



date	5 March 2009		
project name	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Master Plan	project #	07G2U
meeting date	February 25, 2009	time	8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
location	Zelazo Center		
recorded by	Tyler Patrick		
distribution	UW System, UWM, Consultant Team		
purpose	All Campus Meeting & Committee Sessions		

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. The location of the Daycare Center in Downer Woods seems like a good idea, given its location away from the academic core but still on the Kenwood campus.

 - 2. Transit is a concern, particularly as UWM considers multiple locations. How is the master plan addressing transit?

- Response: an integrated transportation strategy will be part of the master plan, including the pedestrian and bicycle network, transit, and parking. These considerations underlie much of the work you see today, but will be further developed throughout this next phase of work.
3. The north-south pedestrian network on campus is intriguing. How will the east-west pedestrian connections work, given high traffic volumes, particularly on Maryland?
 - Response: traffic calming will be a key component of the integrated transportation strategy. The idea is to funnel people to well-marked crossing points. The master plan is also looking at ways to reduce traffic volume through the use of transit and also locating parking access on the periphery of campus to discourage cars from passing through the campus core.
 4. The presentation suggests that Engineering would go to Wauwatosa and Public Health to Pabst. This seems opposite of how it should be; Public Health has more affinity with partners in the west and Engineering with downtown.
 - Response: we are still exploring the various options for program location. Both Public Health and Engineering have several partners that are distributed throughout the region.
 5. What drives program location – donors or the University?
 - Response: the decision of where to locate programs is complicated, as there are many different actors involved. Certainly donors are part of the equation, but so are several other University stakeholders.

C. Subcommittee Break-out Group Feedback

1. Health Sciences:

- a) Need to hold together upper division undergraduate with the graduate school.
- b) An exclusive alliance with one health care partner would be a detriment to relationships with other partners
- c) Need for simulation space for nursing
- d) Double moves generally will not work for the Health Sciences and Public Health labs, but could work for some of the College of Nursing labs.
- e) Public Health needs a building as soon as possible as they have no space now.
- f) There is a potential for wasteful duplication of labs if upper division and graduate are split apart.
- g) There is a strong desire to be out in the community; moving off campus would provide better access and parking for partners, and allow for co-location with the Milwaukee Department of Health; a link to one or more major integrated health systems are expected for most Schools of Public Health.
- h) A disadvantage to moving off campus is loss of adjacency to many Kenwood programs, including Social Welfare and School of Letters and Science programs.
- i) The space allocated for Public Health in the PowerPoint is too low, especially if you include all the projected partners. The School has done new programming that should be incorporated into the space allocation model.
- j) There are stewardship issues with moving off campus.
- k) There is concern about the undergraduate research experience at Kenwood if the graduate programs are located off campus.

- l) There is some program overlap between GLRF and the Health Sciences.

2. Humanities, Education, Social Sciences, Arts, Business:

- a) Mitchell Hall is a great building for the arts. Without knowing what is planned for the replacement facilities, it's hard to imagine that they would have the range of spaces that Mitchell offers. It's unclear how Mitchell could be better used for the Social Sciences.
- b) A new theater at the front door of campus is a great idea. It is good not only for the campus, but for the broader community as well.
- c) Within these departments, it would be very difficult to separate undergraduate from graduate. Many graduate students serve as TAs for the undergraduate population, so there are strong ties to the Kenwood campus.
- d) It's possible for certain extension programs to locate off campus, such as components of Social Welfare.
- e) Kenilworth has worked well for arts in terms of facilities, but tight class change intervals pose some challenges in terms of getting to and from Kenwood.
- f) The business school would like to get all of Lubar back.
- g) For Education, undergrad and grad should stay on campus but research could go off campus.
- h) There is an overall need for integrated/interdisciplinary space.
- i) Like the idea of a central spine; the idea to celebrate Downer Woods is a good one.
- j) Bolton Hall works well for the social sciences, particularly its central location and access. If social sciences are moved, they should maintain centrality.
- k) The current location of Psychology is a problem because of the need to share resources with Life Sciences. It's hard to conceive of splitting the department between animal and human research because there is so much overlap. No matter where Psychology is located on campus, it should be kept together. It's possible that CSM could work for Psychology.
- l) There is a need for showcase buildings
- m) Concern about safety as it relates to Hartford and Maryland Avenues.

3. Engineering and Natural Sciences:

- a) Difficult to separate undergraduate from graduate research because of the TA positions and the fact that graduate students are also researchers; people move in and out of research and teaching positions, and in and out of research areas.
- b) Cannot separate Engineering from Natural Sciences
- c) Locational decisions should be bottom-up and cluster-driven, not top-down.
- d) Flexible spaces are important.
- e) No double moves.
- f) Is Wauwatosha a given or not?
- g) Can more be done at GLRF aside from freshwater science?
- h) What is the impact of the proposed moves on the community?

4. Campus Life:

- a) The campus goal is to have all first-year students in residence halls. This encourages engagement, retention, and success
- b) Riverview has been a success, with the result of 300 less students living in the neighborhoods.

- c) Need to connect athletics and recreation with student life.
- d) With additional campus locations, health services would need to be partially duplicated, as would accessibility services.
- e) Need for academic advisors at satellite locations.
- f) Like the idea of one-stop shopping for student services.
- g) Bolton should include only the front-end operations; back-end operations could go elsewhere.
- h) Library Commons is a popular idea.
- i) Need for universal accessibility.
- j) Gender-neutral restrooms.
- k) Removing Hartford School may be a detriment to the community.
- l) May need to maintain an urgent care facility after CSM vacates its space.
- m) The Student Union is undergoing its own master plan, the findings of which should be incorporated into the overall master plan.
- n) The bookstore idea, while popular, presents parking and traffic concerns.
- o) Student safety concerns – need to provide late night facilities and have them be safe at all hours (eg Union and Library).
- p) Food is key in terms of keeping students occupied on campus.
- q) There is general excitement about the proposed location of the Daycare Center; however, there are parking and drop-off concerns.
- r) Need to provide comfortable space for commuters.
- s) Be more inclusive of students.
- t) Theater is a great idea.
- u) Need for "wow" factors to impress students.
- v) Need a stronger identity and main entrance. This could be Vogel (new Welcome Center) but there is a lack of parking.

Next Steps

1. Document meeting minutes.
2. 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.