

<p>UAF Master Planning Committee Agenda</p> <p>Thursday, January 11, 2001; 9 – 11 a.m. Chancellor's Conference Room; Signers' Hall Room 330</p>	<p>Chair's report</p> <p>Present status of consultant hire for development of the new campus master plan Carol Adamczak (DD&C)</p> <p>Discussion concerning the history and present status of the trails plan</p> <p>Opportunity for a further discussion of the ATCO issue</p> <p>Members' Issues</p>
--	--

Master Planning Committee Meeting

January 11, 2001

Notes

Members Present:

Brian Barnes, Cindy Branley, John Craven, Don Foley, Clark Milne, Kathleen Schedler, Joe Trubacz, Deb Brownfield, Bob Wheeler

Absent:

Brodie Anderson, Chris Bennett, Rick Caulfield, Terrence Cole, Catharine Copass, Mike Supkis

Guest: Carol Adamczak (DD&C)

Handouts:

1. Outline for Development of the Comprehensive Campus Plan (DRAFT); from Carol Adamczak

2. Selected pages from the original WRT proposal for members information; from the chair

Chair's report

No report.

Present status of consultant hire for development of the new campus master plan

Carol Adamczak (DD&C)

The contract with WRT should be signed next week, and the on-campus kickoff meeting at UAF with WRT is planned for January 29-31 (Monday — Wednesday). Present discussions about organizational structure indicate that the Chancellor's Cabinet will act as the "Steering Committee" and the Master Planning Committee will function as the "Master Plan Working Committee." Their objective is to have rapid access to members of a committee comprising broad campus representation, and the MPC just happens to fulfill that need. A first meeting time with the MPC needs to be determined, so the chair will solicit times by email ASAP and Carol will then set a time and location for Monday (January 29). Questions about how extensive the planning program will be should be set by the Steering Committee; does it include TVC and rural sites? It is suggested, as an example, that a focused effort on the main campus could be a first step, and a positive outcome could then lend great support for additional work that would include TVC and the rural sites.

Snow Machines on Campus

A member of the campus community has written to the chancellor and several other UAF officials about a disturbing personal observation of high-speed snowmachine traffic on the campus core area. A copy was forwarded to me and I then distributed it to all MPC members. Comments in discussion included the following:

1. No one knows of a written policy, so how can the campus police do anything?
2. There are UAF employees who use them for transportation to work from off campus.

3. Some of the issues have been discussed by administration. It can be complicated by issues such as policies for non-UAF folks, UAF employees, and UAF faculty or students living on campus.
4. We have a letter from Jamo Parish (SW legal) on this subject. The chair is to find a copy.
5. Need a way to avoid snowmachine traffic in the campus core area.
6. Barriers installed at the trails system appear to have been very effective this year in keeping snowmachines off the ski trails.
7. Do we have to wait for a death before something is done?
8. Snowmachines has also been observed moving at high speeds along the bike trails adjoining the campus.
9. If an ATV or car was observed in the summer doing what the snowmachines to in the winter, the police would be aggressive.
10. There is a cost impact to the campus. For example, in low snow years the underlying vegetation can be harmed. Collisions with trees and other outside hardware, art, etc also inflict damage.
11. Do we want more ugly orange warning signs on campus after a snowmachine hurts a pedestrian? After this brief discussion, it was agreed that a letter to the chancellor would be appropriate, as it relates to the planning issue of campus circulation. Brian Barnes and Joe Trubacz will prepare a draft in time for next week's meeting. Members are requested to immediately forward comments to them.

Request from Provost Reichardt concerning ATCO building.

The on-campus space issue is impacting UAF's ability to hire faculty and staff. Is the solution to populate the campus with ATCOs, and if so, how? The provost has asked us to consider the following:

1. What are our thoughts on the limits to their use on campus?
2. Have we places where they should never be placed?
3. If used, are there "best sites" for them?

His opinion is, in part, that "a few of them is okay, maybe even good-as a statement that we have space need." He opposes a wholesale use of temporary facilities to deliver our programs. Comments in discussion included the following:

1. Brian Barnes provided some detailed background information on the biomedical and other initiatives and programs that will be seriously impacted by the lack of proper office and new laboratory space.

Undergraduate, graduate, and faculty research are all impacted. There is less than five years before programs could be turned away.

2. The EPSCoR program has an urgent, immediate need.
3. There are new positions in SALARM and Fisheries.
4. Many campuses in the lower 48 have construction cranes as permanent fixtures of the campus scene. Not here.
5. There are ATCO units on the Stanford campus!
6. Need a way to make certain that the short-term solution doesn't become a permanent temporary solution. For example, allow no ATCOs without a demonstrated effort to obtain a permanent solution.
7. There has been talk of a new biology facility on campus for years but where is the function needs document?
8. Are we really making the best use of our existing space? Is it used for UAF needs or state agencies?
9. Facilities Services is doing the scoping work on four to five buildings for the campus.
10. We need a list of the existing temporary buildings for starters.
11. Define "short term."
12. Temporary building must go away when the permanent one is done.
13. Due diligence of space is necessary. After this discussion, it was agreed Kathleen Schedler and Brian Barnes would organize all materials in a draft recommendation for next week's meeting. Members are requested to immediately forward

Request from VC for Administration Frank Williams concerning a new building for "computational research and technology-enhanced instruction."

The ARSC folks presently within Butrovich have to move. This is apparently decided, so now there is the question of where they should go. This is past the talking stage as money has been allocated to hire GDM for preliminary concepts. There appear to be only limited options for locations as a strong preference exists for keeping the folks close to the computers; apparently the computers will not be moving from the custom-designed space they are in. Their location is not really viable anyway as office space; no windows etc. There seems to be great interest in attaching the addition to Butrovich. An area of about 50,000 sq.ft. is being discussed. One reason GDM has the work is that they are the local firm working with the museum principle designer, so they will be sensitive to the issue of the signature building (museum addition) just up the hill We need to address the

siting issue etc. Other issues include; more space for the computer science department?; campus circulation; lecture hall space; etc. Deb Brownfield and John Craven will collect members comments and prepare the draft recommendation for next week's meeting. Members are requested to immediately forward comments to them.

Discussion concerning the history and present status of the trails plan

Insufficient time. Deferred to the next meeting.

Members' Issues

Have we received a response from the chancellor concerning our correspondence about the trails committee? The answer is no.

Next MPC meeting

Thursday, January 18, 2001

9:00 - 10:45 AM, Chancellor's Conference Room

The agenda is clear from items 3, 4, and 5, above.