

Draft Master Plan Feedback

This document contains comments submitted about the draft master plan through October 30, 2009. It only contains comments from individuals that have explicitly granted permission for their comments to be shared online.

Affiliation	Comments
Academic Staff	<p>What stayed with me after the presentation was the concept of walkways through buildings so that one could enter the campus at, say, the corner of Cramer and Kenwood and walk in safety and shelter across Maryland and into the Union. I've been at other campuses with such planning, and I've always wondered why we don't have that here. Also, the atrium plan for the Golda Meir Library is a great use of otherwise underused space.</p>
Staff	<p>The Master Plan is a good plan. However, expanding programs, enrollment and research will bring more students, faculty, researchers, staff to support them and others to the Kenwood campus. They will not be walking or taking a little yellow bus to campus. The Milwaukee Transportation system does not meet the needs of all those that UWM is attracting. Replacing lost surface parking spaces one for one is not sufficient. Raising parking fees so that only the highest paid faculty can afford the few remaining parking spots is not changing culture or good parking management. It is merely pricing out those that cannot afford the ever increasing fee. These individual will not just find other parking/transportation. They will find jobs outside of the University. This is an urban university with urban needs. Let's find a better alternative.</p>
Student, staff	<p>Placing the Children's Center 3 or 4 blocks away from campus (the Alumni House site) is not a good option for students. It needs to remain on the central campus. The plan calls for not having additional vehicles on campus, but yet the population who have the most to travel with (stroller, bags, etc) would then have to walk to and from campus or wait for additional transportation like a shuttle. Also, you are overlooking the young children that are at the daycare facility, and the caretakers access to them. Like when a student needs to breastfeed their child between classes. There is a larger number of students/staff who utilize the center for this purpose, more than you may be aware of.</p>
Unknown	<p>I am extremely disappointed in this master plan. It engages in meaningless generalities and politically-correct terms without addressing the serious issues. For example, the parking issue has been a long-standing problem brought about by decades-long mismanagement. The consultants do not even appears to have seriously studied the problem at all. If they had studied it, they would not have referred, in writing, to an existing underground parking at Physics building. There is no such facility existing today. This plan does absolutely nothing to relieve a major problem affecting most campus workers, students, and visitors, i.e. parking on campus. Instead, the consultants repeat the failed and political slogans of 'walk to campus', 'bicycle to campus' nonsense. The consultants do report on major future increases in the number of faculty and students, claim that they will keep the same woefully inadequate parking space fraction of 0.2, and yet plan to reduce available parking spaces. Have they studies math while getting their planning degrees? The money spent on this study is unfortunately wasted.</p>
Staff	<p>Transportation plans of the Master Plan are ridiculous. Clearly no one has bothered to try to take the bus to UWM. The buses that service our area have been continually cut over the past few years. In addition they are cut due to budgetary</p>

	<p>issues not ridership. As for commuting to campus with others, it is often difficult to find others to commute with depending on a schedule. The report relies very heavily on a light rail system for Milwaukee. Milwaukee has been discussing a light rail system since the early 1980s at least. It is not going to materialize any time soon so basing traffic patterns and "transportation hubs" on such a wondrous thing as a potential light rail system is something that would be nice but also could be very poor planning. We need to increase bus accessibility. We need to offer discounted fares on buses. There has to be better security at the outlying commuter lots. These things would make better investments and encourage students and staff, and maybe even faculty to increase commuting to campus rather than driving.</p>
Staff	<p>Continued campus daycare is an essential recruitment and retention tool. Vouchers will not do the trick. The 2009 Chronicle of Higher Education survey placed childcare as the major work/life balance parameter. UWM has comparatively high turnover rates among faculty and staff. As a 4th tier research institution, we must build a reputation of a great work place if we are to succeed. We need to improve this benefit, not make it more difficult for young families.</p>
Faculty	<p>The safety and security of the children should be another consideration on moving the childcare center. The current center was not designed as a childcare center and was not designed in the terrorism and car bomb age. We need a new structure that takes into account security issues as well as convenience, park space, etc. Architects probably have thought about these issues.</p>
Student	<p>I got the impression that the new layout of campus will not be very friendly to off-street bicycle traffic. I live about a mile south of campus, and I generally get to campus by bicycle, and it's nice to be able to get off the road, away from the cars. I think the pedestrian "streets" should be rethought to be more friendly to bicycles as well as walkers.</p> <p>Specifically, it looks like there'll be practically no bike access to the interior of the campus from Kenwood, and I had the impression that the middle of the library, which today is outdoor space (albeit covered) will be converted to indoor space, making it unfriendly to bicycles.</p>
Faculty	<p>The Children's Center must remain open without ANY interruption. This should be a sine qua non of redevelopment.</p>
Architecture Grad Student	<p>Overall plan is ambitious in scope and a worthy goal. Off-campus facility at the county grounds adjacent to Medical College in Wauwatosa may be achievable if reduced in scale, or maybe becomes a strictly virtual connection for the near term.</p> <p>The covered passageway on the ground floor of the middle of the Golda Meir library is a major pedestrian passageway to the Union and points beyond. Once this ground floor becomes an enclosed, multi-functional space—a great idea by the way to utilize existing real estate—however, I am concerned that the amount of pedestrian traffic that now moves through this passageway, may make the newly enclosed space a busy and noisy space for patrons of the library. Any proposed programming within the new Golda Meir lobby I feel would need to fit with what would become an enclosed public plaza, and not a quiet extension of the library.</p> <p>Addressing a similar function as the above proposal, I am intrigued why the master plan does not include renovations to one of the most important north/south pedestrian arteries on campus: that of the passage/alley way between Golda Meir Library and the Hartford Elementary School. I have analyzed this particular piece of the UWM campus as it will be my site for a proposed architectural master's degree thesis project. The greatest merit of this passageway is that it is the</p>

	<p>most direct pedestrian link between Sandburg Hall Housing to the north and the Student Union to the south. This neglected service/alley/passage is heavily used by students and maintenance and delivery vehicles during all hours of the day. Several factors go against the mission of the Master Planning Guiding Principles of creating a “safe and secure environment for the holistic well-being of the students, promoting UWM campus pride, create aesthetically pleasing places and “promot[ing] the efficient movement of people across the campus.” The dismal facts are that this passageway now is one of the darkest spaces on campus at night—which greatly compromises a sense of safety of the users, compared to the aesthetic of the campus it appears as a left-over alleyway at best, and can be one of the most isolating spaces on the entire campus.</p> <p>I realize the enormous scope that the Master Planning Team has so far addressed. I petition that this artery of student accessibility be given the same attention as other important path networks and emerge as a vital connection for student life on campus.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued efforts and I look forward to an improved UWM campus.</p>
Student/Community	<p>I feel very strongly that research should be on this campus for a lot of reasons to offer better education to students. Also, it will give money and information back to the community.</p>
Student (senior); Board member, Milwaukee County First	<p>The language in the master plan discusses the university being part of the city grid, using mass transit, and having fiscal and economic stewardship at heart. I find value in all of those sentiments, and I try to carry them with me throughout my life and work in Milwaukee.</p> <p>With the city grid, using mass transit, and having fiscal and economic stewardship carried in my mind, I have looked at the proposed master plan and attended meetings about it. Each time, I am drawn to the conclusion that the proposed "Innovation Center" on the Milwaukee County Grounds flies in the face of all of these values. Having a satellite campus at any distance causes the campus to be isolated from its parent, a self-enclosing and self-contained realm far from the University. Its great distance from the heart of downtown or the northeast side would further separate it from the university. And a quick look at the location finds that it is so far removed from the city grid and any existing mass transit that a vast majority of people traveling to the site will rely upon their cars to get there.</p> <p>Plans to rely upon Milwaukee County to provide transit of any sort to the far west side campus are foolish at best. Please recognize that we live in Milwaukee County, and that our county government's executive leadership is firmly opposed to providing reliable transit options to the citizens of Milwaukee County. No express buses currently exist in Milwaukee County, and the funding for the express buses is being used to pay for the much more vital Milwaukee County Transit System buses after years of neglect.</p> <p>The heart of the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee is in the city of Milwaukee. The proposed satellite campus in Wauwatosa is farr off the city grid, and far from mass transit. I have not begun to explore the fiscal or environmental implications that building the proposed campus out there would bring with it. Instead, I urge the University to refocus its efforts on building a stronger University within the City of Milwaukee. That is where our university was born, and that is where our university belongs.</p>
Student/Staff	<p>"Transit Center at the Union works well with existing bus stop activity patterns."</p>

	<p>This statement would only be true if all bus routes did actually stop in front of the union. There are flaws with the existing bus stop locations, specifically in regards to boarding. The route 30 and the route 15 do not actually stop in front of the union. The 15 stops at an adjacent corner on Maryland and the 30 stops closer to Downer making it problematic to use the Union to wait for boarding at either of these buses. For a Transit Center at the union, or any location on campus for that matter, to serve all major transit routes, the existing stop locations for the buses would have to be reconsidered to coincide with the proposed transit center.</p> <p>"All transit routes that serve the campus travel along Kenwood Blvd between Maryland and Downer."</p> <p>The exception is Route 15 which runs along Oakland Avenue. The Route 15 is a proposed connection to the Plankinton Site, as well. Oakland Avenue is also identified in the plan as a connection for a future light rail stop and the main transit hub for the campus. This being said, the northeast corner of Kramer and Kenwood is an insufficient location for any transit that is on Oakland Avenue. What is the logic behind having students wait for a bus/train on a block that is not the block where the bus/train stop is located?</p> <p>Common sense would tell us that as a part of the plan, we should focus on strengthening transit service that we currently have in Milwaukee. The transit we have serving our campus should be upgraded to make connections for our students before providing new solutions which duplicate this service like the shuttles serving Kenilworth and Riverview.</p>
<p>Engineering alumni and current MBA student</p>	<p>I'm very excited about the master plan, primarily the reconfiguration of the southwest precinct.</p> <p>I have a nine year-old who is fascinated by science, please provide additional opportunities, such as Science Bag, to bring the children of the city to UWM to learn.</p>
<p>Community Member</p>	<p>In the Draft Master Plan the Kenwood campus of UWM is repeatedly referred to as an "urban campus". This misnomer leads to inappropriate design considerations. Marquette University is an urban campus. UW-Madison is an urban campus. UW-Milwaukee is a residential campus. A casual familiarity with these campuses reveals the huge distinction. This distinction reveals a different mindset for the design of the Kenwood campus. From a residential standpoint there needs to be a greater sensitivity to maintaining a distinct buffer between the campus and the surrounding neighborhoods to avoid negatively impacting those neighborhoods.</p> <p>The main buffer which should be considered is maintaining healthy street setbacks for proposed buildings and keeping student foot traffic within the University grounds where possible. Providing for the main entrances of buildings facing inwards towards the campus rather than towards the streets can help to lessen impacts for surrounding homes. The southwest precinct doesn't provide a proposed buffer of open space similar to which is found adjacent to Mitchell and Curtin Halls in the Southeast precinct. Again, the open space surrounding Mitchell Hall is ideal for a residential campus. Although the green roofs shown in the proposed buildings along Kenwood and Cramer show an improved environmental awareness, they do not substitute for street-level green space. Please show more sensitivity and awareness towards the district in which the campus exists.</p> <p>Expanding on-campus parking and transit solutions for students living off campus will also lessen auto and pedestrian traffic problems within surrounding neighborhoods. This should be a mandatory focus on any Master Plan. While the</p>

	<p>University does a decent job at minimizing problems, this remains an area where improvement is required. With additional expansion, serious attention must be given to reducing neighborhood traffic.</p>
Faculty	<p>The Master Plan was very well done. While it does raise a lot of questions, its' intent is to offer opportunities, challenges and options available to the campus community. I was impressed with the consultants and appreciate the state's support for this very important data/research as we envision our future.</p>
Staff	<p>Please note, all buildings in pages 14 and 15 are labeled incorrectly.</p>
Faculty	<p>I am pleased to see that the Master Plan finally acknowledges the important place of the UWM Children's Center in any plan to build the Kenwood IRB. However, the priority should be to establish the permanent home of the Center from the outset and build accordingly. An appropriate child care facility is difficult to plan on a temporary basis and will lead to an erosion in the strength and place of the Center in campus life.</p> <p>With regard to the placement of the Center, it is critical that it remain on the Kenwood campus. The proposed Alumni House location is completely inadequate for the needs of the families and staff that use the Center. First, the AH location would make it very difficult for nursing mothers on the Kenwood campus to easily feed their infants during the day. Second, the location would provide an obstacle for student staff to easily get to work. Anything that makes it harder for the Center to hire and retain the best student workers is not acceptable.</p> <p>The Children's Center is a truly special place and is one of the premier child care centers in the state of Wisconsin. Any plans for the Center contained in the Master Plan must allow the Center to remain as strong as it is now and allow it to grow stronger in the future.</p>
Community Member	<p>Please consider another site for UWM structure. The area under consideration has value to the people of Milwaukee in its natural state. It is an area that has given pleasure and education to youth and adults of Milwaukee County for years, and should be protected from development. Preserving this area for future generations is education in the best sense!</p>
Faculty	<p>I am writing to express strong support for Priority #2 - The Children's Center. My family has accessed high quality child care and early childhood education through the Children's Center for the past 8 years. Our children are 9 and 5 years old and will continue to access child care at UWM until they are 12 years old. We have been members of the Children's Center family as students and as staff through my faculty position. It is critical to ensure that UWM continues to provide a high standard of affordable child care, early childhood education, and after school care to its students as well as its faculty and staff. It would be detrimental to the university community were there to be an interruption in service due to issues of relocation and development. As you work to accomplish the priorities of the master plan, I strongly encourage you to be mindful of the benefits a high quality child care facility brings to the university, as a support for students, as a model for the local and state community, and as an incentive which attracts and retains faculty and staff.</p>

Community Member	my vote for location of expanded facilities (such as the Freshwater School and/or the Engineering School) is the Reed Street Yards area of Walker's Point. not only is it centrally located to transportation hubs and extremely walkable, it is also close to the river and lake and a short bike ride to marquette.
Faculty	I am very pleased to see that the UWM Children's Center has become a top priority for the Master Plan. I would urge the planning committee and administration to follow through with this priority and make certain that the Center is relocated to an appropriate space in advance of the demolition of the Kunkle building. I believe this to be a crucial step for the students, faculty, and staff of UWM and for the future of the university more generally.
Faculty	The Wauwatosa idea is terrible. It should be killed quickly.
Staff	<p>I would like to see the master plan address issues of teaching and learning as they affect faculty, as well as students. The LTC's role in faculty development is congruent both with UWM's mission and with our academic plan.</p> <p>Faculty development for teaching and learning is key to the mission of Kenwood as well as to other campus spaces. Faculty development must be sustainable, transparent, and promote a sense of shared identity and scholarly achievement throughout.</p> <p>In particular, the programs we support such as Desire2Learn (D2L) offer a one-stop venue for all courses taught on campus. Further, the LTC's online/blended faculty development program reaches out to all academic areas and erases the limitations of space while yet acknowledging valuable differences in each program or locale, whether virtual or physical.</p> <p>Our support of learning technologies such as rich media promotes engagement and active learning. Our emphasis on service to faculty, who work with their peers in the Learning Technology Center, realizes the imperative that pedagogical strategies lead technological choices in the classroom and beyond.</p> <p>In short, our course technologies meet the tests of accessibility and collaboration, drawing upon the experiences of both instructors and students as a source of scholarly achievement and the cultural identity special to UW-Milwaukee and environs. I believe that the significance of this infrastructure should be explicitly acknowledged in the master plan.</p>
Faculty	The expansion of facilities and building resources to the college of Engineering is detrimental to its success and growth. The impact of having a nationally recognized college of Engineering will be refelected on our campus as a whole and our city, and vice versa. Having an interdisciplinary facility is well overdue for our campus, it is time to move forwrad with a 22nd century vision and execution. ONE FOR ALL AND ALL FOR ONE.
Student	The plan inspires me to go into planning. I am curious about the roll the Urban Planning program at UWM played in this. I disagree with putting "Innovation Park" out west. Doesn't seem to fit in with the environmental sustainability portion of the plan. Seems to me a car is required.
Faculty	I have two primary concerns about the Draft Master Plan. I have not gone through the document in detail yet, but I did

	<p>attend the presentation several weeks ago.</p> <p>First, the current plan to encourage use of alternative modes of transportation in order to reduce parking demand is not satisfactory. Increasing the price of on-campus parking is, in effect, taxing students/faculty/staff for living relatively far from the campus. The use of public transportation sounds like a viable solution, but it generally doubles the commuting time, and thus reduces the productive time available each day.</p> <p>Second, I am concerned that there was no mention in the presentation of alternative locations for the day care facility after the current building is raised. Will it move somewhere else on campus, or will it move to a satellite location? This is an issue that should not be taken lightly, since recruitment of talented, young professors (both male and female) will be influenced by the presence or absence of true on-site day care.</p>
Staff	<p>I am very concerned about the Master Plan's recommendations pertaining to parking. Anyone who has tried to park in a surface lot between 9am-3pm knows that parking is by no means "underutilized," as the planners stated at one of the September forums. As the university expands through development of off-Kenwood locations, the need for on-campus parking is likely to grow rather than decrease, given the increased need for faculty and staff to travel between campuses.</p> <p>The Master Plan states: "Through work session discussions with UWM stakeholders, a conscious policy goal to cap the parking supply numbers in the main Kenwood Campus was agreed upon." In the forum the planning firm noted a preferred strategy of pricing parkers off of campus by raising rates and restricting spaces. These ideas reflect a misguided commitment to environmentalism at the expense of UWM employees' and students' pocketbooks and their already precarious work/life balance.</p> <p>There are obvious financial implications for a faculty and staff whose salaries are compressed and who have recently taken further salary cuts and unpaid leave. Many faculty, staff and students who would be affected by the even higher tariffs live outside of easy walking/biking/busing distance due to the high expense of living on the eastside and near northshore suburbs. Others who live within biking distance find biking on icy streets (and campus walkways) for the majority of the academic year to be too precarious; despite the promise of a hot shower, it's not likely that they will ditch their heated, anti-lock braking cars for bikes during the winter months.</p> <p>Parking and transportation options are always an item of interest to employees we recruit, and the current situation -- too few parking spaces, inconvenient off-campus options, exorbitant on-campus options -- is often a drawback. I've had several prospective employees express concerns that the cost of parking needs to be factored into their salary requirements.</p> <p>Of greater concern than the cost of parking is a strategy which fails to recognize that many of the people who park on campus need to have ready access to their cars in order to manage their lives. We don't all have the luxury of being able to opt for greener transportation alternatives. I and many of my colleagues have young children or family commitments which require us to be accessible at the end of the work day and at times during the day. We aren't able to spend time waiting for crowded U-Park buses to take us to our cars when we have to get our children to their swimming lessons and doctors' appointments, or pick them up when we receive a call from the school nurse. Pricing (and crowding) us out of</p>

	<p>campus lots simply results in more people parking on the street, and more problems with the neighbors. I have colleagues who park on area streets and actually move their cars to new street spaces every two hours of the day -- a huge loss of productivity, but a tempting alternative given the high cost and relative inavailability of parking. Moreover, the "campus" vs. "street" parkers are differentiated along salary lines. Lower-paid, full time staff generally park on the street, while those who can better afford to pay for parking do so. Faculty opt to simply work from home. Strategies which force more people out of campus parking lots do not present a viable, long-term solution to the campus parking problem, nor do they promote campus morale, productivity, service, or neighborhood relations.</p> <p>Faculty, staff and students aren't the only UWM stakeholders who are deeply affected by the current parking situation. My office works extensively with community members and holds regular public programs. We frequently receive feedback from participants that they prefer not to meet at UWM because it is so difficult to park. The inadequacy of parking for faculty, staff, students and community members is a serious problem for UWM. The Master Plan needs to acknowledge this and expand -- not simply "replace" -- parking spaces so that the campus, as it continues to grow, can provide appropriate, affordable parking options for those who require them.</p> <p>Finally, the critical need for adequate parking should be taken into account as plans move forward to eliminate the large Sciences parking lot while making way for a new Interdisciplinary Research Building. If building funds are limited and projects need to be prioritized, then the IRB should not go forward until the on-campus parking eliminated through its construction has been relocated to another on-campus site.</p>
Faculty	<p>I would like to report a factual error in the draft of the master plan. The draft states the following about the Physical Environment Committee:</p> <p>"The Physical Environment Committee (PEC) The PEC and its subcommittees will be vested with the responsibility to review and advise on facilities and property planning and site development activities across all UWM campuses and locations. The PEC will review planning and design proposals in association with UAPT. The fundamental charge of the PEC will be to advise UAPT on the continuing administration, maintenance and implementation of the Master Plan.</p> <p>"This includes a process for design review. In order to ensure project development to the highest design standards, the charge to the PEC and its subcommittees is to review project design in conjunction with UAPT and in accordance with the design guidelines section of the Master plan."</p> <p>However, this statement is in conflict with the PEC's official charter, which has been approved by both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Administration:</p> <p>Functions. Makes recommendations for the development of the physical environment of the campus consistent with the mission and with the present and future academic programs of the University. a) Recommends a master plan for the development of the campus reflecting priorities in accordance with guidelines established by the committee.</p>

	<p>b) Recommends the location of new buildings, their inter-relationships and aesthetics and their functional and architectural features.</p> <p>c) Recommends remodeling needs and identifies desirable or undesirable features relevant to future construction.</p> <p>d) Recommends parking and transportation policies.</p> <p>e) Recommends appropriate names for buildings pursuant to established guidelines.</p> <p>(Document 1052, 10/20/77; UWM Administration approval, 11/16/77)</p> <p>(Document 1619, 5/10/88; UWM Administration approval (9/22/88))</p> <p>Note in particular that the official charter gives PEC the duty to recommend a master plan in accordance with guidelines it develops, while the draft document seems to state the opposite.</p> <p>Please correct this factual error in the draft master plan.</p>
Student	<p>It is about time UWM becomes more of a part of Milwaukee! UWM has seems to be overlooked when people discuss the best colleges in Wisconsin. This plan should at least help gain some of the recognition and respect it deserves!! This whole plan has been long overdue...</p>
Faculty	<p>I would like to report an omission from the Master Plan final report.</p> <p>The presentations for the Master Plan described a tool kit that was to emerge from the process. The tool kit was described as helping the campus community to make decisions on how to best develop the physical campus or campuses. In particular, at the conclusion of Phase B, a Decision Tree was to have been provided. At the March 26th campus presentation, which coincided with the conclusion of Phase B, I noted that the Decision Tree was absent, and asked the master-planning team for this important document. I was told that it was not quite ready, but that it would definitely be released later.</p> <p>Two weeks ago, at the Sept 29/30, 2009 presentation, a slide was shown that again indicated that a Decision Tree, stemming from Phase B, was part of the promised tool kit.</p> <p>Evidently, this component was somehow omitted from the draft of the final report. The final report, in contradiction from all previous materials, lists only 3 components for the tool kit arising from Phase B. The missing Decision Tree is vital for the Master Plan to be useful. In its absence, the Master Plan can show only one path of development. We need to know, as was promised, what tradeoffs the various development decisions will entail. Please correct this omission and include the Decision Tree in the final form of the Master Plan.</p>
Student	<p>I don't understand why UWM just doesn't expand in the immediate vicinity, as Marquette does. Purchase the houses or acquire them through eminent domain, tear them down and build what you need. The original plans where to build out towards the River. I know the people in the neighborhood will squawk, but they squawk about everything - nothing will ever make them happy. UWM has been here for over 50 years, they have had time to get used to it or to move. Just do it and be done with it. No need for transportation between facilities.</p>

Faculty	<p>The master plan has taken shape before the current furlough decisions and implementations have taken place. In view of these developments, the University should focus on its highest value assets, the people working here. In this context, paying the full salaries and the canceled increases should come before any other allocations, which include master planning efforts under discussion.</p>
Student	<p>The data on Lincoln park is inaccurate. The information that is contained in the draft may cause some issues with the park system because the given borders are referring to the Golf Course instead of the Henry Aaron Field location.</p> <p>I understand there is a lot of information in this plan and it does not focus solely on one entity more than another. I would think the athletics program would warrant more than a 1/9th of a page of information.</p> <p>An athletics master plan should be considered and done as a supplement to this document. This will allow a major vehicle of the university to be thoroughly analyzed and planned into the future of this campus.</p> <p>I see that Engelmann Field becomes a student quad, but this document doesn't provide an adequate solution to this problem. I doubt the Lincoln Park information would have been included if George Koonce and the department didn't push for inclusion in this process. If we were under the previous athletic administration would athletics have even been considered in this document?</p>
Staff	<p>Concern has been expressed about investing in facilities outside of the City of Milwaukee.</p> <p>Although investment in the city is important, as I look at preliminary enrollment data for the current semester, just as many new freshman come from areas of Milwaukee County that are outside the city itself (15% vs 14% respectively).</p> <p>Therefore, I don't think the University need be apologetic if a relatively modest portion of the total future investments are made within the larger county so long as there are valid reasons for doing so.</p> <p>In addition, a new freshman enrollment percentage that's almost as large as the above Milwaukee city+county total, 27%, comes from adjacent counties.</p>
Staff	<p>For years, the School of Architecture has required its students to come to the Alumni House and design a plan for a conference center that incorporates the House. I would like to see such a plan come out of the Master Plan, incorporating the Alumni House, and also the adjacent building and land now owned by Milwaukee County for its Parks service center. Thanks for your consideration.</p>
Faculty	<p>Comments on Campus Master Plan</p> <p>p. 8, 10 These pages list "opportunity sites." How were these opportunity sites identified, and by whom? What other sites were considered, and presumably rejected? On what basis? Where is the cost-benefit analysis of each site? I can accept the Harbor site for SFS, because WATER is already there. CSM is listed for housing and student lifewhy not for</p>

SPH and research? Why not USB area near Capitol/First for CEAS instead of Tosa?

p. 9 This page addresses open space and landscape analysis, and seems OK. However, it seems to me the access and circulation plans depend so much on other factors as to be unrealistic.

P. 14 what view of campus is this? Maybe wrong precinct of campus?

P. 16 I object to the description of CMP as open, inclusive, and transparent. It was none of the above if the process associated with identifying opportunity sites is not revealed, and if objections to such sites go unheeded. I agree that input was requested and received. However, it was not acted on in any meaningful sense.

P. 18 good on infrastructure and habitability. However, the assumption of enhanced transit services is unrealistic enough to cast doubt on feasibility.

P. 25 This page presents data on the future of the campus. I note a minimal increase in ug FTE, but more in grad enrollment. What is the basis for this projection? I also note a 25% increase in faculty in L/S. Some indication of how this increase is distributed across schools/colleges, and within these units individual departments is necessary. How about a chart with present vs future levels of enrollments/sch and staffing? Or perhaps a reference to elsewhere in the document where the info may be found?

P. 26 Where is support in CMP for scholarly activity that does not constitute collaborative or partnership activity with local entities? The university is more than Natural Sciences and Engineering. Where is recognition of conflict of interest problems? Where is comparable degree of support for Arts and Humanities, or Social Sciences?

P. 29 I would like to see an analysis wherein space/facility needs are proportional to projected expansion. Is it possible to reduce to some per capita figure for each faculty member or staffoffice, lab/studio, teaching, etc.? I know that some of this is in appendix 2, but it is not easily understood by a reader as it is presented here.

P. 34 The Pabst Brewery Bldg 29 is identified as a site for Public, Community, and Clinical Health activity. I think questions about the site and nature of a SPH bldg are conflated. They need to be independent. Considerable expertise suggests Bldg 29 is not suitable as a large scale health research facility, even if remodeled, despite assertions from campus administration and planners it is.

P. 37 What about social sustainability of Bldg 29 and Tosa? People are going to have to come and go, park their cars, eat, do work, etc. I don't see any of this as ultimately part of a cost-benefit analysis.

p. 38 How realistic are proposals about transportation sustainability and connectivity? These proposals all seem to rely on someone else, beyond the university. If the others do not act on the various elements of these proposals, these plans are not feasible.

P. 44 To the best of my knowledge, the Tosa site is not actually available, as no donor has given the money to purchase

it. Even if it were available, it would require extensive infrastructure, as acknowledged electricity, water, sewer, roads. Is this a realistic way to invest this amount of money, and for what return? If only a small number of people would use such a building, is it worthwhile? If a large number of people would use such a building, where is the provision for this number (e.g., transportation)?

P. 48 As I understand this portion of CMP, the three Kenwood IRBs would align W on Kenwood, not N on Maryland as stated. Check here for factual accuracy.

P. 66-transportation egress routes, connectors, quads, plazas, entry courts, etc., all seem reasonable in the abstract. However, what difficulties are going to arise when it comes to actually implementing them? Where would interior waiting areas be situated? I presume ground floors of buildings, but that reduces asf for other uses. Projected bicycle uses are overly optimistic most of the 9 month academic year is not conducive to bicycle travel. Summer is, but fewer students are on campus during the summer.

P. 77 re underground parking, I note appendix 3 lists cost as \$40K per spot. In addition, neighborhood residents have campaigned vigorously against such a plan. How realistic is this idea?

P. 87 How have possible opportunity sites been tested? To assert without evidence that sites advocated in CMP are feasible is insufficient.

P. 88- Isn't this picture of the Marquette athletic fields in the Valley? How about another picture here?

P. 90 The Harbor site for SFS seems reasonable, in light of WATER, although again a cost-benefit analysis confirming its desirability will strengthen the case.

P. 96 Descriptive text here says little need for high quality labs in Bldg 29 for SPH. Surely this can't be correct. SPH will need advanced labs with core capabilities in many important areas.

P. 99 There is some mention of sharing costs with a developer for Brewery/Bldg 29. This is the first mention of this. Needs some explanation.

P. 108 Too little consideration here to CSM for SPH.

P. 136 There is a listing here of near term projects, presumably to be consistent with \$240M in capital spending authority for the campus. How was this priority established, and by whom? I agree with SFS and Neeskay, as well as a Kenwood IRB, as high priority items. I agree that we need a building for SPH. I don't agree that it should be Bldg 29. Even if it were, I can't imagine that \$30M is adequate. Moreover, the site needs to be determined. I agree that an IRB might be useful for CEAS. I don't agree that it should be located in Tosa. No mention is made of Capitol-First site, even though CEAS has just developed a presence there. The Children's Center is listed for demolition. Where will a new Center be located? I see some discussion of CSM for a relocated Children's Center, but we have not acquired it yet. The total here is roughly \$278M, and even then the figures are not valid. How does this figure square with \$240M, some of which may

not be available for years? In subsequent parts of the chart, the Social Science Bldg to be situated on the present Norris Health Center is not listed. Where is the new Health Center to be located?

P. 140 I note that the PEC has become the lead committee. Where is the budgetary consideration, rather than just physical plant, landscape, and bricks and mortar?

Appendix 1. This appendix is 8 pages outlining the desirability of cluster hires and expanding core capabilities. It is good that this is recognized, but it strikes me as so general as not to be of much value. I don't see the basis of this analysis.

Where is an outline of growing academic areas, current faculty/staff expertise in these areas, projected costs/returns of mounting expanded programs in these areas, etc.?

Appendix 2. This appendix is 36 pages analyzing space issues, both existing and proposed. It seems to give disproportionate attention to CEAS and NatSci. It embraces various models, but the assumptions underlying the models are not explained nor is a reference provided where we might find them. A further problem concerns maintenance costs for any new buildings that are constructed. In the past, for example with Lubar, no new maintenance funds (workers, costs) were supplied. They were then siphoned from other buildings. These costs need to be taken into account and planned for. I see no indication of any of this.

Appendix 3. This appendix looks at transportation. It proposes various ways of modifying traffic patterns on surrounding roads. I don't see the reliance on bicycles as being useful, for reasons previously mentioned in regard to p. 66. I would think some sort of transit center, located at the union, would be useful. The campus isn't so big that walking from this point is problematic. We could reduce traffic within campus. I would think some sort of service buy up with MCTS is ultimately going to be the most workable solution.

Summary and Conclusions

I presume some nontrivial portion of this whole process is just boiler plate from previous exercises Sasaki/HGA have gone through. Maybe some of this is good-we wouldn't need to re-invent the wheel if someone else has already found a solution to a similar problem (e.g., UC-Boulder). In other cases I would grant the benefit of the doubt that some of their solutions and ideas will work. But in (many, most?) other cases they simply won't. The problem is that the third category seems to predominate.

Much of the process seems to be driven by private conversations between the administration, about what they want to do primarily because it would be good for their own resumes, and the planners. The CMP seems to instantiate what we have learned about admin ideas, with very little deviance. This is a problem. I object to any characterization of the process as open, inclusive, and transparent. The material in CMP on Tosa and Bldg 29 as opportunity sites, as compared with faculty opposition to these sites, is surely ample evidence here, as is the whole idea of an Entrepreneurial University with a research park to serve as engine of economic development.

The CMP seems to want things both ways. On the one hand, it says that it is a framework, a dynamic plan. Its language is very conditional, with coulds, shoulds, mays, possibilities, opportunity sites, etc. All this suggests plans are open for

negotiation and discussion.

On the other hand, certain specifics are presented as faits accomplis, notably that Tosa is a done deal, with only the details of the IRB to be worked out, or that CSM if used at all would only be for student housing and not SPH, or that SPH would be housed in Pabst Brewery Bldg 29. The language says a "single vision" is developed. All this is exactly the opposite of the first point. One can only conclude that the conditional language is a fraud, meant to deceive folks so that they will accept decisions that campus administration has already made and wants adopted.

The plans for sequencing and implementation are absolutely unworkable. At the very least, all of this is going to require an enormous amount of funding. I realize that we are talking about events spread over many years--20, 30, or more. Nevertheless, it is going to require coordination with surrounding neighborhoods. In light of past experience, these ideas can't possibly be realistic. As a result, we can't pick and choose among the various features, because then only a few things will be different, at the expense of others that will need to pick up the wreckage. Yet, the campus administration will want to pick and choose things for its own benefit, leaving us in the lurch. The money will not have been spent to produce the max beneficial effect for the campus or community as a whole. The childcare center is an example. We can't put it in CSM because at present we don't have access to it. If we do secure access to it, why couldn't we do so in a way that would allow its use as SPH? Why couldn't we purchase Hartford School, open half of it as a charter school and use the other half for day care?

Overall, I didn't sense academic/educational requirements as being the drivers of the plan. To be maximally effective, we should say, here's the kind of academic or educational activity we want, here are the requirements for this activity, here is what a building would look like that would provide for this activity. Instead, we have things just reversed--here is a place we can contemplate building something because we can get a donor for it, and then because we have a donor and our campus administration can now put something on their resumes, what kind of ed program can we put in it?

I saw no justification for Tosa or Bldg 29 as the primary locations for programs (CEAS, SPH) to be housed there.

There is little or no cost-benefit analysis of the moves being proposed. This is absolutely the single biggest problem. I presume advocates in the campus administration can list benefits, but what about costs? I can't imagine that the benefits will exceed costs for at least 2 of the moves Tosa and Bldg 29. Much is made of sustainability, but what about educational and academic sustainability? How can students and faculty be integrated into the life of the university if they are scattered all over the county? How can students get intellectual support, collaboration, input from the rest of the campus community if they are scattered all over the county? Wouldn't people in SPH need to talk with people in Bio-chem? How can people in Bldg 29 or Tosa communicate efficiently and effectively with Chem or Physics? How are students in SPH or Engineering going to take necessary courses in other departments?

I don't have any particular problem with contemplated changes for the Kenwood campus--IRB, pathways, neighborhoods, connectors, quads, plazas, etc. I think we need to look beyond the branding and rhetorical buzz words to the substance. However, as I said above, money for these changes is probably going to be scarce. The real concern is implicitly (or even explicitly) adopting an ill-advised plan for \$240M and the next 20 years.

	<p>Marc Levine's recent working paper outlined a number of far-ranging concerns pertaining to recently discussed initiatives. To the best of my knowledge, he didn't dream these concerns up in the 15 minutes before he made his paper available. Why weren't any of these concerns addressed in the CMP? I realize the CMP was substantially completed before Marc's paper appeared, but that is not the point. The concerns have existed for many years. If the planners weren't aware of them, why not? What does their absence imply about the validity of the content of the CMP? Should the planners have known about them? If the planners were aware of them, why were they not addressed? What does their absence imply about the integrity of the process underlying the CMP?</p> <p>I agree that the campus should not devote its efforts to embalming the status quo. We do need to move forward, and the CMP with the possibility of \$240M in a capital expenditure budget affords a unique opportunity to do so. I agree that the process should be open, inclusive, and transparent, and look forward to working with the campus administration in a collaborative and consultative, rather than adversarial relation. One way is for the administration to recognize the legitimacy of faculty concerns and address them, for example, as those concerns are represented in Marc Levine's working paper and other venues, instead of openly disparaging them and seeing what it can get away with, if indeed that is what has happened. Perspective is what best promotes a reasoned, principled, and deliberate course of action, and perspective is what the current situation demands.</p>
Academic Staff	<p>A full-blown transportation plan is long overdue, regardless of any off-Kenwood development. However, I feel compelled to point out 2 factors. Heavy reliance on an increase of bicycle traffic is simply unrealistic due to our climate. Other than September, half of October and the first half of May, other months during the academic year are frankly not conducive to biking for most faculty, staff and students. When one can bike (June, July, August) traffic and parking are far less of an issue, since we have far fewer classes offered and only about one-third of the enrollment. Second, regardless of one's feelings about the Wauwatosa site (or other off-Kenwood sites for that matter) transportation needs for those sites cannot be adequately determined until we have a real idea of what is going there. If we will have 20 faculty/researchers out at Wauwatosa, we can provide free parking or vouchers when they come to campus and do not need an elaborate plan. If there will be hundreds working there or significant student involvement, then more is indeed needed. The same applies to to other sites. How many faculty/staff and students are involved should drive transportation plans for these sites.</p>
Staff	<p>I thought from the spring presentation that the suggestion of building a new Child Care center at the north end of campus near the Pavillion had general acceptance. It seemed to be the one item that was not particularly contentious. In addition, I had presumed that "sequencing" would logically lead to this being the very first project undertaken to free the land now occupied by Kunkle and targeted for the IRB on campus. Apparently I was mistaken.</p>
Staff	<p>I am deeply concerned that the parking needs of UWM staff members are being given insufficient attention in Master Planning. Full-time UWM administrative staff, especially those with 12-month appointments, have parking needs that differ substantially from those of faculty. My administrative staff colleagues and I must be on-campus 12-months of the year, 5-day a week, typically 8AM - 6 PM. We lack the flexibility of schedule (and therefore of parking) that others (particularly faculty) enjoy. These needs must be better appreciated and accommodated in UWM's Space Planning efforts.</p>
Grad Student &	<p>Why should UWM be hypocritical in eliminating green spaces in MKE county for the sake of an engineering school</p>

MKE Homeowner	<p>facility? If UWM believes in being responsible to the vitality of future generations and our own society's survival, we shouldn't endorse plans that result in net loses in green space. Protect the county grounds and develop in an under-utilized, abandoned sector of the city of Milwaukee. There are tons of places like this that our own urban planning students research all the time, make the purchase and build at a neglected urban site.</p>
Faculty	<p>The maps are not well notated--they need a north arrow, street names, building names (some are incorrect) in many cases in able to be able to read them better.</p> <p>Hadn't heard sites or buildings referred to as "The Brewery" or "Alumni House" before.</p> <p>If Mellencamp Hall is in poor enough condition for it to be demolished, shouldn't Bolton Hall be in line for improvement? I only see (p. 51) that there is a proposed addition to the north side of Bolton Hall; is this going into the narrow area between the north doors of Bolton and the library? Is there room for an addition there?--the site plan makes it look like there is a lot of room but it is a relatively narrow and very heavily travelled E-W route through campus.</p>
Alumni, Community Member	<p>I would strongly urge against building an engineering campus out in the suburbs. As Mr. Santiago himself says, the city is a big draw for the school. As an alumni who now lives in the city because of my positive experience while attending UWM, I agree. So why would you want to put a building in a location that has absolutely none of the draw of an urban environment? That engineering building belongs downtown.</p>
Alumni	<p>Have you looked at the Cousins Center in St. Francis? There's sufficient parking and a fairly large facility. Public transportation may be improved to/from the area especially if commuter trains come to fruition.</p>
Community Member	<p>As a native east-sider and son of a former UWM professor, I very much feel a part of the UWM community. Though I attended UW-Madison (graduating in 2001) I audited several UWM courses in subsequent years. I am vehemently opposed to expansion plans that entail a satellite campus in Wauwatosa and see it as a giant boondoggle. Downtown Milwaukee offers abundant room to expand as well as the opportunity for numerous synergies existing infrastructure, businesses, hospitals, and other institutions. UWM is an urban school and should remain such. Suburban sprawl is a blight on our landscape and culture, and it strikes me as outlandish that Milwaukee's premiere public university would consider subsidizing it. Furthermore, as a young(ish) individual, I feel that I am still in touch with the mindset of today's students, and I am extremely doubtful of the appeal that a suburban campus would have to them. What makes UWM an attractive place to go to school is its setting in Milwaukee not "anyplace-USA" suburbia. Young people are increasingly flocking to the cities, and no one is going to want to live in Wauwatosa. This would leave long commutes as the only option an unsavory prospect.</p>
Community Member	<p>I believe the County grounds should be left as is. The addition of buildings and parking lots will not only disrupt the monarch butterfly migration, but will lead to additional run-off and flooding along the Menomonie River. UWM should find a space closer to its east side campus for its engineering school. We certainly do not need any more retail space in this area, as Mayfair and Bluemound Roads provide more stores than are humanly possible to visit.</p>
Community Member	<p>While I appreciate UWM's need to expand, I would greatly appreciate the campus NOT being placed on the County Grounds in question.</p>

<p>Faculty</p>	<p>I am pleased to see this work. It is obvious that we have so many space restraints based on our location. It is wonderful that such a dedicated group of people have begun to work and develop plans for our next steps as we increase our research, opportunities to incorporate our graduate students, and increase our space where we can optimize our work. The day really should come where we have comfortable and appropriate space, where our resources can be centralized, and productive faculty do not have to have 3 offices in 3 very different locations to conduct either their laboratory or clinical research associated with many different types of human or animal samples.</p>
<p>Urban Planning Grad Student</p>	<p>Throughout the plan it refers to connectivity, however there is little mention of how a campus located in Wauwatosa will be accessible to the rest of the school. Other than driving I don't know a way to get to the Wauwatosa campus. While there is a bus line that travels to the county grounds it is an hour ride from the main UWM campus. The partnerships that UWM hopes to create at the county grounds are theoretical at this point and there is no reason that these partnerships could not be created without the Wauwatosa campus. From what I understand the graduate program would be in Wauwatosa and the undergrads still at UWM. What about the continuity between the two programs? How are undergrads better served by being separated from graduate research and expertise? There is plenty of land in the downtown and harbor area to fully fit all the buildings planned for the Wauwatosa campus. The only benefit I see from a Wauwatosa campus is cheap land and cheap labor provided to companies located at the county grounds in the form of graduate students.</p>
<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Draft Master Plan page 8: The Brewery: there are no comparable adjacent academic institutions that make this an attractive site (only Cardinal Stritch U. is on site) The Innovation Park in Wauwatosa: Children's Research Institute is already connected with UWM on the main campus through the robust NIH center- Children's environmental Health Sciences Core Center. Co-location was not needed. In fact the Wauwatosa IRB building does not even contemplate research of the sort that this Center conducts. Why not? Columbia Hospital. is much more useful than for student housing, student life, and children's day care center. The State remodeling plan conducted after the State budget set aside \$56,000,000 to purchase the property, for example, envisioned Health Sciences moving into the space. Why have the planners continually minimized the importance of the site and what could be done with it at much lower cost than other sites (remodeling instead of new building costs) page 10: Opportunity sites Brewery: Health campus for public, community, and clinical programs plus clinical problems of education, psychology, and social welfare. This is clearly a cluster of "clinical programs" that has little to do with public health. Moreover, none of this was tested through academic programming. Indeed the Public, Community, Clinical Building committee that is now active has essentially scrapped this view and described the building as for the School of Public Health and related programs.</p>

Innovation park: The rationale is poorly framed. Graduate engineering will not move to Wauwatosa. At best only a small contingent of bioengineers will move there. Furthermore, “aspirational” partners not “viable” partners have been identified. I have the best partnership and I am located on the main campus.

Columbia: focus on dormitory space greatly undervalues Columbia

page before 15: Are Maryland, Kenwood, and Hartford streets blocked off and turned into green space as seemingly portrayed in the picture? New library; Hartford school replaced. That rendering does not look like UWM!

page 15: “catalyst for innovation and economic development” is a simplistic view of the university in light of Marc Levine’s thorough study, “The Entrepreneurial University.” At best, this becomes a component of the activities universities engage in not the totality.

Characteristics of transformation (pejorative, uninformed)

- This is not a regional teaching institution! This is a research university that has been ranked as a research II institution.
- Transformation from discipline-centered institution to highly collaborative culture. What does this mean? We have many interdisciplinary programs e.g. public health, lab for surface studies, urban studies, etc.
- We are heavily invested in the urban community; we are not geographically isolated in our programs, research, service. Quite the opposite.

page 16: The Planning Process

paragraph 2: the planning process was not highly inclusive and transparent. It had the gloss of inclusion and transparency but did not listen to input. e.g. feedback sessions organized by the planners continually raised major questions about Wauwatosa. While the vision for Wauwatosa kept changing-Engineering School to Graduate School of Engineering, to biomedical engineering, to an interdisciplinary research building with engineers, health scientists, information scientists, etc gathered there-there was never a willingness to test the credibility of the site in relation to many others that were rejected, such as Capitol and First St. Similarly, the test related to the school of public health continues to be garbled, despite repeated efforts to clarify what public health is and that it is not clinical health.

Phase A, paragraph 2: the planning process did not honestly look at a number of sites (e.g. First and Capitol and sites near Oakland and North, or ones on the Park East, downtown)

page 18: Planning Principles: these are not complete, particularly the stewardship section that does not explicitly describe the components of environmental stewardship that are critical for off site location considerations. As a result, the linkage between site descriptions and the principles is weak throughout the document. For example, one principle was to integrate research and instruction. Yet,

repeatedly, the Kenwood campus is looked upon as the undergraduate (instructional) campus and research is placed elsewhere. See for example the description of the new building for clinical and public health in the present Cunningham Parking Lot for undergraduates and the new building for the same disciplines at the Brewery for graduate research and outreach.

The actual planning principles are accessible from the feedback site!

page 19: The process was anything but responsive. It resisted repeated criticisms of Wauwatosa and moving public health off campus. It was not rigorous as the academic planning stage was flawed as all recognized because it asked for bluesky speculation about future programming not responsible planning. In addition the subcommittees were ad hoc groups not connected to unit planning.

page 24: UWM Mission: urban, metropolitan, local are the adjectives. Yet, most of the city was ignored in off-site analysis in favor of a suburban location for engineering. CHECK the UWM urban mission. What is listed here as the UWM select mission is fabrication. It is not UWM's official select mission. See http://www4.uwm.edu/about_uwm/mission.cfm

page 26: Research areas and partnerships: Health sciences-after I repeatedly described the difference between clinical and public health top the planners, the two are still conflated (Healthcare research is closely tied to Nursing and Health Sciences as well as the School of Public Health.). Heavy focus on healthcare and the uncritical statement that the focus is based on strengths in Nursing and Health Science, omitting the leading role of Letters and Science and contributions from other schools and colleges, is misleading.. Blood center, Aurora, and Health Dept. are only listed institutions-not MCW, not Children's Research Institute. This biases view as to partners and ideas of location. This section needs to be rewritten to include a separate focus on public health, its strengths and opportunities, and its research links to virtually all the schools and colleges at UWM.

Freshwater-this section is much larger than the others because of effort to put business-related research first. UWM's leadership in freshwater research only shows up in the middle of the first paragraph. There follows a much too effusive discussion of the WATER Institute's role in comparison with anything else on the page. It gives the false impression that this is the best thing going when, in fact, it is only one of many strengths

Biomedical engineering.-this section is completely off base. Where did it come from? The strength in engineering is in energy and advanced, sustainable manufacturing. New hires begin to provide engineering with faculty in biomedical engineering.

Advanced manufacturing-lack of research detail here is disturbing

page 33: UWM in the City Note the qualifier at the bottom of the page. The off-campus sites were identified by UWM (administration) prior to the beginning of the

master plan exercise. Other sites were reviewed as well. Where are they discussed? They are not discussed and so the campus is stuck with preconceived locations. Note: the planners repeatedly stated that they would provide the campus with options for development. That did not happen; they basically went with the administration list and refused to consider others.

page 34: First paragraph: "The following principles govern locational decisions..." How can principles be involved when the sites were pre-chosen by the UWM administration?

Guiding Principles include minimizing movement between sites.

Brewery The non-sequitor logic identified above continues here. This is a site for public health as the current building committee quickly recognized. Instead, it is identified as a site for public, community, and clinical health. No consideration is given to adjacency of important academic programs for the School of Public Health, despite Petering having explained this need in detail to the planners.

Actually, in the successive versions of the planners the location first moved back to the main campus and then returned to the Pabst site in an apparent tug of war. b Innovation Park and Columbia are described as above

Lincoln Park and US Cellular Arena identified for athletic expansion here but were never discussed in meetings. However, no other sites are mentioned.

page 36: Map shows clearly that real partners are downtown except the map does not include WE Energies and Eaton Corp. for energy research. Although the listed partners in Wauwatosa are only "aspirational", the focus on health/biomedical research argues strongly that if health disciplines are to be located anywhere other than campus, it should be there. That is the puzzlement of the master plan.

Health is split up. The downtown contingent really has no intellectual partners.

page 37: Under Economic sustainability: regional strengths in health care?? Where did this come from? What is the evidence?

The implication that investing in the Pabst property is investing in underutilized space that needs renovation for urban renewal is a mischaracterization. This is highend real estate that is being developed for profit by Joseph Zilber.

Automation but no mention of energy and sustainability research, which Petering, Tysoe, Holahan demonstrated is a major research theme at UWM based on analysis of academic plans (white paper).

page 38: Environmental sustainability: statement is made that navigable transit system is needed to link sites an minimize carbon footprint. This is like belling the cat plus it is so vague as to be meaningless. If we are spread out (definition of entropy), how will energy use be minimized?

There is no GLRF shuttle system in place as is stated.

There is no content or analysis to this page; anyone could write this.

pages 40,41 Views are not of our campus

page 43: Kenwood campus Strategy- new facilities will focus on undergraduate facilities

for engineering, health science, arts, life sciences. This again is nonsense. The IRB building, for example, is a huge research building project. Trying to separate undergraduate from graduate activities can not be done in the sciences as was repeatedly explained to the planners. For example, undergraduates do research in labs. If labs are elsewhere, how will this occur?

page 46: Maryland avenue is now a pedestrian walk way? It looks like it.

page 48: IRB building The buildings look undersized for the needs with about a 4 story height limit. This impression is magnified on page 49. Why not a 6 story height?

Health building. Primarily undergraduate space for nursing, health science, and public health. The rationale for an undergraduate focus is missing; what we need more than anything out of these schools is research. In addition, public health will have rather few undergraduate programs at least in the near future.

Note: the buildings cover and may block the current driveway to the chemistry and engineering docks and engineering parking lot.

page 51: The MP text does not contemplate a library central tower, for which the current building is prepared. The research function of the library is not addressed in the plans.

page 54: The planners indicate that the main campus has the space to accommodate most of future expansion but later indicate that land is not appropriate for some kinds of research and partnership activities. This general statement is not supported or specific. Thus, in its present form, the statement is meaningless.

Academic Identity and collaboration “allied health” is now “health sciences”

Adjacency is defined as being in the same building: actually the whole campus is adjacent. There is a misunderstanding that interaction depends upon running into one another; actually it depends upon folks finding opportunities to find one another (seminars, invited gatherings, meetings, etc.)

P. 55 co-location overview is generally what exists now.

page 56: Health education and Welfare: everything is co-located except the center piece for health, the school of public health, which will be downtown, that everyone wants to link up with according to the Public, Community, Clinical building committee and Kenwood IRB committee discussions.

page 58: The Kenwood IRB building is described as accommodating undergraduate engineering and science students. Clearly, this is incorrect. These are major research facilities. It is commented that additional space will be accommodated at the innovation park. But we now know that the Wauwatosa IRB building will be for health, information science, bioengineering, etc. In other words, this text is out of date before the report is complete. Why is that?

The Health, Education, and Welfare building again is slated for undergraduate students, when health sciences needs research space.

page 69: Is stormwater management proposal robust? Check with SARUP

page 71: “Fundamental to all these networks is the desire to reduce vehicle miles traveled

to the campus.: How is this consistent with dispersal of the campus? The goal to reduce by 25% the driving to campus. This is extraordinarily modest for the 20 year horizon of this plan.

page 73: A pedestrianized campus???

page 74: The much awaited transit plan is meager at best. Nothing new here.

page 77: Parking spaces remain unchanged even though there is a proposed 25% reduction in driving to campus. There is no incentive not to drive.

page 78: Environmental sustainability transportation, water, energy and emissions: really there is nothing substantive or assertive in this discussion. There is no recognition that the more the campus is dispersed, the more energy will be necessary to power the university. The implications of divided campuses is just ignored, despite the Guiding Principles.

page 82: Water consumption reduction by 20%: no strategies provided. Instead UWM is directed to its own environmental sustainability program to figure this out. Similarly, with energy, it is recommended that we develop plans... Note typo: "typically energy consumption decreases not increases in restoration projects. This sort of glib text is what anyone can write. What value added do we get because named architects are doing it?

page 90: The Harbor The current GLRF facility is 124,000 sq. ft. Only a small part of the building is now occupied. The west end is undeveloped as is a second floor and much of the 3rd floor.

Research clusters as listed have been defined by the School of Freshwater Science. They are not tentative or proposed as indicated in the text.

page 96: The Brewery This is not a gateway to Milwaukee! It can be reached from I-43 but so can everything else. Rationale for Health campus: it is adjacent to Sinai-Aurora, Kenwood (???), and MATC (on site; what is the value added of being adjacent to a technical college that is not a research university?) Sinai is a hospital, not a research medical school and not identifiable with public health, the stated academic unit for the site.

The vision is to house public, community, and clinical (education, psychology, social welfare) health programs. This is a meaningless, content free statement. The building committee has refined this to say that the primary determinant is public health and clinical components associated with it must focus on public health. That makes clear that Sinai-Aurora is not an important partner.

The undergraduate programs would remain on the main campus, thus splitting the units. This split is unsupportable: undergraduates do research, professors must teach. This is a recipe for continual circulation of traffic between the Pabst and campus.

The Pabst site is not urban regeneration. It is a site that is being renovated for profit by the major developer in Milwaukee.

Note that the argument that UWM at the site supports the City's tax base applies

more emphatically to Wauwatosa, where businesses are expected to co-locate with the university. If that site were in the City, the City would benefit from new tax returns as well.

“Because there is little need for high quality labs, the required instructional and clinical space (what about research space?) needs can be met through adaptive reuse of existing buildings. This is an absurdity and a fundamental misunderstanding of public health, which I explained to the planners at least twice. We need wet labs, specialized support labs, a vivarium, etc.

Research and partnerships: the planners cite Sinai-Aurora, MATC, MSOE, and Cardinal Stritch. None does health research. None of them matches UWM in type or quality of institution. MSOE does have an interest in bioengineering, but we want to be in Wauwatosa. Marquette has a department of biomedical engineering but we want to be in Wauwatosa. This section is totally without merit.

The list of possible research clusters is already dated based on the building committee’s work.

page 99: Financial there will be some duplication of services

Timing The planners do not understand that state rules apply to the site as long as state dollars are involved. Thus, the time to build will be similar at all sites.

page 102: Innovation park in Wauwatosa Rationale: locate research clusters, primarily from engineering, near key partners (totally without content when the history of changing vision for this site is considered). The concept is currently an IRB (Interdisciplinary Research Building)

Proposed research clusters: biomedical engineering, imaging, informatics, drug discovery (I am the author of the drug discovery institute proposal; there are no plans for the institute to move to Wauwatosa; nor have we been approached about this idea)

The move to Wauwatosa is driven by partnerships (what partnerships?)

Children’s Research Center Institute is listed (I have the only active partnership with the CRI: Children’s Environmental Health Sciences Core Center and it is not moving to Wauwatosa; part of it is already there)

page 105: The long distance suggests that inter-campus travel should be minimal! Recipe for faculty by default joining MCW in spirit and in practice.

Site has limited infrastructure.

Costs of service duplication mentioned but not discussed in any detail.

page 108: Columbia Vision: student housing, life, children’s center, and academic space with a focus on housing. This is a non-starter for area residents and a least common denominator use of the incredible opportunity to provide more academic space for UWM especially for the School of Public Health and other health disciplines.

page 115: Massing and facades scale of buildings: 3-4 stories! We can not sacrifice the

	<p>opportunity to maximize space with extra stories. Student life will be best if there is the best academic space! (Note on page 123: 6 story maximum for interior buildings when at present we have much higher buildings on campus now)</p> <p>page 136: The cost estimates are incredibly low. Health downtown is listed at \$30,000,000. That is 30,000 gross square feet or about 20,000 assignable sq. ft. That is only a small fraction of what will be needed according to space estimates. Correct information was provided the team in the form of our space plan (January, 2009) and also verbally to correct the above figure in an earlier meeting.</p> <p>page 139: It is unclear what the title STEWARDSHIP means here.</p> <p>page 142: Acknowledgements (spelling) In what sense, is this an academic plan or was the process academic planning?</p> <p>page 146: Physical Master Plan Team: who are they? Please list their names.</p>
Alumni	<p>I was glad to hear that the Committee has reconsidered the idea of moving the UWM Children's Center off campus. As a former student and employee of the UWMCC my time there shaped me just as much if not more than my studies at the University. I found enriching, cross-discipline relationships with fellow students while learning the gold-standard in Early Childhood Education from the fantastic staff and administration. The UWMCC provides a beacon for all of us in the field and it would be a shame for them to be taken out of the context in which they have thrived for so long. Thank you for your recognition of how integral this program is, not only to the families it serves but also to the professionals it creates.</p>
Faculty	<p>I am writing as Director of the Center for Women's Studies and an associate professor of English who used the Children's Center early in my career. Two of my junior colleagues and their spouses currently have children at the Center (only one of the four is tenured). The presence of high quality child care on campus was essential for my career here, and it is equally essential for my colleagues. Excellent child care, like that provided by the Center, is critical to both retention and recruitment of faculty. Child care is not an "add-on" or extra service: it is necessary for students, faculty, and staff to do their work. Many of our students juggle family commitments and schooling: their ability to succeed will be seriously damaged if they are unable to use the Children's Center.</p> <p>I am pleased that the Center is the second high priority on the list and urge you to articulate both long-term and temporary sites for the Center in the Plan. The Center also helps UWM to realize the goals of the Inclusive Excellence initiative, which the UW-System is requiring of all campuses. The IE initiative expects campuses to make their communities and environments accessible and inclusive for students, faculty, and staff--from curriculum to hiring to facilities. Clearly, the Children's Center plays a vital role in making the campus accessible to individuals with child care responsibilities. The presence of the Center signals to individuals with those responsibilities that they are important members of a campus community that recognizes and values their multiple roles.</p>
Faculty	<p>Having read the October draft of the master plan, I have comments to provide in three different areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health Sciences location- 2. I am an Associate Professor of Human Movement Sciences, College of Health Sciences. While our department has both undergraduate and graduate programs, the primary emphasis is undergraduate programs (500 undergraduate

students versus about 40 graduate students). From this standpoint, having our location on the Kenwood Campus in the new "health sciences zone" is in the best interest of the undergraduate students whom we serve. While our faculty do have very active clinical research agenda's in the community, I think moving the Department entirely, or splitting the Department between graduate and undergraduate programs would be detrimental to the interdisciplinary nature of our programs and research. Most of the faculty teach in both the undergraduate and graduate programs, and much of the research is supported by undergraduate student involvement. Furthermore, on-campus collaborations with other units, such as the Athletics Department, is critical to the functioning of certain programs such as the Athletic Training Education Program. Therefore, it is my opinion that the Department of Human Movement Sciences remain on the Kenwood Campus, with remote laboratory locations at the Brewery and Wauwatosa site as needed for research purposes.

3. Children's Center

As a parent of two children at the Children's Center, I was greatly relieved to see the relocation of the Center moved to second priority in the master plan. The outstanding reputation of the Center is well known in the community and it must be maintained without interruption. The importance of childcare directly on campus is multifaceted. First of all, it supports the mission of the university by expanding access to higher education to those students with young children. Maintaining physical access to child care on campus and at a reasonable cost for students is critical to allow the university to meet this mission. Secondly, recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff is enhanced when a service such as the Children's Center can be highlighted. Many young faculty with promising research careers have children and this could be an important factor in attracting them to campus to promote the research mission.

In terms of location, the critical factors seem to be 1)an adequate footprint to accommodate the special design and facility needs of a child care center, 2)adequate outdoor space for playgrounds and green space, and3) easy access for drop-off and pick-up. Either the Columbia location or the location north of the Pavilion seem to meet these needs. The location at the Alumni house is too far from campus, not on public transportation, and would be difficult for student-parents to easily access the center between classes.

The issue of relocation of the Center, temporary or permanent, is a very important one that deserves equal attention as other initiatives in the master plan.

4. Athletics facilities

As the plan has identified, the complete college experience must include not only academics, but also community, social, and residential life. I am shocked to see that there is hardly any mention of the role of intercollegiate athletics in the master plan. Creating a community campus environment is not only about landscaping and study areas, but also about the sense of togetherness and community that is created when there is a "cause " to cheer for. Whether this is in the performing arts or athletics, this shouldn't be overlooked. The current situation where only a few of the athletics teams compete on campus is already a problem, and it would be desirable for all teams to be located on campus. This isn't possible for physical reasons, but the idea to remove yet two more teams (successful teams) from campus is something I do not support. While the new facility at Lincoln Park would undoubtedly be nice, it would further remove the campus community from supporting athletic competition. I urge the committee to reconsider making Engleman Field a "quad", and retain it as a soccer field.

Staff	<p>I think the master plan is excellent. While everyone may not agree with the proposed sites for each and every building, the creativity and vision it shows are great. It gave me an idea of what our campus could look like that I had never imagined or thought possible. I think that disagreement with particular site decisions should be kept distinct from a rejection of the concept behind master planning or the plan itself. I appreciate the thoughtfulness in addressing transportation, weather (any enclosed walkway is a good walkway in January), aesthetics, and green principles. I look forward to my future at UWM knowing that we will make incremental improvements toward a goal of a modern and attractive university campus. Thanks for the hard work of everyone involved. One additional thought: just because objections or ideas were ultimately rejected does not mean that they were not heard. Planning by consensus is difficult, especially with 30,000+ constituents, and some ideas must ultimately be chosen over others.</p>
Alumni	<p>While it's obvious that UWM must expand in and outside of its immediate neighborhood to meaningfully grow, opening up another campus at the Milwaukee County grounds is not in the best interests of UWM, the metropolitan area, or the city of Milwaukee.</p> <p>Education as well as many other knowledge heavy businesses rely on proximity for their relevance. While expansion is necessary, it should be done in a way that reinforces UWM's existing investments and builds on its unique location in the city of Milwaukee. By expanding Downtown, UWM can truly offer its potential students a unique and expansive collegiate experience. Also, by maintaining and expanding the proximity of research to the talent that lives and works Downtown, this will create opportunities for innovation that an office park can't hope to match.</p>
Faculty	<p>Current plans are to develop the southwest quadrant of campus in three phases. We expect the new buildings to sum to about 453,000 gross square feet. The conceptual sketch of these developments in the draft Master Plan shows a tall building to be built last, in Phase 3, on the site of the present Physics Building, while smaller-profile buildings will be built in Phases 1 and 2, on the site of the present Kunkle Building.</p> <p>Given the fact that a tall building on the western edge of campus would shadow our neighbors on Cramer, and that a large building on the present Kunkle site would shadow only UWM buildings, I expect more community opposition to a tall building in Phase 3 than in Phase 1. Therefore, I urge UWM to put as many of our resources as we can muster into the Phase-1 Building. This would help meet our pressing space needs soon, and in the long run would be more neighborly than the present plan.</p>
Student	<p>I really like the plans for the most part. Especially all of the new proposed buildings on the southwest part of campus. The one thing that I really do NOT agree with is investing \$150 mil. in Wauwatosa. I firmly believe that UWM should do everything in its power to keep the campus as cohesive as possible, and as close together as possible. I see far more bad than good in locating the research so far away from the main campus. Downtown would definitely be a alternative. Instead of encouraging urban sprawl in the Greater Milwaukee Area, we should be luring students and families alike back into the City of Milwaukee. Commuting is already an issue in Milwaukee, don't make the problem worse by spreading out the campus so much. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Faculty	<p>I'd like to first commend the committee and the administration in this herculean effort at a vision for our university and I hope much of what they envision comes to pass. I'd also like to acknowledge the responsiveness of the committee and</p>

the administration in addressing concerns of student and faculty parents regarding the Children's Center. It was so refreshing to see the Center go from a low priority to a very high priority, and for the committee and the administration to both affirm its commitment to providing the highest level of childcare on campus and acknowledge the relationship between its plans for the IRB and the relocation of the Children's Center. Obviously, the two projects are linked, and it was so good to read in Director Boulton's letter to Center parents that the administration has committed to relocating the Center before it tears down the Kunkle Center to start work on the IRB. (Temporary housing would be untenable.) There is a logical relationship between the two projects, and I hope the recognition of that linkage will remain in the minds of the planners and the administration.

In addition, though, a new home for the Children's Center makes sense in its own right, even without the necessity of a new center occasioned by the IRB. We have a great resource on our campus in the form of this wonderful, innovative Children's Center that I don't really even consider a daycare but rather a school of early childhood education. The staff is professional and loving and I have no doubt that my child gains something every time he is in their care. For this reason, I think the administration should actually support EXPANSION of the Center, so that more families can benefit from its services. (Indeed, I sent the Chancellor an email to this effect many years ago when my colleague could not get her child into the Center because of the waiting list.) My department has used the Center as a recruiting tool with great success (indeed, it was one reason I came to UWM in the first place and a major reason I stayed even when offered a position at a much more highly ranked institution) and it would make so much sense for the administration to view this Center as integral to its research vision for the university. To wit, if I know that my child is well-cared-for, even stimulated and benefiting from his time at the Children's Center, I can be more productive and can spend more time on campus doing research that will hopefully generate not only knowledge, but also external funds. The expansion of the Center was also favored by the Task Committee on Family and Medical Leave, as one benefit we can offer to nursing mothers since we don't offer them much time at home with their new babies. Being able to be on campus, working, but still close enough to drop in for a feeding or just for a visit to reinvigorate ourselves for work, is so important to working mothers. And it's a huge retention tool for them as well. I know two women who were assistant professors at this university who left academia after having children, and I know this is a widespread issue. (Neither of them were able to get into the Center, incidentally.) We have more women than ever going to graduate school and obtaining PhDs, but then they have children, and they leave, taking with them the huge contributions they would have made in the classroom and to academia. We can help end that by making sure that every faculty member has access to quality childcare ON CAMPUS.

For those reasons, I fully support the master plan's movement of the Children's Center to a second priority and applaud the committee and the administration's responsiveness to our vocal and organized group of student and faculty parents. We obviously care very much about this issue and can mobilize support for the IRB if it means a new and improved and larger Children's Center. So many on campus have had children at the Center or currently have children there or plan to someday have children there. It is essential that the Center have the full support of the administration and the committee. We look forward to helping with raising funds necessary for the construction of the new Children's Center and also look forward to hearing more details surrounding how those funds will be raised (since it obviously cannot come solely from fees for service, which are already somewhat prohibitive – another opportunity for the administration would be to make those services more affordable through some sort of institutional support). I assume you'll hear from students as well on this issue, given that many student parents would not be able to matriculate were it not for services provided by the Children's Center. Believe me when I say that I have searched for alternative child care (my first child was initially on the

	<p>wait list at the Center) and there is NONE that compare to UWM's Children's Center. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback, and thank you for already being responsive to feedback from faculty, something I see as key to the success of the Master Plan.</p>
<p>Non-teaching academic staff</p>	<p>Here is a brief listing of the areas/issues I feel the master plan should consider/include:</p> <p>All issues of physical access, usability, and safety such as making ALL classrooms and ALL student service offices accessible to individuals with a wide range of physical abilities and disabilities, including those who utilize a scooter, wheelchair, guide dog, etc.</p> <p>Making sure that ALL computer work stations (in labs or otherwise) have updated computers and hardware that can be used with a variety of input devices.</p> <p>Assuring the safety of all students in science labs and computer labs by providing adjustable tables and wide aisles.</p> <p>Embracing technology (increased funding and to allow for Internet-based communications with a campus service, office or instructional staff member (Skipe stations throughout campus?))</p> <p>Increased parking and shuttle services at all locations and/or a University-wide carpool service/office.</p> <p>Building a veteran-friendly campus with a Vet's Center.</p> <p>Expanding the role, physical space, and number of psychologist/counselors for counseling services on campus and at the other campus locations.</p> <p>Renovate the remaining older buildings on campus.</p>
<p>Peck School of the Arts</p>	<p>Congratulations on completing the UWM Master Plan. Your efforts to offer insight and options to UWM current and future institutional needs are worthy of serious consideration and diligent strategic planning.</p> <p>On behalf of the Peck School of the Arts, let me share with you some of the concerns we have related to the draft version of the UWM Master Plan.</p> <p>Page 56, Middle Column, First Paragraph: Lines 6-9: The Arts . . . The proposed relocation of administrative offices will make about half of Mitchell available for expansion of the Humanities and Communication programs within the College of Letters and Sciences. . . Given the concepts developed in the plan and the elimination of an arts annex (as proposed in a previous draft), it is highly unlikely that the 70,000 sq. ft. shortfall in instructional space required for the Peck School of the Arts will not necessitate some additional space in Mitchell Hall. The existing programs in Mitchell create substantial noise (dance and music) and any lectures offered during the scheduled dance classes will be problematic. Sound isolation is not possible. The proposed performing arts theatre will not offer a footprint large enough to accommodate the additional instructional</p>

space needs and relocation of dance classes will be costly and a waste of resources. These spaces were custom designed and constructed for the purpose for which they are being used and, in addition, significant student differential tuition dollars have been used in the last five years to remodel and upgrade PSOA spaces in Mitchell.

PSOA Response to Master Plan

Page 2

Page 56, Middle Column, First Paragraph: Lines 12-13:

The Arts . . . Future development deficits in this quadrangle could expand on the current Peck facilities at Kenilworth.

This is simply not feasible. The Kenilworth Square East Building was designed and remodeled to serve as the research facility for the Peck School of the Arts. Faculty and graduate students utilize all of the existing spaces. While some undergraduate classes are offered in Kenilworth (guitar, acting), it is planned and desirable to bring these undergraduate programs back to the Kenwood campus. The only reason they are offered at Kenilworth is that there is no space currently available on campus.

Page 136, Third Column/Chart, Line 21:

Theatre/Performing Arts \$45 M

The estimate for this space is low considering the need to accommodate a 70,000 sq. ft. shortfall for the Peck School of the Arts, the cost of constructing a theatre, the necessity to make the building a signature building on campus, and the cost of the equipment required to outfit theatre spaces.

Appendix: Summary of Retained Campus Development Proposed Kenwood Demolitions- Art Lecture (Arts Quad) asf 3,000 sq. ft . gfs 5,000

While all of us agree that the Arts Center Lecture Hall needs renovation, it currently serves a critical need for PSOA large capacity class offerings and public presentations. We do not have any other space of its kind in the PSOA. If demolished, additional funding will be needed for new construction. The proposed budget of \$45 million for a Theatre/Performing Arts facility will not suffice for all of the needs identified in the UWM Master Plan.

We were also disappointed in the limited planning related to:

- (1) Pedestrian safety concerns for our students crossing Kenwood Boulevard. Students crossing the street to go to the Zelazo Center or home face a gauntlet of automobile and bus traffic. Safety must be paramount in all that we do.
- (2) Transportation solutions (or the lack there of) for students and faculty traveling from the Kenwood campus to satellite campuses including the Kenilworth Square East facility.

Community

I am writing as a community member who is excited about the plans of UWM's Academic Research Center, but concerned about the use of the land around the site of the proposed UWM-Innovation Park at Wauwatosa. I am a

Biomedical Engineer and an academic, so naturally I was excited to hear that UWM planned to locate a research building close to the Milwaukee Regional Medical Center. I was not so excited about the actual location that was chosen for the project. Over a number of years now, I have tried to understand the logic, advantages, and vision that UWM has for this project. I have yet to see any truly lucid, compelling argument/justification. Recently, I have reviewed the latest UWM Campus Master Plan (September 2009). Unfortunately, there was little new justification for the project and only ill-defined terms such as 'partnership opportunities' and 'mixed use opportunities'.

UWM's Master Plan seems to make a significant argument for strategic access and opportunity sites, yet the Innovation Park hardly fits in with the rhetoric. The Master Plan explains how many of the projects, including projects like The Brewery, Plankinton, and The Harbor, locate along the Milwaukee River corridor and, therefore are aided by transportation routes and access opportunities. There is logic to this argument, but Innovation Park is omitted from this discussion and rightfully so, since it does not fit in to this vision. Innovation Park currently does not fit into the Master Plan. However, looking over the Guiding Principles for the Master Plan there are many important components that are required for a more unambiguous, tangible vision and for improving the health, social structure and economics of the Milwaukee Region. In order for an Innovation Park type project to work and to have support from the faculty and the community, the Guiding Principles have to be closely followed, the land use has to be reexamined, the transportation and connectedness of the project has to be addressed, and, importantly, the main argument for the location of this resource as to be revisited and strengthened.

The Master Plan is set as a living document that is supposed to take the community into the future, a long-term plan that addresses long-term needs with vision.

Within this plan should be UWM's understanding of sustainability and equity. Sprawling development is gobbling up over hundreds of thousands of acres annually. Agriculture in the United States is becoming concentrated in the hands of a few "agri-businesses". Only one percent of Americans are growing the food that is eaten by the rest of the population and 87% of this food comes from 18 percent of the farms in the United States (1).

In order for the location proposed for Innovation Park to be well accepted by the community and work in a sustainable, long-term manner, the plans require a minimal footprint, extraordinary concern for land use and must show a clear, concise benefits for health, education and vitality of the community.

An alternate solution:

Turn the area around the proposed Innovation Park into a resource and education center for sustainable living. The model could be based on Rosendal Garden in Stockholm (2), 'the world's first national city park'. Rosendal contains greenhouses, a sweeping mass of meticulously weeded beds for all kinds of plants, and meeting spaces for public courses on the environment, landscape gardening, composting techniques, and the cultivation of flowers, vegetables, and fruit trees. It also contains a cafe for organically grown "slow food" -- the antithesis, the staff will tell you, of fast food (2). Areas of the park could be dedicated to advancing technologies such as solar power and the use of wind for pumping water and generating electricity. This sub-theme probably fits in well with goals of the Engineering Research Center. If Wisconsin wants to plan a role in the 'green economy' it must lead in developing methods and technology.

See satellite map of area

<http://www.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&hl=en&msa=0&msid=105117857178981884068.000476adc9fb42cc088cc&t=>

	<p>h&z=15</p> <p>1)The Natural Step for Communities: How Cities and Towns can Change to Sustainable Practices http://www.amazon.com/Natural-Step-Communities-Sustainable-Practices/dp/0865714916</p> <p>2)The Rosendal Gardens http://visual-notes.blogspot.com/2009/09/stockholm-rosendals-garden.html http://www.frommers.com/destinations/stockholm/A38947.html http://www.rosendalstradgard.se/section.php?id=0000000073</p>
Faculty	<p>Healthcare-Columbia-St. Mary Transportation- Light Rail Walkways/Parking</p> <p>UW-Milwaukee is in an ideal position to set the standards for higher education as a complex multicultural, social and economical institution.</p> <p>Wisconsin/Milwaukee location and history has had an impact on the University's position in today's society.</p> <p>Location,access to medical facilities, future expansion of transportation, and convenient campus accessibilities.</p> <p>Great Lakes water research, Milwaukee Public Schools restructuring, and Urban development and safety.</p> <p>Military/G.I.Bill degree programs.</p>
Academic Staff at SCE	<p>I would like to suggest that the following information be incorporated under the bullet for the Plankinton Building in the section "UWM in the City" (Page 34).</p> <p>"The space currently owned by UWM in the downtown Plankinton Building offers three unique opportunities for ongoing student and community service and future growth. First, on the 7th floor it houses UWM's premier adult education conference center in the heart of the downtown business community. The flexibility of this space serves the university well today and offers many possibilities for the future. Second, on the 6th floor, the building houses the faculty and staff of the School of Continuing Education who serve thousands of students face-to-face from throughout SE Wisconsin and students world-wide through technology. And third, 10,000 square feet of currently underutilized space on the 5th floor is available to other UWM schools, colleges, and new initiatives for only the cost of refurbishing, as the space is already owned by the university and many UWM administrative and support services are already available in the building."</p> <p>There seems to be no mention of the Edith S. Hefter Conference Center in the section titled "Kenwood Campus and the East Side". Accordingly, I would like to offer the following text:</p> <p>"The Edith S. Hefter Conference Center located on the corner of Hartford Avenue and Lake Drive, houses a one-of-a-kind</p>

	<p>venue well-suited for university departmental retreats, small faculty gatherings, seminars, and official receptions. Its restoration was made possible by a donation from a private benefactor with the intent to give the university such a special venue while maintaining the historical and architectural integrity of the building."</p> <p>Please note that the School of Continuing Education is not included in "Table 1: Student, Faculty, and Staff Projections" in the section titled "Master Plan Drivers". While for the most part SCE does not have traditional undergraduate/graduate students, it does have 7 faculty and 72 academic and classified staff who require office and support service space and instructional and conference space for over 19,000 non-credit students.</p>
<p>Alumni, Community Member</p>	<p>Several comments:</p> <p>1)A further exploration of the MPS Hartford Avenue School is needed within the document. The two sentence statement about this school/site's future(on page 51) is overly limited. This building and property is so central to the main UWM campus that the small discussion of the parcel is somewhat shocking. Why is there no vision for this site? Couldn't the school be included in a multi-purpose building with UWM? Does MPS really want to maintain this school building when they are closing many schools throughout the district and Maryland Avenue School is nearby?</p> <p>2) The engineering research campus on the County Grounds is not the best location. Simply stated this idea should be revisited and locations closer to the main campus, in the City of Milwaukee, should be emphasized.</p> <p>3) The plan's seeming lack (based on the list of acknowledgements) of input from UWM's own Department of Urban Planning is a problem. This master planning effort could have gained valuable insight from planning students and faculty while providing a great educational opportunity. Too bad the chance was missed!</p>
<p>Staff</p>	<p>Kenwood Campus and the East Side</p> <p>Proposed Improvements Focus: Expansion of UWM Union and New Bookstore (P.51)</p> <p>Comment: Although I agree with the creation of a gateway to UWM at the corners of Kenwood and Maryland, further research and discussion will be required to determine if the placement of the UWM Bookstore at this location is in the best interest of the campus.</p> <p>Several factors may influence this decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Will the proposed relocation of the Bookstore adversely affect the retail sales relationship that it shares with Restaurant Operations? -Will the new Bookstore location have a negative impact on west/east building traffic? -Should the gateway to the UWM campus be defined by a retail operation? -Will the Bookstore's financial position be strong enough to support the proposed relocation and all other associated costs? If the assumption is that a new Bookstore with higher visibility will increase sales, how will the lack of customer parking be addressed? -Will students support the relocation of the UWM Bookstore? <p>The Master Plan also calls for a space for Alumni in the expanded Union. This idea must be more clearly defined. Is the</p>

idea to have a multi-purpose space that is paid for with Alumni contributions, or is the concept to have a new home for Alumni Relations, thus providing new opportunities at the current Alumni House site? In either case, student support of this concept and external funding would most likely need to be secured, as the use of segregated fees would not be appropriate for this purpose.

Administrative Building: In Campus Life Corridor/Main Street (P.55)

Why has Chapman Hall maintained space in the campus life/main street corridor? Could this space serve a better purpose to support main street or transportation objectives?

Union Gateway: Bookstore Location/Transit Portal (P.62)

Please see previous comments regarding Bookstore relocation.

The introduction of a transit portal at Union south seems logical as the Union is the most active building on campus. However, would a more central campus location be better suited for the campus transit portal?

Perhaps a more central campus location that utilizes Hartford Avenue and delivers the campus community to the campus life/main street corridor would be more operationally efficient? The Union could then serve as a secondary transit portal.

With regard to the UWM Union and Lubar School of Business loading docks: How will these loading docks be reconfigured or masked to promote and enhance the gateway experience?

Spaights Plaza (P.66)

What will the proposed reconfiguration of Spaights Plaza look like? Will this concept support the current and future multi-function programmatic uses of this space?

Transit Portal (P.74)

With the proposed changes to the south and south-west portions of the UWM Union: What provisions are planned for bike and moped racks that do not detract from the aesthetic quality of the gateway experience?

Implementation

Financial Model (P.136)

Union/Transit Portal/Bookstore
\$55 Million

Currently the UWM Union has gained administrative and student support (Union Policy Board and Student Association) to

continue to study the possibility of expanding the Union by 60,000 square feet and renovating approximately 148,000 square feet at a projected cost of \$55 million. This conceptual planning study did not include a four story addition to the Union or a relocation of the Bookstore. It is obvious that the results of the Union's conceptual planning study and the recommendations of the Master Plan will need to be examined collectively to accomplish the most affective use of the available funds. It must be noted that any proposed expansion on renovation of the UWM Union that utilizes segregated feeds as its funding source will require student input and approval. It will be critical for UWM's Student Affairs administration to provide the leadership in the Union expansion and renovation planning process that balances student input with the recommendations and key components of the Master Plan.