



# MEETING MINUTES

---

Meeting Location: Room 6201 Microbial Science, UW-Madison

---

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

---

Notes By: Aaron Williams, FP&M

---

Project/No.: 2015 Campus Master Plan Update

---

Re: Campus Planning Steering Committee Meeting #3

---

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. Guthier: 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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