Appendix A4: Conceptual Alternatives Survey and Feedback

The University is revising its Master Plan (or comprehensive development plan). The slides from Ken Saiki’s presentation can be viewed using the D2L (Desire to Learn) web site set up for the Master Plan. Instructions and links can be found at http://www.uwgb.edu/pboffice/MasterPlan/index.htm. We want your input on the alternatives presented in the plan. This brief survey evaluates your perspective on five critical issues: traffic, parking, location of new buildings, pedestrians, and campus density.

1. Traffic (access and “wayfinding”). Which of these alternatives to addressing issues of getting on and around campus do you favor and why? Check one, comment to the right.
2. **Parking.** With enrollment growth and with facilities plans like the expanded sports/events center, new parking will be needed. Where should new parking go? Check one, comment to the right.
3. **New buildings.** With growth would come a need for more academic buildings and student housing. Where should new buildings go? Check one, comment to the right.
4. **Pedestrians.** How should the campus address pedestrian circulation in the new master plan?

- Move people outside. Maintain the concourse as is and encourage people to walk above ground.
- Preserve both inside and outside. Add new concourses where possible but keep them small and plain looking to encourage people to walk above ground.
- Emphasize the inside. Add new concourses and accentuate “life under ground” by adding lounges, outdoor gathering areas, windows and other highlights.

5. **Campus density.** Which of the pictures below best illustrates the kind of campus you would like to see in the future? Check one, comment to the right.
Name (optional) ____________________________

__Faculty  __ Academic Staff  __ Classified Staff

### MASTER PLANNING SURVEY SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Alternative 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Alternative 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Alternative 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Alternative 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Alternative 2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Alternative 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Buildings Alternative 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Buildings Alternative 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Buildings Alternative 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians Alternative 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians Alternative 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians Alternative 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Density Alternative 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Density Alternative 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of surveys sent: 610
Number of surveys returned: 112 (9/14/04)
MASTER PLANNING SURVEY RESULTS

CODE
AS  Academic Staff
CL  Classified Staff
F   Faculty

1. TRAFFIC (access and way finding)
Alternative 1

Comments:
Southwest Entrance not as much used.

I like the circle idea because it is very confusing for visitors right now. Directions are hard to give.

Library and Weidner remain cornerstones to entry, although I do like the inner loop for sporting events.

Potential problems: traffic bottlenecks at main entrance and intersections w/main entrance.

Do not close southwest entrance. Add inner loop for sports center.

I like the completion of circle drive, but not the closing of the southwest entrance. We will need all of the entrance/exit paths as possible with more students.

Poor access to green lot.

Too much traffic for one entrance/exit.

Do not close the southwest entrance.

I like this concept but see a need for access to sports events. Also, many people are carrying materials to/from campus; somehow it would help to have easier access to the buildings by car to load/unload.

I do not favor closing off the southwest loop – difficult to access that part of the arboretum.

People unfamiliar with campus would appreciate the main entrance being the first they encounter. Also, Weidner Center patrons would be closer to their destination as they enter.

Without road between Weidner and SA, trucks and buses will have hard time at Weidner.

Do not close the southwest entrance.

I think the southwest entrance should not be closed. If it was it would really load up the other entrance at busy times.

I like this one best. I would just de-emphasize SW entrance, not close it. Also, add the inner loop for sports events from plan 2 to ease traffic.

I like the idea of the road going behind the sports center rather than between PSC and MAC – too much pedestrian traffic between those buildings. I think the Welcome Booth should be relocated in an area close to the sports center and the union. Most new prospective students will start at the Union or sports center. Weidner Center people never stop at booth – most know where they are going. It would be nice to have a turn-about with the info center in the center.

Closing this entrance puts severe traffic pressure on other exits especially in late afternoon and during Weidner performances.

Keep main entrance. It is the best and first sight of the campus.

Having the entrance to campus along the bay is very appealing – also the visual appeal of Nicolet Drive.

De-emphasize SW entrance (not close) to avoid congestion on main entrance.

Can those two options be combined?
1. relocate circle
2. keep main entrance and sw entrance.
3. add inner loop for event center traffic.
Easier to give directions. Easier to follow directions.

I think that the addition of too many roads would take away from the campus environmental focus. However, I do not think reducing points of entry to the campus would help with increased traffic flow.

Closing entrance will create problems for Bayfest, Weidner events etc. Traffic lights at SW entrance will help safety issues. Road east of PSC makes pedestrian problems.

Main entrance needed for Weidner Center. Seems to be best choice.

Main entrance takes you to heart of campus — keep it.

Doesn’t seem to be more easily navigable. Would create bottleneck at one entrance.

Closing off the extra street to Nicolet will cause a terrible bottleneck getting on and off campus before and after work and for Weidner Center.

Two exits on Nicolet provides an alternative to leaving campus at “risk” hour and after big events, for those getting on 43 from Nicolet and other area traffic. Would not like to see the southwest entrance closed although de-emphasize is ok.

I think this is the best of the alternatives presented because it is easier to see traffic on Nicolet Drive when leaving campus.

Southwest entrance is confusing to visitors. Enhance the entrance from 54/57.

Southwest drive is too congested, very bad in winter. I have sat waiting for traffic to move out onto Nicolet for a long time and traffic on Nicolet will not let you merge, 2 lanes useless. We need lights!!

Relocating Circle Drive is good idea. Closing Southwest entrance might cause problems for students leaving campus. It is heavily use currently.

No, what confusion to close SW entrance. Anyone who cannot read a map to find their way either does not belong in college or needs to go back to school for map reading. Creates much congestion by access roads. Relocating Circle Drive might be a good idea but expect more speeders if you make it more navigable.

Do not like closing SW entrance. We need all the entrances we have.

The main entrance is central and allows more people to at lest use common sense with directional use. Besides, a campus with an overall beltline if you will would be very convenient.

Please do not close any entrances. That would only create more bottlenecks. SW entrance need not be marked, but should stay open for folks who know where they are going.

Retain a main entrance while at the same time improving navigation around campus. Maintain the integrity of the campus and the arboretum.

Keep main entrance – better traffic control.

Ends confusion w/SW entrance. One main entrance off Nicolet would require traffic control, however.

No, No, No. No need to close Nicolet entrance.

Eliminates confusion about where main entrance is. SW entrance requires you to drive a long way before ever seeing a building.

Traffic: Alternative 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Closing an exit to Nicolet will increase backups on Circle Drive. What is needed is some traffic control on Nicolet.

Do not close main entrance far too important for people trying to locate the Weidner Center. Many are not familiar with the campus.

Like the idea of inner loop. Not sure about closing main entrance — it is a beautiful intro to the campus.

If I am giving directions to someone for both a parking and a meeting spot, this looks simple.

I like deemphasizing one entrance. Not in favor of closing any entrance as it would
add to congestion exiting campus that already is high as long as not detract from spacious/environmental feel of campus.

I like entering the campus immediately off Nicolet. The inner loop will be valuable if the activity center becomes an active place.

Disadvantages: Further distance to drive on campus for Weidner Center. Also may be more confusing to patrons. Elimination of main entrance could create traffic backup. Traffic lights at entrance may be desirable at heavy traffic times. Main traffic way is not convenient to sports center.

Advantages: Would appear to require least amount of cost and construction disruption. Has most logical traffic flow around dorms.

This option would have a negative public input on access to Weidner Center.

I like the idea of an inner loop for sports/events, but not the path suggested. Also we need the main entrance for the Weidner Center.

Horrible access to Weidner Center.

De-emphasize main entrance (not close it).

Can’ close main entrance – would make traffic for Weidner too difficult.

Would not close the main entrance as the campus already has very few entrances.

People often consider the SW entrance as the main entrance. Only the signage indicates otherwise.

If an inner loop is created, I hope serious attention is paid to the Hwy 54/57 turn-off.

Eliminating either entrance could cause traffic congestion at peak times. The inner loop for the PSC is a great idea.

Need to do something to alleviate traffic mess at intersection of Nicolet and southwest entrance.

Main entrance to far from the core.

Don't like entering and not seeing center of campus. Do like sports center loop.

With adequate signs, this option is appealing.

Closing entrances will create problems. Loop around PSC may work.

The simpler the better. Easy in – easy out – easy directions – easy signage. Only issue – no quick way to get to residence life. Have to drive all the way around or would people use Bay Settlement? We have huge traffic issues on weekend. 800-1000 cars on one Sunday afternoon navigating w/ minimal directions.

How does this affect Weidner traffic flow after an event?

Seems to make most sense.

I like this traffic plan for access to academic buildings, but the only concern I have is access by the public to the Weidner Center and Sport Center.

An inner loop for the sports center might be a good idea, but all the traffic ends up at one exit when considering campus exits.

De-emphasize “Main” entrance but do not close it. Do close it as an exit during Weidner Center events.

Main entrance seems to have limited value now. Get people on the circle.

Don't close main entrance.

The inner loops make the core of campus more accessible.

Perhaps a good idea.

Although this may be more expensive, I think the long-term goal of easier navigation and no confusing entrance rests w/this choice. Does current traffic count – rather send most via SW entrance now.

I like the inner loop for sports events, but do not like closing the main entrance. Again, we need all the entrances to handle traffic flow.

Close current main entrance to reduce confusion for incoming deliveries and surplus sale traffic.
I would like to see one main entrance using the present SW one and improving the flow of traffic at peak times, i.e. 4:30. I would also like to see bike paths along road sides to prevent bikers riding on Nicolet. Maybe put a stop light on Nicolet.

No, No, No. The main entrance should be emphasized!

De-emphasize, but do not close main entrance. Welcome booth should be at Southwest entrance, since most folks approach from the south. Give these 2 entrances more logical names! User friendly.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Traffic: Alternative 3**


**Comments:**

Like this approach – where will the parking booth be located?

Need to maintain traffic flow/access to/from Weidner Center. Can an addition sports/event center loop be added to this?

We need a main entrance that is clearly marked with “people” at the desk – Info Center – could be operated by student workers – long overdue.

Not this one – ruins aesthetic appeal of our beautiful campus.

This would make the campus more like a small city. More parking is always a plus.

Addition of numerous interior roads would decrease aesthetic beauty of campus, require greater maintenance and could create more safety issues for pedestrians and vehicle. This choice is least desirable.

Do not want to see either entrance closed.

Provides greatest flexibility for expansion and core of access.

Allows you to get into campus more. Keeps the main entrance and the 2 exits onto Nicolet.

No, keep cars on the outside of campus. We should not build more internal roads.

I do not see network of interior roads in this image. Where are they?

Interior roads and on street parking too much congestion especially with pedestrian traffic.

Try to minimize on-street parking. This would often lead to more congestion as drivers wait for others ho are parallel parking.

Lots of on street parking would be a mess to monitor. Currently difficult to direct visitors to correct building and lot. This would help. Also help handicapped access. Because this campus is atrocious for people w/disabilities – cannot park reasonably close to interior buildings.

One of the things people like about this campus is the traffic-free core. People unfamiliar with campus could become easily confused as they try to navigate congested streets and try to find their way.

Add sports center loop to this and you are set.

Road from WH lot to S to sports center. One road only. Will then work w/shuttle for parking.

I like the on street parking concept to cut the number of lots.

With increased enrollment, all entrances will be needed. Interior roads are a good idea. On-street parking is snail at economical.

On-street parking – need I say more.

On street parking will be a nightmare for traffic and snow removal.

More interior roads would make the campus feel more urban –not as safe or as comfy for pedestrians. Let’s keep this a pedestrian campus please!

On street parking is a nightmare.

Violates a core element of original plan to limit auto traffic in middle of campus.

We are not an urban campus so this type of on-street parking will take away from the pedestrian end and natural beauty.
Keep the 3 entrances on Nicolet.

Seems logical but on-street parking provides congestion to the interior of the campus. More car and pedestrian accidents etc. during class changes.

Traffic congestion at 4-5 pm is already a problem. Need to increase ease of getting in and out of campus. More entrance points?

On-street parking good idea, but what about snow removal?

No.

Best! Can't eliminate entrance/exit roads. It is too congested now when leaving after work. Will roads have to be widened for on-street parking? Need a bike lane on Nicolet Drive. This is a dangerous area.

Do not like network of interior roads – just puts pedestrians at risk.

I think on street parking is problematic for snow removal.

Do not allow on-street parking – a mess!

No on-street parking: facility is already difficult enough for truck traffic.

Better, but would need to know more.

With 7,500 we would feel like a more alive, close knit community. Outside events/ programs would do better.

Parking needs to be out of the core. The core needs to be green space.

Allows for expansion of facilities with no disruption to parking.

Our society needs more walking! However, I feel handicapped parking should be made available next to ALL buildings. The library gets many complaints on this issue.

Lot is too far out.

Do not like any of the categories for Parking. Having attended activities at major universities around the country, my feeling is for the few events annually shuttle them from LS or Wood Hall lot.

This opens up more parking for union and PSC and residents. We are running out of space for sports center and residents with all the additional buildings. I like the road behind the PSC not in front of the parking lots.

Allows for development of academic buildings. Easier snow removal?

No need to have new lot so far out. The land is not needed.

Too far out.

I think this option is the best based on what the campus was created on – environment friendly. Also, seems to be the safest for staff and students getting to their vehicle.

No, people complain about walking now. This cannot be a serious idea. I realize it is proposed by off campus planners.

Coexists with the campus idea. We need to build to maintain a campus theme.

This option does not fragment the open spaces, makes people get exercise, keeps noise levels down near buildings, keeps air cleaner near buildings.

**Parking: Alternative 2**


**Comments:**

I am not sure people will want to park so far out for events at the new center.

Exclude on street parking.
Comments:
Better for those long cold winters.

This seems a reasonable compromise between having parking too near or too far from buildings.

Not in the core. Do not want urban feel to campus.

I like the historical sense of keeping parking at the periphery of campus. Walking is healthy.

This seems reasonable but number one would be ok too.

Close to events/buildings but still within a convenient distance.

Closer to buildings is more convenient but out of core preserves inner beauty of campus.

Keep better access to Weidner --otherwise maybe acceptable.

People on this campus complain if they cannot park near buildings.

Something still needs to be done about handicap parking – maybe one special lot?

Bringing students closer is the attractive feature.

We have long, cold winters so parking should be located closer to buildings as opposed to along the periphery.

Provides easier access for handicapped, decreases travel time. On street parking too difficult to monitor.

Better for new sports center.

Best option because it reduces walking in winter months.

No reason not to make them closer. Keeps them a little further from the trails.

This would be valuable but additional parking is needed on the north end by the blue lot. On street parking can be a mess.

Increases residential parking options yet keeps green space at a premium. It would be nice to have connections to the commuter out lots and academic core via tunnels.

Looks like this is the most appealing option of the three listed.

Closer, yet not in core. It allows the students more convenience.

Avoids paving areas within academic core; maintaining the aesthetics and beauty of the core area.

Discourages housing students from driving to class. Assign parking for special lot instead of just parking in any lot.

Not too close and not too far; seems to be the middle-good choice.

Proximity to buildings is good. Will there be visitor spots in each or a couple of visitor lots? Will this address customer walk-in registration, i.e. shots stays in close proximity to buildings?

This seems reasonable, as long as the core remains pedestrian.

Keeps with current emphasis on lots outside campus core.

Best of both worlds -- fairly close parking without losing pedestrian core.

I prefer parking closer to the buildings unless of course you designate the closer lots for visitors and staff.

Create a designated faculty/staff lot or lots. Combine with on-street parking.

Save core for future needs. It does not increase walking distance.

Do not use yet – but seems logical.

The happy medium of the options.

Emphasis is not on parking but on the campus core.

One huge ramp at sight of existing sports center lot. It is close to MAC – close to housing and close to an expanded sports center. Raise parking rates – now ridiculously low – yes, I am a staff member. To help pay for new ramp, charge additional sports
center ticket price to pay for ramp. Charge additional Weidner event charge to help pay for ramp.

Students and others want and will use parking lots closer to buildings. It is nature of our climate vehicular mode for everyone and convenience culture we live in. Do not see this reversing or changing in the future.

I like the additional parking near housing, sports center and other lots. I think we may need more parking near sports center area.

I actually think our current parking is ok. This option seems closest to an expansion of what we have now.

A good compromise.

Allows shorter time to access buildings. Would not want on-street parking.

Yes, Yes – closer to buildings or even to access to the concourse.

People who bitch about walking on this campus should go to UWM or Madison for a day!

Parking is more aesthetically pleasing if kept at periphery.

**Parking: Alternative 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

Given the climate of the area and the number of people with special needs, it makes more sense to bring parking in rather than cut parking structure.

On street parking is a terrible idea. It is unsightly, and may look congested.

Looks to be easier for traffic flow and foot traffic.

We need a main entrance that is clearly marked with “people” at the desk – info center could be operated by student workers – long overdue.

I like the on street parking idea allowing employees to park closer to work locations.

Most user friendly system.

Too much congestion with pedestrian traffic.

Lots along roadsides are fine; avoid on-street parking.

Best for new sports center. Should connect lots via smaller roads.

Closer parking and on-street parking – smart economically and politically – retain all entrances.

On street parking – need I say more.

No on-street parking.

Do not like street parking idea.

Will create more traffic congestion.

Bad to increase traffic in core.

On-street parking will cause problems with snow removal plus traffic will not flow when people are parking and pulling out along the roads.

Try to impact the Arboretum as little as possible.

No, new interior roads would be clogged with traffic and pedestrians – a step backward.

I like this option also except for on-road parking – too hazardous. But I like the location of those lots.

Provides important access while preserving the beauty of the campus. The fewer functional lots the better.

Pedestrian traffic good. On street parking encourage it.

No on-street parking. It would create more accidents between parking cars and cars driving by.
3. NEW BUILDINGS

**Alternative 1**
CL, CL, CL, C, CL
F, F
AS, AS, AS, AS

**Comments:**
Keeping students closer to rest of campus will make it easier for them to get to classes.

Disadvantage: Separation from existing student residence.

Students won’t interact with older adults as in possibility.

Initially students in new housing may consider themselves isolated from others.

Too far removed from existing housing.

Too far from existing buildings.

Logistics with AC’s and RA rounds would be tough especially due to disconnect from Com. Center. Many things will be housed at the CC when additions are completed.

I like this one. I do think you should allow some roadside parking in new area.

Yikes!

Housing in this one will be quite far from union.

No way – while perhaps pleasing to some students due to proximity to Nicolet Drive, this is a disaster for housing staff trying to complete tasks efficiently. Split campus, this is practical only if housing area proposed is graduate or married housing area.

Do not like to separate student housing.

Would get the feeling of a campus atmosphere w/SW buildings as people approach the campus area – academic buildings, not housing.

More equitable distance from all buildings to academic core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Buildings: Alternative 2**

**Comments:**
Keep housing in a cluster.

When the surrounding area becomes more developed, students will be more likely to use it.

Keeps students integrated with campus.

The possibility of connecting to off-campus developments sounds most promising.

We need a main entrance that is clearly marked with “people” at the desk – info center could be operated by student workers – long overdue.

This sounds great if retail development can come off Scottwood.

I think the community should eventually include commercial development -- is an attractive option.

I like the idea of future development close to our housing.

Keep existing and new residence areas together – more community spirit; easier maintenance.

Keeps housing together while also keeping it set off as its own community.

Housing/unit/sports center should make a cluster.

But with new building both SW and SE of Core.

Keep student housing together so students do not seem isolated in another area.

Keep housing in one location easier to monitor.

Do not overcrowd the southwest.

Keep them together.
Keep housing close to existing housing.

Elongates campus.

I think it is important to keep all housing together for community feeling.

I think that keeping student housing in the same general area as it currently is located is a good idea.

Keeps housing together. Allows greatest flexibility for long-term expansion, growth of both housing and academic buildings.

I think housing should stay together.

Keep students near each other for interaction-type activities.

Keeps housing together in one area – much easier to foster community building.

Keeps the campus core less clustered and aesthetically planning.

Keep housing together.

Best to keep housing outside of campus core.

I think it is important to locate all housing in one area of the university. But I would recommend that only upper classmen live in the faraway residence halls and keep freshmen close by campus.

Having been an on-campus student, I thought it was nice to have all the housing in one area. I also feel that if you were walking back to the housing without a friend that it was a pretty good bet that at least one other person was walking back to housing.

Keep NE core free for more expansion.

It would seem more efficient to keep student housing together on the northeast part of campus.

Remove the Wood Hall lot and extend academic buildings in that area, Parking?

Important to maintain housing in a central location.

Combination of Alternative 2 and 3 – Red area is a swamp and not a good place to build. Blue area a good place to put a circle of buildings such as the ones nearby. Currently empty field requires no removal of valuable trees or destruction of wetland (this person colored in red and blue on survey as referred to in comment.)

A few other thoughts regarding student housing: The rumor was, several years ago when I worked that some or all of the older student apartments would be torn down at some point. I do not know if this was to make room for new housing buildings, green space or whatever. I just want to say that unless the proposed, if accurate is at least 20 years down the road, this would be a big mistake economically. The mortgages or other loans on these buildings are paid off, I assume, and I believe from working in all of them that they are structurally sound. Of more concern to me is the first four UVHI buildings constructed which I believe are more shoddily built and have first floors which are fatally flawed, so to speak, since they are part way underground and prone to water and mildew problems. It would be better to keep the old apartments at 2 people to a two bedroom apartment to make them more attractive, than to tear them down, assuming this is economically feasible from Residence Life’s point of view.

Keep housing all together. This is the only way kids can interact when not using the rest of campus.

I believe the on campus living experience for a campus of our size is best served by one central housing development. With a new S & EC this is accessible and preserves the beauty of campus.

Keep housing in one place.

Keep student housing together.

Keep housing together to service the people living there more easily.

**New Buildings: Alternative 3**
Comments:
Would benefit students w/disabilities.

Increase density will promote more pedestrian activity.

Campus core should maintain academic focus.

I know you have heard this before – but I think it is important to preserve as much of the arboretum as possible.

Brings students closer – it is the attractive feature.

Keeps a closer community feeling.

This would encourage students to use expanded union and PSC more. May create parking issues as most students bring cars.

For interaction of residential students and the RA/AC staff, this would be the best of the three.

I think this one should have more parking for Residence away from Union and PSC and MAC.

Closer housing is user-friendly. Emphasize the Union more to support on-campus living. Housing closer to Shorewood would be nice (by #8 Green or south of #11 Fairway).

Housing closer to campus core would lead to more program interaction.

Housing closer to campus core provides easy walking access.

Too congested this way.

Housing: It is easier for students to walk and closer to union. Academic: closer to entrance.

Better proximity to campus core for student housing.

Keep students close to academic buildings and other housing creating community climate.

Students are clear that they want closer to core. Since housing is consumer choice and solely dependent on student choice and rest to survive need to pay most attention to what students want. No disadvantages to university goals of community building and efficient cost effective operations.

Keep housing together. Do not like idea of seeing housing at SW entrance. Keep this area natural as it now is.

I like having student housing closer to the campus core. May encourage more student participation in campus events and more interaction with each other. But would it hinder future building expansion? Has anyone given any thought to the hundreds of visitors to our campus? When our prospective students and their families come to visit, we need something easy for them to access. They need to be able to get to the admissions office easily.

I would like to see more living/learning programming and think getting housing in closer would help create that.

This allows student activity to be part of campus without seeming to be center of campus.

Keep housing together. Old northeast vs. new southwest – not good.

Housing should be kept in the same area to create a community.

4. PEDESTRIANS
Alternative 1
AS, AS, AS, AS, AS
F, F, F, F, F
CL
Comments:
Would have to make the outdoors more people friendly -- benches, clear signage, path etc. As it is now the outside is not conducive to pedestrian traffic.

The students will cut across the grass – leave worn paths everywhere.

Not in this climate.
Pedestrians: Alternative 2

Comments:
I know people want to see people on campus. But tunnels are our uniqueness.

Students appreciate the tunnels.

Economically feasible.

Encourage people to walk as it is good exercise and extends life!

Not affordable.

What about sidewalks to parking lots??? Like the Weidner Center lots?

Keep some inside walking w/this one.

Why on earth would you do this!!

Improve outdoor accessibility i.e. LS to Union walk.

Pedestrians: Alternative 3

Comments:
How are handicapped supposed to get around in inclement weather or in the snow?

The tunnels are an attraction for prospective students – makes UWGB unique.

Makes school special.

That is why students like it here.

Add concourses above ground. Too much of this beautiful campus and it employees are underground. The above ground concourses should be all windows.

Considering the inadequate amount of staff to remove snow in winter and how many doorways are closed in winter, you need adequate inside pathways.

This is our campus special feature and what attracts many students.

Stay interconnected – matches interdisciplinary mission.

This is attractive to our student body.
It is a huge selling point now especially in winter. Keep the outside aesthetically alive as well and let people choose. They usually walk the shortest distance anyway!

Great for studying between classes. However, the outside also should be preserved if possible.

Above ground in. -50 wind chill is not an option.

Nine months we have cool/cold weather, we live in Wisconsin. I believe the tunnels are a plus for UWGB.

Let’s not forget the weather is lousy in Green Bay six months per year. The best part of the main campus is the tunnel system.

Because we need to choose and investment in inside has already been made.

I really like our unique tunnels, especially during our cold winter months. Students can take outside route if they wish.

Like this idea –need gathering areas.

5. CAMPUS DENSITY

Alternative 1
The academic core should be concentrated – promote interaction, engagement around learning – minimize distance between classes.

Build density by design – leaving large open areas for the future.

When things are too spread out, people are less like to participate.

An attraction of our campus is its beauty. Keep learning and civilization at the heart of campus surrounded by open, natural beauty.

Many students choose UWGB for the open areas. It is important to keep open access around student housing so they have place for activities and stress relief.

We have a feel students like and we should conserve that if possible.

Natural areas on campus should be preserved as much as possible.

Keep draw at core of campus. This is a scenic campus. It should stay that way.

I think this plan will better maintain the overall aesthetic of the campus. Too many roads confuse people and make it difficult to give directions without lots of signage.

I like a dense pedestrian core with the car and housing on periphery.

I think it is easier for people to navigate a cluster of buildings rather than feeling overwhelmed by academic and housing buildings being intermingled. If you know to go to housing, you can go to the housing area to look for your building. The same is true for academic buildings. I also think this preserves the idea of an environmentally friendly campus.

Preserve green space and fill core.

Keep campus environmentally focused – condense.

I like this better than the 2nd alternative, but have problems with both. In a time of tight budgets which will likely remain for decades, anything that adds excess costs will never get past the legislature to begin with. It is best to use existing roadways and corridors rather than tear up the countryside for 15 y cars and add prohibitive costs to campus renewal. At some point someone has to say enough is enough as far as people having to walk too far to get to their destination. People drive around for ten minutes looking for a closer place to park, then spend 20 minutes each way driving to the exercise studio or the diet center.

Open, park-like setting is what makes campus unique – need to maintain that identity for UWGB.

Keep things structured like commercial/residential zoning in real life is the best. Kids need to be away from academics too – especially for free-time.

Most in line with the existing campus, preserves the functionality and beauty of campus. We are currently unique for many reasons and one is the breadth of the campus and its beauty.

Maintain rural feeling as much as possible.

Keeping vehicle traffic down within core should be a priority. There is already too much vehicle traffic (service vehicles) on service road.

There are so many things that make our campus unique – the woods, the concourse, the closeness that it would be a shame to lose them. One knows change is necessary but let’s keep our uniqueness.

Keeps open spaces open for us to enjoy. Avoid interior roads that bring noise, fumes and make it harder for pedestrians to walk safely.

A dense core presents a better sense of community. I like the sidewalk idea.

**Campus Density Alternative 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Classified Staff</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

Leads to a more fully integrated campus.

Our current campus “feel” is important – our signature. Concentration at the center w/roads is not ideal.
I just think this would look nicer.

This plan seems as though it would be a happy camper.

More roads connecting buildings only increases congestion.

May offer more of a community feeling.

It keeps things focused in a general area. As the campus grows in the distant future it will most likely have to spread out.

More open feeling.

Keeps arboretum more intact. Easier for residential students.

The closer and more connected the entire campus the better. Added housing by the union, community center and golf courses is preferred.

Avoids buildings being cramped together.

Spreading the density across campus --though adding more roads may make it more confusing.

My biggest issues include getting people to Residence Life --then from Residence Life to Weidner. Too many turns irritate them! Ease is the key.

I like increased density across campus. Do not like road inside circle drive.

I like creating the feel of an active campus. (like Lawrence in Appleton). Dislike idea of roads (traffic) every 9 feet.

This increases the opportunity for the best of both worlds -- density in a 700 acre campus of 5,800 or 7,800 students.