DISCUSSION:

The group responded to an initial presentation by the master planning team of design schemes for the east, core, and north campuses. The meeting was intended to eliminate options that are not feasible and focus the schemes for later presentations to broader audiences.

Parking
1. Schemes should not depend on structured parking, as it is not always feasible for the university to fund it.
2. When structured parking is combined with office or other uses it is easier to fund.
3. Structured parking located under a turf field at Alpine Village would offer several advantages to the university.
4. An informal parking share already exists between University Village and UCCS students, some of whom park in the lot across North Nevada and use the UCCS shuttle to access the academic core. Representatives from University Village Colorado are amenable to this arrangement and hope it continues into the future, particularly if larger athletic and performing arts venues are located on the North Campus. However, a formal parking share that would result in the university providing less parking is complicated due to the developer’s legal commitments to retailers.

Housing
1. The group felt that the university will begin to develop the next housing village in the near term. Locating an early phase housing development on this plan will be important.
2. The 900 bed housing village shown on the East Campus was thought to be a strong idea.
3. Housing developed on North Campus will be targeted towards upper division students and will not have associated sit-down dining facilities.
4. 1,200 beds is the maximum size for new housing villages to ensure that students feel that they receive individual attention and don’t get lost in the crowd.

Other Uses
1. Administrative and research uses should be indicated as well. Strategies similar to the current thinking for the Academic Health Services Center --- where university offices and other non-classroom functions can be located in unneeded space in other facilities --- are effective.
2. Daycare can be moved from its current location across Austin Bluffs Parkway, which may be a good site for research. A new daycare site allows for a larger footprint than they have currently and should be close to services, but does not need to be close to the core. It must include outdoor play areas. East or north campuses would be desirable locations.

3. Student health will ultimately outgrow its location in the public safety building and is another candidate to relocate outside the academic core.

Circulation

1. The group felt that the alignment of Stanton Road is important and it should remain connected to the campus and to Austin Bluffs Parkway.

2. While parallel parking has been proposed for North Nevada as part of other planning processes, this configuration was never adopted as a preferred alternative. Its current configuration, which would continue into the future per existing plans, does not facilitate storefronts facing North Nevada Ave. Representatives from the Urban Renewal Authority said the city might consider reducing the street to 4 lanes along the section adjacent to UCCS’ North Campus.

3. The concept of the pedestrian and transit spine needs to be developed in more detail to propose where the spine will be pedestrian only and where it will accommodate vehicles.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

_________________________________
Sally Foster
Campus Planner
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MEETING REPORT

PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: October 12, 2011 1:30 pm

SUBJECT: Open Session for Students and Faculty

ATTENDEES:
- Andrea Hassler: Students for Environmental Awareness and Sustainability
- Amber Lytle: Students for Environmental Awareness and Sustainability
- Cerian Gibbec: Students for Environmental Awareness and Sustainability
- Megan Fisher: Colorado University Foundation
- Carole Huber: Geography and Environmental Sciences
- Tom Huber: Geography and Environmental Sciences
- Gary Reynolds: Facilities Director, UCCS
- Priscilla Marbaker: Tapis Associates
- Kevin King: Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
- Sally Foster: Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The group responded to an initial presentation by the master planning team of analysis and a concept plan for the campus, focused specifically on the North Campus.

Transportation
1. The group felt that the spine will be a necessary aspect of the campus as it continues to grow.
2. There were concerns about how to run the spine through the most sensitive landscape areas, and the group concluded that construction will have to be handled very carefully.

Program
1. Facilities and programs located in the north campus should be selected carefully.
2. Some participants expressed concern that the Visual and Performing Arts programs would feel isolated on north campus. After discussion, however, the group concluded that the benefits of a consolidated new facility for VAPA would outweigh those concerns.
3. There was concern about locating the Academic Health Services (Peak Vista) facility in a north campus location far from the nursing program in University Hall.
4. Participants discussed the need for the master plan to work hand in hand with the Strategic Plan’s priorities for growth and new initiatives.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAIN’T/GROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner

xc: All Attendees

We will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.
MEETING REPORT

PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan
ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00
MEETING DATE: October 12, 2011 2:30 pm
SUBJECT: Master Plan Committee Meeting

ATTENDEES:
Carolyn Fox  University Architect
Jane Lloyd  UCCS Library
Ralph Seaman  Eagle Rock Neighborhood
Mike Maloney  Colorado Springs School District 11
Andy Burkart  UCCS IT Department
Janel Owens  Sustainability
Sabrina Wienholtz  UCCS Student Life
Matt Sidor  Student Government Association
Ramaswani Dandapani  UCCS School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Val Snider  Colorado Springs City Council
Jim Rees  Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Ralph Giese  UCCS Residence Life
Greg Stock  UCCS College of Business
Gary Reynolds  Facilities Director, UCCS
Priscilla Marbaker  Tapis Associates
Kevin King  Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster  Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The master planning team presented an updated version of the site and space needs analysis based on comments received during their September meeting. Committee members then walked together from the University Center to Alpine Village, discussing different building and landscape conditions that contribute to the quality of pedestrian experience on campus. Finally, the group responded to an initial presentation by the master planning team of design schemes for the east, core, and north campuses. The meeting was intended to guide the design team in refining the schemes for a second presentation to the committee later in the week.

Research
1. Some committee members expressed concern that areas of the site are not specifically called out in the schemes to promote research. Stakeholders from the City of Colorado Springs are interested in seeing how this plan will contribute to economic development in the city as a whole.
2. The group discussed a research strategy where facilities are integrated into academic buildings across campus rather than located in one concentrated area. From the perspective of the engineering department, this approach supports the entrepreneurial sort of research they facilitate most often.
3. The master planning team will brief the committee on research during the January meeting, focusing specifically on the conclusions from the Strategic Plan.

East Campus
1. As you approach the campus from the east, the topographic change across the site just west of University Hall makes it a very prominent viewshed. Buildings sited there should take advantage of the site and should not include structured parking.
Campus Organization and Transit
1. The group discussed whether the campus would have two or three academic nodes, expressing that it is an important strategic campus organization issue, but did not reach consensus.
2. It would be helpful to be able to quantify how much time students and faculty would save by being able to use the transit spine.
3. Realistically, a shuttle would need to have 7 stops to serve all campus destinations, particularly for students, faculty and staff who may be handicapped or have lower mobility. The university could run a 3 stop express route in addition to the “local route” during peak class hours to ensure smooth class changes.

Timing and Phasing
1. One of the important first phases of master plan implementation will be starting to develop a new housing village. The master plan should clearly delineate whether this village should be located on the east campus or adjacent to the existing Alpine Village.
2. Given the connectivity issues associated with development on the North Campus, a desirable development strategy would be to infill new uses on the core and east campuses first, saving the North Campus for future development.
3. If the arena is located north of the Four Diamonds complex, some or all of the existing fields could be preserved in the short term.

Student Life and Recreation Considerations
1. The committee noted that the early schemes do not show the sorts of student life and activity spaces that create a node within each housing village.
2. In addition to social spaces incorporated into residential areas, specific considerations need to be given to the location of social spaces for commuters.
3. An expansion of the rec center will form the bridge between the existing core campus and development on the north campus. If it expands to the north, it will still feel disconnected due to the bluffs between Summit Village and the rec center. For this reason, expansion to the south is preferable if the topographic site constraints allow it.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner

xc: All Attendees
We will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.

PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: October 13, 2011  2:30 pm

SUBJECT: Food Service

ATTENDEES:
- Tamara Moore  Director of Auxiliary Services Marketing
- Susan Szpryka  Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
- Ralph Giese  Director of Residence Life
- Jeff Davis  Director of the University Center
- Gary Reynolds  Facilities Director, UCCS
- Sally Foster  Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The group discussed future food service needs for UCCS that should be accommodated in the Master Plan, focusing on the connection between sharing a meal and building community. To take advantage of this connection, food service venues should be sited and programmed carefully within housing villages and the academic core. Food service needs in housing villages vary depending on whether or not the units are apartments for upper-division students or suites for lower-division students. Despite the mission-driven objectives for food-service on the campus, facilities need to perform financially within a competitive environment where people have many options, resulting in a "choosiness" about food.

**Apartment-Style Villages**
1. Traditional dining halls are not needed in areas where students have full kitchens within their units.
2. Apartment villages would include:
   - a coffee shop located in a visible, high traffic site where students can "see and be seen." Pairing a Starbucks-sized coffee shop with a larger social space, laundry facility or bookstore would help create a node of activity. Experience with the rec center smoothie bar suggests that coffee is key.
   - a convenience store ("C Store") where students could purchase every day grocery and pharmacy items without needing to leave campus.
3. Initiatives where students are given a cup or mug at move-in and receive discounts on drinks when they use them can help to build loyalty and integrate the community space into their daily routine.

**Suite-Style Villages**
1. One traditional dining hall should be provided in each village of 900 beds to provide meals as well as an opportunity for students without full kitchens in their unit to socialize.
2. The existing dining hall in Summit Village is close to the right size: the code capacity is 249, but it is set up on a regular basis to seat 160 and 198 for special events. New facilities should be slightly larger, accommodating more seating and more kitchen space.
3. Current catering operations are located in the Summit Village dining facility. If a new facility could provide a larger catering kitchen, that would improve operations at the Summit Village facility.
4. Loading facilities for a new dining hall should be slightly increased from the Summit Village facility. To accommodate deliveries and catering, which happen mostly in box trucks and vans, it would likely need one bay with a dock and 2 or 3 additional bays.
Considerations for North Campus

1. Because of the concentration of restaurants located at University Village Colorado (UVC), university-operated food service venues should be considered carefully. The university does not want to try to compete with the retail across North Nevada Avenue. Coffee shops are likely not viable, especially if a coffee-oriented establishment is added to UVC.

2. Residential areas of North Campus may be able to support a smaller convenience store.

3. A small cafe associated with the Visual and Performing Arts facilities would likely be supportable in addition to concessions associated with an arena.

4. The arena will need to have its own catering kitchen in addition to the kitchen serving the remainder of the campus.

Sustainability

1. UCCS does collect compostables.

2. Greenhouse and orchard operations growing food on campus will likely grow in the future, providing a larger percentage of the food served in dining halls.

Other Food-Service Opportunities

1. Given the significant number of commuting students at UCCS, dining located near the academic core is important. New grab-and-go style establishments would be most successful co-located with student union functions and sited on the East Campus to avoid competition with UVC.

2. Delivery and call-ahead models are interesting ways to meet students' needs for a quick meal. It will be difficult to compete with national chains' pricing for delivery, but call-ahead and online pre-order services can be accommodated with collaboration with IT.

3. The "C4C" facility build at CU Boulder is a great facility but not within reach for a school of UCCS' size in the near-term.

University-wide Servicing

1. Mountain Lion Way is difficult for semis to navigate.

2. The addressing system is confusing for people making deliveries.

3. A central receiving facility would reduce the need for intensive loading at many of the campus food service locations; however, the facility would be difficult to fund and is likely a long way off.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner
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MEETING REPORT

PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: October 13, 2011 3:30 pm

SUBJECT: Open Focus Group #2

ATTENDEES: Mary McGill – GES and PSC Program Assistant
Suzanne Scott – Budget and Planning
Gayanne Scott – Resource Management
Peg Bacon – Provost
John Harner – Professor
Christina Jimenez – Professor
Glen Whitehead – Professor
Gary Reynolds – Director of Facilities
Sally Foster – Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:
The master planning team presented a summary of their campus observations, the Concept Plan, and a summary of the program elements being considered for the North Campus. Members of the campus community participated in a discussion with the team in an attempt to validate campus observations and the direction in which the Concept Plan is guiding the Master Plan, as well as to offer their ideas for future development at UCCS.

Transportation and Parking
1. The spine is a necessary component of the campus to ensure it functions well as it grows.
2. Participants mentioned that student groups have suggested using gondola or monorail systems as a transportation option on the campus. This idea would work in conjunction with the concept of the pedestrian spine connecting the length of the campus.
3. The ugliest part of the campus today is the surface parking area along Austin Bluffs Parkway in the core. The East Campus offers an opportunity to provide a resource of parking in garages that would free some of this valuable central land for development.

Campus Organization
1. New campus facilities should be developed incrementally and adjacent to existing facilities so as to avoid "leap frog" development.
2. The Core Campus should be emphasized as the heart of UCCS.
3. Siting academic buildings to facilitate a ten-minute class change is critical to scheduling and space utilization. A proposal to lengthen the class change time was not approved by the student body.
4. UC Santa Cruz would be a good example for UCCS of a campus that stretches over a considerable distance and uses effective transportation to facilitate class changes.
5. The nursing program at University Hall already feels somewhat disconnected to members of the focus group, who felt that new campus development should attempt to make the East Campus feel more connected.
6. The group felt that the North Campus needs to be well integrated with the university as a whole through a connected network of social spaces that make it a "real university village."

North Campus Program
1. A new arts facility is needed to allow the programs, which are scattered across campus today, to interact easily. The visual and performing arts programs at UCS are highly interdisciplinary and collaborative: shared spaces for these programs would help continue this facet of their mission.
2. There are many community organizations interested in using the facilities proposed for the Visual and Performing Arts Center. This affords the opportunity for the university to form partnerships.
3. An 800-seat concert hall with acoustics tailored very specifically to musical performances would put UCCS on the map and make it distinctive.

Natural Environment and Sustainability
1. The biggest challenge for this Master Plan and its implementation all be integrating new buildings into the sensitive natural landscape that exists on the site today.
2. Adequate amenities should be provided for pedestrians and bicycles to move safely around campus.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner
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**PROJECT NAME:** University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan  
**ASG PROJECT #:** 21131.00  
**MEETING DATE:** October 13, 2011 5:30 pm  
**SUBJECT:** Public Forum  

**ATTENDEES:**  
- James Hamer  
- Justin Wines  
- Michael Weed  
- Steve Caer  
- Molly Mrazek  
- Julia Tivera  
- Bob Thompson  
- Kathy Thompson  
- Mitch Kerstens  
- Donna Merrick  
- Barbara Martin  
- Tom Westby  
- Gaby Westby  
- Dave Rice  
- Betsy Rice  
- Kyle Rodman  
- Sam Escalante  
- Ken Pals  
- Carolyn Hime  
- Gary Reynolds  
- Kevin King  

**DISCUSSION:**  
The master planning team presented a summary of their campus observations and the Concept Plan. Members of the campus community and its neighbors had an opportunity to comment on the work to date and offer suggestions for the future.  

**Transportation and Parking**  
1. Significant concern was expressed about the availability of parking on campus currently. The plan should address this shortage.  
2. Neighbors in Cragmor Village asked for clarification on the University’s parking strategies for the Core Campus and expressed frustration with university parking that has spilled into adjacent residential areas. Eagle Rock residents worry that similar trends will impact them as well.  
3. Participants were curious how many more commuting students will enroll in the future and how that will impact parking needs.  
4. Attendees expressed interest in the university pursuing discounted or free city bus passes for students.  
5. Bike rental systems were thought to be an effective strategy to improve mobility and reduce the need for parking.  
6. The traffic volume and speed on Austin Bluffs Parkway raises safety concerns, especially because students attempt to cross outside of the intersections.  
7. The City plans to widen Austin Bluffs Parkway in the future, which will have impacts on the campus. Attendees wondered if the university had input into this decision.  
8. Pedestrian paths, especially those connecting University Hall to the Core Campus, need to be better lit and supplied with security phones.  

*We will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.*
University Growth
1. The group commented that the plan should establish an approximate number of students that the University can accommodate by developing the North Campus.
2. Participants were interested in knowing how much growth in enrollment the university expects.

Planning Process
1. Meeting attendees felt that the process has not had enough student input and expressed a desire for students to be more involved and engaged in the planning process.
2. Participants suggested that more information should be posted on the website to inform a broader audience and help the university community decide if they want to attend meetings.
3. Some attendees felt that the Concept Plan did not take the long-term needs of the university into account.
4. Requests were made for more specific information to be included in the plan.
5. Some participants expressed skepticism about the transparency of the process and questioned whether university leadership had already developed detailed plans that they were not sharing. They emphasized the importance of taking the comments received into consideration.
6. The group asked for clarity on the eastern edge of the Urban Renewal boundary.

Environmental Considerations
1. The attention paid to the unique North Campus landscape of bluffs and prairies was appreciated. New development must respect the land.
2. Stormwater management is a challenge for the campus and solutions in line with the City’s new stormwater management manual should be explored.
3. The group felt that trails and open space are important elements to be included in the plan.

University Impact on Surrounding Areas
1. The pressure to convert owner-occupied homes to student rentals in the neighborhoods south of the campus is changing the quality of the neighborhood. Zoning strategies to limit the number of rental properties in the area were discussed.
2. Neighbors inquired about the university’s desire to acquire additional property south of Austin Bluffs Parkway.
3. Eagle Rock neighborhood is almost entirely surrounded by university property. Participants wondered if the neighborhood would remain.
4. Attendees requested that drawings show the streets south of Austin Bluffs Parkway to allow proposals to be understood more easily.
5. Participants asked for more detail about the interaction of the University Village Colorado (UVC) with future North Campus Development. One student expressed concern that the university would replicate UVC on the east side of North Nevada. Members of the planning team agreed that retail development is not appropriate for this site.
6. Some students referenced earlier master plans that proposed a research park on North Campus as an indication of a move towards commercial development.
7. One attendee expressed that the large blank walls along the river that are a part of UVC are detrimental to the experience along the trails.
8. The group questioned the long-term uses of land on the west side of North Nevada Avenue due to its proximity to proposed university expansion on the North Campus.

Respectfully submitted,
MEETING REPORT

PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: October 14, 2011 9:00 am

SUBJECT: Master Planning Committee Follow-up Meeting

ATTENDEES:
- Ralph Giese, Residence Life
- Jane Lloyd, Library
- Sabrina Wienholtz, Student Life
- Ralph Seaman, Eagle Rock Neighborhood
- Andy Burkhart, IT
- Carolyn Fox, University Architect
- Jim Rees, Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
- Liz Rockwell, Cragmor Village Neighborhood
- Ramaswami Dandapain, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
- Linda Kogan, Sustainability
- Mike Maloney, Colorado Springs School District 11
- Matt Sidor, Student Government Association
- Gary Reynolds, Director of Facilities
- Priscilla Marbaker, Tapis Associates
- Kevin King, Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
- Sally Foster, Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

Based on feedback the Master Plan Committee gave in response to the master planning team's first presentation of design schemes, the team developed several new schemes, focusing specifically on the North Campus. During this meeting, the team presented these refined schemes, discussing express versus local transit routes along the proposed spine, the layout of North Campus facilities that are likely to be constructed on campus in the near-term, and the full build-out capacity plan for the different zones of the North Campus. Committee members responded to the schemes, providing further direction as the planning process moves forward.

Transit and Parking
1. The plan needs to clearly specify which portions of the spine will be used for transit only.
2. Committee members inquired about whether the parking resource at University Village Colorado (UVC) could be counted towards the parking totals on North Campus to prevent the university from needing to build as much parking. Based on earlier conversations with UVC developers, the master planning team responded that UVC parking is informally available for people who are attending events on the North Campus as the developers feel that it will improve the success of facilities like the arena and the Visual and Performing Arts Center (VAPA) as well as increase business at their establishments. A formal parking share arrangement is not likely to be possible, however, because of legal commitments pertaining to the number of parking spaces provided on site to the retailers in UVC.
3. The group discussed how the plan connects to transit services offered by the City of Colorado Springs. Buses that run along North Nevada Avenue stop at the underpass to pick up and drop off passengers, providing an easy connection to the site from northbound and southbound transit.
4. Parking lots intended to serve the major event venues (area, VAPA) should have at least two means of egress to North Nevada Avenue.
5. Neighbors in Eagle Rock expressed concerns about traffic around the event venues when large events are letting out. Concentrated parking at the northern edge of the site will help to avoid those concerns.

We will proceed in reliance on this report.
Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.
6. Eagle Rock neighbors also want to maintain an easy connection to North Nevada Avenue from Eagle Rock Road.
7. The committee felt that the variety of spatial conditions introduced along the pedestrian spine was strong and should be preserved as the scheme develops.
8. Establishing separate spine routes for pedestrians and transit and personal vehicles should be achieved whenever possible.
9. The pedestrian portion of the spine should not dead end at the performing arts center or be required to pass through the building to continue north to the athletic complex.

Athletics
1. Members of the committee questioned the location of all the athletics competition venues so far away from the heart of the campus and whether this would limit opportunities to develop UCCS traditions, pride and loyalty among the student body. The group discussed moving the athletic facilities to the southern portion of the North Campus, but concluded that circulation was easier and the sites gained greater visibility in the location further north. Former UCCS students expressed that they enjoyed an opportunity to go outside of their normal circle for a special event when they were on campus and that the separation might help students feel like the events were more of an escape.

Campus Organization
1. The committee did not reach complete consensus on the best use of the land adjacent to Alpine Village and extending west through the arroyos; however, some members of the group expressed a preference for housing on those sites.
2. The committee recommended that the team engage the civil engineering consultants to look more closely at the area north of Alpine Village and its suitability for structured parking, academic and residential uses.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAIN/gROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner

xc: All Attendees