PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan
ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00
MEETING DATE: September 7, 2011 11:30 am
SUBJECT: Master Plan Executive Committee Meeting

ATTENDEES:
Carolyn Fox University Architect
Jerry Syracuse Design Review Board Member
Susan Szpryka Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
Tom Cone University Village Colorado
John Olsen Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Gary Reynolds Facilities Director, UCCS
Jim Rees Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Priscilla Marbaker Tapis Associates
Larry Sly Wilson Associates
Kevin King Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:
The group responded to the presentation of initial observations based on the team’s first visit in July and data gathered since that time. The comments helped refine the message of the presentation for later presentations to the full Master Plan Committee, Open Forum, and Design Review Board.

Overarching Comments
1. All proposals of the Master Plan must be fiscally feasible. Failing to acknowledge financial realities has caused the University to depart significantly from several past master plans.
2. The approach to the Master Plan should be similar to that taken for the East Campus Master Plan: The team defined buildable areas first, then established appropriate massing, and finally, identified programs that fit the location and capacity of each site.

Space Assessment and Need
1. The University has several estimates of how many students could be accommodated in their existing classrooms. Ayers Saint Gross’ estimate of 9,700 seems low in comparison and might be met with some resistance. This statement was generalized and did not include a specific projection for future meetings.
2. Shared spaces are problematic for space assessments, especially in the University Center, where rooms are used by student groups, athletics, and conference services, limiting their capacity.

Health Sciences Programs
1. Long-term planning envisions that nursing will continue to occupy University Hall.
2. A clinic, Academic Health Services Center, or facility for the aging could be located on the North Campus. While co-locating these facilities with the nursing program would be ideal, it is not fiscally feasible to build a new nursing facility and these related functions do not require a strong connection to the core.
3. The north campus clinical facility is programmed to 55,000 GSF initially and could possibly grow to 125,000 GSF with the addition of two wings.
4. Housing near University Hall would be ideal for nursing and other health sciences students.

We will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.
Core Campus
1. Most core campus buildings are 3 stories tall and this height range should be respected for any new buildings. Several committee members expressed that on specific sites topography and land constraints may necessitate taller buildings.
2. The Master Plan should explore how the University can create logical groupings of academic units as the campus grows.

Connections to the Strategic Plan
1. By January, the Strategic Plan team will have a good idea of what their plan will propose and can start to fully integrate it with the Master Plan.
2. The plan will project through 2020 and will make statements about how many students the University will strive for and what programs will drive its growth. Conclusions from the plan should inform assumptions in the Master Plan.
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DISCUSSION:

The Master Planning team met with Susan Szpryka and Jim Spice to gain an understanding of parking and transportation systems on campus and desires to improve them in the future.

General Policy

1. Students pay a $70 fee each semester for parking and transportation. This was instituted based on a 1998 student referendum with the stipulation that as a result, free parking with a shuttle to campus must always be provided to students to some location on campus.

2. Transportation and parking are funded separately and revenues from each are used to pay for new facilities. Parking revenues have funded a significant portion of the campus road network, but are not use for alternative transportation.

Parking

1. On-campus parking is split between three categories:
   a. Hub Parking: approximately 2,000 spaces in the core of campus available to permit-holders only. Faculty and staff pay $200 for the fall or spring semester and $100 for the summer semester ($500 for the year). Because they pay a parking and transportation fee, students purchase permits for $165 for the fall or spring semesters and $80 for the summer session.
   b. Overflow parking: 1,000 spaces at Four Diamonds where all students, faculty and staff can park for free and ride a shuttle to the Core Campus.
   c. Visitor parking: Visitors may park in Lot 1 or in the parking garage and must pay a metered rate.

2. 2.1 permits are issued for every parking space on campus. This ratio has remained constant over the last few years, but parking has grown harder to find. This suggests that students are staying on campus longer rather than just coming for class and leaving immediately.

3. Based on permit sales and parking demand, the University is close to being able to afford another garage. However, the convenient location of the first garage drove its success, and a similarly optimal garage site does not seem apparent.

4. Metered parking provides about $300,000 a year in revenues to the University.

5. Monday through Thursday from 10 am to 4 pm is peak parking demand. Especially during the first few weeks of the semester, it was difficult to find a spot. After 4, however, it is easy to find spaces.

6. While university officers, who can ticket on campus and in surrounding neighborhoods, ticket illegally parked cars aggressively, approximately one third of tickets end up voided.

7. Neighbors in areas surrounding the campus, especially to the south, do express concern about students parking on their streets.
8. Some students are already choosing to park at University Village and use the pedestrian underpass to get to the shuttle. The developer doesn’t have significant issues with this as long as they use the spaces further away from the storefronts.

Traffic
1. Based on Larry Sly’s conversations with the City, they feel comfortable with the volumes accommodated by the intersections surrounding the campus.
2. Staff experiences on campus show that the Meadow Lane intersection can be challenging and they feel that timing should be adjusted for peak traffic hours.

Campus Shuttles and City Transit
1. The University operates two shuttle routes:
   a. Internal circulator from Alpine Village to University Hall
   b. Four Diamonds to Centennial Hall along N. Nevada and Austin Bluffs Parkway (15-20 minute loop with 4 buses running on 5-7 minute headways) --- this shuttle is well-used and occasionally has to leave people waiting because it is full.
2. Due to the walkability of campus, the internal circulator route seems less critical than the Four Diamonds parking shuttle.
3. The shuttle’s route used to run directly adjacent to Summit Village dormitories, but was rerouted after complaints that it was overly noisy. Electric or hybrid buses would address this issue as well as improve the sustainability of the project.
4. The University spends around $600,000 a year on its shuttle services.
5. The University would consider some sort of tram system to get students into the core campus, particularly if the return on investment was favorable.
6. UCCS has tried to reach an agreement with the City to provide bus passes to their students at no cost to the student. These efforts have not yet been successful.
7. There is interest in having the FREX bus service to Denver stop at 4 Diamonds, but further study into the viability of that stop has not been pursued.
8. The study undertaken by the Streetcar Task Force shows that a streetcar line would serve the University via N. Nevada Avenue in its third phase of development.

Bikes
3. Biking is a popular mode of transportation on campus. However, the topography, particularly along Austin Bluffs Parkway, makes biking to campus very challenging from certain areas of Colorado Springs.
4. The 60 bike racks installed last year are usually seen filled.
5. Campus shuttle buses are equipped to hold two bikes each.
6. Students can rent mountain bikes and use repair services from the rec center.
7. New roads on campus, particularly in the North Campus, should accommodate bike lanes.

Car Sharing
1. UCarShare recently began serving the UCCS campus. There is one car available in Summit Village that students can reserve for a fee of less than $10 an hour.
2. The University’s only incentive to carpool is the cost of parking permit fees. They have tried to designate carpool parking spaces, but found that they could not effectively enforce this policy.
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MEETING REPORT

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

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: September 7, 2011 1:30 pm

SUBJECT: Housing Focus Group

ATTENDEES: Susan Szpryka Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, UCCS
Ralph Giese Director of Residence Life and Housing, UCCS
Jameel Braddock Residence Hall Manager
Molly Kinne Associate Director of Residence Life
Gary Reynolds Facilities Director, UCCS
Jim Rees Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Priscilla Marbaker Tapis Associates
Larry Sly Wilson Associates
Kevin King Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The Master Planning team met with Susan Szpryka, Ralph Giese and other Residence Life staff to further their understanding of housing and amenities available on campus today as well as factors that will shape future housing development.

General Housing Trends
1. Students prefer single bedrooms. “Double double” units, with two bedrooms that are each shared by two students, would be very unpopular on campus.
2. Many students who choose to live on campus cite the nice housing accommodations as a reason they chose to attend UCCS.
3. There is a strong demand for on campus housing: the waiting list reached 147 students this summer and more students might have requested housing if the length of the list had not discouraged them from trying.
4. Residence life initiatives should focus on the freshmen experience. Currently there is no residence requirement for first year students. Because data show that students who live on campus get higher grades and are more likely to complete their degree, the strategic planning committee may want to consider implementing a residence requirement.
5. While lounges are provided on every floor, they are not large enough to accommodate a floor meeting or other large gatherings. These sorts of large meeting spaces are lacking.

Summit Village
1. Summit Village provides suites where three to four students live together sharing a common living space. The units do not have kitchens. There are four unit types:
   a. 4 single bedrooms in a unit
   b. 1 double room and two single rooms in a unit
   c. 3 larger singles with no living area
   d. Private single
2. The students who live here range in ages, but all freshmen who live on campus live in Summit Village.
3. Residents of Summit Village have access to the artificial turf space in the courtyard as well as the West Lawn. Both of these spaces have added outdoor space that was previously lacking, but large open areas for more active uses are still lacking and are a particular challenge due to topography.
4. The University is in the process of designing an additional 215 beds in the Summit Village area.

We will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) days.
Alpine Village
1. Approximately 300 apartment-style beds are located in Alpine Village. All units have a living room and kitchen, but there are several variations in unit type:
   a. 1 bedroom efficiency unit
   b. 2 bedroom, 1 bath unit
   c. 4 bedroom, 2 bath unit
2. Outdoor gathering spaces are really lacking in Alpine Village.

Future Housing Needs
1. There is a need for more suites to accommodate freshmen and sophomores. Unit types that accommodate larger groups of students --- potentially more than 4 --- are preferred.
2. Additional apartments will be a longer term need on campus.
3. The University does not anticipate providing family housing at any point in the foreseeable future.
4. Housing colleges for upperclass students connected to their academic program or a shared interest would be desirable.

Dining
1. Dining facilities break even with about 900 students. The current facility is breaking even and will start turning a profit with the addition of new beds in Summit Village. However, 200 additional beds will max out its capacity.
2. New housing communities should be clustered with 900 students to support a dining facility.
3. Summit Village residents are required to have a meal plan in some form. While Alpine Village residents are not required to have a meal plan, many choose at least a minimal plan. A small number of commuters purchase a meal plan as well.
4. “Munch money,” which allows students to purchase food at on-campus establishments using a pre-paid card. They are exempt from taxes and get bonus dollars on their card in addition to what they pay for directly. As a result, this program is very popular.

Student Parking, Services, and Amenities
1. More than half of students who live on campus bring cars (550 out of 900 students). They receive a residential parking permit and can park in Lot 9 or on the fourth floor of the garage.
2. Parking will continue to be a need for residence halls because many services are not available on campus and because many students work off campus to pay for their education.
3. The group discussed the benefits of reducing the amount of parking they must provide by asking students not to bring cars to campus. However, they acknowledged the University would need to hold up its end of the bargain by providing necessary services and amenities.
4. University Village has greatly improved access to retail and jobs within close proximity of the campus. However, there are still gaps.
5. The amenities students express a desire for include:
   a. Outdoor spaces for passive recreation (“see and be seen”) as well as active recreation (intramural sports)
   b. Retail, especially grocery, convenience store, and pharmacy
   c. Access to doctors, dentist, and hair salons/barbershops
   d. Movie theaters and other entertainment
Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

Sally Foster
Campus Planner

cc: All Attendees
MEETING REPORT

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

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: September 7, 2011 3:00 pm

SUBJECT: Master Planning Committee

ATTENDEES:

Sabrina Wienholtz Program Assistant, UCCS
Carolyn Fox University Architect, UCCS
Teri Switzer Dean, Kraemer Family Library, UCCS
Tom Cristiasian Dean, Letters, Arts and Sciences College, UCCS
Minette Church Associate Professor of Anthropology, UCCS
Linda Kogan Sustainability Director, UCCS
David Anderson Associate Professor of Chemistry, UCCS
Val Snyder Colorado Springs City Council
Robyn Marshke Director of Institutional Research, UCCS
Jim Spice Public Safety Director, UCCS
Ralph Giese Director, Residence Life and Housing, UCCS
Ron Tollman Eagle Rock Neighborhood
Ralph Seaman Eagle Rock Neighborhood
Homer Wesley Vice Chancellor for Student Success, UCCS
Jarod Gray UCCS Student Body President
Greg Stock Associate Professor, College of Business, UCCS
Gary Reynolds Facilities Director, UCCS
Jim Rees Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Priscilla Marbaker Tapis Associates
Kevin King Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The Master Planning Committee responded to a presentation of the master planning team’s initial findings related to campus growth, site analysis of the North Campus, and concept plan. Discussion refined the team’s analysis and provided direction for future phases of the planning and design process. Their comments included:

Transportation
1. The group expressed that an internal pedestrian path would serve the needs of the campus well. They felt that a more detailed understanding of the modes the spine would accommodate is needed.
2. While there is a need for both transit and pedestrian traffic along the spine, the design should take care to ensure they interact appropriately.
3. The University should explore electric transit vehicles as a more sustainable option.
4. The work of the Colorado Springs Streetcar Task Force should be referenced, as their proposals would extend streetcar service to the North Campus in later phases of its development.
5. The link between parking and stormwater management is important to consider and address.
6. The committee felt that the University should consider instituting a requirement that students who live on campus not bring a car during their first year. The group discussed the need these students would have for access to amenities including groceries, big box retail, entertainment and services and the possibility of operating a shuttle to make a weekly trip to any services not available within walking distance.
Academic Organization
1. It is important for the master plan to preserve the feeling of a tight-knit core as the campus grows.
2. The group discussed two strategies for organizing academic functions on campus as it grows that should be further explored during the design process:
   a. Discrete program groupings, such as sciences and liberal arts, would cluster in themed campuses with housing in proximate but separate locations
   b. Housing and academic programs would be collocated in an academic village

Student Groups
1. The space classifications for the University Center should be looked into more carefully due to the shared nature of the spaces there. The sense on campus is that the campus needs more space for student union functions.
2. Affinity groups are growing in popularity and struggle to find meeting and storage spaces as they grow.
3. Greek organizations are relatively new on campus. Currently, their primary need is for meeting and storage space, but the group imagines that Greek housing may exist on campus in the future. The group discussed the potential benefits of the University maintaining oversight of the Greek organizations by providing housing on campus for them.
4. Themed residential programs that serve as an alternative to Greek housing, such as foreign language programs, would be desirable as well.

Housing Experience
1. Community building should be considered at all scales of residential fabric: individual unit, hall, building, and village.
2. Members of the committee were hesitant but felt positively about increasing the percentage of students who live on campus. They cited the data correlating student success with on-campus housing experiences, the need to create a critical mass of activity on campus, and the tight off-campus housing market as factors that suggest an increase is needed.
3. The mix of traditional and non-traditional students is an asset to the University and should be preserved even as the University moves towards more students living on campus.

Property Acquisition
1. To achieve its mission in light of a growing student population, the University will be interested in adjacent properties as they are available.
2. Neighbors in the Eagle Rock community acknowledged that their properties would be valuable to the University and inquired about the sites the University is most interested in.
3. The University has prioritized acquisition of parcels to the east of their core campus to allow them to connect to University Hall and has no defined priorities in the Eagle Rock neighborhood.

North Campus Site Considerations
1. Minette Church clarified that erosion in the arroyos has exposed cultural resources leading to more being identified in these areas. Based on available research, cultural resources are likely to be found in many other areas of the site when it is disturbed, particularly along the ridgelines where populations would camp to have the best views for hunting.
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A group of student government representatives met with the master planning team to discuss their understanding of student opinions about the campus today and in the future. Their discussion covered the following topics:

**Student Community**
1. To ensure effective communication with the student body about events on campus, the University should consider installing screens in building entries across campus that could display daily news and events.
2. As online classes gain in popularity, maintaining student community becomes more important.
3. The University/Events Center is not big enough for all the activities that students would like to hold there. UCCS’ campus really lacks space that is dedicated only for students, rather than shared space. They imagined that this space would include meeting rooms, a general lounge, and more diversified food options (potentially mainstream chains).
4. The representatives mentioned that the ROAR office is a great resource for clubs and organizations but will not be able to adequately meet the needs of a larger student body.
5. Additional resource centers to address the unique needs of specialized student populations, such as a women’s center, are needed on campus. They should be housed in easily accessible locations.

**Sustainability**
1. Sustainable development and lifestyles are a priority for UCCS students, who feel that the University should be a leader for the community in terms of sustainability.
2. Housing is an area where sustainability is particularly important. Cohousing initiatives, such as those in Boulder, are good models.
3. Students inquired as to whether the Master Plan would specify a certain level of LEED certification for new buildings. The University already has several LEED certified buildings and will continue to pursue LEED gold for new buildings on campus.
4. While sustainability is a priority, the representatives did not think students would support significant increases in fees to support more costly initiatives. They felt the focus should be on more cost-effective sustainable measures.

**Class Scheduling**
1. Several student representatives had taken at least one online course. Most of them did not prefer this method of taking courses because they felt more disconnected, but knew many colleagues who prefer the online course model.
2. The group felt that moving classes to Fridays and Saturdays was a practical solution to providing classes as the campus grows, recognizing that student tuition would be used to fund new facilities. They favored a more conservative approach to growth.
3. Because so many UCCS students work while they attend school, moving classes outside of traditional hours would make it more difficult for many students to finish their degree on time.

Parking and Transportation
1. Finding a parking spot on campus can be a real challenge, often taking 15 minutes or more.
2. Students would be interested in programs to get free or reduced price city bus passes.
3. The ability to move between all the academic buildings quickly at class change is important, especially as the campus expands and thinks about relocating some functions to the North Campus.

Other Universities as Models
1. The group expressed an interest in other universities that could be used as benchmarks for UCCS as it grows.
2. Adam State College’s model for housing developed around an arena could be interesting to explore on the North Campus.
3. If the campus grows significantly, new transportation systems will be needed to get students and faculty around the campus. West Chester University in Morgantown, West Virginia’s tram system from residential to academic areas is an interesting model.

Other Discussion Points
1. As the student body grows, demand for and viability of a football team will increase. Having a team would potentially grow interest in the University and lead to greater enrollment as well.
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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
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SUBJECT: Faculty Assembly Representatives

ATTENDEES:
Andrea Hutchins  Faculty Assembly President, UCCS
Gary Reynolds  Facilities Director, UCCS
Priscilla Marbaker  Tapis Associates
Larry Sly  Wilson Associates
Kevin King  Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster  Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

The master planning team met with Andrea Hutchins, the director of the undergraduate program in Health Sciences and the President of the Faculty Assembly. She offered her opinions about the campus today and in the future on behalf of the faculty. Discussion touched upon:

Online Courses
1. Online courses offer the University a growth opportunity to reach toward students who would not attend at all otherwise.
2. It is a challenge to keep online students engaged in the academic and community life of the University.
3. The University conducts the graduate nursing program entirely online. Students complete all their coursework online and the faculty all work from home. This poses challenges in keeping the faculty engaged in the life of campus and in service. Because of the need for videoconferencing or skype, even holding a department meeting becomes more challenging.
4. Apart from the graduate nursing program, there are not faculty members teaching exclusively online courses. They tend to teach a mix of online and in person courses.

Class Scheduling
1. Securing classrooms in desirable time blocks can be a challenge. Preferred time blocks (in order of preference) are:
   a. Monday through Wednesday, 10 am to 2 pm
   b. Monday through Wednesday, 8 am to 10 am
   c. Monday through Wednesday, 2 pm to 4 pm
   d. Thursday or Friday
2. As UCCS grows, moving classes to Fridays and evening hours and growth in the weekend university will be necessary to accommodate all courses.
3. Classroom sizes limit certain programs’ ability to grow enrollment without hiring adjunct faculty, who tend to have lower retention rates (the criminal justice program has already experienced this). While the University prides itself on small class sizes, larger classrooms would offer significant benefits:
   a. The largest classroom on campus has 295 seats. Only one more of these will really be needed.
   b. There is one 125 seat classroom in Dwire Hall. Having several more classrooms of this size would significantly increase capacity.
4. Hybrid class models, where some students attend in person and others participate online, could address classroom size limits and faculty constraints.
5. If the campus spreads out, the University will need to consider whether or not 10 minutes is an adequate allowance for class change.
Campus Connections
1. Property acquisition to the east of the core campus is very important to allow University Hall to be connected to the rest of the campus.
2. University Hall already feels disconnected. As the campus grows, it will be important to strengthen the connectivity between facilities in different locations to avoid isolating students and faculty in their departmental “silos.” Avoiding sprawl should be a top priority.

On-Campus Housing
1. Increases in the amount of on-campus housing could significantly improve the freshmen and sophomore experience, allowing them to meaningfully connect with the university community early in their education, making them more likely to stay involved even after they move off-campus.
2. Special interest housing would help students develop their interests further.
3. Any housing developed east of the core campus would be popular with health sciences students.

Parking and Transportation
1. It seems that more students arrive on campus earlier before their classes and stay afterwards to participate in other activities on campus. This is good for campus life, but causes parking challenges.
2. Parking should be minimized in the center of campus. There may be off-campus opportunities for satellite parking facilities with shuttle service to campus.
3. Bike facilities including paths, racks, lockers and showers would remove some of the barriers to biking to and around campus.

University Character
1. The connection to the natural environment defines this campus. Care should be taken not to overbuild the land the University has.
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PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan
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MEETING DATE: September 8, 2011 10:00 am

SUBJECT: Student Recreation Facilities

ATTENDEES: Susan Szpryka Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, UCCS
Matt Gaden Director of Recreation, UCCS
Daniel Bowen Coordinator of Intramurals, Outdoors and Sport Clubs, UCCS
Tim Stoecklein Associate Director of Recreation, UCCS
Gary Reynolds Facilities Director, UCCS
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DISCUSSION:

The master planning team met with staff from the Department of Recreation to understand their current facilities, programs, and unmet needs as well as considerations for future facilities with a growing student population.

Recreation Center
1. The rec center is four years old and has had a significant positive impact on facilities and programs available to students. Surveys indicate that they like the recreation spaces that the University has but would like more of it.
2. It is used most by those students who live on campus. Recreation facilities are often reserved for a particular floor’s exclusive use for a dodgeball tournament in the gym or exclusive use of the pool for an evening.
3. The Recreation Center’s pool is a 25 yard pool and is only open for 7.5 hours out of the 16 hours a day the full center is open, but adequately serves the needs of the campus. The group imagines that no additional water facilities would be necessary in a near-term expansion.
4. While not the ideal situation, the Recreation Center’s gym is the back-up location for athletics’ practices.
5. The University built as much space as they could afford at the time and are already looking to expand the rec center within the next 2 or 3 years. The National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) recommends that a school of UCCS’s size have between 90,000 and 95,000 square feet of recreation space, while they currently have only 54,000. In any expansion, doubling gymnasium and fitness space would be a top priority. The group also mentioned additional locker room space, multipurpose gymnasium spaces, and racquetball courts as desirable additions.
6. Parking needs to be maintained at the recreation center.

Outdoor Space
1. Outdoor fields are one of the University’s biggest recreation challenges: formal fields are shared by athletics, recreation, and community organizations and are highly scheduled as a result. While they do have lighting, expanding their usable hours, agreements with neighbors stipulate that all activities must end before 11 pm.
2. While the West Lawn and the turf field in Summit Village are great new amenities, the campus still lack informal outdoor space for casual recreation (pickup games, throwing a Frisbee or a football) on the whole. The topography and the compact campus make sites hard to find.
3. Ideally, informal fields would be collocated with housing, making them convenient for residents. The group felt that students would not travel from the Core Campus down to the North Campus just for informal recreation as they would for a scheduled intramural activity.
4. There was an interest in pursuing fields constructed on top of a parking structure to maximize land capacity and ensure parking availability.
Funding
1. Funding for recreation comes from student fees, gym membership fees from alumni and faculty, and housing fees. Housing fees are only used to fund programs.
2. This funding structure means that they must have the students enrolled before they can afford to build new facilities. They University will continue to build as much as they can for the available funding.

Future Growth and Needs
1. If the percentage of students living on campus increases, the staff anticipates that participation in recreation programs would increase.
2. At a certain point, the University might need to develop an additional recreation center to serve the needs of a significantly larger student body and campus. However, the group discussed the significant efficiency benefits to developing one large, central facility.
3. As the North Campus is developed, existing hiking and biking trails should be preserved and new trails should be added to create a recreational amenity throughout the unique site.
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Several graduate students from different departments in the University attended a focus group session with the master planning team, providing their input about the University community and campus today and in the future. Several students completed their undergraduate coursework at UCCS as well and contributed their perspective on how the campus has changed during that time.

**Core Academic Campus**
1. The current campus organization facilitates easy class changes. For many graduate students, most or all of their courses are located in the same building.
2. Computer labs for dedicated student use are lacking, particularly for engineering students. The labs available are often booked for class use and students who need specialized software for their coursework struggle to find available time to use the labs.
3. Several students with classes in Columbine agreed that the space there is uncomfortable.
4. Most of the students felt that office space is lacking on campus and thought it would be beneficial for graduate students to have some sort of office space to hold office hours and work during the day.
5. Space for research and development, particularly in conjunction with engineering programs, is needed on campus and provides additional opportunities for corporate partnerships. Locations at the edge of campus would suit this program need well.

**Amenities**
1. Food options on campus are lacking in quality and don’t appeal to most members of the focus group. University Village and Clyde’s were cited as significant improvements to the options in around campus.
2. The student representatives use the recreation center very infrequently, citing confusion about how to get there, lack of parking, difficulty working the center’s hours into their schedule, and lack of information about group classes as barriers to using the facility.

**Community Social Spaces**
1. Graduate students lack community: while they know students within their departments, they don’t feel connected to the larger network of graduate students. They suggested that a lounge dedicated to graduate students might be helpful in
building this sort of community, but acknowledged that department-specific graduate student lounges might get more use.

2. Students agreed that on the whole, the Union does not feel like a space that fosters community. They cited the atmosphere at Clydes as appealing to graduate students. The Heller Center was also mentioned as having an appealing atmosphere despite its hard to access location.

**Sustainability**

1. Sustainability is an issue that students care about: they are interested in seeing the University do whatever it can to reduce its impact on the environment.

2. Students mentioned a desire to see a native landscape in more places on campus, specifically mentioning xeriscaping to reduce water use.

**Parking and Transportation**

1. Parking is a significant challenge on campus. Students who had been at the University for longer commented that parking has always posed problems. The garage improved the situation for awhile, but growth has constrained parking availability again.

2. The shuttle from the Four Diamonds arrives regularly and provides an effective way to get to the Core Campus.

3. Graduate students’ schedules either require that they spend all day every day on campus or that they make brief trips to campus somewhat infrequently.

**Campus Identity**

1. One of students’ favorite things about the campus is its proximity to the mountains and that they can experience views of Colorado’s unique landscape even during class.

2. The University needs to establish a sense of place. It does not have the long history and culture of other institutions, so it has to find its own niche. The Colorado landscape is an opportunity to reinforce its unique location.

3. Several students chose to attend UCCS because they had personal ties to Colorado Springs and did not want to relocate. Others cited specific programs unique to UCCS that caused them to relocate to attend school.
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PROJECT NAME: University of Colorado Colorado Springs North Campus Master Plan
ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00
MEETING DATE: September 8, 2011 5:30 pm
SUBJECT: Public Forum

ATTENDEES:
Gary Reynolds Facilities Director, UCCS
Jim Rees Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority
Priscilla Marbaker Tapis Associates
Kevin King Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.
Sally Foster Ayers Saint Gross, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

A group of neighbors, faculty, staff, and students attended a public forum to provide feedback on a presentation of initial observations of the UCCS Campus, particularly focusing on a site analysis of the North Campus.

Traffic and Safety
1. Neighbors expressed concern about pedestrian safety along Stanton Road in the Eagle Rock neighborhood because cars frequently travel significantly above the speed limit. Speed bumps would alleviate the issue.
2. The group felt the idea of a pedestrian and transit spine would improve transportation situation on campus. The precise location of the spine will need to be determined with care.

Planning Process
1. Faculty members expressed concern that there was not enough faculty representation in the planning process, particularly from the Department of Geography and Environmental Sciences. They stressed that representation should be balanced to include equal input from environmental and development perspectives.
2. Faculty members requested that sessions be held during the daytime so more faculty could attend.
3. Attendees suggested that the master planning team hold a focus group session with the UCCS Sustainability Committee to tie their initiatives and perspective into the master plan proposals.

North Campus
1. Neighbors familiar with the North Campus highlighted the wildlife, including coyotes, which currently inhabit the site. As the site becomes more actively used, this could pose problems.
2. Recreational trails through the site are an amenity that would likely be popular with the University population as well as neighbors.

Campus Needs
1. Residence Life staff stressed the lack of outdoor and indoor spaces for scheduled and unscheduled student gatherings and the importance of incorporating these amenities into future program for development on campus.
2. Increasing the percentage of students who live on campus was thought to be a strategy that would improve the campus community.
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MEETING REPORT

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

ASG PROJECT #: 21131.00

MEETING DATE: September 9, 2011 10:00 AM

SUBJECT: Design Review Board

ATTENDEES:
- Jerry Syracuse Design Review Board Member
- John Prosser Design Review Board Member
- Candy Roberts Design Review Board Member
- Victor Olgyay Design Review Board Member
- Teresa Osborne Design Review Board Member
- Lois Drake Design Review Board Member
- Steve Collier University of Colorado student
- 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 a summary of their initial observations and a draft concept plan that will guide planning decisions moving forward in the process. Design Review Board members responded to the presentation, offering suggestions for further exploration.

Online Courses
Board members expressed interest in knowing more about system-wide trends towards online education. They voiced concerns about the quality of education provided using online delivery and stressed that an online model should not drive the master plan capacity.

Emerging Themes
The group felt that the stated “emerging themes” dealt more with program needs and should be renamed. The specific identity of the institution and the place needs to come through more clearly in the themes.
Board members affirmed several of the stated trends, including:
- decreasing state support.
- increase in distance and online learning.

North Campus
Appropriate programs and functions for the North Campus include:
- performing arts
- residence halls
- recreation facilities
- health institutes, particularly tied to obesity issues
- facilities (offering a redevelopment site in the Core Campus)

2. Major concentrations of classroom uses should not be located on the North Campus.

3. Funding opportunities are important to the Board of Regents.

4. Rather than focusing on the areas where the University should not build, the Design Review Board would like the Master Plan to show how to appropriately build on sensitive sites. The landscape is the identity of the place, not the thing from which everyone needs to stay away and the entire site should become a teaching environment.

We will proceed in reliance on this report.
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5. Site history, topography, geology, and climate should be explored in greater depth and discussed throughout the presentation to highlight the fragility of the site. Slopes over 10 percent are not buildable in these conditions.

6. The board suspects that the capacity of the site has been overestimated in the past. A drawing clearly demarcating buildable areas would be helpful moving forward.

7. Due to the sensitive nature of the site, UCCS is more land constrained than they seem. The master plan should consider models from other campuses that have used space efficiently, including CU-Auraria, CU-Anschutz, and Chicago.
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