

date	5 March 2009		
project name	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Master Plan	project #	07G2U
meeting date	February 25, 2009	time	6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
location	Zelazo Center		
recorded by	Tyler Patrick		
distribution	UW System, UWM, Consultant Team		
purpose	All Campus Meeting		

These minutes represent a summary of the content and character of each meeting and are not meant to be an exhaustive list of the comments made.

SUMMARY

The presentation reviewed the progress made between December 2008 and February 2009, including campus and community-wide engagement and feedback sessions. The consultant team presented space and program refinements, as well as a vision for each of the four opportunity sites: Kenwood, GLRF/Pieces of Eight, Pabst/Plankinton, and Wauwatosa. The presentation concluded with an overview of how future space needs might be accommodated across the opportunity sites.

A. Outline of Presentation

1. Engagement:
 - a. Principles Overview (Process and Planning)
 - b. Schedule Overview
 - c. Feedback from website and sessions
2. Where We Were – from scenarios to district visions
3. Space and Program
4. The Vision
5. Next steps – initial space moves and next visits

B. Comments, Questions, and Responses

1. Where will Daycare go?
 - Response: Several options are being considered, but the site of the Grounds Services Building, north of Klotsche, seems to have a lot of momentum and would provide an on-campus setting that does not preclude the growth of the academic core.

2. Concern about addition of student housing at Columbia St. Mary's (CSM). When the last Sandburg Tower was built, the amount of partying seemed to increase in the neighborhood.
 - Response: The idea is to provide a more structured environment for students on campus, including the addition of residences and supporting student life amenities. This will give students something to do on campus. Since the size of the undergraduate population is projected to remain relatively the same, any addition in on-campus student housing will draw students out of the neighborhood. In addition, housing is merely one alternative for the development at the CSM site. Other programmatic needs could also become part of the ultimate program.
3. How much time will the Consultant Team spend on feedback?
 - Response: The overall purpose of tonight's presentation was to give an update on where we are in the process. As mentioned in the beginning of the presentation, there are a variety of forums for feedback, including the website and in-person feedback sessions at UWM, and allotted some time for questions and comments this evening.
4. Has the Consultant Team considered selling all of Kenwood and moving elsewhere?
 - Response: The replication for investment is too high to ever consider leaving Kenwood altogether.
5. Will the monarch butterfly conservation area at Wauwatosa be preserved?
 - Response: The consultant team has spoken with a local expert to understand where the butterflies roost. It is possible that the monarch area can become a learning environment for the region and the consultant team understands the value of this environmental asset.
6. How can the Integrated Research Building integrate engineering and life science if it is at Wauwatosa?
 - Response: Currently, the various options for the siting of this building are being explored, including a location on the Kenwood Campus.
7. It is important to put UWM facilities within the city of Milwaukee in order to grow the tax base. A move out to Wauwatosa is a centrifugal force. The Post Office and Park East should be considered. There is a tremendous economic multiplier effect.
8. School of the Arts – PSOA provides a valuable resource to the community and generates revenue for the Milwaukee economy. The needs of this school should not be underestimated. The need is more than just one theater.
9. Has any further consideration been given to the Tower Automotive site?
 - Response: This site remains on a longer list of sites we have discussed, however other site that have better access and adjacency to partners have taken priority for development opportunities.
10. What is the future of the Riverworks area relative to this plan?

- Response: The University currently has space in the Riverworks area, and there is certainly potential for future development here.
11. Downer Woods is very precious and is a lab for the elementary school.
 12. Has research been done on neighborhood degradation at other universities across the country?
 - Response: There is a benefit to bringing students into the system. The undergraduate population is not growing, so when you add new beds to campus, you are effectively decreasing the number of students living in the neighborhood. Moreover, the addition of much needed student life facilities on campus will provide students with activities on campus rather than out in the neighborhoods.
 13. How are utilities being addressed?
 - Response: The first step is to determine how much overall capacity is required at each location. We will then use this information to look below the ground. The Kenwood plans you see tonight do account for the location of existing utility lines

Next Steps

1. Document meeting minutes.
2. Next set of meetings is March 25-26, Next set of meetings is March 25-26, during which time the consultant team will present a refined vision for UWM as well as explore the technical and operational issues relative to each site, and develop story lines around transportation, neighborhood, utilities, among others.

The information above will stand as recorded unless Sasaki receives written comments within five days of the distribution date from a recipient requesting an amendment.