

2015 UW-Madison Campus Master Plan Update

Campus Planning Committee

REV: 6/19/15

First	Last	Title	Representing
Marwa	Bassiouni	Program Specialist	Academic Staff Representative
Seth	Blair	Professor	University Committee
Chris	Bruhn	Assistant Dean	CLS
Derrick	Buisch	Professor	Humanities
Thomas	Chitwood	Student	ASM
Margaret	Conklin	Asst. to the Dean of COE	College of Engineering
David	Drake	Associate Professor	UW Arboretum Representative
Bill	Elvey	Assoc Vice Chancellor	Facilities Planning & Management
Mary	Erickson	Asst. to the Chancellor	Chancellors Office
Beth	Hart	Asst. to the Dean	L&S Office
Pamela	Herd	Professor	Committee on Women
Eden	Inoway-Ronnie	Asst. to the Provost	Provost
Shawn	Kaeppler	Professor	Biological Sciences
Therese	McHenry	Asst. to the Dean	CALS
Peggy	Leister	Administration	Academic Affairs
Sarah	Mangelsdorf	Provost	Campus Planning Committee Chair
Jesse	Markow	Researcher	Recreational Sports Board
Trina	McMahon	Professor	Environmental Representative
Melanie	Meyer	Student	ASM (alternate)
David	Noyce	Professor	College of Engineering
Linda	Oakley	Professor	University Committee
Michael	Pflieger	Assistant Dean	Information Technology Committee
Gary	Pine	Supervisor Buildings/Ground	Classified Staff Representative
Julie	Schram	Asst. to the Dean	CALS
James	Schauer	Professor	Physical Sciences
John Karl	Scholz	Dean	Letters & Sciences
Bill	Tracy	Professor	Campus Transportation Committee
Katharyn	Vandenbosch	Dean	College of Ag & Life Sciences
David	Weimer	Professor	Social Sciences



2015 Campus Master Plan Update

AGENDA

Campus Planning Steering Committee Meeting #1 March 26, 2015 8:40-10:00AM Room 159 Education Building

1. Introduction to the Campus Master Planning Team (5 min)
2. Exercise: “The Master Plan Update will be successful if...” Report Back (10 min)
3. Intro to Campus Master Planning Process - components, schedule, committee structure (10 min)
4. Master Plan Update Coordination with Other University Plans (5 min)
5. Campus and Community Communications (10 min)
6. Exercise: Preserve, Enhance, Transform (20 min)
7. Exercise: Master Plan Goals Review/Prioritization (20 min)
8. Next Steps

*****Come Prepared to Discuss the Following*****

The consultants would like you to think about the following statement, “*The Campus Master Plan will be successful if...*” 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

Please forward your list via email to Aaron Williams at awilliams@fpm.wisc.edu by 12:00 noon on Tuesday, March 24, 2015 so we can synthesis the responses for discussion at the March 26 meeting.

NEXT MEETING: JULY 30, 2015 – 8:30 AM to 10:00 AM (Room TBD)

Facilities Planning & Management

9th Floor WARF Building 610 Walnut Street Madison, Wisconsin 53726-2397
(608) 263-3000 FAX (608) 265-3139

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

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, March 26, 2015,
8:30-10:00AM

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #1

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

Faculty/Staff: Marwa Bassiouni, Seth Blair, Derrick Buisch, Sarah Mangelsdorf, Jesse Markow, Linda Oakley, Michael Pflieger, Gary Pine, James Schauer, Karl Scholz, Kyle Schroeckenthaler, Katharyn Vandenbosch, David Weimer,

Invited Guests: Luis Fernandez, Mark Guthier, Mike Warren, Kari Knutson, Scott McKinney, Jocelyn Milner, Jeff Novak, John Link, Ralph Turner, Sarah Van Orman, Mark Wells

FP&M: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Teresa Adams, Doug Rose, Margaret Tennesen, Pete Heaslett, John Hahn, Rob Kennedy, Rick Lane, Andrew Howick, Chris Gluesing, Alex Roe, Andrea Stoffel, Deborah Biggs, Doug Sabatke, Paul Umbeck, Dan Okoli

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

The meeting was called to order at 8:30AM

Campus Planning Committee order of business:

- Approval of November 20th minutes.
- B. Elvey presentation on budget implications going forward

Campus Master Plan – Gary Brown

- 18-24 month process to create a guiding document, every 10 year process (2005, 1995)
- 2005 was primarily a capacity plan, “when do we need think about moving pieces around”
- 2005 we’ve completed 35% of the building recommendations
- 2005 we had 225 public meetings, please encourage. April 28-May 1
- 2015 master plan is a complimentary piece, focused on the spaces around buildings.

Campus Master Plan Introduction/Interaction – Mary Jukuri

Introduced a list of results from “The Master Plan will be Successful If...” emailed out previously to all participants at the meeting.

- Vision:
 - o Articulate goals
 - o Demonstrate of these goals translate into innovation, vision, concepts
 - o Offer a flexible blueprint and framework
 - o Do our near term projects match our long term goals
- Academics and Research
 - o Confirm and expand upon future building sites from the 2005 plan
 - o Future flexibility for a range of instructional spaces
 - o Support the increase in STEM disciplines
 - o Address aging research labs and infrastructure against modern research
- Campus Assets
 - o Enhance and maintain a sense of place
 - o Preserving historic and cultural resources
 - o Maintain a campus wide network of greenspaces
 - o Confirm the campus boundaries and acquiring properties internal to the campus
- Resources
 - o Wise use of resources
 - o Upgrade utilities master plan
 - o Manage stormwater

Process and Timeline

- Leadership Team (Chancellor, advisors, Mayor of Madison, Shorewood Hills rep)
 - o CPSC (the steering committee that will give campus wide holistic campus guidance)
 - o TCC (look at the working issues, broken into 5 subgroups)
 - Open Houses ,Focus Groups, Community Meetings, Online Discussion
- Static main website + Town Hall website
- Project Schedule (24 month process with 6 steps)
 - o City approval required at the end of this process to receive new zoning (last 6 months)
- SGJJR will be analyzing data over the next 3 months + what was learned from CV#1

This is an update...this process is starting with a strong foundation

EXERCISE #1 (dots): Preserve, Enhance, Transform

- PRESERVE-RED: Areas of campus that are functioning well and should be maintained and improved
- ENHANCE-YELLOW: Areas of campus that have good potential, but need significant improvements
- TRANSFORM-BLUE: Areas of campus that are challenging and need to be completely rethought

EXERCISE #1 HIGHLIGHTS

- Red Dots
 - o Lakeshore Preserve, Lake Shore Path, Chazen Area, Bascom Hill, Ag Hall, Camp Randall Park/Stadium, Lakeshore Dorms, Rec Fields,
- Yellow Dots
 - o Highland Ave intersection is difficult for the hospital and wayfinding, Observatory Drive corridor, West Rec Fields
- Blue Dots
 - o Lot 60, Van Hise, Medical Building, Block south of Granger...sidewalks undersized-west of this block is not very flexible

- Intersection at Charter and Observatory/Linden
- Van Hise has no sprinklers...in the same category as Humanities...Cabreeny Green of the campus
- Congestion during passing time at Charter/Linden and Observatory...this intersection feels the most urban of campus...highest congregation of undergraduate students

EXERCISE #2 (dots): 2005 Master Plan Goals

- Green dots on goals setup in 2005 that should be focused on for this update
- What goals have been achieved?
- Is there a topic missing?
- A lot of dots on the Goal #2 (Academics) and Goal #4 (Buildings and Design Guidelines) and Goal #6 (Transportation and Circulation)
- Maintain 13K parking spaces was mentioned, what is the appropriate carry capacity
- Buildings and Design, a number of comments about teaching and learning flexibility
- Decreasing the boundaries between education and research work
- Student Life-on campus housing spaces has been completed along with renovating Union Spaces
- Focus more on programming of existing spaces and less on adding new buildings
- Connecting Near West with rest of campus
- Ensuring building design includes safety best practices
- Creating spaces that enhance human well-being
- Provide better winter weather pedestrian option
- Designing transportation system to enhance

OTHER

- need to understand the places where we live, work and play...need a variety
- Can we do something with the old Hospital site?

End of Minutes

Meeting was completed at 10:05AM. 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.



WISCONSIN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

AGENDA

Campus Planning Steering Committee Mtg. #2

July 30, 2015

8:30 to 10:00 a.m.

Wisconsin Idea Room (Rm 159) Education Building

1. Approval of March 26, 2015 minutes (Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting #1)
2. Campus Master Plan
 - a. Master Plan Goals (draft)
 - b. What We Heard
 - c. Summary of Campus Analyses
 - Buildings and Land Use
 - Landscape and Open Space
 - Green Infrastructure
 - Transportation and Parking
 - Utilities
 - d. Framework Plan
 - e. Next Step

Upcoming 2015 Meeting Dates:

September 17 – Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting – 6201 Microbial Sciences Bldg.*

December 17 – Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting – 6201 Microbial Sciences Bldg.*

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

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

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

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
CPSC Meeting #2

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Attendees:

Faculty/Staff: Brian Bridges, Chris Bruhn, Thomas Chitwood, Aaron Crandell, David Drake, Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Shawn Kaeppler, Jim LaGro, Sarah Mangelsdorf (Chair), Jessie Markow, David Noyce, Lance Raney, Ian Robertson, Kari Sasso, James Schauer, Karl Scholz, Petra Schroeder, Karen Soley, Katharyn Vandenbosch

Invited Guests: Lori Berquam, Paul Broadhead, Mike Grady, John Horn, Jason King, Jeff Kosloske, Kari Knutson, Jocelyn Milner, Jeff Novak, Kate Sullivan, Bill Vanderbloemen, Mark Wells,

FP&M: Bill Elvey, Gary Brown, Pete Heaslett, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Rick Lane, Alex Roe (UWSA), Beth Reid (DOA)

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

Absent/Excused: Seth Blair, Pamela Herd, Trina McMahon, Melanie Meyer, Michael Pflieger, James Skinner, Dave Marcouiller, Deborah Biggs, Katherine Cornwell, Mark Guthier, Andy Howick, Bruce Maas, Scott McKinney, Everett Mitchell, Sue Riseling, Ralph Turner, Sarah Van Orman, Steve Wildeck

Agenda: Meeting to present draft materials for TCC #4. Consultant team to share in-progress work for review and comment.

Provost called to order and received approval of minutes.

B. Elvey discussed organization of master plan committees and opened the floor to the consultants.

G. Brown updated committee on progress to date and mentioned the passing of Peter Schaudt with a moment of silence.

M. Jurkuri recapped the consultant work to date:

- This meeting is about presenting the analysis data and findings to date.
- Encouraged CPSC members to review draft goals and get comments to G. Brown.
- Consultants will be back in September to present initial preliminary alternatives.

- During the Fall of 2015 the consultant team will refine alternatives and develop a draft plan in early 2016 (Spring semester).
- Final plan to be released in late summer 2016.
- City approval of the master plan will begin in Fall 2016.
- Discussed focus of the Campus Master Plan Update.
- Consultants focused on the six 2005 goals and expanded to get to a list of 10 draft 2015 goals for discussion.

Draft Goals (10) presented

Sticker map exercise

- Presented the CPSC sticker map that was completed in March showing areas in need of attention verse areas that are currently successful.

Major Campus wide Issues that were heard:

- Discussed the 12,000 year story of human habitation and how it makes UW unique.
- Density of southeast campus will be increasing.
- Addressing adjacent neighborhood concerns related to traffic and development.
- Working with the city on the Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood/Corridor plan.

J. Hoffman

- Explained how the CPSC and TCC interact; TCC will make recommendations to CPSC.
- Analysis summary:
 - o Discussed how the 2005 plan informs this Update plan
 - What were the recommendations from the 2005 plan that will remain and what will change.
 - Campus capacity graphic presented indicated where new buildings from the 2005 plan were identified, some have been implemented.
 - Capacity Density graphic.
 - Comparing the existing floor area ratio (FAR) with the proposed FAR
 - Current Building Uses.
 - West campus dominated by health sciences
 - South campus is more heterogeneous
 - Central campus is heavy academic
 - Future building uses indicate a mix of research and academics as most prevalent in South Campus
 - No new administration buildings indicated, no new on campus student housing indicated or proposed
 - Current Off-Campus Uses in the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Capacity Off-Campus Uses.
 - Indicate how much development/density could occur based on zoning and current neighborhood plans
 - Dense, mid-rise housing buildings are proposed along Regent Street
 - The Old University corridor could also significantly increase in density
 - Student Housing
 - Off-campus verse on-campus 'spike-o-graph' was shown
 - G. Brown, a lot of the developers/developments indicate their projects are not geared directly toward students. There are students that live in these projects, but there are also a large proportion of young

professionals. UW wants to ensure the city is providing necessary open space and infrastructure to support this projected higher density.

- All of these changing demands will inform recommendations going forward
- S. Szwałek discussed the landscape components of the analysis
 - Tree Canopy Cover
 - Ash Tree loss (attrition/projects)
 - Native American 12,000 year story
 - Historical and Cultural Landscapes
 - Campus View sheds and access to Lake Mendota
 - Open Space Ratio-how much usable open space exists for each campus area. Compared this ratio to the 2005 plan projections.
 - Landscape Framework Plan, compares areas to preserve and what could be altered.
- D. Wolmuth reviewed the green infrastructure/stormwater components of the analysis
 - Discussed the existing developed stormwater features
 - Total Suspended Solids (TSS) Loading by District/Existing Best Management Practices (BMPs) – looking at campus on a sub-watershed level to document sediment/phosphorus loading
 - TSS Loading by Source Area
 - Parking lots/streets/rooftops – sources of pollution
 - TMDL Compliance Goals-TSS
 - In respect to watershed requirements forthcoming
 - Green Infrastructure Opportunities
 - B. Elvey, the UW will be required to meet requirements by partnering with other agencies in the watershed by using adaptive management.
 - D. Drake: what is meant by “areas of preservation” – Response: Areas with little anticipated future change.
 - K. Vandenbosch: will the CPSC get to see the ‘deeper dive’ information.
 - ***G. Brown, we will send the TCC presentations to all CPSC members.
- B. Smalkoski discussed the transportation and parking components of the analysis
 - Transportation Improvements since 2005
 - UW is already a leader in Transportation Demand Management and this plan will provide recommendations for additional upgrades to that program.
 - Travel to Campus: Trip Origination.
 - Evenly distributed 1/3 from West, East and South
 - Vehicle congestion
 - On-campus roads function well with limited congestion
 - University Ave and major arterials through campus are congested at peak hours.
 - Non-Motorized issues
 - Transit Boardings
 - 17,000 boardings on campus per day, 50% on Route 80
 - Locations with Transit Delays
 - Charter/Linden provides significant delay

- Parking Supply
 - 13,000 spaces exist today
 - Average occupancy is around 80%, different based on user types
 - Looking at sub user groups to maximize efficiency
 - B. Elvey: Confirmed that we looking at the turnover of the spaces with the consultant.
 - D. Drake: Are the intercity buses being discussed with the City
 - Consultant team working with city to identify a bus terminal site, likely at Lake Street city ramp site.
- P. Krause discussed the utility/infrastructure components of the analysis
 - Building Load Analysis is being completed to define requirements for future needs.
 - Flow Modeling to inform capacity deficiencies
 - Electrical one-line diagram, a framework for the entire campus
 - SGJR looking at the civil utilities (water, sanitary, storm)
 - Existing Renewable Energy Systems
 - Campus also purchases some renewable credits
 - Consultant team will also look at feasibility of other new alternative energy systems (i.e. PV, solar, wind, etc.)
 - Evaluated the 2005 Utility recommendations and what has been implemented
 - J. K. Scholz: Is this utility map telling us there is a significant amount of upgrades that are required
 - B. Elvey: We need to continue to work with UW System to insure a utility capital project is included in every biennium.
- J. Hoffman discussed the framework plan, the consultant playbook for the alternatives
 - The overlay plan and components were presented
 - Green: Areas of Preservation, the core function will continue to occur, but improvements may be recommended to enhance program/function/aesthetics
 - Yellow: Change Areas, locations where there are concerns, poor open space, identified as change areas per the 2005 plan
 - Potential Utility projects are located all over campus.
 - When over green areas, projects need to be sensitive to the quality of these spaces
 - When over yellow areas, projects have opportunities to significant enhance, re-program, provide facilities to meet our goals
 - View sheds are shown as reference to future developments, historic/important views to maintain
 - Red lines indicate transportation issues and concerns

What does the term open space mean?

- Includes all types of open spaces. Active & passive recreation/social spaces as well as stormwater facilities.

How do we determine the functions of the 'Areas of Preservation'?

B.Elvey: We have lost approximately 10 acres of impervious surface on our campus due to development over the past 10 years. Tells us we need to do better stormwater management.

Consultants are looking to the adjacent open spaces around campus to help meet student needs.

Bicycle transportation component being looked at closely.

Next CPSCP Meeting:
September 17, 2015 to share initial alternatives

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/Materials Available:

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



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. Szwałek: 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. Szwałek: 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. Szwałek: 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. Szwałek: 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 Location: Rm. 6201 Microbial Science,
UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, December 10, 2015,
8:00-9:30 AM

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #4

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

CPSC Members: Seth Blair, Gary Brown, Chris Bruhn, Thomas Chitwood, Aaron Crandall, David Drake, Sarah Mangelsdorf*, Jesse Markow, Michael Pflieger, Lance Raney, Ian Robertson, James Schauer, Karl Scholz, Petra Schroeder, James Skinner, Katharyn VandenBosch

Invited Guests: Teresa Adams, Mark Guthier, Bill Elvey, Andy Howick, Patrick Kass, Jocelyn Milner, Jeff Novak, Alex Roe, Kari Sasso, Karen Soley, Kate Sullivan, Mark Wells, Paul Umbeck, Margaret Tennessen, Rob Kennedy, Doug Sabatke

Consultants: Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Neal Kessler, Eric Schuchardt, Dave Wolmut (SGJJR), Brian Smalkoski (KH), Stan Szwalek, Shuangshuang Wu (HS), Paul Huettl, Bill Albert (AEI)

Absent/Excused CPSC Members:

Gail GeigerPamela Herd, Shawn Kaeppler, Jim LaGro, Dave Marcouiller, Trina McMahon, Melanie Meyer, David Noyce, Bill Tracy

*Meeting Chair

Meeting goal was to present the Draft Preliminary Master Plan to the Campus Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) for review and input.

Agenda

1. Approve September 17, 2015 minutes (CPSC meeting #3) ***ACTION ITEM***
2. Overall Campus Master Plan Update Status Report
 - a. Building Opportunities
 - b. Landscape Master Plan
 - c. Green Infrastructure Plan
 - d. Long Range Transportation Plan
 - e. Utilities Master Plan
3. Review and Discuss Current Draft Focus Areas
 - a. Central Campus
 - a. South Campus
 - b. Near West Campus
 - d. West Campus

Approve September 17, 2015 Minutes

Moved by L. Raney, seconded by J. Schauer to approve the minutes as presented. Approved unanimously.

Presentation of Draft Preliminary Master Plan

M. Jukuri: Presented the agenda for the meeting. Comments from the September 17th CPSC meeting have been incorporated. Questions were recorded as pertinent to the agenda listed as follows:

- Project Update + Status (M. Jukuri)
- Preliminary Plan Goals (M. Jukuri)
- Draft Campus Master Plan (M. Jukuri)
- Campus Landscape + Green Infrastructure Draft Plans (S. Szwalek)
- Draft Long Range Transportation Plan (B. Smalkoski)
- Preliminary Parking Plan (B. Smalkoski)
- Infrastructure – Renewable Energy (B. Albert)
 - o K. VandenBosch: How do parking counts change in the Superblock?
 - M. Jukuri: They will increase by upwards of 200-500 stalls. Remember this area is replacing Lot 34 and the street parking on Observatory Drive (Lot 26)
 - o A. Howick: What is the life expectancy of the old hospital (aka. The Medical Sciences Center) on University Avenue?
 - G. Brown: The original hospital portion of the building, mainly along University Avenue, is considered historically significant. The north half of the complex (Bardeen, Medical Sciences, Service Memorial Institute, Bradley, Social Work & the Middleton Building) is less significant and appropriate for eventual removal and redevelopment.
 - o S. Blair: Where is south campus parking being located?
 - M. Jukuri: Under shared green space of the new south quad (the block south of Grainger Hall) or in existing surface lots.
 - o D. Drake: Our campus is somewhat of an “amoeba” but in other places we have distinct borders. Do we want distinct edges and defined boundaries or less so and blended into the adjacent neighborhoods?
 - M. Jukuri: This has been discussed within the TCC and DRB. In certain areas it is important to have a distinct entry and boundaries. In other areas, it might be better to have more of a blend.
 - o A. Crandall: Would the ‘triangle block’ (west of N. Randall Avenue and between University Avenue and Campus Drive) be the site of a large art installation?
 - S. Szwalek: Art is one option for this site or it could also be a designed open space. We don’t envision as a heavy pedestrian gathering space, more a visual arrival to the center of the campus from the west.
 - o K. VandenBosch: How is the intersection of Campus Drive, University Avenue & Breese Terrace, by the Wisconsin Energy Institute, changing if at all?
 - B. Smalkoski: This intersection is not changing as it was upgraded recently. The proposal is to modify where the signals are located to create an improved and safer pedestrian crossing at Henry Mall.
 - o D. Drake: Seems like the south side cycle track on University Avenue would have greater shading and thus more ice in the winter.
 - o J. Markow: Removing parking along Observatory Dr. will limit disabled individuals access and could act as a further impediment.
 - B. Smalkoski: Accessible parking needs could be accommodated by a small parking area supplied in front of Liz Waters, on the street.
 - P. Kass: Last fall, UW transportation implemented an on-demand, fixed-route campus circulator shuttle system to accommodate accessibility needs.

- J. Markow: The new circulator system is still more of a dependent system that is not favored by a wide range of individuals with disabilities.
- K. VandenBosch: The curvilinear bridge at Charter & Linden is not direct enough to ensure student use.
- S. Mangelsdorf: A park-like bridge is one idea, but remember we are in a campus setting. We need to make sure it is safe for all users day and night.
- J. Markow: I suggest looking at the San Antonio Riverwalk to see how they provide access and transitional grades at different points (Turning Basin). I prefer a compromise between concept 1 & 3.
- A. Crandall: Concept 3 seems more engaging for pedestrians. Is there still enough of an emphasis on vehicles at the street level?
- K. VandenBosch: Linden Mall? What makes it a “mall”?
 - G. Brown: The 1908 Campus Master Plan (1908) identified this stretch of Linden Drive as the ‘Greater Mall’ with Henry Mall named the ‘Lesser Mall’. The term “mall” typically is used to describe an urban area or street which vehicular traffic has been excluded. It does not refer to a covered area, like a “shopping mall”. In this context, it really refers to the large setback of green space along the north side of Linden Drive and a small setback with trees along the south side.
- A. Howick: Concept 3 is interesting, but the design for an overhead bridge needs to consider light and air underneath. We do not want an area similar to Wacker Drive in Chicago where it is dark, uncomfortable and potentially unsafe.
- K. Sasso: Concept 3 is interesting. We would want to see more to address security and visibility utilizing “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” concepts.
- J. Schauer: Concept 3 does not seem to address bike circulation?
 - B. Smalkoski: Bikes would continue to circulate how they do today on the street. Typically you wouldn’t see them using the overhead bridge but they could carry their bikes up and down the stairs as they do today.
- M. Pflieger: When forcing people to underground/structured parking, consider lower cost options for the employees. Underground parking usually has a higher permit fee.
 - B. Elvey: We will always provide lower cost transportation options. One of the best and lowest costs is our park-and-ride facilities that are used by a variety of employees.
- K. VandenBosch: Accessible parking, visitor parking, truck/service access are all concerns I have around buildings on Linden Drive and in the near west campus. We need to make sure those needs are considered in all of our plans for the campus.
- P. Umbeck: Consider dumpster placement and service/loading access, even at this scale.

G. Brown next steps:

- February 24, 2016 is public open house #4. The consultant team will present the Draft Preliminary Master Plan materials, which were shared with the CPSC today, updated per our discussions and comments.
- The consultant team will be back on February 25, 2016 to share progress on the Preliminary Master Plan Update with the CPSC. FP&M staff anticipate that the city approval of the Campus Master Plan will be toward the end of 2016.
- Today’s presentation will be distributed to CPSC members only via email. Please remember this is for internal use only. The materials can be shared with your respective leadership teams, but please direct staff and colleagues to the Campus Master Plan Update website at (www.masterplan.wisc.edu) for current information. Also, please encourage everyone to attend the February 24, 2016 Public Open House at the Gordon Dining & Event Center.

S. Mangelsdorf adjourned meeting at 9:30AM

Upcoming 2016 Meeting Dates

February 25, 2016 8:30-10:00AM – Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting #5

Preliminary Campus Master Plan Review

Room 159, School of Education

April 14, 2016 - 8:30-10:00AM – Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting #6

Draft Final Campus Master Plan Update Review

Room 159, School of Education

June 2, 2016 - 8:30-10:00AM – Campus Planning Steering Committee meeting #7

Draft Final Campus Master Plan Update Review

Room 159, School of Education

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 Location: School of Education Room
159, UW-Madison

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, Feb 25, 2016 8:30 to
10:00AM

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #5

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

Attendees: Seth Blair, Gary Brown, Chris Bruhn, Thomas Chitwood, Aaron Crandall, Bill Elvey, Michael Pflieger, Lance Raney, Karl Scholz, Petra Schroeder, James Skinner, Katharyn Vandebosch (acting chair), Katharine Cornwell, Mark Guthier, John Horn, Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Jocelyn Milner, Jeff Novak, Lisa Pearson, Kate Sullivan, Mark Wells, Dan Okoli, Kim Todd, Bill Patek, Jon Hoffman, Mary Jukuri, Dave Wolmut, Eric Schuchardt (SGJJR), Kevin White (Kimley-Horn), Stan Szwalek, Mike Skowlund (Hoerr Schaudt), Paul Huettl, Scott Moll (AEI)

Absent/Excused: Lori Berquam, Deborah Biggs, Brian Bridges, Paul Broadhead, Luis Fernandez, Mike Grady, Pete Heaslett, Andy Howick, Jason King, Kari Knutson, Bruce Maas, Scott McKinney, Everett Mitchell, Sue Riseling, Alex Roe, Kari Sasso, Karen Soley, Ralph Turner, Bill Vanderbloemen, Sarah Van Orman, Steve Wildeck

Agenda:

1. Approve December 10, 2015 minutes (CPSC meeting #4) ***ACTION ITEM***
2. Revised Draft Master Plan Update Presentation & Discussion
 - a. Campuswide Vision and Principles
 - b. Landscape and Open Space Recommendations
 - c. Green Infrastructure Recommendations
 - d. Transportation and Parking Recommendations
 - e. Utility Recommendations
3. Final Review and Adoption Schedule

Kate Vandebosch called the meeting to order at 8:40 AM.

Presentation:

M. Jukuri: Presented agenda, where we've been and reviewed overall campus plan. The presentation varies from the agenda in that it is divided into six sections which correspond with the six master plan goals.

Support Our Mission:

M. Jukuri explained the campus capacity to grow, based on the 2005 plan by an additional 0.7 Million Gross Square Feet.

Manage our Resources:

S. Szwalek: Reviewed significant additional information in the landscape plan and overviewed the master plan graphics highlighting the existing quads and how proposed quads/green spaces are planned to integrate with the entire campus system. The landscape intentionally becomes more natural (organic) as you move toward the lake and especially toward the Lakeshore Nature Preserve on the west campus.

M. Jukuri: Green Infrastructure is playing a major role in the Campus Master Plan to not only meet our DNR permit requirements in regard to sediment and phosphorus removal, but also to increase the educational value to the campus community, enhance the campus brand, provide habitat, and interject more 'green' open space into the south campus. While our goal is to promote green infrastructure wherever possible, the area of campus north of University Ave is very different than the area south of University Ave and as such, has different strategies for implementation.

- North of University Ave: Larger watershed based stormwater management practices with more naturalized solutions.

- South of University Ave: Project by project and site by site with more urban solutions.

P. Huettl: Utility Infrastructure

- Presented the existing and proposed utility infrastructure capacity based on the proposed building opportunities in the next 30 years.
- Major recommendations include the potential for adding addition capacity at the West Campus Cogeneration Facility around the year 2035 (5,000 tons).
- Renewable energy recommendations included a discussion about transpired solar collectors and photovoltaic opportunities on future buildings and parking structures.

Make Travel Easy:

K. White: Transportation

- Presented overview of recommendations including recommended bike/pedestrian improvements as well as street vacations/additions.
 - Noted the addition of a dedicated left turn lane off of N. Charter Street onto east bound West Johnson Street would help alleviate the existing back-up of Charter Street at the late afternoon rush hour.
- Overviewed the 'Superblock' and the proposed street additions to that area. Streets will favor bike/pedestrian/transit over vehicular circulation but does provide less traffic congestion at the Linden/Charter intersection.
- The master plan will continue to show a connection of the campus drive shared-use ped/bike path south of the existing Meat Science building connecting to Babcock Drive. The Meat Science Lab will need to be pulled back and reduced in size to accommodate the future path. In the near future, the Meat Science facility will be renovated for the Seeds/Plant Germplasm program.
- Parking was summarized as UW-Madison being a national leader in Transportation Demand Management (TDM), which allows for the existing and future constrained parking resources and lower than average parking ratios compared to our peer universities.
 - Currently we provide parking for staff and faculty only and offer a constrained demand of 13,000 spaces (.34 parking spaces/staff & faculty only), which includes approximately 1,400 spaces for visitors and 2,600 campus utilities/service vehicles.

- UW-Madison would like to add 2,000 visitor designated spaces over the course of the long range campus master plan.
- K. White indicated the location of additions and reductions for indicated parking in the overall plan. The general theme is about putting structured parking in convenient locations throughout campus near major arterial streets for easy access.

Celebrate our Lakeside Setting:

S. Szwalko: This goal includes the removal of parking from our lakefront and internalizing it to where the demand is the highest. Restoring the function, view and historic landscape aesthetic of Observatory Hill is a major recommendation for the master plan. Addition of a major stormwater management facility for educational purposes combined with thinning of the vegetation to create a more historically appropriate oak savanna ecosystem in this area are two of the larger recommendations. Also removing street parking along Observatory is recommended to provide better pedestrian accommodations and increase the scenic quality of the overlook from the top of this glacial moraine called Observatory Hill.

M. Jukuri: The west campus landscape recommendations indicate how to visually connect this area to the lake while creating indoor and outdoor gathering spaces. Incorporated into these outdoor spaces is opportunities for green infrastructure and the potential for redirecting stormwater with the loss of Lot 60 and an overall 'greening' of this area of campus.

Revitalize Outdoor Spaces:

M. Jukuri: The focus for this goal is the introduction of green space that is currently lacking particularly in the area south of University Avenue. This includes a block-by-block approach to adding larger green areas when development is proposed. As a topographically low point of campus it also affords stormwater management opportunities.

Be Good Neighbors:

K. White: Campus Welcome:

- The primary entrance gateways into campus have been identified which will include recommendations for major signage and landscape enhancements. University Avenue is consistently identified as a major divide between the north and south campuses, but is also a primary branding opportunity for the campus. Over 60,000 vehicles a day travel through the University/Johnson corridor.
 - University Avenue recommendations include a combined two-way bike path that is protected from vehicular traffic via a vegetated median. The recommendations favor comfort to a larger bike user contingent, reduce overall conflicts, and support the future bus rapid transit (BRT) potential currently being discussed along the corridor.
- The Henry Mall 'intersection' with University Avenue is another multi-functional area with a variety of conflicting uses. With the future extension of Henry Mall/Engineering Mall through the existing Engineering building toward the Camp Randall Memorial Park and a desire for pedestrians to cross at this point, the plan will indicate a number of improvements to support these goals:
 - Aligning and designating a defined pedestrian and bike crossing point connecting to the cycle track in this area currently recommended for the east side of Henry Mall.
 - Providing a distinctive campus arrival aesthetic in this area.
 - Providing vertical barriers in the medians to prevent pedestrian midblock movements that are unsafe.
 - Relocating the existing traffic signals to the east (University Ave side) and bus shelter to the east (Campus Drive side).

A. Crandall: Is there a separate bike and pedestrian crossing at Henry Mall?

K. White: Yes, a continental walk for the pedestrians and a colored bike crossing.

M. Jukuri: Next steps.

- April 13 & 14, 2016 campus visit.
- CPSC plan adoption April or June 2016
- Executive Leadership Team review and approval September 2016
- City of Madison approval, October/November 2016

J. Skinner: For the Linden/Charter pedestrian overpass, how do people use it at the ground level? How many people will feasibly use it?

M. Jukuri: Our planning studies and video reviews have indicated we will be able to redirect many of the east/west pedestrians, perhaps up to 50% using the intersection today. There will always be an at-grade crossing present for some pedestrians moving through the intersection at grade.

K. VandenBosch: There are two concerns remaining. The closing of Linden Drive from the Horse Barn going west, due to us being an Ag Campus we have a large quantity of big trucks and program interaction that street currently allows. Eventual removal of the existing Meat Science building does not fit with the current plan to relocate Seeds into this old building. There are also programmatically related buildings along Linden Drive that removing access off Elm disconnects.

M. Jukuri. We are not proposing to completely remove that building, rather removing 10-20 feet off the south side of the existing building to allow the path to slip by. There is still access from Linden Drive via a 'loop' through this block. But we can look at this area again.

B. Elvey: The existing Meat Science building is actually in the railroad Right-of-Way, which will be an issue going forward. The long term plan is to renovate this building and get it out of the right-of-way, off railroad property and allow the bike path to connect through all the way from the Dairy Barn to Babcock Drive.

M. Guthier: There was mention of the proposed future Humanities Center location. Are there other proposed buildings we know about, but are not being informed of?

B. Elvey: This is exactly why we do the department level master plans to identify where specific programs might be located. We have an idea for many of them, but individual college master plans are our method to determine exact program and size with respect to what program goes into what proposed building opportunity site.

J. Novak: You are taking active programming away from Observatory Hill with the stormwater and reduced lawn area. Can we still have some outdoor passive recreation areas for our residence hall students in this part of the campus.

Jukuri: The stormwater facility is in the footprint of the existing Lot 34.

B. Elvey: Just to clarify, are you talking about active recreation next to Tripp Commons? We can add in a small lawn area east of Tripp Commons. The recommended plans for this area also include lawn spaces west of Elizabeth Waters Hall for passive outdoor recreation.

K. Scholtz: Will the new parking ramp/garage be up and running prior to the removal of Lot 34?

G. Brown: The timing of any new parking facility or removal of any parking at Lot 34 and on Observatory Drive is all hinged on the future development of the corner of Charter and Linden which will contain the 'replacement' parking area below that building complex. No parking will be removed in Lot 34 or along

Observatory Drive until the replacement parking is open and operational. That goes for all the proposed parking facilities. We will continue to anticipate the removal of parking with replacement facilities.

J. Skinner: I worry about a summer CPSC meeting and getting quorum for a final recommendation on the master plan. Is a mid-May meeting better?

G. Brown: We will look into this and see about the potential for taking action on the plan in April.

After a motion and second, K. Vanden Bosch adjourned meeting at 9:43.

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: A. Williams, Assistant Campus Planner
UW-Madison Facilities Planning & Management

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

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

Date/Time: Thursday, April 13, 2016
8:30-10:00AM

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #6

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

Agenda: (attached)

Attendees: Seth Blair, Gary Brown, Chris Bruhn, Thomas Chitwood, Aaron Crandall, Bill Elvey, Aris Georgiades, Shawn Kaeppler, Sarah Mangelsdorf*, Jesse Markow, Michael Pflieger, Lance Raney, Ian Robertson, James Schauer, Karl Scholz, James Skinner, Mark Guthier, Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy, Mark Wells, Cathy Weiss, Teresa Adams, John Hahn, Paul Umbeck, Bill Patek, Jon Hoffman, Dave Wolmut, Cassie Goodwin, Eric Schuchardt (SGJR), Brain Smalkoski (Kimley-Horn), Stan Szwalek (Hoerr Schaudt)

Absent/Excused: David Drake, Gail Geiger, Jim LaGro, Dave Marcouiller, Katherine McMahon, Melanie Meyer, David Noyce, Petra Schroeder, Bill Tracy, Katharyn Vandenbosch, Lori Berquam, Brian Bridges, Paul Broadhead, Katherine Cornwell, Luis Fernandez, Mike Grady, Pete Heaslett, John Horn, Andy Howick, Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Jason King, Jeff Kosloske, Kari Knutson, Scott McKinny, Jocelyn Milner, Everett Mitchell, Jeff Novak, Lisa Pearson, Sue Reseling, Kari Sasso, Karen Soley, Kate Sullivan, Ralph Turner, Bill Vanderbloemen, Sarah Van Orman, Steve Wildeck

Agenda:

1. *Approve February 25, 2016 minutes (CPSC meeting #5) ***ACTION ITEM****
2. *Draft Final Master Plan Goals & Recommendations*
 - a. *Landscape and Open Space*
 - b. *Green Infrastructure*
 - c. *Transportation and Parking*
 - d. *Utilities*
3. *Finalization and Approval Schedule*
4. *Recommend Draft Final Master Plan to Chancellor ***ACTION ITEM****

Questions/Discussion:

B. Elvey introduced the team and presented objectives for this Draft Final Master Plan meeting included action on approval to the Chancellor.

G. Brown gave the presentation focused on the tagline “Extending our History, Embracing our Future”. Presentation was organized around the six approved goals of the master plan.

Provost: Dean Vandenbosch has expressed concern to me about the existing Meat Science building modification to allow a bike path facility as well as concerns over Linden Drive and access to the CALS building in the Near West campus.

B. Elvey: We want to plant the seed so we do not forget about the bike path. Eventually we will have to address the fact that the existing Meat Science building is in the railroad right-of-way. This 'missing' link bike path will connect the broader region from Middleton through downtown to the Capitol city path.

G. Brown: After we have a CALS masterplan, we can address the very specific programmatic and land use issues in this part of campus.

J. Markow: Currently the building at the corner of Brooks Street and Mills Street is in the way to accommodate what the master plan is showing. In regard to the SERF reconstruction, at what point will the roof design be considered and/or introduced into the discussion.

B. Elvey: We are weeks away from an agreement from Athletics and Rec Sports on the \$87M SERF reconstruction project. We have confirmed that the building will be designed to allow for green elements on the roof. Whether they do something day 1 or not is yet to be determined, but clear direction has been given that it should be more than just a roof.

G. Brown: The apartment building was fought hard and we will be around longer than that building. In the interim we will develop the east section of the block and maybe the road vacation.

B. Elvey: Letters and Sciences has forty-size or so building around campus. The facilities master plan that they are currently undertaking allows them to see the future and how considerations in program and development play out within the context of the university. It is a very useful tool.

Provost: I would like to make a recommendation to the Chancellor in regard to the current status of the master plan and confirmation that the direction is favored.

A motion was made by K. Scholz, seconded by C. Bruhn, to approve the Draft Final Master Plan. The motion passed by voice vote.

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: A. Williams, Assistant Campus Planner
UW-Madison Facilities Planning & Management