodes
- B. Elvey: Difficulty visualizing the difference between a green street and street lined with trees.
- D. Wolmutter: Street lined with trees is a landscape approach, Green streets have a heavy stormwater approach.

Green Infrastructure

- Stormwater features indicated as linked systems as opposed to larger singular facilities due to spatial constraints.
- UW is responsible for the sediment coming from the VA lots, even though UW does not control the land use.
 - o Willow Creek is a water of the State
- B. Elvey: It is desirable to relocate Grounds from the 2005 master plan.
- TCC Work Group Leads, we are showing all the graphics we'd like to show in 2 weeks, but will be massaged into a cohesive whole.

Parking/Transportation:

- In regards to the 2005 master plan modified to today's numbers.
- Assumptions were made to building uses based on gathering information
- The model has said there are some areas of 'unmet' demand. Most of the lots are maxed out at 95% use.
- 13,000 stalls are not sufficient to meet the growth of the 2005 master plan adjusted for today.
- What is latent demand? Existing but not yet developed or manifest, hidden, concealed.
- There is a 350 stall unmet demand...most seem to be to the west.
- Transcient: Visitors, general parking, Reserved building spaces
- The hospital itself does not show a demand because it is taken care of first and WIMR is what is left. The same is true of the Lakeshore Latent demand...these buildings are filled 'last'
- Kevin: KH Alternative for a signalized intersection at Walnut with Campus Drive.
 - o Option 1: signalized at Campus/Walnut
 - Doesn't work very well with grades and particular the railroad bridge
 - o Option 2, slip ramps
 - Space is limited
 - o Option 3, slip ramp
 - o East bound campus drive is the important piece

West Campus Alternatives:

- Option 1: Union West
 - o Large union, new road alignment and integrated athletic/union facility
- Option 2:
 - o No Union structure on this side of campus
- Option 3:
 - o Smaller union, gridded street network, practice soccer field located in its current location
 - o Athletics did not want a soccer field inside the track infield.
- Discussion of what should be shown on some of the larger topics (G. Brown/B. Elvey to meet)

Near West Campus Alternatives

- Campus Drive path and connection to Chamberlin Ave
- Alternative 1 ignores Meat and Muscle, but is the preferred route if that building was every considered for removal
- Alternative 2 takes the path through a reconfigured Linen Dr.
- All options try to better utilize the open space and allow for building introductions, rather than landscape being remnant land that surrounds buildings.
 - o Option 1: Horse Barn east campus, Pete idea about open space around the barn, passive/romantic sort of landscape
 - P. Kass: Vet Med is a hospital, needs 24/7 access in the context of road closures on campus
 - o Option 2: How can we make this area a destination.
 - Providing programmable open space for staff/students...creating a place
 - o Option 3: Lots of discussion
 - Opportunities to provide more gracious green space around the landmark buildings (horse/dairy barn). Remove excessive circulation pavement.
 - How does south bridge connection over Willow connect back in to the West? Herrick or Linden?

Central Campus Alternatives

- o Observatory Option 1:
 - Remove parking from street
 - Lower maintenance landscaping, minimal lawn
 - Working landscape in the current Lot 34 area. Ability to pick up stormwater from Trip/Adams Halls and discharge into this area. Good potential for collection
 - R. Kennedy: Where is the proposed parking going.
- o G. Brown: Do the super block slides prior to Observatory Hill slides
- o Observatory Option 2:
 - Removal of Observatory Drive, dead end on both sides with cul-de-sacs
 - A larger cared for lawn is shown than Option 1...still less lawn than today
 - R. Kennedy: Is KH modeling what the impacts would be if Observatory removed.
 - Observatory is needed for redundancy...could be a fire lane/plaza and not through traffic most of the time.
- o Charter Street Option 1:
 - By lake, a stair system is suspended above the landscape, allowing the landscape to continue in/around/under.
- o Charter/Linden Drive Intersection
 - Enforcement
 - Pedestrian scramble
 - Gated fencing to direct circulation
 - Permanent median...restrict turning movements
 - Grade separation...340' 5% grade slope heading to the west
- o Charter between Linden/University
 - Showing tree planters in terraces for scale and buffer peds from vehicles
- o Superblock
 - Option 1: Mid Blocks in both the NS/EW direction
 - Option 2: Mid block in the EW direction

- Option 3:
 - Parking structure is replacing Lot 3

South Campus Alternatives

- University Avenue:
 - Option 1 floating transit, bike lane on the north of University
 - Option 2: bike lane on the south of University
 - Option 3: protected bus/bike lane
- Charter Street:
 - Like the realignment of Charter Street
 - South of Dayton St.
 - Removal of parking on Charter will have to be coordinated with the City
- Brooks/Mills would be more pedestrian oriented
 - Option 1 South Campus, active corridors NS
 - Option 2 south Campus, internal block courtyard
 - Option 3 south Campus gathering space
 - Not seeing an emphasis of a green street on Dayton
- SGJJR wants more direction by September 8.
- G. Brown to coordinate with Provost and B. Elvey
- UW to inform SGJJR what should be shown at:
 - TCC: show everything
 - CPSC: B. Elvey to direct
 - ExLT: abbreviated-refer to agenda



MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Rooms 159 & 198 School of Education, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, September 16, 2015, 8:00-11:00AM

Re: Campus Visit #4, TCC #6
Landscape Work Group
GI/Stormwater Work Group
Transportation Work Group

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

Faculty/Guests: Kate Christopherson (CoM), Beth Reid (DOA), Alex Roe (UWSA), Kate Sullivan (UWEX), Neil Mack (DoIT)

FP&M Staff: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Rob Lamppa, Dan Okoli, Kris Ackerbauer, Julie Grove, Jeff Pollei, Aaron Williams, Rhonda James, Marcella Otter, Patrick Kass, Kurt Johnson, Ellen Agnew, Rick Werre, Pete Heaslett, Harmony Makovec, Marisa Trapp (FP&M)

Consultants: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Neal Kessler, Eric Schuchardt, Bill Patek, Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin (SGJJR), Mike Skowlund, Stan Szwalek (HS), Kevin Krause, Paul Huettl, Scott Moll (AEI), Brian Smalkoski, Kevin White (KH)

Excused/Absent: Jim LaGro (URPL), John Harrington (DLA), John Krogman (DoIT), Drew Beck (CoM), Sam Dennis (DLA), Jeanette Kowalik (UHS), David Marcouiller (URPL), David Noyce, Ken Potter, Dave Liebl (CEE), Doug Rose, Rob Kennedy, Dan Dudley, Jonathan Bronk, Matt Collins, (FP&M), Randy Mattison (UWSA), Anita Thompson (BSE)

TCC MEMBER-ALL GROUP PRESENTATION*****

Schedule & Goals

2015 Master Plan Update goals presented.

Schedule presented:

- Draft Preliminary Master Plan presented December, 2015
- Preliminary Master Plan presented, February, 2016
- Final Master Plan & Documentation presented, April – September, 2016
- Plan Approval, September 2016 through January 2017

Campus Framework

- Existing campus landscape pattern overlaid with the proposed landscape concept plan that envisions: A more intentional, more connected, more engaged, more natural and more iconic landscape experience and aesthetic throughout campus.

Alternatives: West Campus

- Observatory Hill Concept 1: Prairie & Wetland
 - o Need a small area near residence halls for informal active recreation lawn area
 - o Incorporate sledding potential with this informal active recreation lawn area
- Observatory Hill Concept 2: Restore the Hill
 - o P. Heaslett: Driving over Observatory Hill is the only way many people experience the University, it has a lasting impression, would hate to remove this experience.
 - o J. Grove: Wetland idea and celebrating our water location would be a great engagement opportunity.
 - o P. Heaslett: Why remove traffic all together?
 - S. Szwalek: A more complete restoration and respect to the 12,000 year history, removing modern traces in favor of a more natural experience.
 - o Observatory Drive is the only full east/west connection route through campus.
 - o Removing parking on Observatory and adding bike lanes is supported by the group.
 - o Naturalizing should help reduce maintenance, which is attractive to FPM OM budgets.

Alternatives: Central Superblock

- Central Superblock Concept 1: Linden Quad
 - o Increasing density near Lot 20 is appropriate for staff parking desires and to accommodate the loss of Lot 34.
 - o If we expand parking in this location we will need to provide two points of access.
 - o Mid-block east/west would alleviate the Linden Drive traffic if parking is increased internally.
 - o Large courtyard south of the Greater Mall does not frame the mall, it dilutes the area with more green space.
- Central Superblock Concept 2: Interior Quad
 - o Best overall layout, good use of existing grades and respects the Greater Mall.
 - o The more central the parking the better for the users. Placing parking under the shared green space area is preferred.
 - o McCardle building will be one of the first to be deconstructed. It is currently lightly used and has few occupants.
- Central Superblock Concept 3: Courtyards
 - o From a utilities standpoint, the more streets the better for running utilities.

Alternatives: Charter Street

- North Charter Street
 - o What is envisioned for winter maintenance? Stairs will be closed, the potential to look at metal grating to limit snow accumulation may be possible.
 - o Area needs to provide bike parking at the toe of Observatory Hill in this location
 - o What type of use does this path get in the winter?
 - G. Brown: Minimally used since the Lake Shore Path is not maintained in the winter. Want to limit access down this area as it currently exists in the winter. It is not an adequate walking route.
 - o E. Agnew: Does the stair want to go on the east side of Social Science?
 - G. Brown: The 1966 introduction of Social Science to this area created an upheaval with Muir Woods preservationists. The outcome of this was the 1918 Marsh and an agreement to not develop Muir Woods further.
 - o S. Szwalek: The intent is to make this area safer in a more elegant manner.

Alternatives: Charter/Linden Intersection

- B. Smalkoski: The proposed alternatives are trying to solve transit delays while simultaneously allowing convenient pedestrian movements.
- We just took down a bridge over University Avenue, why are we proposing another bridge?
 - o M. Jukuri: The proposed bridge is more analogous to the existing bridge from Bascom Hill to Humanities. It takes advantage of the grade and is a more natural pedestrian desire path. By connecting the bridge at the general assembly halls to the east and the Greater Mall upper promenade we are gathering a large percentage of the intersection users and removing them from the intersection.
- B. Elvey: With the bridge option, does this mean we are then controlling pedestrian movements at grade?
 - o B. Smalkoski: Not necessarily, since there are low volumes of vehicular traffic on Charter/Linden for most of the day, students will continue to cross whenever.
- The College of Engineering has been consistently studying this intersection and feels a scramble will not resolve the current condition. The low volumes of vehicles are the primary reasoning behind their studies.

Alternatives: South Campus

- Concept 1: Blocks and Courtyards
 - o Enhancing Dayton Street as a campus 'local' street is a positive
 - o If Charter is to become more bike friendly, ensure the connections to existing infrastructure are available. A bike station (similar to Millennium Park) would be best in this area of campus.
- Concept 2: Central Quad on Dayton
 - o Mills Street is a primary north/south in campus, especially for service vehicles.
- Concept 3: Urban Plaza on Johnson
 - o Plan should emphasize buildings along Johnson instead of 'green' space. We know the Granger north plaza is a cold space that is not used heavily. Ensure the first floors of buildings are open and full of glass (similar to WID) to activate the street level.

Alternatives: University Avenue

- Concept 1: Northside Cycle Track
 - o The addition of turn lanes, as requested by the city, will impact Park Street and Randall Avenue intersections along this corridor, we need to see the entire corridor to understand these impacts.
 - o Bikers naturally want to be on this side of the street to make turning movements into campus easier.
 - o More conflicts with the transit stops occur in this concept.
- Concept 2: Southside Cycle Track
 - o This side is preferred by the City of Madison. Connection to the regional bike trail on the west is difficult.
 - o P. Heaslett: Where to bikes turning into campus stack? With thinner lanes the concepts need to accommodate where people wait.

Alternatives: Linden Drive

- o Is there really a need for more greenspace around Willow Creek? There appears to be ample greenspace in the immediate vicinity.

- M. Jukuri: We see this as a defining natural element of the West Campus that could be an iconic campus space. With the projected influx of bodies to this area of campus there is an opportunity to restore the water course, increase biodiversity, enhance education/programming and treat stormwater.
- Does it make sense to focus on the water from campus that comes into Willow Creek? It is 1% of the total watershed, which is primarily an urban residential land use. Would a more cost effective solution be focusing on campus runoff entering the lake directly?
 - M. Jukuri: While we understand the runoff from the upper reaches of Willow Creek are far more detrimental than what enter the creek via UW land, there is a responsibility and desire to address the existing quality of the Creek. It is a unique situation where UW can monitor improvements to stormwater at both a creek and lake perspective simultaneously.
- We need two points of egress to the VetMed Hospital.
- Parking ramp as shown on Lot 60 was to accommodate accessible parking, if the ramp is located further east, the plan needs to accommodate VetMed accessible parking.

Alternatives: West Campus

- Union West is not a viable term in light of the current financial climate. This building will continue to be shown as a 'Mixed-Use' building to accommodate a social need on this end of campus.
- Concept 1: Front Door on Observatory
 - The east/west path is a good connection to the Health Sciences campus from the Lake Shore Path.
- Concept 2: Lakeview Gathering
- Concept 3: Lakefront Gathering
 - Can a beach be implemented in this concept?
 - M. Jukuri: The potential exists when you are creating something this different in the area.
 - This concept could be done in conjunction with the dredging of University Bay, one project to dredge and modify the lake edge.
 - Need to accommodate the boat launch facility with minimal parking, or combine this parking lot within a larger parking area.

End of Minutes

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise comments are assumed to be correct.

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Room 6201 Microbial Science,
UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, September 17,
2015, 8:30-10:00AM

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #3

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

CPSC Members: Seth Blair, Gary Brown, Chris Bruhn, Aaron Crandall, David Drake, Shawn Kaeppler, Jim LaGro, Jesse Markow, Michael Pflieger, Lance Raney, James Skinner, Katharyn VandenBosch*

Invited Guests: Deborah Biggs, Mark Guthier, Bill Elvey, Pete Heaslett, John Horn, Jocelyn Milner, Dan Nelson, Dan Okoli, Jeff Novak, Alex Roe, Kari Sasso, Kate Sullivan, Ralph Turner, Paul Umbeck,

Consultants: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri (SGJR), Brian Smalkoski, Kevin White (KH), Stan Szwalek (HS)

Absent/Excused CPSC Members: Thomas Chitwood, Pamela Herd, Sarah Mangelsdorf, Dave Marcouiller, Trina McMahon, Melanie Meyer, David Noyce, Ian Robertson, James Schauer, Karl Scholz, Petra Schroeder, Bill Tracy

*Meeting Chair

Meeting goal was to present the key area draft alternative concept plans to the Campus Planning Steering Committee for review and input. CPSC members were asked to approve the master plan goals and July 30, 2015 minutes.

Agenda

1. Approve July 30, 2015 minutes ***Action Item***
2. Approve Master Plan Goals ***Action Item***
3. Review and Discuss Draft Alternative Concept Plans

Approve July 30, 2015 Minutes

- Moved by L. Raney, seconded by S. Blare to approve the minutes as presented. Approved unanimously.

Approve Master Plan Goals

G. Brown: Reviewed major goals:

- o Support our mission and the Wisconsin Idea.
- o Managing our resources, both physical and fiscal.
- o Make travel easy; transportation is always important for people, goods and services.
- o Celebrate our lakeside setting; embrace our 4-mile shoreline.

- Revitalize our outdoor space; insure our indoor and outdoor spaces are functional and diverse as well as encourage campus wellness.
- Be Good Neighbors; be transparent and collaborative in our planning efforts by involving our neighbors around us; minimize impacts whenever possible and assume the common good for all.
- Amendment to goal #5f. New objective should read: *“Refine and unite our on-campus neighborhoods by revitalizing both indoor and outdoor civic gathering spaces and utilizing the campus for experiential learning, health, and wellness.”*
- Moved by L. Raney, seconded by S. Blare to approve the 2015 Campus Master Plan goals as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

Review and Discuss Draft Alternatives

M. Jukuri: Presented the overall draft framework plan for the entire campus noting key information consolidated from the data analysis phase and showing how key areas overlap, providing direction for the overall campus master plan.

S. Szwalek: Presented the draft alternatives for the key landscape master plan focus areas:

- Observatory Hill Alternatives: #1 “Prairie & Meadow” and #2 “Restore the Hill”
 - D. Drake: Usability of the wetland does not seem as utilitarian in our climate.
 - C. Bruhn: How is the access accommodated to the La Follette House and Washburn Observatory area?
 - S. Szwalek: On Observatory Drive, the parking numbers will be reduced and the only parking would be at the turn around. Service access to the La Follette House would be maintained but the parking up on the hill likely would be removed and consolidated south of Linden Drive.
 - J. Markow: Where would the bus route be relocated?
 - B. Smalkoski: Down Linden Drive like all the other current bus routes. Only the evening bus route #80 uses Observatory Drive west bound.
 - J. Horn: What is the program use of the hill? Rec Sports would like to see more active recreation opportunities, the hill is heavily used by Liz Waters students.
 - S. Szwalek: The prairie or low grasses would limit this area to more passive recreation, but there could be an area reserved closer to Liz Waters that is a mowed lawn to accommodate this active/informal recreational need.
 - J. LaGro: Removal of Observatory Drive limits the access to alumni and visitors to experience this space. Would prefer to see the drive remain with through traffic east and west.
 - K. VandenBosch: Restoring the resettlement habitats is desirable. How are the prairie and meadow maintained?
 - S. Szwalek: Prescribed burns or mowing would be required; the goal is to reduce overall maintenance and move away from lawns that have to be mowed weekly in this area.
 - What would removal of Observatory Drive mean to Linden Drive traffic?
 - B. Smalkoski: Linden Drive can handle more traffic from a purely numbers standpoint; additional concepts to be shared later today look at ways to redirect some traffic loads and enhance pedestrian use along Linden Drive.

M. Jukuri: Presented Superblock three alternatives: #1 “Linden Quad”, #2 “Interior Quad”, #3 “Courtyards”:

- K. VandenBosch: Our faculty are very familiar with this area and the proposal to replace all the buildings along Linden Dr. east of Henry Mall. How do we marry the masterplan to its execution? Nutritional Sciences program is not a good match for their existing building. The burden and reality of having to raise 50% of new proposed building project funds with implementing aspects of this master plan will be difficult.
 - B. Elvey: the idea of planning is well engrained at UW. It is all about seizing the moment when funds become available and having the plan in place to help guide the proposed development across campus. Those buildings will be replaced; it is a question of when.
 - G. Brown: The next step is the district and college master plans following the overall campus master plan. These departmental master plans do detailed planning to address very specific questions and help direct implementation of specific programming needs.
- C. Bruhn: Is there a proposed replacement parking for the loss of Lot 34 and the loss on Observatory Drive?
 - G. Brown: Yes. In a new structure south of Linden Drive.
- C. Bruhn: Is the building designation of academic or research a hold-over from the 2005 plan?
 - G. Brown: Yes. The title “academic/research” suggests that the proposed buildings could be either academic or research or a mix of the two.
- J. Markow: You are drawing a lot more traffic to this area. How are people getting to this from the east bound traffic on Johnson?
 - G. Brown: Many people in Lot 34 use Charter Street today; not many use the back entry of Walnut or Highland Avenue. So, yes, traffic will increase, but not it is not anticipated to change significantly.
- A. Crandell: Will the interior courtyards be able to be experienced?
 - M. Jukuri: Yes both physically and visually.
- J. Skinner: Are underground walkways anticipated?
 - M. Jukuri: Not considered at this level of the master plan. We typically don’t recommend underground walkways as they are expensive and typically consider unsafe or have a feeling of being unsafe by most users.

S. Szwalek: Presented North Charter Street proposal:

- Changes the asphalt service drive down to the Temin Lakeshore Path to a pedestrian staircase to minimize runoff and erosion problems. No comments

B. Smalkoski: Presented Charter/Linden intersection two alternatives:

- A. Crandall: How would the “pedestrian scramble” work? When the light is red, will students stay put?
 - B. Smalkoski: We could set the timing for 2/3 pedestrian and 1/3 vehicles movements to give more time to the pedestrians; that, however, would impact bus turning movement and scheduling
- K. Vandenbosch: Not convinced compliance will occur and prefer the bridging option
- J. LaGro: Has any data been collected on turning movements and number of pedestrians using the intersection?
 - B. Smalkoski: 2,200 cars and 95 bikes in the 15-minute time period. All recommendations are rooted in the data. Kimley-Horn has reviewed data from Engineering Department studies.

M. Jukuri: Presented South Campus three alternatives:

- #1 “Blocks and Courtyards”
- #2 “Central Quad on Dayton”
- #3 “Urban Plaza on Johnson Street”
- Focused on the insertion of green space in a variety of capacities.
 - D. Drake: Concept 2 and 3 appear to have more connection. Better in an overall sense.
 - R. Turner: What would the UWPD say about green street enhancements from a security perspective:
 - UWPD: Encourage CPTED principles, once we get into the details of the actual landscape design, we will be more interested.
 - G. Brown: Most all plantings will be lower than 18” in height and we would be limbing trees up to maintain view sheds from the street to the sidewalk.
 - UWPD: Making greenspaces and plazas and creating the UW an inviting “living room”, also attracts non-UW people which has pro’s and con’s.
 - B. Elvey: The fact that the city does not require open space for downtown residential development is putting pressure on UW’s spaces. The city is, however, looking at building a new downtown park east of the university to help alleviate this problem.
 - J. Markow: I work in the Ed Science building. Alt 2 is desirable largely for the open space on to Dayton Street and simply just more open. I do not think you’ll be able to close both streets. Brooks Street is more likely for potential closure than Mills Street.
 - J. Lagro: Concept 2 is the strongest; the enhancement to the north side plaza on a busy street is not very usable, i.e. Grainger School is an example of why it doesn’t work. The north plaza is dark, cold, noisy and on a very busy street. No one uses that space.
 - M. Guthrie: Is a green space still shown on the existing Wendt Library site?
 - G. Brown: Yes, and as is shown in the College of Engineering Master Plan.
 - J. Krogmen: Consider that the larger the green space, the more challenging the wifi/networking connectivity is to cover that space and its users.

S. Szwalek: Presented two alternatives for a University Avenue cross section:

- D. Drake: all of the concepts in regard to cycling, do they help Madison move to the next tier of bike friendly community?
 - B. Smalkoski: the protected bike lane will be more desirable to a broader section of users. Right now the city has a pretty high level and rating in being bicycle friendly.
- B. Elvey: We are talking a long timeline to do this since University Ave was recently repaved by the City.
- J. Markow: Is exposure from a winter bicycling standpoint being considered?
 - B. Smalkoski: It is being considered, as only one of the many factors.
- S. Blair: You would think the north side would be more desirable and limit conflicts with bikes.
- K. VandenBosch: Prefers the planted barrier to separate the uses.
- A. Crandall: What would be the proposed width of the two-way bicycle track?
 - B. Smalkoski: 6’ max. per lane, 12’ total curb to curb.
- M. Pflieger: More conflicts in the bike lanes occur with pedestrians than vehicles in my daily commute...south side seems more favorable for locating the dual direction bike lane.

M. Jukuri: Presented Near West two alternatives:

- K. VandenBosch: Like the idea of renovating Willow Creek. Alt 1 with Linden as a pedestrian mall...how does service access function to all the buildings in this area?
 - M. Jukuri: Still need address the service access functions in this area; it is not being suggested as a purely pedestrian mall...vehicle access will need to occur as well and cohabitate with pedestrians.
- J. Markow: I appreciate opening up the block for more greenspace and redeveloped buildings.
- J. LaGro: keeping the function of Linden Drive as a street is more appropriate due to current lack of pedestrian loads. I would put an emphasis on renovating Willow Creek. Is there another way to get access to Vet Med rather than another vehicular bridge over Willow Creek?
 - M. Jukuri: We will continue to explore this and balance if Easterday Drive remains as well as what the openspace offset from the creek should be. The second bridge also does help from a redundancy stand point if there was ever an emergency that closes the bridge on Observatory Drive.
- B. Elvey: We met with the Vet School Dean, Mark Markel on 9/16. His major concerns are how the new buildings will be serviced by their clientele. Parking, large vehicle access, etc. are all very important to their clients. Easy wayfinding is also important.
- J. Horn: The recent RecSports master plan shows we are low on outdoor recreational field space. The new Natatorium will be the hub for both the near west and west fields...so if widening Willow Creek is proposed, we need to be cognizant of this fact as we design the new Natatorium facility. It appears our mid-point bridge will be lost limiting our direct pedestrian access to the west fields.
- D. Drake: Willow Creek is heavily used by wildlife. Fox, raccoon, turtles, birds...once we start introducing more people to the creek area, we need to be cognizant of these potential conflicts.

M. Jukuri: Presented three alternatives for the West Campus:

- J. Skinner: What are the benefits of a combined or separate track/soccer facility?
 - M. Jukuri: Combined, the soccer fans are further from the action; most schools are combining from a purely land availability stand point.
 - B. Elvey: There is not an athletic rep in the room. We do not have a good indication from the Athletic opinion on the combined vs.separate layout for the track and soccer complex. They are not currently thinking about this area due to other higher priority projects.. They are however starting a new Athletics Master Plan that will review the McClimon Track and Soccer complex. We'll be meeting with Athletics soon to share these proposals with them to understand their preference. *(Note: after meeting with Athletics, FP&M staff confirmed that Athletics still prefers separate track and soccer facilities if and when the track needs to move for expansion of the future health science buildings.)*
 - R. Turner: Lot 60 currently has a covered path through the Pharmacy building; please consider this with any new parking structure locations in the area.

G. Brown next steps:

- October 27th public open house #3 has been scheduled to present the alternatives shared at this CPSC meeting.
- The consultant team will be back on December 10, 2015 to share progress on the Draft Master Plan Update and first draft of the overall master plan graphic.FP&M anticipates city approval of the Campus Master Plan toward the end of 2016.

K. VandenBosch adjourned meeting at 10:05AM

End of Minutes

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise comments are assumed to be correct.

Recorder: Aaron Williams, Assistant Campus Planner
UW-Madison Facilities Planning & Management

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Rooms 159 School of
Education, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, December 9,
2015, 1:00-4:00PM

Re: Campus Visit #5, TCC #8
Landscape Work Group
GI/Stormwater Work Group
Transportation Work Group
Utility Work Group

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

Faculty/Guests: John Harrington (DLA), David Liebl (UWEX), Randy Mattison (UWSA), Anita Thompson (BSE), David Trowbridge, Ben Zellers (CoM), Mike Hanson, Kathy Kalscheur, Lisa Pearson (DFD)

FP&M Staff: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Rob Lamppa, Kris Ackerbauer, Julie Grove, Jeff Pollei, Aaron Williams, Rhonda James, Jonathan Bronk, Matt Collins, Marcella Otter, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Kurt Johnson, Ellen Agnew, Pete Heaslett, Harmony Makovec, Marisa Trapp, Doug Rose (FP&M)

Consultants: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Neal Kessler, Eric Schuchardt, Bill Patek, Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin (SGJJR), Mike Skowlund, Stan Szwalek (HS), Kevin Krause, Paul Huettl, Scott Moll (AEI), Brian Smalkoski, Kevin White (KH)

Excused/Absent: Jim LaGro (URPL), John Krogman (DoIT), Drew Beck, Kate Christopherson (CoM), Sam Dennis (DLA), Jeanette Kowalik (UHS), David Marcouiller (URPL), David Noyce, Ken Potter, (CEE) Dan Dudley, Dan Okoli, Rick Weere (FP&M), Alex Roe (UWSA), Beth Reid (DOA), Steve Wildeck (UWEX)

TCC MEMBER-ALL GROUP PRESENTATION A. Williams)*****

Areas of Change (M. Jukuri)

- West Campus
 - o 'Liner' building is moved adjacent to School of Nursing facility
 - o Large parking structure shown to replace lot 60 removal
- Near West Campus
 - o VetMed expansion cuts off circulation across Linden.
 - o There is a 'U' of circulation maintained back into the interior of this area
 - o Give some green space around the horse barn for it to breath and act as a terminus to the Linden Greater Mall on this western end.
 - o Regional bike path shown adjacent to Campus Drive, cutting off Meat and Muscle.
- Superblock

- Lot 20 is envisioned as becoming more efficient, which allowed for the block to be opened up and better bisect the block with transportation.
- South Campus
 - The Design Review Board has always viewed this portion of campus as having no 'there' there.
- Engineering Precinct
 - Parking structure relocation
 - Wendt Library indicated as green space

Engineering master plan and the interaction of the existing 'new' private housing development

G. Brown: The Engineering master plan is aware of this and has planned a 30 year master plan.

Lot 45 building, what is shown?

G. Brown: Shown as academic use, but might become a utility facility.

What is the future of the railroad cutting through the middle of campus. It would be better to not have freight trains cutting through campus.

R. Kennedy: The 50 year lease and the ability to compromise with the railroad makes any change to this area unlikely. It has been planned for future commuter rail with stops at Union South and near Kohl Center.

Would there be a pedestrian connection through the VetMed facility along Linden?

M. Jukuri: At this point in the planned design we can assume there will not be ped. access through.

LANDSCAPE WORK GROUP-TCC #8(G. Brown)*****

Faculty: John Harrington (DLA)

FP&M/DOA/UWSA: Gary Brown, Kris Ackerbauer, Julie Grove, Jonathan Bronk, Ellen Agnew, Harmony Makovec, Lisa Pearson (DOA)

Consultants: Eric Schuchardt, Neal Kessler, Mary Jukuri (SGJR), Stan Szwalek, Shuangsshuang Wu (HS)

Excused/Absent: Sam Dennis (DLA), Dan Okoli (FPM), Alex Roe (UWSA)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Landscape/Open Space Work Group meeting #8 of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project.

Stan S. provided an overview of the draft preliminary landscape master plan (PPT on file).

Comments/Questions:

John H. – overall the “social landscape” type will mix in with the other areas and types of landscapes; prior concepts showed a “rural” landscape – is that still being considered?; Might be able to show the landscape north and west of Ag Hall as more naturalized and as a “meadow landscape” as opposed to mowed lawn.

Kris A. – what does a typical “green street” look like? Can you give us some examples? (Stan provided photo images of prototypical green streets along with cross sections.)

Kris A. – what about the huge rains that we sometimes get? How do green street systems handle those flooding conditions? (Gary noted that we typically design for 100-year storm events when designing stormwater facilities. The high flooding events, 500-year storms like what we had in 2008, are less frequent and will cause street flooding. The challenge is to design for those large flood events so that they do not create significant damage to structures or people.)

“Landscape Typologies” – is this the correct word or do we want to use “landscape character”?

Observatory Hill

Kris A. – how did the students like the plan for oak savannah on the hill and taking away their active recreation areas? (Gary noted that they were actually fine with the proposed changes as long as we kept some green lawn space on the east side near Liz Waters.)

John H. – it would be nice to bleed the oak savannah landscape across and south of Observatory Drive to include the mound landscape. Also would be good to have savannah around Tripp, Adams, Carson Gulley, etc.

Jonathan B. – Is the meadow landscape an alternative to mowed lawn? Can we use no-mow or a mix of fescues and different seed mixes as alternatives to mowed lawn? (Yes – that is the idea. Reduce the amount of bluegrass lawn areas that require regular weekly mowing. We can use a variety of mixes for different that would be selected based on the soil, sun, etc. The plan is to have a native meadow, savannah landscape on Observatory Hill that has shorter grassland species mixed in under oak savannah trees. This maintains the open views from a security standpoint for pedestrians on the sidewalks and trails.)

John H. – different lawn mixes and a meadow mixes, prairies, etc. would allow for more educational uses in a variety of campus departments.

Central Campus

Julie G. and Kris A. – The plan shows parking under the current Humanities building site, correct?? Where and how much? (This is a carryover from the 2005 Campus Master Plan which called for 400 underground parking spaces under the two new buildings planned for this site.)

Mary J. – is this helpful to show the variety of landscape spaces and landscape types?

Julie G. – yes, it is very helpful to give guidance to the departments as they develop new buildings.

Jonathan B. – yes since it gives us some way of making the whole campus more cohesive. It’s also a guideline for smaller landscape projects so they fit in with the overall campus landscape.

Mary J. – what about occupied vs. non-occupied greenroofs? Do we need two categories? Probably could be one category.

Perhaps the courtyard, plaza, terrace could be one category? What do these mean? No lawn? The graphic seems to depict things to literally for the typical viewer.

Jonathan B. – we may want to add a definition for each category in the final written document so we know the distinction between the different types of use.

South Campus

Stan S. – “green alley” spaces are also being reviewed for use in the N. Brooks Street & N. Mills Street area as well as along Engineering Drive. Similar to green streets but in a narrower configuration.

Near West Campus

Jonathan B. – blend the landscape typologies more, especially around the lakeshore residence halls; more naturalized and similar to the lakefront; bring the lakefront landscape into the campus.

Kris A. – Where does the storage space that is currently in the old Horse Barn go when it is converted to a different use? (Gary – unfortunately we don’t get into the details of the programmatic changes to spaces up at the overall Campus Master Plan level. This would be dealt with in detail in the CALS facilities master plan.)

John H. – can the section of Linden Drive/Mall west of Elm Drive have a better pedestrian environment? Yes, surely.

West Campus

Stan S. – We would like to create a better arrival/wayfinding experience for hospital patients and visitors; convert traditional lawns to low mow or meadow landscapes bringing the shoreline landscape into the campus.

Observatory Drive - Prairie and Wetland

Kris A. – we need to make sure the sidewalks, especially on the south side of Observatory Drive, are wide enough for snow plowing. (Again, this kind of detail is not included at the Campus Master Plan level. We will be providing general site design guidelines for use across campus but we are not designing the streetscape along Observatory Drive at this time. We’ll want to look at this when we actually take the parking off the street and reconfigure the street cross-section.)

Ellen A. – Are the sidewalks north of Observatory Drive all paved? (Stan – there likely would be a hierarchy of paving options; some could be crushed stone but the major desire lines would be paved.)

Charter/Linden Intersection

John H. – It would be nice to lower the road if we can but that doesn’t seem possible. The overhead pedestrian connections need to be as direct as possible. Concept one (ie Istanbul landscape bridge) seems to connect everything really well but it might be hard to keep the space under the bridge light and airy.

John H. – what percentage of pedestrian traffic would come off the street if we build the bridge? Seems like it might be a lot but we do know that pedestrians also flow down N. Charter Street toward University Avenue.

Mary J. – the biggest issue is the bus traffic and getting off schedule due to the heavy congestion of pedestrians crossing at this intersection.

Julie G. – We need to add some functions in the new buildings that help draw people to the bridge; lecture halls, sitting areas, food service, etc.

Kris A. – What about the grades in front of Sterling Hall? Can you get up to the bridge coming north on Charter Street? It might be too steep to get over the service drive on the north side of Sterling Hall. (Stan

S. - The hardest part seems to be the design up from the south on Charter Street and how that design works for both pedestrian and vehicles through this space).

Gary B. - It will be important to connect the 2nd floor bridge to the west addition/infill at Ingrham Hall as well.

John H. – Concept 4 seems intriguing but it doesn't seem to address the pedestrian routes needed from the east to the northwest.

University Avenue

Stan S. – the south side combined bike lane tends to be moving forward over the idea for the north side bike lanes; the south side dual bike lane makes it easier to manage the bus stops and for the buses not having to cross the bike lanes.

John H. – What is the minimum width of tree planters on the south side islands? (Stan S. – they will be up to twelve feet wide). John is also concerned with bike traffic in the dual lane bike path and the fact that the bikes will want to go fast in the cycle track which will create a safety issue.

Lisa P. – How do the eastbound bikes cross the westbound bike traffic to turn left and go north into the campus? We need to understand how those turning movements work. (All of the turning movements will need to be reviewed once we actually move forward with a project.)

Jonathan B. – What about the landscape plantings in the street medians? What type of landscape plantings are we suggesting for those areas? (Stan – probably not stormwater plantings but large shade trees to help emphasis the street tree canopy in these areas. The large trees will also do a lot for stormwater management.) Floodplain trees might work. Large trees would be best.

John H. – We'll need to make sure there is enough room (soil capacity wise) for the large canopy trees in those medians.

Stan S. – We want to maintain a 12 ft. sidewalk on each side of the street as well, especially in heavily used areas, to accommodate the heavy pedestrian loads during class change times.

John H. – We need to push for large trees in this corridor; they do so much more than just make things look nice. They help slow traffic, create a sense of campus and help reduce stormwater.

Jonathan B. – With these being city streets, the city arborist will likely demand diversity of tree species in the right of ways of University, Dayton, etc.

Kris A. – For the area around Henry Mall at University Avenue, we still have a problem where Babcock Drive swings off of University Avenue. It is still a pinch point for bikes and vehicles going around the corner, even after it was updated recently.

Lisa P. – We also need to look at the pedestrian crossings especially to the west of Henry Mall. We really can't remove the one that provides access for engineering students to the Babcock Drive, Biochem, and the Ag Hall area to the north and west.

Linden Drive & Willow Creek

John H. – We really need to look at pedestrian access and making sure we are accommodating as much porosity as possible.

John H. – We need to draft guiding principles for the overall campus landscape master plan

- Reduced mowed turf areas.
- Increased large canopy trees and diversity of species.
- Increased stormwater management, rain gardens.
- Important landscapes for support of teaching on campus, etc.

Stan S. – The consultant team will be drafting a preferred species list for campus landscape plantings. FP&M staff will review and provide feedback.

Jonathan B. – Can we be more focuses on ecosystem services when we develop that preferred planting list? Plants should be selected for habit creation, pollinator landscapes, etc.

STORMWATER/GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE-TCC #8 (A. Williams)*****

Faculty: Anita Thompson (BSE), David Liebl (UWEx)

FP&M/DOA/UWSA: Rhonda James, Matt Collins, Marisa Trapp, Aaron Williams (FP&M), Kathy Kalscheur (DFD)

Consultants: Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin, Eric Schuchardt, (SGJRR)

Excused/Absent: Jim LaGro, Ken Potter

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Stormwater/Green Infrastructure Work Group meeting #8 of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project.

D. Wolmut provided an overview presentation of the materials to date:

- Goal is to provide stormwater that people see and is functional to meet permit and campus needs. It may be more aesthetic at times, or more contained (subgrade) in others. SGJRR interested in testing ideas and getting the committees feedback.
- UW does not have a good stormwater map that is specific for the permits.
- Total Permit area=841 Ac
- Non-Exempt Area=499Ac
- M. Collins: We do not have to adhere with Strand's modeling areas since we are creating new maps with updated data.
- South Campus has been added to the SLAMM model. The streets have been broken out and are not included in the numbers.
- Storm Sewer Outfall/Basin Mapping
 - o Primarily showing pipe outfall.
- Source Areas
 - o Total Impervious Areas=306Ac
- Best Management Practices
 - o 2008 Neilson Pond, Street sweeping (primary reduction method), Lot 34 bioswale,

- 2015 Added a number of practices that have been done since. Green roofs are not included.
 - SLAMM can model green roofs from a volume reduction standpoint, not a sediment reduction standpoint
- M. Collins: A large portion is by street sweeping. There are mechanical, vacuum and high suction sweepers. Streets are assumed as mechanical sweepers. DNR currently doesn't allow you to take credit for a 'street' that doesn't have curbs (i.e. parking structures do not count). UW should get credit for these facilities since they are swept regularly.
- Sheet flow erosion is not accounted for currently. DNR does not allow any credit for bank stabilization. It assumes everything is in a stable condition. Curve number of forested steep slopes are exempt in the SLAMM model (presettlement).
- Liebl identified the central lawn of Bascom Hill as a site for infiltration of roof water from adjoining (up-gradient) buildings via sub-surface drain fields. This would require an investigation of subsurface soils (no borings are known to exist); Identifying conflicts with buried utilities; Plumbing the roof drains from adjoining buildings; Outreach about the project goals.
- GI Enhancement Opportunities
 - Areas where major redevelopment is occurring.
- Redevelopment Evaluation-Site by Site Basis
 - Lot 60, 2500 lbs of sediment per year coming off the site.
 - Lot 60, redevelop with 40% removal (80% TSS reduction) we get 1200 lbs per year.
 - Every new campus project should meet the 80% TSS reduction requirement (city is 80% reduction over the existing)
- HydroCAD Model
 - Indicates rate and volume
 - We should identify the outfalls that are undersized or where high volumes are occurring and determine what flow attenuation practice could be implemented.

'Multi-Site' GI Opportunities

- Areas where we can use multiple sites to implement a GI practice
- Area 'A'
 - Lot 76 currently drains into the Lot 60 ponds
 - VA area, not owned/operated by the UW, but in our permit area which UW is responsible for. This area goes back through the Willow Creek section.
- Area 'B'
 - Wetland on the west side of the Willow Creek. SGJJR has looked at wetland on the east side, but requires more space and moving the creek to the west does not pan out from a cost/benefit stand point.
 - ***What are the uses of the Willow Beach parking lot, can this area become a GI facility?
 - Can we treat a portion of Observatory Drive on the west side of the Natatorium?
 - Linden Drive proposed to have green street practices integrated.
 - Dairy Barn, everything to the south and west goes to the sanitary

- Meat Science parking lot is disconnected from a drainage stand point north to the Dairy Barn due to a large steam line bisecting the area.
- West athletic fields
- ***Where does water go at the cross connection at Observatory and Elm and at Linden Elm?
- Minimum capture 40%, size indicated currently.
 - M. Collins, please recommend what it is solving. It is worth running the model on it. Is it just for the sediment and P, or for infiltration? Infiltration is difficult due to ground water and soil conditions.
 - ***M. Collins to get soil borings for around DeJope to SGJJR for modeling BMP
- Grass swales along Observatory Drive? It would be possible to assign 'other' projects to contribute to grass swales to compensate when they cannot meet the requirements.
 - Each project is its own set of stormwater credits, rather than amassing a large sum of money to do something big.
- Conflict issues. Pervious pavement bicycle lanes in this area that are raised might make some sense in this area.
- Pervious pavement. It isn't just the pavement, it is the system underneath and the correct construction is critical.
- Any benefit to having a more ag related BMP in the Dairy Barn location?
- Area 'C'
 - Lot 34, what can we effectively treat? What does this get us?
 - Could pick up the storm system off of Babcock Drive, the Residence Halls, Observatory Hill...can treat about 16 AC
 - Potential to grab some of roof water from Tripp/Adams.
 - Superblock
 - Partial infiltration and partial underground storage
 - Using the GI BMP to reduce some of the capacity that currently goes into the Orchard Street 'super' pipe that drains to Monona Bay
- Area 'D'
 - Green Streets not in our permit area
 - Brooks Street large elliptical pipe could be picked up and treated in the Dayton Street quad.
 - SGJJR to look further into infiltrating above utilities and dealing with chlorides in the R/W.

Adaptive Management if UW can safely show an on campus reduction of 40%, should UW even join adaptive management?

***There needs to be a recommendation in the master plan about who is responsible for maintaining aspects of BMPS.

TRANSPORTATION WORK GROUP-TCC #8 (R. Kennedy) *****

City: David Trowbridge, Ben Zellers (CoM)

FP&M: Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy,

Consultants: Brian Smalkoski (KH)

Excused/Absent: David Marcouiller, David Noyce (UW), Drew Beck, Kate Christopherson (CoM), Brian White, Emily Moser, Jeffrey Smith, Matt Horton, William Reynolds (KH)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Transportation Work Group meeting #8 of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project.

- “Bike Priority Street”? Check what that means and why only one on Linden Drive by Elm Drive.
- Include commentary about why Linden Drive cannot be closed since it was recommended in the 2005 Master Plan.
- Don’t like “play” street. Develop alternative to describe proposal for Dayton.
- Eliminate intersection cross section for University Avenue.
- Provide more space to west for design of University Ave. cycle tracks to show intersection with Breese Terrace.
- Describe how a 10’ wide cycle track for two-way bike traffic will work for passing situations and otherwise answer concerns for ‘bikers’ wanting a wider track.
- Advanced green for bikes desired on cross streets.
- “Proposed two-way conversion” for Charter Street added to legend.
- N-S connection at street Brooks/Mill should be explored for pedestrians—mall opportunity.
- Describe rationale for new NS and EW streets in super block. Emphasize it as a driveway for the new parking structure(s) and pedestrian/bike circulator, not a motor vehicle route.
- Delete Far West on Slide 35.

UTILITIES WORK GROUP-TCC #8 (J. Pollei) *****

FP&M/UWSA: Jeff Pollei, Rob Lamma, Rick Were, Kurt Johnson, Pete Heaslett (FP&M), Randy Mattison (UWSA), Mike Hanson (DFD)

Consultants: Bill Talbert, Brian Stiklestad, Paul Huettl (AEI)

Excused/Absent: Dan Dudley (FP&M), John Krogman (DoIT), Keven Krause, Mike Broge, Scott Moll (AEI)

This is Technical Coordinating Committee Utilities Group meeting #8 of the 2015 Campus Master Plan project.

MECHANICAL:

- UW FP&M indicated there seems to be a pinch point in pipe capacity in the steam and chilled water piping distribution through the Engineering Campus.
- The chilled water plant dispatch order was discussed. UW FP&M indicated the plants are dispatched in the following order with approximate capacity.
 1. WCCF Expansion – 10,000 tons
 2. WCCF Existing – 10,000 tons
 3. Charter Street (CSHP) – 26,000 tons
 4. Walnut Street (WSHP) – Peaking with either steam or electric chillers depending on electric demand
- The current differential pressure on the chilled water system is 30-31 psi on a peak day.
- How the chilled water flow model should be set up was discussed. The following was agreed upon between UW FP&M and AEI.
 1. WCCF Expansion and Existing should be based on fixed flow

2. CSHP should be based on pressure differential
 3. WSHP should be set to the remainder of the flow required
- A total of 75,000 lb/hr of low pressure steam has been distributed to campus from the Charter Street Plant on a peak day.
 - There seems to be a pinch point in pipe capacity in the high pressure steam piping distribution in the Health Sciences Super Block.
 - How the steam flow model should be set up was discussed. The following was agreed upon between UW FP&M and AEI.
 1. WCCF and WSHP should be set to provide 300,000 lb/hr of steam to the system
 2. CSHP should make up the remainder of the required steam flow
 - UW FP&M asked AEI to check and see if superheat is accounted for in the steam model.

RENEWABLE:

- University's current wind energy purchase contract of 15% of campus electricity runs through 2020. Cost to the UW system is approximately \$3.7M/yr with approximately 50% of that for Madison.
- Revise terminology associated with biomass to 'defunded' from 'rejected'
- Consider MG&E's new renewable energy standards that include specific targets for renewable energy contributions.
- Consider including an economic sensitivity analysis that identifies the utility cost threshold that achieves the minimum payback. The State currently requires a 10 year simple payback for projects.
- Refine the 'new' building list to identify which buildings are actually new or where existing to be renovated will accommodate renewables. Remove buildings from map and calculation that may not be applicable (i.e. Cogen Chiller Expansion has limited roof, greenhouses, etc.)
- Change label on 'Wind' component to 'Purchased Wind' so it is clear that it is not on-campus renewable.
- The current blended virtual electricity rate for the University is approximately \$0.09/kWh. Major efficiency projects are largely complete and demand limiting control strategies are used.

ELECTRICAL:

- AEI and UW FP&M (Rick Werre and Kurt Johnson) started to discuss electrical deficiencies. Future meeting to be scheduled to further advance list. It is encouraged UW FP&M start creating a list for future meeting.
- Reviewed One-Line diagram. It was noted that Dayton Street Substation was not completed. Rick Werre to send drawing of configuration of Dayton Street Substation to AEI to incorporate (Information was received from Rick on 12/15/2015).
- After information on Dayton Street Substation is updated in One-Line Diagram, a hard copy will be sent to Rick Werre and Kurt Johnson to review for any additional information that should be included for final delivery.

End of Minutes

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise comments are assumed to be correct.

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: WARF Rm. 132, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, November 19,
2015, 2:00-3:30PM

Re: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

Attendees:

on-call: Mary Jukuri, Stan Szwalek, Shuangshuang Wu(HS), Brian Smalkoski (KH), Jeff Pollei (FP&M), Beth Reid (UWSA), Alexandra Roe (DOA)

In person: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Matt Collins, Jonathan Bronk, Rhonda James, Aaron Williams (FP&M), Scott Moll, Paul Huettl (AEI), Dave Wolmutt (SGJJR)

Agenda:

Introduction: (M. Jukuri)

- Materials sent today are all of the in-progress work. Use today's meeting to go over the campus wide systems and spend some time on the focus areas. In preparation for TCC #8 and Campus Visit #5 (December 9-10).
- Want TCC group leader feedback. Major aspects that are missing or going down the wrong path. Graphics all need to be polished and refined from their current state.

Campus wide map showing building footprints and locations. (M. Jukuri)

- New humanities complex.
- Parking and arts lofts.
- South of Grainger block.
- CoE campus master plan.
- Superblock modifications.
- Biotron site modifications.

Landuse map: (M. Jukuri)

- SGJJR has not changed the land use assumptions from the 2005 master plan.
 - o Black: existing buildings.
 - o Blue: buildings have been modified (shape/sf).
 - o Orange: new buildings to the 2015 plan.
- 2005: net addition of 6.5M sf.
- 2015: net addition of 7M sf.
 - o Showing at least as much capacity, SGJJR are comfortable being within 5-10%

- ***SGJRR break out what our available future capacity is with the 2015 CMP.

Landscape Master Plan (S. Szwalek)

- Concept Diagram to help organize the framework of the
 - Working landscape: characteristic of stormwater management, natural areas, less lawn.
 - ***Is this based on APPA Grounds Levels?
- Overall Plan
 - Social Landscapes: iconic spaces, Bascom Hill.
 - Working Landscapes: Ag gardens, stormwater areas.
 - Natural landscapes: Preserve, etc.
 - Active Landscapes: Rec/athletic Fields, events.
 - Way to organize site design guidelines and landscape standards.

Green Infrastructure (D. Wolmutter)

- Enhancement Strategy
 - Working with HS to determine the best locations to meet stormwater goals
- Multi-Site Treatment Opportunities
 - VA area is being considered because they feel a cooperative agreement might be appropriate.
- VA land
 - VA is included in UW's permit area.
 - If we had a quantifiable number we could give to the VA it might help us with the DNR. By definition of the permit they should not be part of our permit. Their water goes directly to the city's system.
 - ***Gary, Matt, Rhonda, Bill meet with VA on this topic.
 - UW would need to push the VA to do things in this area. UW would not take on this and would not pay for it, but would receive the credit in the COM's eyes.

Parking/Traffic (B. Smalkoski)

- ***G. Brown, A. Williams to meet to discuss parking meeting outcomes.
- Street Network
 - Vacate Lorch Street
 - On triangle block, only if no existing or proposed buildings are on the site, Lorch is required for loading and access purposes.
 - Vacate Easterday Street
 - Only if the plans indicate something between the proposed VetMed and Willow Creek. Indicate plaza with stormwater feature.
- Transit Operations
- Parking
 - Knowing there is a shortage of visitor parking on campus, where can it be added.
 - Park+ model indicates where district shortages are and helped define where the best locations should be positioned.
 - Establishing target ratios or parking per square footage based on the different user groups on campus.
- Lot 60, 1311 spaces.
 - Proposed ramp on West Campus removes the liner buildings to create a 1500 stall ramp.
 - Allows for the removal of parking at BioTron.

- ***The liner building on the parking structure was the only Health Science growth area, where does this go? What sf of the 'union' building can be allocated for the Health Sciences, the 'union' does not need to be on the size/scale of Union South or MU.
- The entire greenhouse planning to date is assuming the BioTron remains. If BioTron is taken the greenhouse plan would have to accommodate for this research use.
 - ***A. Williams to get consultant team latest Greenhouse plans

Utilities: (S. Moll)

- Analysis is two-fold
 - Documenting the existing, AEI is comfortable with making informed decisions going forward.
 - Analysis of new buildings is currently beginning
 - Renewable energy analysis.
 - Engineering campus is a good space to showcase new technologies integrated into new facilities.
 - Public perception: what can UW do to showcase select renewable energy items?
 - We are looking at the roof tops of garages for PV.
- Looking at a garage south of the NAT, does potential for geothermal exist?
- Geothermal under Athletic fields?
 - Has to be a unique reason because it doesn't coordinate well within the campus system.
- CoGen facility?
 - We have been put on hold until 2016 when we determine the fate of our existing power plants.
 - West Campus CoGen facility. UW provides the operation and equipment, MGE handles the distribution and control of the power creation.
 - UW operates the CoGen plant with MGE and the State.
 - Charter and Walnut has a contract between the State and MGE that dictates how UW can/cannot use the energy.
 - MGE is directed from the Midcontinent Independent System Operator...MISO Energy.
 - ***summarize questions we've received on the CoGen/power questions...send to Bill for his and Faramarz review/reply.

Campus wide Systems:

1. Observatory Hill
 - a. Does the facility on Lot 32 need to be this large?
 - b. Appears to drain directly to the lake?
2. Central Superblock
 - a. One way northbound for a portion on the new north/south extension street?
3. North Charter Street
 - a. HS to take another pass at this area based on truck traffic, ADA parking.
 - b. Bridge options presented, creative thinking is good, need to pull back on quantity.
4. South Campus
5. University Avenue
 - a. Proposed cycle track on the south side. UW has not directed the team that this is the final, preferred location. UW to advise on direction after PBMVC and Joint Southeast meeting.

6. Linden Drive/Willow Creek
 - a. Need to show the new Linden drive as a road, not a pedestrian only
 - b. ***send them information on the south access drive for the parking deck
7. West Campus
 - a. With the large parking deck it appears Walnut and the new east/east street should continue on three sides for ingress/egress.

Schedule

-

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: 30 N. Mills, Lake Room, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, Feb 10, 2016,
10:00-12:30PM

Re: Technical Coordinating Committee
Leaders Meeting #9

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

Attendees:

on-call: Jon Hoffman, Eric Schuchardt (SGJR), Shuangshuang Wu, Stan Szwalek (HS), Kevin White, Matt Horn (KH)

In person: Gary Brown, Rob Kennedy, Dan Okoli, Rhonda James, Aaron Williams, Matt Collins (FP&M), Dave Wolmutter (SGJR), Scott Moll, Paul Huettl (AEI)

Two levels of materials

- TCC Leads information
- Review for outside of Webex, single discipline calls set up occurring in the next couple days...materials for those meetings

Agenda:

- Aerial Oblique Illustrations
- Landscape/Open Space
- Green Infrastructure
- Transportation/Parking
- Utilities
- Phasing & Sequencing
- February 24 TCC Meeting – format, preparations

TO DO:

***simplified plant palette

***cultivars vs. natives

- Aerial Oblique: demonstrate recommendations in the master plan and set a character for the plan.
 - o Observatory Hill
 - Graphic resolution to allow zooming into sections of each graphic

- Separate building colors a little better to differentiate proposed/existing/neighborhoods, same for master plan graphic
- Willow Creek
 - Same comments
- South Campus
 - Same comments

Landscape/Open Space

- Need the 'Overall Vision' / Theme / Name
- Slide 5
 - Highlight or show campus boundary
 - Proposed buildings should read the same between illustrations and master plan graphic
 - Master plan graphic: existing buildings white
 - Illustrations: existing buildings grey
 - No trees on Highland in the R/W
- Slides 8-12
 - Defined edges to provide a Cue for Care. Organize for average viewer and assist maintenance staff in definition
 - Prefer edges to be more natural where appropriate, urban areas could be more architectural
- Slides: Transportation
 - Arterial Streets
 - 30' street tree planting, 8' terraces
 - ***Check types: Arterial, Neighborhood, Green (rename: streetscapes)
 - ***Differentiate University Ave/Johnson Ave
 - Neighborhood Streets
 - Ex: R/W is 62 or 66
 - Want to show wider sidewalks than the R/W will allow
 - ***Show R/W line to show that the sidewalk may extend over R/W line
 - Green Streets
 - No infiltrating, simply slowing runoff, treating and taking back to stormsewer
- Slides: Focus Areas
 - Observatory Hill
 - ***Parking in front of Liz Waters
 - Charter Linden Bridge
 - ***FP&M to comment (tree monoculture, bridge buried, skinny walks, streetscape rails)
 - University Ave
 - ***Is stacking space enough, left turn onto Lake
- Slide 34: Henry Mall Crossing
 - West bound Old University bike lane
 - ***need to show Lorch Drive
 - ***crossing movements, not convinced it will work
 - ***FP&M/trans to meet on this discussion separately
- Slide 36: South Campus Quad
 - ***Street Names, differentiate new/proposed buildings

- Slide 39
 - o Graphic: bike lanes, no bollards, trees blow out everything
- Slide 41: Near West Campus
- Slide 43: Graphic
 - o Creek stairs, bridge

Stormwater and Green Infrastructure

- ***only showing permit only...need to also show south campus area as a separate number, but visually combinable to the view
- ***Green roofs are considered impervious...do we want a separate number for Green roofs
- Permit Area
 - o Phosphorus control (TMDL compliance)
 - o TSS control
 - o Volume reduction/groundwater recharge priority
 - o Larger scale features than the more 'site' specific south campus features
 - o ***Green Roofs: need a specific recommendation about how we should look at green roofs going forward understanding they do not 'help' us meet TMDL compliance or TSS control.
 - o Observatory Hill
 - 3,700 lbs/yr more is the anticipated capture
- South Campus (non-permit area)
 - o Volume reduction
 - o Peak discharge Control
 - o TSS control from R/W areas (cooperation w/city)
- Modeling Results
 - o 187,690 lbs/yr existing yield>>>MP BMP's integrated>>>81,171 lbs/year to be covered by Adaptive Management
 - o Need to get to a 72% reduction
 - SGJR showing we can get 55% reduction on campus
 - o ***Pervious vs. Impervious Now and Future Graphic

Long-Range Transportation Plan

- ***Linden Dr as a 'Bike Priority Street'
- New route through the Superblock
 - o Accessing parking is primary role of new proposed streets
 - o Will this have the look and feel of a traditional street?
- End of Trip Facilities
 - o Integrate landscape buffers
 - o Promote high capacity racks
- ***Gary, Trans, Kimley Horn
- Charter Street Bridge
 - o Bridge feasibility at Willow Creek
 - Needed to prove there was no alternative to putting a new bridge, prove there is no floodplain impacts, or backup.
 - DNR contact: There is no wetlands in this area currently

Utilities & Renewable Energy Update

Feb 24 meeting 1-4PM

- Meeting all together from 1-1:30
- Admin group will meeting
- Utilities group will not meet, Utilities group members will meet within the next month

Phasing/Sequencing

- SGJJR/FP&M need to address in a call off-line

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: 30 N. Mills, Lake Room,
UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Wednesday, April 13, 2016
10:30-12:00 noon

Re: Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting #11

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

In person: Gary Brown, Dan Okoli, Matt Collins, Rhonda James, Jonathan Bronk, Jim LaGro, John Harrington, Marcella Otter, Ellen Agnew, Kris Ackerbauer, Julie Grove, Aaron Williams (FP&M), Jon Hoffman, Dave Wolmutt, Cassie Goodwin, Eric Schuchardt (SGJR), Stan Szwalek (HS)

Joint TCC Meeting: Landscape & Green Infrastructure

Agenda:

- *Vision and Guiding Principles*
 - *Landscape*
 - *Green Infrastructure*
- *Master Plan Land Use Impacts*
- *Campus Landscape Plan*
- *Open Space Design Guidelines*
- *Streetscape Design Guidelines*
- *Green Infrastructure Opportunities*

S. Szwalek began by setting a vision for the landscape at UW in the coming decades

D. Wolmut presented green infrastructure objectives and major recommendations.

G. Brown: What are green roofs considered?

D. Wolmut: Green roofs to contribute in the small storm events only, not larger events

J. LaGro: The typologies are not very useful from a design guideline standpoint and putting these large areas into silos doesn't get at the multifunctional nature of these spaces...or the multi-functions they can perform if they currently do not.

J. Harrington: Many of the areas lie in multiple typologies, things overlap. How do you create design guidelines that speak to this very real condition?

S. Szwalek: Typologies were intended for APPA maintenance levels and to show the university where these typologies physically are located on the campus.

J. LaGro: The typologies are very appropriate for APPA maintenance level. Design Guidelines are different than Maintenance Guidelines. No discussion of social/ecological function?

J. Bronk: Do we want to talk about our landscapes to touch on ecosystem service benefits?

C. Goodwin: We discuss habitat in the green infrastructure component of the plan.

J. LaGro: These areas focus on plants, but nothing about pedestrian experience/design...would like to see greater emphasis on the pedestrian system. Nothing is addressing the ground plan? Are there locations for special paving or other methods to enhance the user experience?

G. Brown: They are developing plaza recommendations, streetscape (including sidewalk) recommendations, amenities, and pavements.

J. LaGro: The Open Space guidelines has a longer list...to include transportation related guidelines...are we discussing the non-vehicular zones. Open space is very much about the pedestrian experience.

J. LaGro: Are you recommending dimensions on the tree terrace widths?

S. Szwalek: We will be recommending 8' terrace widths, and up to 1200 cubic feet of soil/tree.

D. Wolmut: GI practices need to not only function, but be visible and prominent to the public.

J. Hoffman: The visibility of the west ponds will be drastically improved with the placement of green spine between the hospital and lake.

D. Wolmut: Near East underground treatment. Balance social/recreational use with treatment capabilities.

J. Harrington: The less lawn the better. Apply throughout campus...if you don't need lawn, take it out.

C. Goodwin: There are maintenance concerns with underground detention...beyond the more costly expense. We are looking at these regional opportunities. The superblock may have something underground where it is taking the larger area, that is not visible, but marrying this with an above ground-visible option.

J. LaGro: Important to make GI visible for public to learn about how we are being sustainable. I am in favor of a multi-level approach from signage to digital to inform people. There are economic benefits to an effective messaging of these facilities. A cost benefit analysis may show gifts are increased to GI facilities if they are branded/messaged well. Do a featured article in the Alumni Magazine on green infrastructure on campus.

J. Grove: The reason we do small, site scale detention chambers is the cost...project have to pay for these and often very little is earmarked for such expense.

K. Ackerbauer: Are the underground storage facilities designed to be easily cleaned out.

D. Wolmut: There are design approaches to make cleaning easier...they are typically considered 'confined access' structures. You can make it easier, but it will always involve a higher level of maintenance than say a detention pond or rain garden.

J. Bronk: Willow Creek feels more separate from the stormwater to the east...why is everything located on the west side if all the pipes are coming in from the east?

D. Wolmut: The indicated wetlands and the creek are both separate systems. They will not be connected, but feel they need to read as one system. Design development will help further define this area.

M. Collins: bottom line you are not trying to treat the water in willow Creek, you are trying to treat water prior to entering the creek.

J. LaGro: Email from 4/12/16, questioning why there was nothing on Bascom Mall?

D. Wolmutt: We do not have a specific graphic for Bascom Mall. There are a lot of unknowns, and agree it is important that opportunities be looked at. The overall recommendations indicated 'improved conveyance/volume reduction'.

S. Szwalek: The recommendations for the area between the buildings and the sidewalk.

J. LaGro: We also need to address the concrete runnel on the inside of the walk. Get rid of the paved existing slues.

D. Wolmut: We are looking at recommendations about how to put things back (after major infrastructure/utility projects) in a more appropriate manner. Should we be replacing concrete with concrete...are there alternatives to routing. Our final report will have more site specific recommendations, while today we focused on broader scale recommendations.

J. Hoffman: The utility master plan was not discussed today. Lathrop is the most prominent and there are plenty of other projects coming along.

G. Brown: Bascom Hill and Lathrop Drive are both large project coming along. They are currently beginning in '17-'19.

J. LaGro: Lathrop Drive does not function well as a pedestrian environment.

M. Collins: Funding. We need a stormwater fund that is assigned to projects, and if a project does not have space then it goes into a regional system. We'd like to talk to Ken Dvorak to see where the money goes.

Follow-up/Tasks:

1. How is Urban Agriculture considered?
2. Send TCC #10 minutes to all TCC members. GB needs to approve