This workbook reviews the preferred campus alternative that was presented on campus by JJR on Tuesday, September 28, 2010. Please use this workbook to understand how the alternatives considered last spring have been consolidated into the preferred alternative.

This workbook first summarizes the campus’s responses to the three alternatives presented last spring, summarizes additional analysis, and describes and illustrates the preferred alternative. Now is a critical decision-point in the campus master planning process, and your input is needed and appreciated.
In Spring 2010, JJR presented three alternative futures to the UW-Eau Claire campus.
The campus reviewed these alternatives through the Master Plan Steering Committee, student outreach over a lunch period, and a mid-afternoon faculty/staff worksession. Additionally, over the summer the campus leadership met with the City of Eau Claire and the campus neighbors (CVTC, Sacred Heart, Third Ward, and Historic Randall Park) to get their reactions and input.
Each alternative contained elements that were supported by many individuals on and off campus. This slide summarizes the supported elements of Alternative A.
This slide summarizes the supported elements of Alternative B.

Campus Alternatives Review Comments

- Need Haas expansion, as close to existing Haas as possible
- Maintain band practice field
- Nursing should stay on Lower Campus
- Front door should be on Lower Campus at State and Garfield
- CVTC support Upper Campus development and expansion onto their site, but timing is unknown
- Sacred Heart discourages intense use of State Office Building site for intense uses (e.g. an arena)
This slide summarizes the supported elements of Alternative C.

- Some Lower Campus residential needed
- Need strong pedestrian connections between Upper/Lower
The examination of the alternatives prompted additional analysis over the summer. The JJR masterplan team further investigated two issues related to space needs.

The utilization of McPhee/Olson was studied, and the utilization of that complex is very high, primarily due to extensive recreational use. The JJR masterplanning team is recommending that Kinesiology be moved out of McPhee/Olson into new academic building; potential resource sharing with Nursing. Athletics and Recreation can then expand into McPhee/Olson backfill.

The JJR masterplanning team also further investigated the components of a future fine/performing arts expansion, especially if the university partners with the Eau Claire community on a joint facility. The analysis determined that a reconstruction of parts of Haas plus a small addition are needed to accommodate general arts education on campus. Additional structure(s) are warranted for arts majors, either in separate fine arts and performing arts structures or combined. These facilities should be located near the Haas Fine Arts building. However, if the Eau Claire community is a partner in these facilities, they could also be located off-campus.
The demand for additional on-campus student housing was shown last spring. Over the summer, the JJR masterplanning team worked through the campus financials and phasing to determine how many building projects the campus can financially support. The analysis indicated that the campus over the next 20 years could construct at least 4 new halls on campus, along with renovations of many existing halls. Since the demand for on-campus housing cannot be accommodated in 4 halls, there is an opportunity for public-private partnership for an off-campus res hall.
This slide summarizes the major elements that must be accommodated within the campus master plan.
The preferred plan concept expands facilities on Water Street, relocates the Sciences and reserves future building sites on Lower Campus, dramatically expands the residential neighborhood and provides critical open spaces on Upper Campus, and extends the campus out to State Street and Clairemont Avenue.

The next pages describe the preferred plan concept segment-by-segment.
On Water Street, the Childrens Center is constructed as it is currently planned. This graphic shows how a combined university-community arts facility could be constructed on the Water Street campus. One arts facility (either Performing Arts or Fine Arts) could be constructed on the southwest corner of Haas. The second facility could be constructed on the east end of the Water Street lot, with a parking structure on the rest of the Water Street lot. The open space west of Haas accommodates both the band practice field and is an open space that is the center of the Water Street campus.

*Will the preliminary master plan accommodate the growth of the fine and performing arts? How best can the campus and community collaborate on these new facilities?*
On the west end of Lower Campus, the Sciences are moved out of Phillips into a two-phase structure on the KT/Putnam lots. KT and Putnam are demolished once replacement beds are available elsewhere on campus.

Garfield Avenue is closed to vehicles and converted to a route for only pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and occasional maintenance and emergency vehicles. The street reconstruction allows for the campus to approach the river through overlooks. The Putnam lot is converted into an outdoor classroom. The bridge landing is reconstructed and simplified. The reconstruction of the Student Center will create a new campus mall. The McIntyre façade will be the terminating view of a very prominent open space, so the campus should consider improving the east façade of this building.

*Will the preliminary master plan accommodate the growth of sciences? How well will the reconstructed Garfield Avenue function and connect Lower Campus to the Chippewa River? Are there additional opportunities that should be incorporated?*
The draft sketch above shows how Garfield could be reconstructed for pedestrian, bicyclists, and transit. The paving patterns will emphasize that this is a pedestrian zone, connecting to overlooks of the Chippewa River.

The sketch shows a potential façade of the new science building. While the building is not designed, the important guideline is that the science building should face and open up to the river.

In the final campus master plan, the sketch will be refined and fully rendered.

*What do you think of the character of this potential view? How well will the reconstructed Garfield Avenue function and connect Lower Campus to the Chippewa River?*
On the east end of Lower Campus, the Visitor’s Center is relocated to the southeast corner of the Hibbard Lot. The corner of State and Garfield should become the “front door” of the campus – where campus visitors are encouraged to enter campus.

The Zorn/Brewer/Kjer and Phillips structures are demolished after those uses are relocated. In the long-term (beyond the 20-year timeframe of this master plan), these sites should be building sites for academic or residential uses. In the interim, these sites should become surface parking lots. In the long-term, when either the Zorn or Phillips site becomes a building site, a parking structure should be constructed on the Hibbard Lot.

Lower Campus residential options are maintained with a residence hall constructed on Roosevelt Avenue south of Schneider Hall.

*Are there adequate residential options on the Lower Campus? Should the Phillips and the Zorn/Brewer sites be future academic buildings? Residential buildings?*
On the northern portion of Upper Campus, at least three new residential halls are constructed. The first will be located on the tennis courts, the second west of Towers. The need for more on-campus housing is immediate so these two halls will be designed and constructed as a single project.

Once Horan Hall is “de-densified” (restoring common lounges, RA’s without roommates), it will have a very low bed count on very strategic site. The master plan recommends that Horan be reconstructed as a larger and denser res hall. Dining services should be moved to the a portion of the first floor, with windows overlooking the Lower Campus.

The Governor’s Lot is reconstructed as a passive over space that becomes the central quad for Sutherland, Governors, Horan, and Res Hall #1.

Hilltop should be renovated or reconstructed (based on an on-going facilities assessment) and dedicated to recreational uses.

Transit and maintenance vehicles on Garfield will follow the existing road to connect to University Avenue. However, pedestrians will follow a new grand staircase to connect the central Upper Campus pedestrian path running east-west between Res Halls #1 and #2.

Once the uses in Crest are relocated, Crest should be demolished a res hall should be constructed on the site.
The draft sketch shows what the Governors Lot could look like after its reconstructed as central open space. Towers is shown in the top right, with Res Hall #1 in front of it. The open space is intended to provide critical passive open space for upper campus residents. Dining services in reconstructed Horan spill out into the open space.

In the final campus master plan, the sketch will be refined and fully rendered.

*How well does the preliminary master plan expand on-campus housing options? What do you think of the character of this potential view? How well will the conversion of the Governors Lot make Upper Campus a better place to live and recreate? For pedestrians, is Upper Campus better organized and connected to Lower Campus?*
On the southern end of Upper Campus, the university expands out to Clairemont Avenue. The State Office Building is acquired and the building is repurposed for university outreach functions, including Continuing Education, Adult Learner classroom space, satellite offices of Admissions, Academic Advising and Registration, business/internship outreach, and a ticket/information office.

The lease on the Oak Ridge Lot will expire over the life of this master plan and the Governors Lot is converted to open space. These parking spaces are replaced on the State Office Building site. Note that the population of Upper Campus will increase as students are brought onto campus in new res halls, but as a part of the campus sustainability initiative, additional parking spaces are not provided.

*Does the preliminary master plan bring the University out to a prominent view on Clairemont Avenue? Should there be more or less parking on Upper Campus?*
As indicated previously, Garfield Avenue is converted to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit. The graphic above shows the major pedestrian pathways in yellow. A potential transit loop path (which could either be a campus shuttle and/or a part of a larger EC Transit route) is shown in red.

Vehicular paths are shown in blue. In general, parking and vehicular circulation is moved to the edges of Upper and Lower Campuses.

**How well does the preliminary master plan allow pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicles move around and between campuses? Vehicles cannot drive between the Upper, Lower, and Water Street campuses without leaving the campus boundary. Does that matter?**
The preliminary master plan recommends that important campus functions be located off-campus. The university and the City of Eau Claire now mutually benefit with shared athletic facilities at Bollinger Fields, Hobbs Arena, and Carson Park. The preliminary master plan recommends that the basketball arena (Zorn) be combined within a multiple function meeting space off-campus in partnership with the community. This facility should be highly accessible to campus.

The university should also partner with a private developer to provide off-campus residential housing on Water Street. Residential Life staff could staff and program the residential hall.

Beyond the 20-year horizon of this campus master plan, future expansion sites are the Phillips Site, Zorn/Brewer site, Hibbard lot, and the CVTC site.

*Should the Zorn replacement facility be located off-campus? If so, where are potential off-campus locations that would still be accessible to campus? Should the university partner with a private developer to jointly develop a Water Street residence hall?*
The in-progress SketchUp model shown above indicates the building massing of the preliminary master plan, as seen in an oblique aerial from the perspective of north of campus. This Sketch-Up model will be converted to an hand-drawn sketch in the final campus master plan.

*What do you think of the changed building massing on each of the campuses?*
When reviewing and assessing the preliminary preferred master plan, be sure to consider if it furthers and strengthens the campus’s strategic vision and values.
In particular, the Strategic Plan includes goals for the Campus Master Plan.

*Does the preliminary master plan further these goals?*
The preliminary campus master plan was presented on campus on September 28. Over the month of October 2010, the UW-Eau Claire campus community will review and comment on this working draft concept.

Your input is needed and appreciated. Please consider the questions in this workbook, and submit your questions, concerns, and suggestions to Mike Rindo, special assistant to the chancellor, at rindomj@uwec.edu. Please submit them by October 29.

For more information about the Campus Master Plan, please contact Mike Rindo.