A. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES REVIEW

LAKES, VEGETATION AND LANDSCAPE COMMITTEE
Minutes from the January 9, 2012 meeting

PARKING & TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes from the January 10, 2012 meeting

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE
Minutes from the January 17, 2012 meeting

LAND USE AND FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE
Minutes from the February 7, 2012 meeting

B. OTHER/MISC.

1. Bryan Hall Site Summary – excerpted from the 2005 Preservation Plan, which was broadly adopted by the UF Campus Master Plan.

2. Learning Discovery Workshop – Report of Results (March 2012)
The University Lakes, Vegetation and Landscape Committee (ULVLC) met Monday, January 10, 2011 at the University of Florida Facilities Planning and Construction Division Conference Room 226 Stadium West.

Members attending:
- Linda Dixon – Facilities, Planning and Construction
- Gail Hansen De Chapman – Environmental Horticulture - Chair
- Jeff Holcomb – University Police Department
- Lionel Dubay for Bob Miller – Business Affairs
- Stephanie Sims - Sustainability
- Mark Siburt – City of Gainesville
- Marty Werts – Physical Plant
- Timothy Young – Academic Advising

Members not attending:
- Thomas Conlon – Pediatrics
- Linda Hayward – Physiological Sciences
- Fred Gratto – Physical Plant
- Greg MacDonald - Agronomy
- Jason Smith – Forest Resources and Conservation
- Carol Walker – Facilities, Planning and Construction
- Morton Zhou – Student

Also attending:
- Erik Lewis – Facilities, Planning and Construction
- Howie Ferguson - Facilities, Planning and Construction
- Erick Smith – Arborist
- Jeff Lajza – UF Libraries

Gail Hansen De Chapman, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M.

I. **Adoption of Agenda**

Motion: **Tim Young moved to approve the agenda w/changes and minutes.**

Second: **Lionel Dubay**

Motion Carried Unanimously

II. **MINOR PROJECTS**

**Smathers Library – Tree Removal**

Michael Richardme

Michael said that he was before the committee to request that a magnolia tree in front of Smathers Library be taken down, due to its roots being intertwined with many utility lines. Michael recapped that he had been
before the committee in 2010 to get permission to put in a transformer, since the existing utility closet was not big enough to handle the new one. He said that as the project moved forward that they had realized the issue. He said that he had Erick Smith, arborist, do a report in which he said that the tree should be removed and that he should be attending the meeting shortly.

Marty Werts said that the magnolia was about 16 dbh and that it was probably planted by former Grounds director / landscape architect Noel Lake. He said that roots and utilities were always an issue on campus and that it would be a shame to remove such a nice tree. He noted that the tree doesn’t block the view of the historic entrance to Smathers, and he does not think it warrants removal. Michael said that the project had not sought removal of the tree before, but that after looking at all the utilities running through the area, he felt that it was a bad location and that the project is willing to pay the mitigation fee or replant. He continued that the tree was nearly bare on one side, due to trimming to protect the building. Gail Hansen De Chapman asked why the tree needs to be removed if the transformer project is completed. Michael responded that there were lots of utilities under the tree and that it will create future problems if left in the ground. Erick Smith said that the project had done a good job of protecting the tree and avoiding large roots, but that it is a tight space and will push on utilities. Gail asked why they hadn’t asked to get the tree removed when they started the project. Michael said that they had not realized that the utilities were so abundant until after they started and went on to explain how bad it would be for the internal collections if a tree branch was to fall on the transformer. There was a back and forth discussion between Marty and Michael / Jeff Lajza about the potential impacts and the fact that these issues are faced all over campus, along with the fact that open space and utilities tend to overlap.

There was group discussion on impacts to roots by cutting and the significant historical entrance that is obscured by the tree and covered walkway. Tim Young suggested that the tree discussion be postponed until the walkway comes down. Jeff went back to the potential cost if the tree was to fall on the transformer. Linda Dixon noted that the walkway removal had already been approved as part of the David Conner’s Plaza of the Americas (POA) Conceptual Plan. Gail asked Erick Smith to address the trees and utilities on campus and in this location. Erick said that it was indeed a problem all over campus and that dealing with these issues is ongoing adventure. Lionel Dubay recapped the discussion noting that: 1. the project had hired an arborist, who recommended removal; 2. the project offered to mitigate the tree and replace with a good size one in the area; and, 3. the cost if the tree were to fall would be expensive with the money having to be found. Linda Dixon stated that any new trees should be planted in accordance with Connor’s concept plan for the POA. Erik Lewis suggested that the Yardley Courtyard could use a Little Gem Magnolia replacement, due to the loss of one on Buckman from an irrigation problem over the summer. Mark Siburt stated that he had disagreed with the removal of the magnolia a few months back because it was clogging a stormwater drain and that he would not allow fears of potential impacts to be the driving force for tree removal. There was additional discussion about how to arrive at a motion, amount of mitigation and who could vote with Tim and Lionel working out a motion with Tim requesting more mitigation than normal.

**Motion:** Lionel Dubay made the motion to approve the tree removal with a mitigation ratio of 8:1 and not to exceed $2500.

**Second:** Tim Young

**Motion Carried Unanimously**

### III. MAJOR PROJECTS

**UF 366 – Remote Libraries**  
Howie introduced himself and went over the committee’s role in reviewing projects. He introduced the remote library project and said that he was not sure when it will be built, but that they have design money so the project is moving forward. He showed the location and said that they were looking to add about 27,000 sq. ft. to the existing 42,000 sq. ft. building. He said that the facility would house about 6 million books in high density shelving units and that the facility would work as a warehouse for all of the state university system’s libraries. He said that they did not foresee any tree impacts, unless utilities upgrades require it (has not discussed with GRU, the utility provider.) He showed photos of the site. Marty Werts suggested some new planting along 39th avenue, but Howie said that they were in site approval part and were not ready to discuss design. Gail Hansen
De Chapman asked about stormwater, Howie said he was not sure how it would be addressed at this point. Linda Dixon noted that the expansion is listed in the Master Plan’s Capital Improvements Element and that trees on the site were planted pine. This led to a brief discussion of pine plantations being present on a few of the satellite properties and whether it should be included under the mitigation policy with Erik Lewis suggesting that perhaps a policy should be added to the Master Plan exempting it.

Motion: Tim Young moved to approve the project as presented.

Second: Lionel Dubay

Motion Carried Unanimously

---

**UF 380 – WBCA – Undergraduate Studies Building**

Howie introduced the project as the sister project for Hough Graduate Studies Building and stated that it will serve undergraduates. He said that the project was being funded primarily from Mr. Heavener with additional funding coming from the business school, other donors and the Foundation. He went over the preferred location on the north side of Bryan Hall, adjacent to the corner of University Avenue and 13th Street. Howie went over the internal needs of the building for classrooms and that they have not finalized how big the building will need to be. He went over a study of the Tigert – Criser – Hough – Little parking area by David Conner that VP Poppell had commissioned before his retirement. He mentioned some of the participants that had worked with David including Linda Dixon, Scott Fox, Lionel Dubay, Stuart Cullen (Civil Eng.) and Walker parking garage consultants. Howie said that the study had settled on changing how traffic moves through the area and making a more aesthetically pleasing, pedestrian friendly landscape in place of a garage and new building at this point. He continued that by moving the proposed business building to the alternative site on the north side of Bryan they would be leaving future options for this area open. He said that the study had also addressed the placement of the new building in its new proposed location and showed a few renderings of how the gateway from 13th and University could be changed to give a more open presence to the University. He said that the Business School was happy to have the building close to their other buildings and showed renderings of a potential footprint, noting that they were not at the design stage, just site selection. Howie went over the Master Plan policies that give direction to construction in this area, including open space connections and the importance of the gateway onto campus. There was some group discussion about the pedestrian entrance feature on the corner of University and 13th and when it was constructed. He went over potential tree impacts based on the footprint and the build to line, which included 27 potential tree impacts not including any changes that may be made to open up the gateway.

Marty Werts said that the Athletic Association had contacted him about extending the seat wall along University Avenue from Murphree to SW 2nd Avenue and ventured that this project may consider extending it east. Gail Hansen De Chapman asked why this site was selected over the other site next to Hough Hall. Howie said that the president, vice president and dean of the college had felt that this was a better location. Gail asked if they were saving the other spot for something better. Howie said that he felt that they wanted to keep their options open. Linda Dixon said that element of the David Conner study would be incorporated into the Master Plan. There was a general discussion about tree mitigation with Tim Young expressing concern about trees being planted on site counting towards mitigation and Linda pointing out that the LVL would need to change its policy to do otherwise. Tim also expressed concern about other trees that may be impacted as part of potential gateway changes on University Avenue and 13th Street. Gail asked if it should be considered as two different projects, with Howie saying that from his perspective it is one, since he will be managing. There was more discussion about the open space, potential changes, age of entrance sign, tree impacts and goal of opening up.

Erik Lewis pointed out that major changes to two other corners of the intersection were coming in the future with the open lots to the north and east and that there was an opportunity to create a totally new presence.

Motion: Tim Young made the motion to approve the project with an encouragement to minimize impacts to large trees.

Second: Lionel Dubay

Motion Carried Unanimously
IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Tree Report

Marty asked if the committee had any recommendations for placement of the loquat trees (and other recently planted trees along the northeast perimeter of campus) that the committee had requested be removed. Gail Hansen De Chapman suggested that some trees could be placed along Hull road in front of the SW Rec. Center and noted that the committee had previously suggested placing some tree around married student housing where the fruits may be of more value by residents. Linda Dixon said that there are power lines along Hull Road that dictate what and where trees can be planted and to be careful, because there are some road/bike improvement moving forward in this area. She also said that the committee had recognized the need to have a street tree plan along prominent corridors. Marty suggested that he could also plant some additional loquats at Ficke Gardens. Linda noted that this area is where the columbarium had been approved and Gail said that loquats did not fit in with the landscape plan for the garden. Lionel Dubay said that Grounds should coordinate on the locations with Norb Dunkel to make sure he approves.

There being no further business for discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.
PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
January 10, 2012  2:00 PM  206 TAPS

ATTENDEES:
Members: Juan Nino, Pradeep Kumar, Paul Davenport, Bob Miller, Carolyn Huntley, Teresa Kauf, Ray G. Thomas, Ira Harkness, Cindy Craig, Sonu Jain
Ex-Officio Members: Scott Fox, Chandler E. Rozear, Stephanie Sims, Linda Dixon
Non-members: Ron Fuller, Lionel Dubay, Brad Barber, Joseph Floyd, Howie Ferguson, Peter Miller, Jeff Lasza, Nina Shubert (recording)

FACILITATOR: Scott Fox

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Ira Harness moved to approve the November 2011 minutes. The motion was seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

TAPS DEPARTMENT UPDATE
PRESENTING: Ron Fuller
DISCUSSION:
Ron Fuller gave an update for Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS), covering:

- **Complimentary Visitor and Patient Parking** – Implemented this week (January 9th).
- **Parking Meter Replacement** – Rates for parking have changed to $.25 for a 1/4 hour. Pay stations at the Welcome Center Garage have been changed. The pay station operation will be easier as the machines will operate in real time.
- **Retro-fit lighting in Hume Garage (V)** – Replaced high pressure sodium lighting. Fluorescent lighting is more efficient, offering cleaner, crisper lighting. Expecting lower utility costs. Next retro-fitting will be Shands Garage IX.
- **Zimride** – Launched on January 10. Replaces Green Ride ride-share program. More intuitive program – intergrades with Facebook and Twitter.
- **Paving Projects rescheduled due to snags** –
  - Norman Hall North Lot- completed soon
  - Ramp Between Garages III and Medical Plaza

AUXILIARY LIBRARY FACILITY AND HIGH DENSITY STORAGE FACILITY – UF 366
PRESENTING: Howie Ferguson
DISCUSSION: Project site is the current facility at Waldo road and 39th Avenue. Site is Master Plan compliant. Offers off-site storage for books for all 11 state universities and will store up to 5 million volumes. Currently no planning, design or building money, but preparing for when funding will be available. Although no parking impact or current decal parking in this area, TAPS’s concerns may extend to expansion of parking area and eventual decal enforcement. Seeking approval of programming phase.
ACTION: Bob Miller moved to approve. Ira Harkness seconded. Committee approved unanimously the Library expansion project.

WARRINGTON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING – UF 380
PRESENTING: Howie Ferguson
DISCUSSION: Funded and compliant with Master Plan. No building design as of the time of the meeting. This will be a undergraduate building, a sister to graduate building at Hough Hall. This building would be a smaller version of Hough with 5-8 classrooms and 15 offices. Building options
selection was due to preserving current parking areas and good location near undergraduates in Bryan, Stuzin and Matherly. There was some discussion regarding traffic access to this building for deliveries and parking for faculty and staff working in the building. Staff and faculty for that area park in gated, Yulee, O’Connell Center and Norman lots and garages.

**ACTION:**  Juan Nino moved to table, seconded by Pradeep Kumar, the issue pending future information. After discussion, the motion to table failed. To clarify, Howie asked only approval by the T&P Committee for the building site approval to pass to the Vice President. Bob Miller proposed approval, seconded by Teresa Kauf. Committee unanimously approved the site.

**DECAL ENFORCEMENT REVIEW**

**PRESENTING:** Juan Nino

**DISCUSSION:** A presentation given by Juan Nino showed the departmental statistics and workings of TAPS from data provided by TAPS. Discussed were:

- Parking area enforcement
- Identifying trouble areas around campus
- Parking patrol staff and duties
- Quantity and quality of citations written

**ACTION:** Paul Davenport suggested a motion to evaluate regarding better enforcement. Bob Miller stated no motion was needed. No action necessary by the Committee. TAPS and UPD will coordinate to evaluate improvements to enforcement.

**MOWRY ROAD CROSSWALK DISCUSSION**

**PRESENTING:** Teresa Kauf

**DISCUSSION:** Proposal for a crosswalk between Garage II and Garage III to assist with crossing Mowry Road, presented with a map and pictures of the area. Chandler Rozear provided the crosswalk policy information. The University has 6 (six) criteria for the crosswalk policy:

1. There is sufficient pedestrian volume.
2. Reasonable need to direct pedestrians through this area.
3. Location is adequately illuminated
4. The crosswalk area is visible to traffic from up to 200 feet.
5. Crosswalk conveys simple and clear meaning to pedestrians and drivers.
6. There is no existing crosswalk within 500 feet.

Teresa Kauf offered that people were crossing in this area even without the benefit of a crosswalk. Scott Fox stated that crosswalks can serve to give pedestrians a false sense of security when they are placed in areas that do not meet the guidelines. Per Chandler Rozear, the proposed crosswalk did not meet criteria 4, 5 and 6. Ray Thomas suggested rumble strips or a traffic hump before the stop sign. Scott acknowledged the steep grade from the parking garage exit and the issue with regular parkers not coming to a full stop. Scott asked if Major Barber could assist with this issue.

**ACTION:** No action was proposed or taken by the Committee. TAPS and UPD will look at the area to see what may be able to be done and report back to the Committee.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**ACTION:** No other business

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING:** No agenda items were presented for the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ira Harkenss proposed adjournment, Paul Davenport seconded. Committee meeting adjourned at 3:58pm.

I. Adoption of Agenda and Approval of November 2011 Minutes.

Motion: Lionel Dubay moved to adopt the amended agenda and approve the minutes.

Second: David Hickey

Motion carried unanimously
II. **MAJOR PROJECTS**

**UF-380 - Warrington College of Business Administration Undergraduate Studies Building**  
*(Programming Stage)*

_Howie Ferguson_

Howie said he was before the committee to present the proposed location for Hough II and introduced Brian Ray, Director – College of Business. He went over the committee review process and said that this was his 6th project in the Historic District. He said that the project would coordinate with the Division of Historical Resources at the Department of State. Howie said the building was the sister building for Hough I, but would in this case serve as an undergraduate classroom building. He said that the way the department teaches classes has changed, therefore changing the way rooms are configured and that the building would not contain faculty offices. He went over the proposed location on the north side of Bryan Hall, adjacent to the corner of University Avenue and 13th Street. Howie discussed a study of the Tigert – Criser – Hough – Little parking area by David Conner that V.P. Poppell had commissioned before his retirement. He mentioned some of the participants that had worked with David including Linda Dixon, Scott Fox, Lionel Dubay, Stuart Cullen (Civil Eng.) and Walker consulting (parking garage consultant). Howie said that the study had settled on changing how traffic moves through the area and making a more aesthetically pleasing, pedestrian friendly landscape in place of a garage and new building at this point. He continued that by moving the proposed business building to the alternative site on the north side of Bryan they would be leaving open future options for this area open. He said that the study had also addressed the placement of the new building in its now proposed location and showed a few renderings of how the gateway from 13th and University could be changed to give a more open presence to the University. He said that the business school was happy to have the building close to their other buildings and showed rendering of a potential footprint, noting that they were not at the design stage just site selection. Howie went over the master plan policies that give direction to construction in this area including open space connections and the importance of the gateway onto campus. He listed the pros for the project as: preserves area west of Tigert for the future; no parking impacts; opportunity to change the stairwell on the north side of Bryan; and create new campus greenway. He said the cons to this location were: Obstructs north entrance to Bryan; 27-30 trees impacts; limited vehicular access; and no expansion potential.

Carol Walker said that this committee had previously wanted to address the stairwell on the north side of Bryan and that it was universally thought of us a poor addition caused by the need for a fire safety route. Howie went over the site alignment with the Master Plan and showed the build-to line /setbacks along University Avenue and 13th Street. He discussed the Memorandum of Agreement with the Division of Historical Resources that requires projects in the Historic District to coordinate with the state on changes and additions. He noted Master Plan policies regarding height, open space connections and prominent gateways onto campus and stated that the project was committed to addressing each of these issues. Howie went over the site specifics and footprint, noting that the footprint would be around 15,000 sq. ft. with a gross of 45,000 sq. ft. He said that building in the historic district tend to be inefficient in relation to gross sq. ft. vs. net useable space. He said that design and footprint would be affected by the inside requirement and the design/historic preservation constraints outside. Howie went over photos of Bryan, noting that Bryan is obscured from the north and east by trees and that the prominent views are in the west and south, which will not be impacted by the project. He said that the project intends to match the height of Bryan, to improve open space connections, enhance the corner of 13th and University, and to resolve conflicts between functionality and orientation of entrances.

Tom Caswell asked if the project was funded. Howie said that a single donor along with the College and the Foundation were covering all of the costs. Tom said that this is an important site on campus and that the funding must be sufficient to get it done right. Tom asked about the age of the gateway entrance on 13th and University. Erik Lewis said that it had come up in LVL as well and that the plaque showed it being from the early 1950s. Tom said that it was an important element to keep in consideration as the
design move forward and Howie said that the lettering reminds him of the Hub, which is from the same period. Linda suggested that Howie discuss with Carl Van Ness to see if there is additional information on the gateway. There was a general discussion about the gateway and various options that opening up presented. Randall Cantrell asked how far you would have to walk to get the building as a guest lecturer. Howie said that it would take about 15 minutes form Norman or the O’dome, but noted that it was the same under the current situation. Linda Dixon said that the Tigert lot opens at night and that the college can buy tokens to park there for visitors to use when necessary. David Hickey said that he was glad to see that the site had already been in the Master Plan and agreed that the space was very important from a design perspective. Lionel Dubay said that he agreed with the open space discussion and that he feels that the area behind Tigert is too small for a parking garage and as such the idea to make it more pedestrian friendly was a good idea. He also said that he agrees with Tom on the need to get the architecture right. He asked about the hurdles that will be required to get rid of the north stairwell to Bryan. Linda said that it will require coordination between EH&S and the Division of Historical Resources and Howie said that coordination was not specific, but more of a collaborative process to find solutions. Carol said that the placement of undergraduates at the site will make the area and corner more energetic and active. Linda stated that the site is an important open space, but is not heavily utilized and that the new building and corner changes give the University an opportunity to create a better urban form with new entrances and functional space. Randall asked if the budget allows for charrettes and collaboration. Howie said that it does and he can see having focus groups that focus on various components of the project including the outside open space and internal utilization. Mark Hill noted that the Chemistry building had recently followed a similar approach and had included a lot of committee input. Linda said that it would good to invite committee members to sit on the selection committee process and Howie agreed noting that John Ingram had sat in previously on other historic area buildings consultant selections.

Motion: David Hickey moved to approve the project as proposed as long as it follows the Master Plan policies and that any variations would need to come back before the committee.

Second: Randall Cantrell

Motion carried unanimously

III. MINOR PROJECTS

Non-Registered 50-Year Old Buildings  Erik Lewis

Erik said that he was before the committee to restart the process of reviewing buildings that are over 50 years old or will be by 2020. He went over an updated presentation that Linda Dixon had given in 2010 that included buildings likely to be impacted by new buildings. He said that the plan previously had been for Roy Graham to participate in the review and that Dawn Jordan, Harold Barrand, and Mark Hill had agreed to serve on the sub-committee. Erik said that the recent request to demolish the Theta Chi building had led to a discussion within the committee on how to deal with potential historic structures and the Carol Walker had suggested that some policies be added to the Master Plan to ensure review and protection when necessary.

Erik showed photos of the buildings that may be impacted in the next 10 years and went over some of their locations. Tom Caswell asked about the PKY buildings that were on the list. Linda said that most of the buildings on the site will be demolished to make room for the school’s new master site plan that the committee had previously approved. Carol noted Bill Tilson’s comments on Theta Chi and reiterated the need to review the buildings. Linda said that the only restrictions on Fraternity and Sorority buildings were on the deeds the University had given them and that she had talked to the Division of Historical Resources about them and that they were not able to give much guidance. She continued that Roy Graham had felt that the whole of Fraternity Row could be eligible for listing as a Historic District of its own, due to the significance of the buildings as a group, and that Roy had presented at a meeting of the Greek house corporations about the potential and benefits...
of listing on the National Register of Historic Places, but that she wasn’t sure what had become of it. She said that the subcommittee would focus on capturing information on each building and should focus on the architecture, people and research that took place at each structure in order to determine its significance following national standards. Erik said that he would serve as staff for the sub-committee and set up a meeting in the near future for those interested in serving. He said that Bill Tilson had agreed to serve. Mark Hill agreed to serve again and Carol Walker suggested that Kevin Heinicka and Miles Albertson should be included. Erik said that he would also contact Carl Van Ness and Harold Barrand.

**Discussion**
Tom Caswell said that Judy Russell, Dean of the Libraries, had told him that they were ready to bring the Smathers Colonnade removal to the committee, which Linda said may be unnecessary since it had been previously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM.
Minutes
February 7, 2011 at 2:00 AM
University of Florida Land Use Facilities Planning Committee
Facilities, Planning & Construction Conference Room
226 Stadium West

Members Present:
Dr. Thomas Caswell, LB-Architecture Fine-Arts, Chair of PHBSC
Mr. Jeff Chorlog, Physical Plant Division
Mr. Lionel Dubay, Business Affairs
Mr. Norb Dunkel, Director of Housing
Dr. Gail Hansen De Chapman, Chair, Lakes, Vegetation and Landscaping Committee
Mr. Edward Hart, Legal Information Center
Mr. Kevin Heinicka, IFAS Facilities Planning & Operations
Dr. Shannon Holiday - Dentistry
Mr. Chip Howard, University Athletic Association
Dr. Greg MacDonald, Agronomy
Dr. Bill Millard, Chair, College of Pharmacy
Dr. Jacqueline Miller, Florida Natural History Museum
Ms. Anna Prizzia, Office of Sustainability
Dr. Ata Sarajedini, Astronomy, Chair, Transportation & Parking Committee
Mr. David Stopka, Recreational Sports
Dr. Ray Thomas, Geological Sciences
Mr. Andrew Underkofler, Student
Dr. Joseph Wilson, Computer & Information Science & Eng.

Members Absent:
Mr. Erik Bredfeldt, Rep-City of Gainesville
Mr. Lee Catledge, UF Enterprise Systems
Mr. Scott Fox, Transportation & Parking
Mr. Mathew Hersom, Student
Mr. Alex Hyyti - Student
Mr. Steve Lachnicht, Rep-Alachua County Commission
Mr. Marcus Motes, Student
Dr. P.K. Nair, Forest Resources and Conservation
Dr. Sven Norman, Dean’s Office - Pharmacy
Dr. Kenneth Osfield, ADA
Dr. Ata Sarajedini, Astronomy, Chair, Transportation & Parking Committee
Dr. Jason Smith, Forest Resources & Conservation
Dr. Scot Smith, Forest Resources & Conservation
Dr. Saundra TenBroeck, Ag. Animal Sciences
Dr. Gurpal Toor, Agricultural Soil & Water
Ms. Carol J. Walker, Facilities Planning and Construction
Mr. Gary Zetrouer, Recreational Sports

Visitors:
Erik Lewis, Facilities, Planning & Construction
Howie Ferguson, Facilities, Planning & Construction
Fred Rowe, Facilities, Planning & Construction
Peter Miller, Libraries
Jeff Lajza, Libraries
Horace Tucker, WCBA
The University Land Use Facilities Planning Committee members met in 226 Stadium West. Dr. Bill Millard, Chair, called the Land Use meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

I. Adoption of Agenda & Approval of December 2011, Minutes.

Motion: Dave Stopka moved to approve the agenda and minutes as presented.

Second: Jacqueline Miller

Motion carried unanimously

II. MAJOR PROJECTS

Remote Libraries

Howie introduced himself and Jeff Lajza, Libraries Facilities Manager, and went over the committee’s role in reviewing projects. He introduced the remote library project and said that he was not sure when it will be built (PECO); but that they have design money so the project is moving forward. He showed the location and said that they were looking to add about 27,000 sq. ft. to the existing 42,000 sq. ft. building. He said that the facility would house about 6 million books in high density shelving units and that the facility would work as a warehouse for all of the state university system’s libraries. He said that they did not foresee any tree impacts, unless utilities upgrades require it, which will be through GRU the utilities provider. He showed photos of the site and stated the parking would be expanded to accommodate the 35 or so additional staff at the facility.

Motion: Dave Stopka moved to approve the project as presented.

Second: Ray Thomas

Motion carried unanimously

UF 380 – WBCA – Undergraduate Studies Building

Howie introduced the project as the sister project for Hough Graduate Studies Building and stated that it will serve undergraduates. He introduced Horace Tucker form the College of Business and said that the project was being funded primarily from a major donor with additional funding coming from the business school, other donors and the Foundation. He went over the preferred location on the north side of Bryan Hall; adjacent to the corner of University Avenue and 13th Street. Howie went over the internal needs of the building for classrooms and said that they had not finalized the space needs/size of the building, stating that a 70,000 sq. ft. building would not fit, while a 40,000 sq. ft. would (15,000 foot print). He went over a study of the Tigert – Criser – Hough – Little parking area by David Conner that VP Poppell had commissioned before his retirement. He mentioned some of the participants that had worked with David including Linda Dixon, Scott Fox, Lionel Dubay, Stuart Cullen (Civil Eng.) and Walker parking garage consultants. Howie said that the study had settled on changing how traffic moves through the area and making a more aesthetically pleasing, pedestrian friendly landscape in place of a garage and new building at this point. He continued that by moving the proposed business building to the alternative site on the north side of Bryan they would be leaving future options for this area open. He said that the study had also addressed the placement of the new building in its now proposed location and showed a few renderings of how the gateway from 13th and University could be changed to give a more open presence to the University. He said that the Business School was happy to have the building close to their other buildings and showed renderings of a potential footprint, noting that they were not at the design stage, just site selection. He went over the other committee presentation noting that he would be working throughout the design process with the Preservation committee and that T&P had given him the most push back due to service drive issues. Howie went over the Master Plan policies that give direction to construction in this area, including open space connections and the importance of the gateway onto campus. Howie showed the build to line on the north and east, stating that Tigert Hall serves as the eastern edge, not Bryan. He listed the pros for the project as: preserves area west of Tigert for the future; no parking impacts; opportunity to change the stairwell on the north side of Bryan; and create new campus gateway. He said the cons to this location were: limited size/height; obstructs north entrance to Bryan; 27-30 trees impacts; limited vehicular access; and no expansion potential.
Ray Thomas asked about tying directly to Bryan Hall in order to combine service entrances and preserve green space and wondered whether the donor naming had anything to do with it being built as a stand-alone building. Howie said that the donor did want the building to have his name, but that the costs of tying would be exorbitant given all the code upgrades required in the existing building in order to make it meet current codes and cited his recent experiences with Weimer's addition. Jacqueline Miller asked about where the current service drive for Bryan is and where the new buildings would be located. Howie said that Bryan does not really have one and that the project will be working with PPD and emergency management people to determine the best way to address it. Bill Millard noted the similar issue that had come up with the Chemistry building. Joe Wilson asked about where they might connect to Bryan and how the determination of need for classrooms is made. Howie said that the connection would be through the stairwell on the north side. Linda Dixon said that Education Plant Survey is how the state determines the amount of classroom space needed in order to justify new buildings for the PECO list and that she was pretty sure that the last survey had shown deficits. Joe, noting that it was not PECO funding asked whether the college really needed more classrooms. Horace said that the college needs these classrooms to address changes in the way classes are now taught and the deficiencies of existing classrooms they now use in Matherly. Ray Thomas asked how this works with RCM and the need for colleges to justify space and pay for it. Howie talked about the domino effect the college was planning as it moved classrooms into the new building and moved other programs into the older spaces. Ray asked about restrictions by the donor on time for the building to be built. Horace said that he had not read the agreement, which was worked out by the Foundation.

Motion: Jacqueline Miller moved to approve the project as presented.

Second: Dave Stopka

Discussion: Joe Wilson asked to make either a friendly amendment or a substitute motion to bring the build to line into line with the west side of Gerson instead of the current build to line that is even with Tigert. Linda went over the Master Plan policy and land use restriction and rational for the current line and noted that it would put another major constraint on the already constrained site. Joe said that he understood Linda’s point, but felt that this was an important green space to protect and asked to substitute the current motion with his own.

Motion 2: Joe Wilson moved to approve the project as presented, but with the build-to line being based on the eastern edge of Gerson Hall, not Tigert.

Second: Ray Thomas

Motion 2 failed with only Joe and Ray voting for it.

The Chair called for a vote on the original motion.

Original Motion carried with Joe Wilson and Ray Thomas in dissent.

III. MINOR PROJECTS

LM5005 Fresh Food Court

Fred introduced himself and described the location of the Broward area food court. He went over the construction team and said that he would be working with Lionel Dubay on the project. He said that the plan included the expansion of the building to the east and south by about 20 feet (approximately adding 3800 sq. ft.) and that they would be remodeling portions of the interior. He said that the addition would add 340 seats and showed the floorplan of the existing structure. Fred went over the reason he was here before going to LVL (due to tree impacts) and Dr. Millard noted the motion would need to be structured with that in consideration. Fred showed sketches of the proposed expansion and noted that a heritage oak would need to have some limbs removed.
Dave Stopka asked whether the project had considered expanding to the north. Lionel said that the queuing at the front entrance prevented the expansion and said the reason for the project was to improve service. He went over changes to the meal plan that they are initiating and discussed the need to expand Preview, which is partially run through the food court. He said the expansion would include an area that can be sectioned for meetings. Ray Thomas asked about squaring off the building to the north, where a gap exists in the proposed plans, to maximize footprint space. Fred said he would look into, but thought there may have been a reason not to do it the first place. Linda Dixon went over the importance of the pedestrian connection on the east side, which is identified in the Master Plan as a primary bike/pedestrian Open Space Connection and noted the many students that use this path coming from Yulee, Diamond, Beaty and Sorority Row areas.

**Motion:** Ray Thomas made the motion to approve the project with the condition that the project considers squaring off the eastside expansion to line up with the current structures north side and that the project gain approval from LVL.

**Second:** Joe Wilson

**Motion carried unanimously**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM.
BRYAN HALL: COLLEGE OF LAW
Site Summary
The site context of Bryan Hall is unique because it is surrounded by several landscape types and components, which are the building periphery landscape, the campus periphery landscape treatment to the north and east, the campus’ main gateway at the corner of University Avenue and 13th Street, Emerson Courtyard open space design, done in 1987, to the west, and the compatible landscape design, implemented with Gerson Hall’s construction in 2004, to the south.

Connections Between Bryan Hall and the Landscape
North. The building periphery landscape design on Bryan Hall’s north side is minimal, with no obvious connection to the structure. In this space are located sizeable bike rack and utility box areas, a large stairwell addition with a second floor entrance, and an emergency exit. Because of the high visibility of Bryan Hall’s north façade from University Avenue, this is an opportunity to create a connection between the structure and the building periphery landscape by installing plant material that responds to the architectural features of the north façade, and minimizing or removing unsightly views such as the bike rack and utility box areas and emergency exit. The stairwell addition and second floor entrance made to Bryan Hall’s north façade is detrimental to the view from University Avenue. Covered by the stairwell is a grand two-story concrete-detailed façade, with an entrance, and secondary façade that includes a detailed granite panel. The stairwell’s removal would provide the opportunity to improve the view of Bryan Hall, and of campus from University Avenue, because this would allow a unique architectural feature to be appropriately treated by plant material and landscape features to create a strong focal point.

Bryan Hall’s location in the historic district’s northeast corner is significant because the campus’ historic periphery landscape treatment of an open lawn borders the north and east side, and because this northeast corner is the main pedestrian entrance, or gateway, to campus. There is no obvious connection between Bryan Hall, and the open lawn and gateway. However, as the gateway transitions into the open lawn space, there is symmetrical treatment by the pedestrian circulation, plant bed and plant material in the northeast corner. An opportunity exists in the historic district’s northeast corner to create a connection between Bryan Hall, and the open lawn and gateway, and to strengthen the connection between the open lawn and gateway. Plant material at Bryan Hall’s northeast corner should respond to architectural features. Views can be improved to Bryan Hall, and to the gateway, by expanding the symmetrical treatment from the gateway to Bryan Hall, and elaborating on the existing symmetry. Physical elements, such as planters, plant material, overhead landscape features, and consistent hardscape materials, can be used to expand the gateway across the open lawn, and to more strongly identify this gateway as the main pedestrian entrance to campus, by creating a secondary gateway, or plaza, that also serves as a node for pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Because this is the main pedestrian gateway to campus, a secondary gateway would also be an opportunity to locate interpretation of the University of Florida architecture’s historic preservation and campus landscape.

Character-defining features:
Detrimental or missing feature
- Poor view of highly-visible large bike rack and utility box areas.
- Poor view from University Avenue of emergency exit.
• Poor view of large stairwell addition and second floor entrance, which interrupts view of architectural feature.
• Poor view from main pedestrian gateway located at University Avenue and 13th Street.

**Feature appropriate to context**
• Symmetrical treatment at gateway by pedestrian circulation, plant bed and plant material.

West. The building periphery landscape design on Bryan Hall’s west side is minimal, with no obvious connection to the structure. In this space are located a primary entrance with handicap-accessible ramp, a hardscaped secondary entrance area with benches, and a linear plant bed along the façade. The opportunity exists to create a connection between the structure and the building periphery landscape by plant material responding to the architectural features of the west façade, including windows and hardscaped secondary entrance. Physical elements can be used to strengthen the hardscaped secondary entrance area with consistent use of construction materials and details, and to minimize view of the handicap-accessible ramp.
Located to the west of Bryan Hall is Emerson Courtyard. This open space design has little connection to Bryan Hall’s west side. The existing connections are pedestrian circulation on axis with the secondary entrance, and consistent use of construction material and some plant material. To strengthen the connection created by the plant material, between Emerson Courtyard and Bryan Hall, an expanded plant palette and improved planting design should be used. The opportunity exists to strengthen the connection between the secondary entrance and Emerson Courtyard by improving the view along the pedestrian circulation by creating a focal point in the courtyard; at present, the view terminates at a retaining wall. The opportunity also exists to create a connection between this secondary entrance, Emerson Courtyard, and pedestrian circulation entering from the campus periphery landscape of the northeast corner, by locating the focal point in Emerson Courtyard where the two axes intersect.
Additionally, the opportunity exists to create a connection from this secondary entrance to the Anderson Hall and Matherly Hall corridor by location of a focal point. However, this may involve realignment of the retaining wall south of Matherly Hall.

**Character-defining features:**

**Chief Feature**
• Pedestrian circulation on axis with secondary entrance.
• View, on axis with secondary entrance, through Anderson Hall and Matherly Hall corridor, to Library East.

**Feature not significant**
• Hardscaped secondary entrance area with seating.
• Handicap-accessible ramp at primary entrance.
Detrimental or missing feature

- Poor view from pedestrian circulation, on axis with secondary entrance, which terminates at retaining wall.

East. The building periphery landscape design on Bryan Hall’s northern east side is minimal, with no obvious connection to the structure. Located on this façade is an emergency exit. Because of the high visibility of Bryan Hall’s east façade from 13th Street, this is an opportunity to create a connection between the structure and the building periphery landscape by plant material responding to the architectural features of the east façade, and minimizing unsightly views such as the emergency exit.

A connection exists between Bryan Hall’s southern east façade and the building periphery landscape design on the east side. This connection is the use of plant material to respond to an architectural feature, by framing the secondary entrance. With the construction of Gerson Hall, compatible landscape design was implemented that also created a connection between Bryan Hall’s southern east façade, and the open lawn east of Bryan Hall, which is the campus’ historic periphery landscape treatment. The connection is pedestrian circulation, along a cross-axis, that extends from a secondary entrance to additional pedestrian circulation located in the open lawn.

Character-defining features:

Chief feature

- Pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall and perimeter campus landscape.

Feature appropriate to context

- Plant material that frames the secondary entrance on southern east facade.

Detrimental or missing feature

- Poor view of highly-visible emergency exit on northern east facade.

South. A connection exists between Bryan Hall’s south façade and the building periphery landscape design on the south side by the use of physical elements to respond to architectural features of the structure. This connection is created by planters, which are extensions of the architecture, to respond to the windows and doorways by smaller planters being located between the windows, and larger planters framing stairs up to a platform with three entrances. The planters are further connected to the structure through the use of brick, a consistent construction material. Plant material in the planters also respond to the windows and doorways, by differentiating planters between the windows with one plant type, and planters framing the entrances with another plant type.

There also exists a connection between Bryan Hall’s south façade and the open space design between Bryan Hall and Gerson Hall, implemented with Gerson Hall’s construction in 2004. This connection is the primary pedestrian circulation that extends from Bryan Hall, on axis with the entrance, through the open space. An additional connection exists between Bryan Hall and Gerson
Hall since the pedestrian circulation terminates at Gerson Hall’s north façade, where signage for the structure is located on the façade as a focal point.

**Character-defining features:**

**Chief feature**
- Secondary brick planters located between the windows.
- Primary brick planters that frame the entrance area.

**Feature of high importance**
- Primary pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall to secondary open space between Bryan Hall and Gerson Hall.
- Primary pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall to Gerson Hall.

**Feature appropriate to context**
- Plant material used to differentiate between secondary and primary planters.
Guidelines for Rehabilitation and Preservation

Recommended:

- Relocation of highly-visible large bike rack and utility box areas.
- Screen view from University Avenue of emergency exit.
- Removal of stairwell and second floor entrance on north façade.
- Placement of physical elements to respond to north façade’s architectural feature of grand two-story concrete-detailing, entrance, and secondary façade with detailed granite panel.
- Improve view from main pedestrian gateway by use of plant material to respond to northeast façade of Bryan Hall.
- Reinforce gateway located at University Avenue and 13th Street as main pedestrian gateway by secondary gateway design, and extension of gateway by use of physical elements and consistent hardscape pattern.
- Preserve, and expand on, symmetrical treatment at gateway by pedestrian circulation, plant bed and plant material.
- Preserve pedestrian circulation on axis with secondary entrance.
- Rehabilitate view, on axis with secondary entrance, through Anderson Hall and Matherly Hall corridor, to Library East.
- Reinforce connection between hardscaped secondary entrance, with seating, with Bryan Hall by using physical elements and consistent construction material.
- Minimize view of handicap-accessible ramp at primary entrance with physical elements.
- Rehabilitate view from pedestrian circulation, on axis with secondary entrance, which terminates at retaining wall.
- Preserve pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall and perimeter campus landscape.
- Reinforce connection on southern east façade with additional plant material that frames the secondary entrance.
- Screen poor view of highly-visible emergency exit on northern east facade.
- Preserve secondary brick planters located between the windows.
- Preserve primary brick planters that frame the entrance area.
- Preserve primary pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall to secondary open space between Bryan Hall and Gerson Hall.
- Preserve primary pedestrian circulation, on axis with Bryan Hall, connecting Bryan Hall to Gerson Hall.
- Maintain intention of plant material used to differentiate between secondary and primary plan.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The interactive Discovery process asked participants to consider their current learning environment and then to develop attributes of an ideal learning environment that will support the academic mission of the college.

DESIRED OUTCOMES FOR THE WORKSHOP

- Establish a priority for learning environment attributes.
- Begin to articulate a vision for the new undergraduate business college building.

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The workshop began with participants’ introducing themselves and describing their favorite place to be. Without only a few exceptions, the participants talked about being outside, at the beach or a lake. This was followed by a brief presentation on the role of the environment in the learning process, including results of a recent survey on higher education environments, and a discussion of six important attributes of successful learning environments (social, adaptable, stimulating, healthful, resourceful, and sustainable).

Next participants were asked to list and discuss some of the obstacles and enablers to learning, especially around the current undergraduate business school learning environment and experience.

After a short creativity exercise, participants were asked to think about the possibilities for the new business school building. Specifically, they were asked to think about how the new building should feel and what it should do. This activity resulted in about three dozen items, which were distilled into the six top level attributes described below for voting (shown in order of relative importance after voting). The voting process asked participants to reflect on the relative importance of each attribute to every other attribute in terms of contributing to the success of the future learning environment, then to judge how the attribute is performing in the current learning environment. Note that ALL attributes are important; the voting merely prioritizes them and provides an opportunity to understand how they are performing now and identify the level of consensus around them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_attribute</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME BASE</td>
<td>A community place that people want to come to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGING</td>
<td>A place to meet with your groups and academic colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>A place that showcases the school and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTABLE</td>
<td>A flexible multi-purpose learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL AWARENESS</td>
<td>A place that helps people get to know each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTION</td>
<td>A place that helps students and faculty connect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results, and subsequent discussion reflect a desire by participants that the new business school building provide a **strong sense of identity and engagement in a professional atmosphere**. There is also a desire for flexibility to support different teaching and learning styles, and the ability for members of the college to connect easily. It bears repeating that all these attributes were identified as important for the learning. The voting merely revealed the consensus around priorities. Participants were also asked to rank to what degree these attributes exist now. This report includes a matrix of those results, along with planning recommendations to achieve results related to all attributes.
OBSTACLES AND ENABLERS

Participants were asked to consider their current learning space and situation and identify factors that are enhancing (enablers) and detracting from (obstacles) their ability to achieve their learning goals. Responses were focused on both place and practice within the learning environment.

**Obstacles to Learning Success**
What are the things, real or perceived, that get in the way of learning? A brief discussion set the context for looking forward.

- dim lighting – draws energy
- too hot
- poor acoustics
- lack of desk space
- fixed furniture
- not enough space in general
- room setup in fixed front projection format
- glare – sun in our eyes
- when technology doesn’t work

**Enablers for Learning Success**
What does our learning environment have going for us today that helps us meet our learning goals?

- having TA’s and students in same space
- being able to converse with other students
- face-to-face
- u-shaped classroom layouts
- Google-like learning atmosphere
- study rooms setup by subject or class to support informal interaction
- larger desk area / worksurfaces to spread out
- collaborative technology to support students working together
- looped lecture in a space
- bridge virtual and physical in space
ALL ATTRIBUTES OF THE IDEAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Participants were asked to think about how the new undergraduate classroom building should feel and what it should do.

How should the new building feel?

- a destination
- attractive
- bean bag section
- clean
- clean
- collaborative
- comfortable
- energy
- engaging
- flexible
- food
- fun!
- futuristic
- high tech
- incentive
- modern
- multi-purpose
- open (visually)
- outdoors
- professional
- social
- welcoming
- well lit

What should the new building do?

- give students a reason to come to building
- facilitate social relationships
- enhance social presence
- eliminate barriers between
- use classrooms as study rooms
- have 24 hour access
- instill a sense of pride in the college
- showcase who we are
- provide a home base for students and student groups
- enhance the community / student life experience
- be a place to call home for business students
TOP LEVEL ATTRIBUTES OF THE IDEAL FUTURE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The attributes that made up the obstacles and enablers to learning, along with the ideal attributes of a new learning environment were collapsed into the following six top level attributes of the ideal environment. Because they represent a range of shared ideas, the top level attributes are related and have several common elements, especially around themes that came up often. They are described here in alphabetical order.

ADAPTABLE

A flexible multi-purpose learning environment.
This attribute refers to having spaces that can quickly and easily be rearranged and that have the technology to support different teaching formats.

CONNECTION

A place that helps students and faculty connect.
This attribute refers to having a building design that enables easier informal contact between faculty and their students.

ENGAGING

A place to meet with your groups and academic colleagues.
Related to connection, this attribute deals more with having places for students to work together during and between classes.

HOME BASE

A community place that people want to come to.
This attribute expresses a desire to have a place where students will feel a sense of pride and belonging to the College. The building should be so inviting that students will choose to spend much of their time there between classes socializing and working with fellow students, rather than other campus locations or off campus.

PROFESSIONAL

A place that showcases the school and activities.
This attribute reflects the desire to promote the academic programming and stature of the College of Business on campus to prospective students and faculty, and to celebrate the activities of the College to current students and visitors.

SOCIAL AWARENESS

A place that helps people get to know each other socially.
This attribute is similar to Connection and Engaging, but is more focused on the opportunity for students to build social relationship with fellow students in informal settings and extra-curricular activities.
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE TO A SUCCESSFUL FUTURE

Question: Looking back from a place of great success, which attribute was most important and by how much?

Using paired comparisons, participants ranked each attribute of the ideal future learning environment. Responses are listed below in order of higher importance to lower importance, left to right. Note that ALL attributes are considered important; the voting merely prioritizes them and provides an opportunity to understand how they are performing now and identify the level of consensus around them.

As illustrated here and on the matrix the results reflect a very strong desire by participants to have a new building that provides the College a strong sense of identity and of being a home base on campus for undergraduate business students. Further, the building should be very professional in atmosphere and support high levels of engagement. After that, the program should support various teaching styles and help faculty and students connect, and provide opportunities for students to build social relationships with other students.
**TODAY’S PERFORMANCE**

**Question:** On a scale of 1 to 9, with 1 meaning not at all and 9 meaning perfect, how well are each of these attributes performing today?

Responses are listed below in order of voter response. It is interesting to note the high degree of consensus that all attributes are rated below ‘adequate’ (5 – the heavy red line) in terms of the degree these attributes exist or are performing today.

In particular, considering the importance given to the role of the new building as a home base for the program, it’s very low ranking on the current performance scale represents a tremendous opportunity for a new building to radically boost the importance of the physical learning environment in student’s lives, as well as the standing of the academic program on the campus in general.
The data collected during the visioning session reflects the group’s consensus on the answers to two questions. “Looking back from great success, how important was each attribute?” (importance) and “How well is each performing today?” (performance). Plotting the responses results in the matrix illustrated below. As the matrix shows, one of four general conditions may exist for each attribute. As illustrated, there is also a circular direction in which issues tend to develop over time. The four conditions (or quadrants) are described on the following pages.

When considering the results on the profile it is important to keep two factors in mind. First, all the attributes are important. However, since resources are always constrained, the process of scaling them in terms of future importance and current performance helps prioritize activities and sharpen organizational focus. Second, it is natural for these issues to change position over time, both in terms of importance and performance. Therefore, it is helpful to regularly re-assess all four quadrants of the framework to identify necessary adjustments to organizational attention or action.
NEAR TERM OPPORTUNITIES

(High importance and low performance) This area is particularly significant since these attributes are considered very important to future success but not necessarily performing as well as preferred. Attributes in this quadrant are near-term opportunities for improvement. Sometimes called 'low hanging fruit', they are needs that are important to the near-term future and, if integrated into a longer term strategic plan, will catalyze the institution towards achievement of the future vision.

The attributes that fall into this category constituted a great deal of the open discussion during the session. For the participants, the central purpose of the new undergraduate building is to provide students a sense of identity in a professional environment that helps them engage in the learning process with faculty, teaching assistants and fellow students.
EMERGING ISSUES

(Low importance and low performance) This quadrant represents factors that are not considered as critical to the future success and are not receiving much attention. When an institution is newly forming or in a process of renewal, it is typical to have issues in this quadrant. These issues are considered emerging with new importance based on new directions of the group. These factors deserve monitoring and active exploration.

Often attributes fall into this quadrant because they are new ideas, or are not usually associated with the facility type. Also, participants may not have much experience working or learning in environments with these attributes. But, it’s important to remember that these attributes are still considered important, and should be explored in more detail in the next phase of the project.
**IDEAL ZONE and OVER PERFORMING ZONES**

(High importance and high performance) Attributes that fall into this quadrant are considered both important to future success and perceived to be well supported by the organization.

(Low importance and high performance). Attributes that fall into this quadrant are include those that the organization is supporting well but may not be important to future success. The prospect may exist for re-allocating some resources to the “near term opportunity” attributes.

For this exercise there were no attributes that fell into either of these quadrants. This is usually the case when there is not an existing facility that accommodates the new program.

These quadrants will be important during post occupancy evaluation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the voting results as well as the discussion and opinions expressed in the session, several recommendations for the design of the new learning environment emerge:

HOME BASE - A community place that people want to come to.
This high ranking of this attribute suggests an exterior and interior design with a strong identity for the college and its programs. It also suggests providing a range of spaces that can support all the learning and social activities of the students so that they will want to spend most of their time in the building, rather than other places on campus or off campus. Because of the large number of students who participate online or via distance learning, it is especially important that there is strong online presence for the college, so that those students have a virtual home all the time, as well as physical home when they are on campus.

PROFESSIONAL - A place that showcases the school and activities.
This attribute is related to having a learning space that reflects real life professional environments. Its relatively high rank in the voting suggest that the building should have design features and furnishings that resemble corporate office settings as opposed to those found in conventional classroom buildings.

ENGAGING - A place to meet with your groups and academic colleagues.
This attribute suggests providing a range of technology rich group spaces located so that students can easily locate and work with their fellow students between classes. As with several of the other attributes, visibility and awareness of others, both in real and virtual space is critical for this attribute.

ADAPTABLE - A flexible multi-purpose learning environment.
There was considerable discussion around giving faculty and students the ability to reorganize space quickly to support different learning styles, will fewer fixed furniture classrooms in favor of more mobile, and generously sized desks. This corresponds to the prevailing trend in most learning environments, and many corporate settings, so seems to be a reasonable directions. At the same time, there was also discussion around the value of having several technology rich “case-study” type rooms, which support student discussions and the broadcast / online components of some instruction.

CONNECTION - A place that helps students and faculty connect.
The focus of this attribute was to support interaction between faculty and students. Depending on the availability and location of faculty offices, the potential for interaction is highly dependent on the design of circulation and the transparency of group work areas, keeping in mind that the best way to foster informal interaction is to increase the possible routes between destinations and decrease the depth (average number of turns) between destinations. Other variables include average distances and degree of visibility. Technology will also be critical, especially with regard to virtual connection to distant students.

SOCIAL AWARENESS - A place that helps people get to know each other.
While related to connection and engagement, this variable also promotes the idea of the building being a social center for extra-curricular activities as well as a place for people to learn about each other in real time or virtually. The ability to make social connections, as well as engage and provide a sense of home is especially critical for those students who mostly participate online or via distance learning.
NEXT STEPS

Below are several options for next steps. Note that this list is not intended to be inclusive of all the steps in the overall metrics, design, development, or implementation process. These are simply potential next steps to move forward on issues that surfaced in the workshop.

**Commit to ongoing engagement to facilitate change.** Obtain additional perspectives and senior direction. Use key components from this report as a starting point for discussions.

**Learn and educate.** Seek engagement and additional information from institutional leaders and staff about key elements of the vision and attributes, their key learning issues that relate to the vision, and potential solutions. Use this discussion as an opportunity to continue educating leaders and staff on the strategic value of the physical environment.

**Communicate outcomes and plans.** Share this report, recommendations, and action items that result with session participants. Use ongoing participant input to clarify topic areas through dialogue, exploration, etc.

**Generate and evaluate solutions.** Working with your design team, explore learning environment solutions broadly by reviewing the desired attributes identified in the session and incorporating them into conceptual design. Call on your Herman Miller Strategist to support the design effort if desired.

**Be realistic.** After completing the exploration during the solution-generating phase, consider constraints around real estate, budget and other strategic alignment issues. Being cost-driven is smart, but remember to broaden focus to include not just near term cost savings, but also long term learning outcome and performance gains.

**Measure.** Measuring performance is essential for gauging project success. Success measures consist of key performance indicators related to variables such as faculty and student performance and satisfaction. A balanced scorecard identifies the current performance of these variables and establishes goals to work towards. The variables are selected based on the overall vision and goals of the project.
“If I asked my customers what they want, they simply would have said a faster horse.”

Henry Ford