



Facilities Planning & Management

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

MEETING MINUTES - APPROVED

Campus Planning Committee

February 16, 2023

Hybrid Meeting

Bascom Hall– Room 260 + Virtual WebEx

8:30am to 10:00am

NOTE: Reference meeting recording on [CPC website](#)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Present: Cathy Arnott Smith, Craig Berridge, Chris Bruhn, Duncan Carlsmith, Kate Corby, Yevgenya Grinblat, Joel Gerrits, Diana Hess, Kurt Paulsen, Paul Peppard, Andrew Pietroske, Tom Purnell, Karl Scholz, Bret Shaw, Lindsey Stoddard Cameron, Mark Wells, Eric Wilcots

Excused: Doug Reindl, Ian Robertson, Liz Sadowski, Deneen Wellik

FP&M: Ellen Agnew, Josh Arnold, Mark Bastian, Eric Bauer, Jim Bogan, Angie Bollinger, Jonathan Bronk, Janine Glaeser, Chad Hinman, Lindsey Honeyager, Rhonda James, Patrick Kass, Jon King, Molly Lenz, Brent Lloyd, Rex Loker, Jesse Luckey-Winters, Gabe Mendez, Dennis Rodenberg, Clark Solowicz, Manny Tarin, Margaret Tennesen, Cindy Torstveit, Scott Utter, Craig Weisenthal, Aaron Williams

Guests: Lucien Gerondeau, Vanessa Herald, Alex Johnson, Alex Roe, Paul Seitz, Kate Sullivan

Note: Bret Shaw is back from sabbatical and attending in place of Karen Oberhauser representing the Arboretum Committee.

a. Scholz, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

2. OLD BUSINESS

a. Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 15, 2022. **(ACTION ITEM)**

- **Minutes were approved unanimously**

b. Status Report: 2023-25 Biennial Capital Budget (Torstveit)

- Hess: There is a lot of critical lobbying work going around for the Engineering building project. What is the thought around lobbying for art and music?

- Torstveit: Every time we talk about Engineering, we are talking about Humanities and ensuring that there is understanding that these need to occur in parallel.

- Roe: We anticipate the We are hopeful that the Governor who is pro-education will be favorable to our requests.

- Hess: Governor's budget will not include bonding authority recommendation. Is this positive?

- Torstveit: Correct, it was not included. There is further negotiation to occur.

- Provost: I interpreted it as if the Governor proposes it is not happening, so it is better to let the legislature work on the item.

- Roe: We are taking a different approach this time and working separately on the item. We are working with the legislature and their representatives looking to have it be a separate bill to go through the process.
- Wilcots: Where is the maintenance and repair discussion in the budget?
 - Torstveit: These projects are managed in the All Agency minor project program. The Governor will determine where those thresholds align after he releases his recommendations.
 - Roe: There are two separate programs within the capital budget which are not identified on the slide. The Instructional Space program has three classroom/lab projects recommended. The Modern Facility Renovations program which are large All Agency projects. UW has four projects in this program. These are included in the \$200M All-Agency funding GFSB. Only the Major Capital projects are what are indicated on the slide.

3. NEW BUSINESS

- a. 2025-27 BCB Planning Process & Principles w/Discussion (Torstveit/Williams)

Presentation given and time allowed for committee discussion and review of past planning efforts, lessons learned, and opportunities for improvement going forward.

 - Timeline & Milestones:
 - February – SCDs receive list of existing projects and description of BCB process.
 - March-April – FP&M meets with SCDs, if needed, to review process, current projects, and schedule.
 - April – FP&M meets with UWSA to review issues/project list.
 - June – Deadline for SCDs to confirm existing and new projects.
 - September – SCS notified of projects advancing for CPC review. Announce CPC presentation schedule. SCDs submit draft CPC presentations to FP&M for concurrence.
 - September-November – SCD presentations to CPC. FP&M recommends 2023-25 biennial capital budget and 2023-31 six-year plan to CPC.
 - November – CPC recommends 2023-25 biennial capital budget and 2023-31 six-year plan and sends to Chancellor.
 - December – FPM submits 2023-25 biennial capital budget and 2023-31 six-year plan to UWSA.
 - Hess: Campus needs to determine (ELT) how important is the project AND given the givens what is the best strategy to get it funded. Traditional CPC has determined what gets submitted to UW System for enumeration even if it has gift money. Did CDIS go through this process and if it did not what does that mean? One of the challenges is the projects that make it on the list but are unlikely to get funded can stall other projects. Do we need a different process given the variegation of the project types.
 - Torstveit: This is exactly why we are having this discussion. Campus is seeing these same sorts of questions. CDIS was on the six-year and moved up as a donor stepped forward.
 - Wilcots: It was presented last biennium, although the focus of that presentation was on Levy Hall.
 - Torstveit: VC Cramer and I have been discussing if identified funding needs to be better integrated into project discussions.
 - Provost: We talk about P3 projects, but we do not have a successful example on campus. Possibly Art Lofts, possibly Music might be the first step in the proof of concept.
 - Torstveit: There is some fear if we do not put it on the list because we want to pursue as a P3 and that delivery method does not work due to approvals, etc. what happens to those projects. This was traditionally why we held parallel paths for projects.
 - Provost: As you know the projects on the list are typically on biennium after biennium and eventual, they are approved.
 - Hess: This is not how things really work. CDIS is a good example for campus. From the beginning it was not thought about as an enumerated project. Campus should identify projects that it sees as priority and go all in to make that project

happen. This is different than waiting for a donor. How do we prioritize within the variegation.

- Provost: There are very few alumni that can fund buildings. There is also a disincentive argument to funding everything with non-state dollars and the optics that presents. It could potentially turn off any public funding dollars to the institution.
- Discussion of draft Capital Development Planning Principles
 - Hess: The rubric is challenging because there are things that do not apply to all buildings and penalizes projects in that regard. At a minimum I would recommend an assessment expert work with FP&M to develop a rubric that can work equally across the board. There are ways to operationalize this rubric.
- Paulson: Process comment. How do we want SCDs to present the materials to the committee? As an expression of Shared Governance, the process needs to be open and transparent.
- Hess: There needs to be a way to bring projects forward, but maybe not everything. Maybe separate building projects from major maintenance items. Is there a way for SCD's to bring a 1-page summary forward and then FP&M identifies what goes into the full presentation process. The Baldwin Grant is a good example of entities submitting a preliminary proposal first to have the opportunity to submit the full proposal.
 - Torstveit: Potentially we could use the list from last time and provide it to each SCD. If there are no changes, we use what was submitted. If there are changes or new Deans have taken over, we meet more thoroughly to go through the process and understand needs.
- Purnell: Is there a way to see what projects have been on the list in past biennia? The number of projects on the list and how little is funded was eye-opening and alluded to the seeming futility of the presentations. Is there a proof of concept project that we could run as a private project which may influence the process?
 - Provost: I do not know what project has the best chance of getting funded. It depends on the capital budget recommendations. If the project does not get recommended, do we then pull them out as a P3 concept.
 - Hess: As a process, are there different pathways? Also, asking SCDs what you want to add to the list and if so, maybe the SCD provides a 1-pager. We must balance the process with the amount of effort and work to avoid wasting time and resources.
 - Provost: It really is a balance. As frustrating and sad as this is, the ROTC project is one of those projects that continues to be on the list, but never gets funded. I will be leaving this position knowing I did not get ROTC funded, which is unfortunate.
 - Stoddard-Cameron: Whatever is decided, we need to have fair guiding principles and a process that allows all SCDs to remain relevant.
 - Torstveit: We do need to identify alternative methods of delivery so we can meet the extreme programmatic need.
- Wilcots: Simplification will be appreciated. If there are simple changes to the presentation. Maybe it is a 1-pager on what needs to be added/reduced.
- Gerrits: Pairing down is critical and necessary.
- Shaw: Are SCDs given constructed feedback or coached ahead of presentations?
 - Torstveit: Yes, FP&M reviews and offers feedback as necessary.

FP&M to come back next meeting with a set of ideas for the proposed direction on the process.

b. West Campus District Plan Update (Seitz/Williams)

Seitz and Williams gave a status presentation on the West Campus District Plan informing around current direction and specifically inviting committee members to the upcoming Public Information Meetings. Project website: <https://www.vc.wisc.edu/realestate/>

- Seitz: The project is the design development phase, and we will be presenting conceptual plans at three public informational sessions during the week of February 20, 2023.
- Gerrits: Is every 'green' building a new building?
 - Seitz: The green buildings are currently the proposed new buildings with a phased strategy being thought about in the background.
- Stoddard-Cameron: How are you thinking about setbacks.

- Williams: Through the Campus Master Plan we created our own zoning standards for this area based on typical development envisioned at that time. As this project moves forward and there appears to be need and support for increased density this will challenge those standards. The City of Madison will need to be involved in any changes.
- Seitz: There is some housing in this plan. We are currently in the tension of housing verse institutional mission. Housing is important to create vibrancy and meet an acute need, but it also takes up finite land resources.
- Provost: It is a misnomer to consider what is on the screen as ‘the’ plan. This is a set of conceptual ideas.
 - Seitz: Correct, we are developing a plan through this process.
- Wilcots: The list of stakeholders has been identified, but is there a list of industry partners that are also being engaged in this process?
 - Seitz: We have Chris Kozina who is UW’s industry engagement advisor along with the Dean’s from the district. We understand what has been asked for from industry partners on campus and will use this plan to find appropriate partners.
- Hess: How does this plan interact with what was just discussed in the Biennial Capital Budget?
 - Seitz: This process will feed into the next Campus Master Plan update and be informed by the needs on the list developed.
 - Torstveit: We will need to identify all projects, but what tract is it on and what biennium is appropriate?
 - Wilcots: A building on the Biotron site could be in two years and could be one of the six on the recommendation list?
 - Torstveit: Agreed, this is very possible.
 - Seitz: This relates to the additional comments around delivery method/
 - Provost: How much of the green buildings could be in partnership with University Research Park?
 - Seitz: We will identify parcels; how many is too be determined based on what industry interest and programmatic need dictate.
 - Torstveit: We still have the obligation to UW System to list all our building needs, not just those for enumeration.
 - Hess: This is exciting, but there are entities not on this side of campus desperately in need of space. We need to be clear that campus is not allowing new development to skip the line ahead of the programmatic needs that are known. There is nothing special about this process and it will go piece meal?
 - Torstveit: Yes, the proposed projects still need to follow the process and meet the needs of campus.
 - Hess: You can imagine if we have an extensive list of projects SCDs and their donors are paying attention to this cue and frustrated by things not moving. What do West Campus projects do to this cue? If it truly is a P3 then these projects do not impact the cue.
 - Seitz: We started on the West District because of an identified opportunity with the Biotron site and will expand this to other sections of campus to strategic move needs along quicker.
 - Lloyd: We are also looking at future opportunities through this process and how doing things in the West District may unlock parcels or space in central/south campus to accommodate needs. None of this is done in a bubble.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Next meeting is March 9, 2023.

- Committee Members please attend in person at Bascom Hall Room 260.
- Guests & Interested Parties please attend virtually

Meeting Date	Tentative Agenda Topic(s)	Location
NOTE: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS MAY MOVE DATES AND ARE INDICATED AS REFERENCE ONLY		
March 9, 2023	2025-27 Biennial Capital Budget	260 Bascom Hall In-Person + WebEx

April 20, 2023	2025-27 Biennial Capital Budget 2025 Campus Comprehensive Plan Discussion Signage and Wayfinding Design Guidelines	260 Bascom Hall In-Person + WebEx
May 18, 2023	2025-27 Biennial Capital Budget CDIS artist maquette recommendation	260 Bascom Hall In-Person + WebEx

5. MEETING ADJOURNMENT
 - a. Scholz adjourned the meeting at 10:18am