

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

Comments are separated into broad categories and are listing in the order they were received

### ***Alternative Transportation/ Parking***

- I am writing to support the suggestions of the NCNA, my primary concerns are preserving as much open space as possible and reducing traffic. The most obvious way to effectively eliminate the traffic problem is by closing Tucker at Stanford (and improving the intersection of Tucker and University for better flow that direction). The traffic circle installed on Yale is a big improvement. Something could be done to make Tucker and University work well for automobile traffic. Also, Tucker at Stanford could be closed to cars, but open as a bicycle and pedestrian access route. That would be fantastic and make the streets much quieter and safer. We live almost directly at that intersection and in the mornings and afternoons there is a constant stream of traffic down Tucker in the morning and up Tucker in the afternoon. Without that access, nobody would drive through the neighborhood unless it was to get to the law school (not a lot of folks), or to their homes. That would be so wonderful! –*Camie Nicholas, North Campus Neighborhood Resident; 8/21/2009*
- The plan continues an auto-oriented campus. Where "activity" nodes are mentioned, read "traffic" (congested) nodes. There could be scant pedestrian "activity" in these areas since there is no reason for ped activity. This is disingenuous, putting a positive spin on increased traffic. The plan does not seem to support or foster a campus vision that, if given a clear choice of alternatives, would be the choice of most. It's too easy to imagine something better. There are better university models - in practice - from which to draw. The increased traffic seems to place the burden of traffic analysis and mitigation upon the City. Adjacent neighborhoods will suffer this will be an ongoing conflict for UNM. – *Richard Borkovetz, Neighborhood Resident; 8/25/2009*
- I would like to see a plan that encourages more walking, biking and use of mass transit. I would like to see more pedestrian areas in open green spaces that link the campuses and academic building together. I would also encourage you to remove the existing traffic circles and cancel all future plans for any new traffic circles. Less cars - More Pedestrians. I am not a fan of the traffic circles you have in this plan. I frequently utilize the traffic circle on the North Campus not using my scooter or bike. I feel very unsafe using this traffic circle. I see that the new plan calls for more. Once again it appears that this plan caters to automobile traffic and to top things off it puts in confusing traffic circles that in my experience people do not know how to use. – *Jim MacFarlane, UNM Staff/Alumni; 8/28/2009*
- One significant stakeholder is missing from those represented in the plan: the City of Albuquerque. How does this plan tie in to the city's comprehensive plan? The city's centers and corridors plan would suggest an attempt at infill, mass transit, mixed use development, etc. Along those lines, it is common knowledge that the city is attempted to introduce a streetcar system to the University and Yale corridors. Would it not be complementary to use student housing in the south campus as a catalyst to support the goals of both the city and University? The current plans shows student housing in the far southwest corner where students will be isolated. Placing those buildings along Yale Blvd on the east side of the south campus would boost business along Yale and activate the corridor with a larger pedestrian presence, enhancing the opportunity for the city to create a successful streetcar system that may help to improve the

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)*

area through redevelopment. This plan would also tie in the CNM campus, creating a strong pedestrian/ alternative transit path along Yale. – *Tim Trujillo, Community Member; 8/28/2009*

- As written, the Master Plan update does not address the means by which the University will bring about greater use of alternative modes of transportation by students, staff, faculty and administration. My recommendations include but are not limited to collaborating with the City to improve bus service, reduction of single occupant vehicles, incentivizing use of alternative transportation modes and effective education for all those coming to the University regarding the need for reducing the number of vehicles coming to the area. – *T'Brin E. Back/ Mardon Gardella, Neighborhood Resident; 9/3/2009*
- The long-term plan proposes to decrease parking on central campus and "encourage" faculty and staff to make fewer car trips and use alternative transportation. Making it more difficult for faculty to park on campus at a reasonable price will be disastrous for students. If faculty are forced to waste time by parking far away or taking public transport, they will inevitably spend fewer days on campus, working from home, except on the days that they must come in to teach. This may be beneficial from the perspective of reducing traffic on campus. It is not good for education, as students already complain that faculty can be inaccessible. It is critical for students, whose schedules are often constrained by off-campus work schedule, that faculty be on campus and available throughout the week. Parking policies should facilitate this contact, not actively discourage it. – *Martin N. Muller, UNM Faculty; 9/4/2009*
- As I look at the Master Plan I find many forward-looking ideas (e.g. concentrating medical buildings on the Lands West Property). However, the proposals dealing with traffic and parking strike me as 20th century solutions to 21st century problems. Emphasis seems to continue on facilitating access to the main campus by individual automobiles. This conflicts with stated university objectives of encouraging more mass transit and alternative transportation. It would seem appropriate to encourage more parking in areas peripheral to the main and north campuses, and then providing shuttle service from these locations to campus facilities. The proposed transportation center at Yale and Camino de Salud makes some sense. However, access from parking locations east of University Blvd to the Lands West facilities should be accomplished by grade separations instead of stoplights at the intersections. This will facilitate the flow of traffic along University Blvd. Shuttles or moving sidewalks could enhance pedestrian movement from parking facilities to the various facilities on the North and Main Campuses. Likewise, traffic directed to South Campus can more easily access that area via Cesar Chavez, Gibson, Lead and Coal, than from Central, with shuttles to move people from that area to Main Campus (or even North Campus). – *Karl Schwerin, Community Member; 9/8/2009*
- There is a need to address student housing parking by acquiring the structure north of Hokona Hall also the land currently known as CIRT could provide for expansion of the current parking structure. – *Walt Miller, UNM Staff; 9/8/2009*
- There is currently no coordination between the UNM PATS shuttles and UNMH shuttles. This non- coordination caused the University to suffer in the following ways: 1)UNMH Shuttle drivers refuse to drive people from their medical centers (such as orthopedics, sports medicine, the cancer center) to the Duck Pond. By not driving to the duck pond, patients and main campus personnel cannot enjoy the benefits of using the Zimmerman Library or using the Student Union. 2) Both UNMH shuttle drivers and UNM main campus shuttles will not stop at Lomas and Yale Blvds. This makes it impossible for UNM student, staff and faculty to network with the city bus system. The city bus system, incidentally, goes out of its way to accommodate UNM. It is unfortunate that the arrangement is not reciprocal. These two halves of "PATS" are

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)*

accommodating their own needs and not that of the University, which desperately needs them to change their modus operandi. In short, PATS is no longer just about parking, it's about moving UNM students, staff and faculty around the University through the use of their shuttle buses. – *Chuck Reuben, UNM Staff; 9/10/2009*

- I have reviewed the master plan and although I do not have any major criticisms or comments about the overall project design, actually, the proposed changes seem very exciting to me, I do have one major question: What is meant by "remote" parking for faculty and staff? As members of the faculty, most of us are on central campus each day, preparing for classes, teaching, meeting with students, participating in committee work, researching and writing. Parking has always been an issue as it is now I am a bit bothered by the idea of having to park, let's say, at South Lot and then having to wait for shuttles like students have been doing. How much time will this consume? Will we have to pay for this parking? And will administrators be required to do the same? It seems very inconvenient for those of us who not only have spent many years training and working for our doctorates but now do a very large share of running (and building the reputation of) this university. – *Ray Hernandez-Duran, UNM Faculty; 9/10/2009*
- I am writing regarding an issue with campus planning - motorcycle parking. A large motorcycle parking lot just north of the Centennial Library was demolished for a new building. I would estimate that lot could hold nearly 200 motorcycles, and I often saw 80-100 cycles parked there. That lot was replaced with a meager 10 spaces on the south side of the Centennial Engineering Center. I put off purchasing a motorcycle permit for the first time since 2006. This semester I have spent time walking around campus and only today for the first time did I see an open motorcycle space and that was at noon! Fortunately I did not spend \$70 on a useless permit. Nor do I believe it is reasonable for me to have to arrive before 8am to get a cycle parking space when my class is at 11am. I find it interesting that individuals purchasing a South Lot permit are virtually guaranteed a space while those of us who are using a fraction of the gasoline and a fraction of the parking area are NOT guaranteed a space. It might appear that there is a lack of commitment to students, faculty and staff who are attempting to commute to conserve resources. Many of us live far enough away that taking city buses is not an option. Motorcycling was a great option - until now. Motorcycle spaces take up such little area. Surely there are accessible areas on campus that for a small investment could be paved for motorcycles? As an example, there is a small unused triangular grassy patch just east of the Centennial Library. Many other spots exist on campus. Isn't it in our best interests to promote conservation of the environment and natural resources? Removing much of the campus' motorcycle parking is sending the wrong message. – *Cecil Compeau Jr., UNM Student; 9/10/2009*
- Traffic: The Summit Park NA and the North Campus NA are currently addressing traffic flow, pedestrian and bicycle routes that will have large impacts on access to the North Campus. The UNM Planning Dept. had full access to the design process. Now we are evaluating the implementation and modification phase and close cooperation with any UNM Master Plan is essential for the UNM Planners to be able to interconnect the North Campus with appropriate links to city streets, bike, parking and pedestrian facilities. Request: UNM Planning Dept. cooperative development with local city development process, the SPNA and NCNA. – *Keith Rasmussen, Summit Park Neighborhood Association Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Whether we like it or not, UNM is a commuter school where most of our students drive from home or work to attend classes. We are concerned the plan of having only a few parking structures on campus will create significant bottlenecks at these structures in terms of finding parking places and getting in and out. We will see more and more students late to classes, as

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)*

they drive around looking for a parking spot. I cannot believe that you can replace most of the B parking available near and around the ECE building with just a single structure. This simply does not make sense and will lead to frustration for the faculty, staff and students. Furthermore, in our department (ECE) we have adjunct lecturers that just drive in to give a lecture and then leave. By making most of the campus impassable to cars, these lecturers will have to park far away and walk to their classes, adding an additional 10 mins each way to their commute. This will cause a drop in people who are willing to be adjuncts for courses, which will jeopardize courses and teaching at UNM. Finally the fact that we have convenient parking near the buildings makes UNM an ideal location to hold meetings with researchers from Sandia and other organizations around Albuquerque. By getting rid of nearby parking, it will be less convenient for visiting researcher to stop by UNM as part of their daily schedule. Although trying to have a sustainable plan for parking sounds like a great idea, there needs to be a lot more input from the departments and the faculty that will be on the receiving end of the decisions made. I only received an email YESTERDAY that requested that we reply by TODAY if we had any concerns regarding the proposed parking policy. We do have concerns regarding this plan and strongly discourage this from moving forward without more direct input from the faculty, staff, and students of this university. – *Pradeep Sen, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009*

- As an employee of the UNM Health Sciences Center (HSC) and as a public health professional promoting healthy and active lifestyles, please consider my below recommendations that applaud the current inclusion of a variety of public health promoting strategies and considerations; and also request a few additional public health concerns be considered. 1) Regarding the section that will "Develop better pedestrian, bike, and transit connections to the Central and North Campuses:" safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between Central Campus and North Campus is essential to promoting active/healthy lifestyles among staff and students and I thank you for including this language in the plan. This more specific language under "Healthy Communities" Section on p.14 "Goal Increase the capacity of the University of New Mexico Hospital to serve the community. Strategy: Improve at-grade crossings on Lomas Blvd. to connect North and Central Campuses. Explore option of grade separated crossings." is also essential to safely connecting the two campuses. Specifically, as a cyclist (and pedestrian) crossing from the HSC to Central Campus at the Lomas/Girard intersection, I and my colleagues, have regular challenges and unsafe situations with little existing infrastructure to calm traffic and promote safe and efficient crossing. A common strategy that pedestrians and cyclists take to cross Lomas is to do so at Vassar to then utilize Redondo Drive. If pedestrians and cyclists are prompted to utilize such mid-block crossing wishing to use the safe connecting street of Redondo drive, considering traffic calming, signage and additional infrastructure to provide safe crossing here would drastically increase the safety of crossers. – *Emily Piltch, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*
- I am a junior faculty in ECE department. It seems that your plan will remove the parking spots outside of ECE building for both reserve spots and B permit. As a young faculty, I work very late hours and sometimes leave my office after midnight. As a female faculty, I definitely do not want to walk on the University Ave. to the new planned lot late at night. I think we should be able to keep the option of reserved spots outside our department while improving other issues with parking. – *Yasamin Mostofi, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009*
- Biker Friendly Campus: a lot of people know the issues of parking and transportation and getting to school, and I have seen an increase of bike usage in the 5 years that I have been at UNM. I

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)***

applaud the efforts of including this in the Master Plan and I really like the map of bike trails laid out in the plan. – *Monika Irene Roberts, UNM Student; 9/11/2009*

- Transportation. Firstly, the lack of adequate access for students and staff to the freeway, especially outbound, seems like a major stumbling point. At Louisiana and I-40 there is a park-and-ride that is nearly full usually. That seems like a good template of a workable future. It would be nice if the DOT and UNM could work out a dedicated parking structure at the freeway nearby so cars could be dumped immediately. The conversion of the campus to a pedestrian and transit campus could then proceed apace. The major investment required to make a reality on this scale is a commitment I do not feel in the document, despite the repeated statements about making campus more friendly to pedestrians, bikers, and transit. Making it easy, fast, and cheap to get out of your car early would make campus better and make the surrounding neighborhoods contiguous without a morass of too many cars.

The Transportation Strategic Plan may be the source of this apparent disconnect. It mentions the free city bus passes as well as the park-and-rides, and even proposes changing of University Boulevard profile. However, in apparent haste to support the Lot C structure as a solution, the Plan seems to overlook the obvious point that the closer a structure is to the freeway, the easier everything else would be to solve. The plan as written clearly shoehorns and exacerbates the existing problems on the MLK freeway entrance by staking out a continued reliance on the Lot C Structure as some kind of sustainable plan. So, under the heading “Stakeholder in NMDOT South I-25 Corridor Study,” I believe the search for a park-and-ride (for transit to campus) should be a priority. It seems obvious to me that this solution would solve most of the thorniest issues in the master plan regarding campus quality for pedestrian enhancements.

Fundamentally cars are not a safe mix with bikes and pedestrians. I hardly know anyone who has not a friend who has been injured or killed by this mix. Further, drivers and congestion and density are not what they once were when the small neighborhoods surrounding the University were built. It appears from the “gateway” talk in the document, which I would say feels quite vague, there is hardly adequate attention to this simple consideration for pedestrians and bikes. The point of separating the cars from pedestrians at the Cornell/Central entrance in the context of limiting the car traffic on Redondo is mentioned. I believe this spirit needs to spread around campus. The east-west corridor for non-vehicular traffic is mentioned but its location is not delineated in words. For all appearances, it is what would be the continuation of Roma. I believe Roma and University should be re-engineered to be a pedestrian crossing and as a major pedestrian entrance to campus (NOT A CAR ENTRANCE). Currently it is used extensively by pedestrians despite the six lane hurdle and the lack of curb ramps. Turning at that intersection is restricted and could be further restricted, I believe. The proposal in the Transportation Strategic Plan for University Boulevard to be narrowed to four lanes total (down from six) would facilitate this move.

The frequency of the appearance of the word pedestrian in the text of the draft Master Plan Draft give me tremendous hope going forward as neighbors. –*Whitney Durrell, Spruce Park Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*

- Transportation/ Traffic/ Parking/ Shuttle/ Bus/ Bicycle/ Light Rail: Bicycle Friendliness, We recommend the following to make UNM’s campus more bicycle-friendly: 1) Dismount zone at the center of campus for pedestrian safety, 2) Safe, secure, well lit, conveniently located bike racks, 3) Enforcement of traffic laws for bicycles, 4) Respect for bicycles/ bicycle-friendly paths, 5) A low-fee bike share program, 6) Egress and Ingress that promotes bicycle use and discourages Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) use. Better pedestrian, bike, and transit

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)***

connections to the Central and North Campuses. Light rail from parking to South Campus to Main Campus to North Campus to Parking that connects with Route 66 bus line and the Rail Runner. Light Rail and the Duck Pond: We oppose the removal of the duck pond. It has great historic value and it plays a significant role in the identity of the campus. We want to invest in the light rail, but not at the expense of the most significant green space remaining on main campus. – *GPSA/ Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*

- University Heights Neighborhood Association (UHA) supports improved connectivity and agrees with the Plan's statement that such connecting "requires a comprehensive transportation plan that links the three areas while minimizing the impact of automobiles on surrounding neighborhoods" (p. viii). However, the draft plan does not include some of the key elements that would fulfill that goal. The draft Plan discusses the need for improved bicycle and pedestrian connections within the campus and proposes a "people mover" between Central and Lomas (p. 41) and a pedestrian/ bicycle route between the South and Central campus (p. 15). Missing from the draft Plan discussion are connections across Central between Yale and Girard. For more than 30 years, the closing of the Stanford vehicle entrance to make it a better pedestrian and bicycle entrance has been requested by UHA. During the time the entrance was closed while Pearl Hall was built, there was much less vehicular traffic through the UHA area, resulting in improved conditions for pedestrians and residents, and minimal negative impact to UNM. In addition to connecting the Central and South campus, there would be many benefits to better connections with CNM (some of which are mentioned in the draft Plan) and with the UHA area (which are not explicitly mentioned). The Master Plan should explicitly discuss the fact that the large majority (more than 80%) of students will continue to live off campus and recognize the need to develop better connections with those people, especially in the surrounding neighborhoods. Recommendations: 1) Permanent closure of the Stanford vehicular entrance or the alternative of right turn only exit on Stanford and a new entrance east of Stanford and a new entrance east of Stanford as discussed at our July 7 meeting should be incorporated into the plan to minimize automobile impact on the UHA area. Such closure also is consistent with the goal to restrict automobile access to the Central campus (p. 41) and would provide for a dedicated pedestrian/ bicycle entrance to Johnson Center and Johnson Field, as well as new buildings that are proposed in the draft Plan. UHA also believes that the proposed closure of Redondo between Yale and Stanford (p. 41) would result in increased traffic into the Stanford entrance, with the undesirable associated increased traffic through the neighborhood. – *Ben Roberts, University Heights Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Transportation/ Traffic Issues: Numerous concerns arise with respect to assumptions and recommendations contained in the "Transportation Strategic Plan (June 2009)" (TSP). 1) The TSP contains the statement, "The Central/ Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Interchange provides access to the south and west sides of the Central Campus. Central Ave. is a city arterial with 6 lanes and raised median islands. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. is a 2 lane collector street owned by City of Albuquerque" (TSP, 9). As has previously been discussed at length with the university, MLK Blvd. should not be viewed or promoted as a primary access point to Central Campus. The redesign of the Big-I and the access from I-25 to MLK has had lasting, negative impacts on the Sycamore and Spruce Park neighborhoods. There was significant discussion during the facilitated meetings between UNM, the City, and the Spruce Park and Sycamore neighborhoods regarding the proposed Lot C parking structure about needing to work with NMDOT to have signage installed along and improvements made to I-25 to direct people to access Central Campus via Lomas rather than MLK. 2) With regard to the City of Albuquerque Transit System,

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)***

the TSP states, "There is currently no formal coordination between ABQ Ride buses, and PATS or UNMH shuttle services" (TSP, 17). It is also noted in this section that the \$65,000 that is provided by PATS and the legislature for student bus passes is "less than what would be generated through the fare box and individual pass sales" (TSP, 19). In order to expect cooperation, not to mention on-going subsidies, from the City of Albuquerque with respect to transit coordination and services, UNM should have engaged ABQ Ride management and planning staff at the onset of the Master Plan Update process and should do so in the future. 3) Under "Suggestions for Further Study" in the TSP, the first bullet reads, "Perform a transportation study of UNM to identify the existing conditions of the surrounding roadways, analyze the impact of the proposed campus growth on the local roadway network, and determine possible solutions... Analyze the impact of campus expansion on the surrounding neighborhoods" (TSP, 45). These analyses should take place prior to making decisions about where to locate and develop projects, such as parking structures, so as to help inform those decisions. RECOMMENDATIONS: Perform transportation studies, analyze impacts, and develop solutions on the front end, rather than the back end, of developing capital projects, BEFORE Finalizing plans and seeking funding. Work with neighborhood leaders and the City to understand the impacts that certain development proposals will have on existing street networks before finalizing plans. – *Isaac Benton, et. al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009*

- I have comments about UNM's approach to parking for its employees (both faculty and staff) on the main campus (not south campus; not HSC). Our planners seem to be creating parking problems at a faster clip than they are solving them. I wonder if it's easier, and the machinery better in place, to spend money on capital-improvement projects than it is to come up with a solution to what has so far been an intractable problem. Or maybe it's only considered a problem by the 9,630 of us who need to find parking on campus near the building in which we work. As I listened to the master plan presentation at the August 11 meeting, it sometimes seemed as if the university's planners were simply tossing a few clichéd "solutions" at this problem and then ignoring it in the hope that it would go away. It hasn't gone away, and the master plan holds no promise that it will go away any time in the near or even distant future. The fact that parking continues to be the most frequently expressed concern (as Mr. Dekker described it: "parking, parking, parking...") should not bring our planners to shrug their shoulders with an "oh that again" attitude when these questions are brought up. They are brought up because they have not yet been resolved. The fact that parking continues to be harped upon should not deafen planners' ears to the problem out of some sort of resignation to the fact that the planners have not yet been able to, and perhaps are not able to, resolve this problem in a proactive, win-win fashion (or, in the case of UNM's many constituents, a win-win-win-win-win fashion). Whatever the reason for UNM's inability to find solutions to this problem, the result of its practices so far has been that faculty and staff are increasingly being tossed out into the proverbial street and left to fend for themselves when it comes to finding a way to get to their desk each day. It is a well-worn if not so funny joke that employees are up a creek whenever they have an appointment or UNM errand during the day that requires them to relinquish whatever spot they may have been able to commandeer by arriving on campus before anyone else was awake. I was aghast when I heard it suggested during the August 11 Regent's meeting that UNM's solution to its parking problem should be to make parking more "scarce" and expensive for employees. In fact, UNM is already on this path, using an ever increasing percentage of its ever-diminishing number of parking spots for "reserved" parking, available only to those whose compensation is high enough that they can afford to pay the, yes,

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Alternative Transportation/ Parking (cont'd.)*

exorbitant permit price. This policy is reminiscent of the strategy behind 19th Century company stores, and it is unbecoming of a university that calls itself New Mexico's flagship university. Regarding proposed solutions: One proposed solution is that more people will walk or ride a bicycle. However, I haven't heard a distinction made between commuting to and from campus versus getting around during the day once one is on campus. Nor have I heard a distinction made between getting around on campus during the day – which certainly lends itself to walking, bicycling, shuttles, etc. – and going into, and returning to UNM from, the Metro area during the day. The parking issue is related more to getting onto campus than to on-campus transportation, yet most of the discussion about solutions applied only to on-campus and intra-campus errands. The images used in slide presentations to illustrate this utopian view of bicycles, buses and pedestrians seem consistently to be photographs of UNM's lovely early summer campus with its colorful flowers, blue skies and blossoming trees. The fact is that for a large percent of days each year, UNM's walkways are slick with ice, drenched with rain, or so hot as to be unwalkable except for short distances. Nor do the photographs that are shown suggest solutions that would work every workday of the year for individuals who must bring with them large containers for books, papers, lunches and laptops. Another proposed solution is that more people will use mass transit to get to and from campus. It's fine to say that someday Albuquerque and New Mexico will have adequate public transportation. However, that is not currently the case and it would be foolish to use it as one of the cornerstones of UNM's parking solution. Regent Koch's comment during the August 11 meeting was well taken: Workday transport must be fast. Very fast. This applies to campus shuttles, city buses, Rapid Ride and even RailRunner. My time before and after the eight hours that I work for UNM is my life. It is unjust for the university to require that I spend that time waiting around for transportation. What would be the cost to UNM if its 11,189 full-time ABQ campus employees (reference UNM 08-09 Fact Book pg. 6) worked seven hours a day instead of eight hours because of time spent waiting for and using mass transportation? It would be unwise of the university to elect to spend my workday time in that way. (Needless to say, it would also be silly to then wonder why productivity on campus was less than it ought to be, and unjust to point the finger at employees as the cause.) RailRunner is one example. Even if its routes were more extensive, waits and travel times are unacceptable. I'm told that it is sometimes so overcrowded that one must wait even longer for a later train. Furthermore, trip times on RailRunner and on buses are significantly longer than making the same trip by car. Mass transit in the Metro area is beginning to be a reality, but it has a long way to go. Regarding motorcycle parking: University planners would presumably prefer that UNM's people at least convert to using scooters or motorcycles instead of automobiles. However, the number of motorcycle parking spots is in free fall, at least in the southwest corner of campus. Why would planners allow that to happen? Regarding bicycle parking: Have the planners considered the fact that bicycle theft on campus is rampant? I've seen no numbers reporting the theft rates; I know them because of friends and acquaintances who have tried the bicycle solution. I've been left to wonder why UNM media report on other crimes but always leave out the number of bicycle thefts. Please consider the inaction on the part of campus police in locating thieves and stolen bikes when weighing the wisdom of recommending bicycles as a commute solution to the people who are counting on you to deal with these issues. – *Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009*

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***Bernalillo County Public Health Facility***

- The soon-to-be-gone public health center is right across from my house. Please don't let them build a 2 or 3 story building right there! My dream is to see that space become an extension of the medical school park and sculpture garden. Boy would that be nice. We've been putting up with a lot of construction for the past couple of years! – *Cammie Nichols, Neighborhood Resident; 8/21/2009*

### ***Campus Architecture Style***

- (Page 19 and elsewhere) We feel that the plan should consistently reference "Spanish Pueblo Revival" style as the more historically accurate name for the campus architectural style rather than "Pueblo Revival" style. The basic elements of the campus style -- adobe stuccoes, flat roofed cubic forms -- are found in both Pueblo and the Spanish colonial villages of New Mexico. The revival style components that can be attributed specifically to one of the cultures are drawn equally from these two traditions. The Pueblos provide the sort of terraced stepping masses seen in University House, while Spanish architecture provided carved wooden porch brackets, and mission forms such as the two tower facade of Scholes Hall, and the church-like reading rooms of Zimmerman library. The 1960 Warnecke campus master plan includes a letter from long time university architect John Gaw Meem indicating why he was careful to describe campus architecture as being in the Spanish-Pueblo styles (statement appended below). The historical scholarship on New Mexico architecture notes a tendency to call this the Pueblo style despite the style's clear dual origins-- the omission reflecting a broader pattern of romantic Anglo-American veneration of Pueblo Indians and relatively less interest in (and even unself-conscious racism toward) the Spanish-Mexican culture of the state. In light of this history, the term Spanish Pueblo Revival style should be used throughout the Master Plan. – *UNM Historic Preservation Committee/ Richard Chapman, Chair; 9/8/2009*
- Over the last several decades, UNM has shifted from a focus on open green space to an urban "hardscape" that results in less green space and is designed to accommodate vehicular traffic. There is too much concrete – we want more greenscape. Make the campus more accessible to light weight, non-fossil-fuel-based vehicles that can traverse green space easily. We support edible landscape such as a campus garden. Past student-led efforts such as GROW (Gardens Raise Our World) experienced multiple barriers in achieving aim of edible landscapes that provide affordable and sustainable food sources to students. UNM's Master Plan should envision and encourage such spaces. We support the continued incorporation of UNM's historic Southwest revival architecture. George Pearle Hall and the Domenici Center for Health Education break from the John Gaw Meem's vision of creating buildings that reflect the surrounding community and culture exemplified by Zimmerman Library, the chapel, and Mesa Vista Hall. *Densification: We are all for increasing density. We recognize that campus densification is key to a more sustainable university, the preservation and reclamation of green space, and a more vibrant campus culture. But, wherever increasing buildings to 5 stories is seen as necessary for densification, we want to ensure that the Southwest vernacular architecture is respected and that set backs are used (i.e. the façade is set back from lower levels – like the Taos Pueblo).* – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### **Campus Amenities**

- Chapter 4 mentions on campus amenities: I believe that the more services we can offer students on campus, the more likely they will stay on campus for more hours a day than they usually would. Again, I believe that a recreational center can help play into this, but also (as the plan states) increase food services, maybe have some sort of grocery type store on campus that would lessen the off campus trips that most students would make anyways. – *Monika Irene Roberts, UNM Student; 9/11/2009*

### **Campus Landscape/ Open Space**

- What happened to the 1996 Master Plan that connected the north and south campus with green open areas - free from automobile traffic. That plan had limited automobile traffic and seemed much more in line with the other goal of reaching carbon neutrality by 2030. I liked that plan much better. – *Jim MacFarlane, UNM Staff/Alumni; 8/28/2009*
- (Pages 22-23) The campus historic resources survey, research and analysis summarized in the UNM Getty Heritage Plan concluded that the dual pillars of campus historic character are the architectural idiom established by John Gaw Meem, and the modernist landscape design developed in the aftermath of the 1960 Warnecke, which removed streets from the heart of the campus. The 1962 landscape master plan by internationally renowned landscape architect Garrett Eckbo represents the most important of these landscapes stretching from in front of administration building, across the Duck Pond and Smith Plaza to the College of Education south courtyard, Union Square (North of the SUB) and the first phase of the Cornell Pedestrian Mall to the South edge of the SUB. We feel this important legacy should be acknowledged in the Landscape Architecture Principles (22), and that a Goal, Objective and Strategy(s) be developed (23) to outline the preferred treatment of these landscapes. The UNM Campus Heritage Plan discusses approaches and principals for reconciling landscape preservation with changing needs, such as our current need to conserve water. We would be happy to work with you, based on the ideas in the heritage plan, to develop these additions to the plan. – *UNM Historic Preservation Committee/ Richard Chapman, Chair; 9/8/2009*
- I'm a student at UNM. I was looking through the proposed update, and the only part that immediately struck me as unnecessary was "renew the Duck Pond area and Smith Plaza with new fixtures, lighting and water features." I'm never on campus at night, so maybe Smith Plaza is in need of some new light fixtures, but I really don't see a reason to fool around with the Duck Pond. New water features sounds as if they would use up more water, which would just be a waste. Even if that's not the case, I think that the Duck Pond is great just the way it is. – *Victoria Scheidler, UNM Student; 9/10/2009*
- I agree that Smith Plaza is "featureless". However, this master plan should determine what purpose it should serve and not just stick a fountain in the middle, Also, trees are far more effective to cool a space than a high maintenance water feature. As campus density increases, perhaps this is a building site (maybe underground, with a landscaped top - Univ. of Arizona Mall). In any case Smith Plaza deserves more discussion in this master plan report. – *Bob Notary, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*
- Regarding the 1996 master plan: I appreciated Regent Gallegos's relevant question during the August 11 meeting: What has happened to the open-space corridor that was agreed upon in the 1996 master plan? I heard no discussion that did justice to or even addressed the careful

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Campus Landscape/ Open Space (cont'd.)***

thought that went into the reasons and planning for that corridor. Is it, as parking appears to be, another casualty of a myopic preoccupation with capital projects? – *Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009*

- *Pedestrian Pathways:* We support the increase of East/West pedestrian routes especially from the student housing to the SUB and DSH to Zimmerman plaza (needs better bicycle/pedestrian options). However we also appreciate that the New Mexico style of circuitous architecture in that it inspires interaction with others, privileges locals over outsiders, and does not emphasize the linear, efficient Germanic values that dominate in American culture. – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*

### ***Child Care***

- Need to identify land for child care for both the north and south campus. – *Walt Miller, UNM Staff; 9/8/2009*

### ***College of Fine Arts***

- I was surprised to see that the Reservoir location was not listed as reserved for the College of Fine Arts. This has been an assumption for the last decade. Given the fact that, for instance in the case of Music, accreditation is threatened by having poor facilities, not enough practice rooms, rehearsal halls that are illegally filled beyond capacity, private lessons going on in the Popejoy lobby for lack of space, and offices for tenure-track faculty that don't even meet Big Red standards, let alone accreditation standards for music spaces, this space which should be an in-progress design for the entire College of Fine Arts has not been formally designated for the College of Fine Arts. This must be changed to reflect the real needs of the College of Fine Arts ASAP. – *Steve Block, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- The space issues for the music department have become extremely problematic. For two of the classes I teach, several students have to sit on the floor in the corner of the room because there is not enough space. My office is a tiny closet with no ventilation in the basement of the Center for the Arts. It is important that the College of Fine Arts get the reservoir for building space to accommodate our/ its growth. – *Paul Lombardi, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- I am writing on behalf of the UNM Music Prep School which is housed in the Music Department on Saturday mornings. Our enrollment is almost at 600 this semester and we are using every ounce of space in the music department to provide this program to the community. We have nowhere to grow in terms of space. Any consideration you could give in your planning to help our situation in terms of space for the College of Fine Arts and the Music Dept. would be greatly appreciated and most helpful to us so that we can continue to expand our program. – *Diane Bonnell, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- I am writing to request that the College of Fine Arts be considered for a new building on the Reservoir Site. Our Space issues are extreme. I currently teach 52 students in a classroom zoned for 35. We frequently must offer our offices for practice rooms and the UNM Children's Chorus a 90 voice chorus of children made up of children of the ABQ Metro Area and 25 UNM Music Students is forced to rehearse in an off-campus location that 1) has no handicapped access and 2) no restroom facilities. We need a new building. -- *Regina Carlow, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- The College of Fine Arts, especially the Music Department, has several space shortages. We have seen strong growth in music majors and faculty and now some new faculty do not have offices (and are forced to take over very small practice rooms as offices). Students do not have

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *College of Fine Arts (cont'd.)*

anywhere near the number of practice rooms needed already. We also need more classrooms that can support pianos. We need the Reservoir space quiet badly to address very pressing space needs for our program. – *Richard Hermann, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*

- The College of Fine Arts and especially the Music Department desperately need more space for rehearsal rooms, a recital hall and bigger studios. It is almost impossible to set up master classes and rehearsals in Keller Hall since it is booked out almost all the time. Most of the studios are too small for more than 4 students. Reliable booking for Keller Hall has to be made more than 6 months in advance. At the same time the major ensembles naturally have priority which leads to the absurd situation of waiting for a confirmation which then leads to cancellation of guest artists or recitals. The situation is desperate and does not fulfill national and international standard. – *Falko Steinbach, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- The College of Fine Arts NEEDS the reservoir space to relieve our cramped classrooms conditions. Restore it to use as originally promised. -- *Glinda Wyndorf, UNM Staff; 9/9/2009*
- I am writing to strongly support the plan for a new College of Fine Arts building on the Reservoir land. I am a professor in the Department of Music, which has experienced tremendous growth in the past 5 years. It is my understanding that we have grown from some 125 music majors in the last decade and that our current major count is approaching 400. This has led to many painful space issues. Every one of my oboe students has complained this semester about their inability to find a practice room in our now inadequate facilities. Many of our faculty no teach in offices that are in fact windowless basement practice rooms in which there is not enough room for the professor, the student and a piano. In my studio we desperately need a reed room in which all of the UNM reed making equipment can be stored for the students use, a norm in every state institution I have visited, the absences of which makes it difficult for me when I am recruiting students for our department. My lessons are constantly being interrupted by students who need to use this equipment which must now be stored in my office. Our classrooms are very overcrowded. One music theory class has over 120 students. I am teaching classes of 35 in rooms which can really only fit 25 students. It can also be said that the age of our present facilities are negatively impacting our teaching. The heating system in my office has not worked properly for more than two years and is so cold that it endangers the instruments that I teach (they can and have cracked). I have been informed by physical plant that our pneumatic HVAC is 40 years outdated and the parts are no longer available, so that my temperature is not actually adjustable. These complaints are widespread in this college. Fighting for space in the college has reached an unpleasant peak, and it is clear to everyone that we cannot continue to grow within the facilities we have now and meet the universities expectations for this kind of sustained growth in quantity and quality. I strongly urge the university to go forward with a plan to build the new CFA on the reservoir land. – *Kevin Vigneau, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- As a member of the Music Faculty in the College of Fine Arts, I am writing with an urgent plea to expand our office and rehearsal space. For the past four years, I have had to teach budding opera singers in a very small basement practice room. There is no window in the room, the air quality is poor and the space is simply no conducive to learning how to make a free expansive sound. The students have a hard time finding a free practice room in which to work, as well. As the goal area is the largest in the College of Fine Arts, I am sure you can imagine the importance of having a better space. There is also no good space in which it perform an opera! We need to accommodate our growing vocal department. My students mention the problem in every evaluation. It would be greatly appreciated if you could take this into serious consideration. I am

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### **College of Fine Arts (cont'd.)**

now teaching my graduate students off campus. The evaluations from my students are available if you are interested. – *Jacqueline Zander-Wall, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*

- We are desperate for space in the College of Fine Arts. In the music department alone we are all sharing offices, full-time faculty teach next to student practice rooms in the basement, and there are constant issues regarding ensemble and rehearsal space. This is a very old building - we outgrew this building twenty years ago. We need a new building immediately! – *Leslie Umphrey, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- After TEN years of working at UNM I still must try to make music and teach in an office the size of a small closet with no windows and no proper temperature control (and a student lounge right outside the door). I am embarrassed for me, for my colleagues, and for this university. I respectfully request that the reservoir be designated as the next building space for the College of Fine Arts. There is no rehearsal or teaching space available on weekends. It is a disaster and several times I have thought of leaving UNM given that my self-esteem continues to deteriorate with each passing year. And I still may -- sooner than later but I implore you to make a difference -- to appreciate the significance of the arts in our culture and our university and show some respect for dedicated faculty. – *Patricia Ann Repar, UNM Faculty; 9/9/2009*
- Please consider this an urgent and passionate appeal for more space for the Music Department. My own classroom is on overload by more than 50%, and our scheduling problems due to lack of classroom, studio, office and practicing space is intense to say the least! – *Arlene Ward, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*
- It is imperative that the reservoir site be designated as a new Center for the Arts. The College of Fine Arts, including 4 academic departments, 3 research units and performing and visual arts spaces is spread across seven + buildings across campus, many of them hand-me-downs and repurposed spaces that are inappropriate and inadequate for teaching, creative activity, and public performance. The reservoir, located close to current arts facilities and to Central Avenue - one of our most public faces, is the ideal location for an expansive new facility for pedagogical, creative, research and performance-based use. It was an early understanding that the reservoir was earmarked for a new fine arts facility - one of UNM's Master Plan objectives in the category of economic development. The perfect match for the need to develop the reservoir area, and the need for a new arts facility is to bring the two together. – *Holly Barnet-Sanchez, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009*
- We were asked by the office review the "Space" plan, and I didn't find such a plan, at least as pertains to the Art and Art History Department. I would like to see a new art building mentioned in this document, as it has been suggested to us that one is in the pipeline, and I am curious as to its envelope and location. Part of that interest is that I, as representative of the Art and Ecology program, would like to have that building work with the open space network proposed. – *Catherine Page Harris, UNM Faculty, 9/11/2009*
- I am on the faculty of the Department of Music in the Center for the Arts. I have been involved with the university since 1971, first as student and then as faculty. The space needs of the department have dramatically increased over the years, but we are still confined to the same physical limitations as in the 1970s! I served for a number of years as classroom scheduling coordinator for the department and can attest firsthand to the shortage of classroom and rehearsal spaces, and as a performer I have also experienced the difficulty of scheduling concerts in our available concert facilities. We desperately need more space to accommodate our increased need for faculty and staff offices, instrument storage and practice rooms for students. I have previously served on the department's "Space Usage Committee" in trying to

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***College of Fine Arts (cont'd.)***

utilize our existing space in the most efficient manner, and I think I can safely say that every inch of space, every closet, nook and cranny has been investigated and put to use. In spite of these efforts, the situation is critical, and ultimately the quality of our instruction suffers because of our inability to provide enough space for all the activities that are necessary to a successful university music program. I have long felt that somehow the reservoir space could be utilized most effectively as a means of expanding our space. Its proximity to the Center for the Arts makes it a prime candidate for expansion. Please consider the potential benefit that this space would have for the Music Department in your planning for this location. – *Colleen Sheinberg, UNM Faculty; 9/12/2009*

### ***Commercial Development***

- Retail and Other Commercial Uses on Cesar Chavez & University: The Master Plan suggests retail and other commercial uses be encouraged on Cesar Chavez and University. But what kinds of commercial/retail should be promoted? Banks? Strip malls? Wal-Mart? Boutiques? Commercial uses should cater exclusively to residential needs; promoting pedestrian traffic in the neighborhood and encouraging urban densification while discouraging sprawl and increased vehicular traffic. We don't want to see University between Central and Lomas developed for commercial for any and all commercial purposes. The area between University and Cesar Chavez near CNM might be a less problematic area for commercial development. – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*
- University Heights Neighborhood Association (UHA) has serious concerns about the "mixed use" Central Avenue edge, because the impact on surrounding businesses and sustainability of the surrounding neighborhoods have not been considered. UHA believes that much more discussion should be held with nearby neighborhoods and businesses before the various residential and commercial "mixed use" areas are implemented. There can be serious impacts to businesses, many of which have difficulties in the best of economic times. The potential for vacant commercial space along Central Avenue would contribute to social problems, which helps neither UNM nor the neighborhoods. Also, the map on page 62 should clarify whether there could be mixed-use development on Central Ave. west of Girard. UNM's current renovations at Central and Stanford to the "old" Architecture Building and the new Tamarind Institute Building, costing more than \$6.5million, are not mixed use. Nor is the proposed student recreation center apparently planned as mixed use. There is substantial existing off-campus mixed use zoning along Central in the UHA (and Silver Hills) areas, which serves now, and can serve in the future, to provide mixed use development. Recommendations: 1) Mixed use residential/ commercial buildings should not be included in the plan along Central Avenue due to their negative impact on surrounding businesses. 2) Before mixed use residential/ commercial buildings are developed in any location, there should be close collaboration with affected neighborhoods and businesses to determine the impacts of proposed mixed use activities and what commercial activities, if any, should be developed. Developments that are agreed to mutually benefit neighborhoods and

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### ***Commercial Development (cont'd.)***

University needs should be pursued. – *Ben Roberts, University Heights Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*

### ***Community Engagement***

- Form a community based citizen committee, in conjunction with the planning department to discuss and record advances in the plan, as they unfold. Once again, minutes should be maintained and reported to the UNM President and Board of Regents, on a regular basis. – *Michael Kenney, Community Member; 8/11/2009*
- Where can I find all the community input and additional commentary on the August 11th Master Plan? – *Judith Binder, Neighborhood Resident, 8/31/2009*
- Involvement: Our neighborhood was not treated as partner or stakeholder in the development process. Our area is greatly impacted by traffic accessing the UNM North Campus via Girard, Constitution, Lomas and Indian School. Cut Through traffic by medical school students and staff, hospital staff, medical clinic staff, law school students and staff adversely impact the safety of our area and create constant street parking stresses. The density and vast size of the development proposed for the North Campus will dramatically increase this problem. Request: There we ask for true participation in decisions that impact development density and traffic flow. The UNM SWOT report states that a weakness is : "Historic perception that decisions are made without input from those whom they will impact - community, faculty, staff, etc." The Report on Community Engagement & UNM Campus Development, states that "despite this [historic perception] UNM has yet to define a path for community engagement" and adds the examples of the four day Campus Development Visioning Charrette did not include input from community leaders or neighborhood residents. The Report includes several models of other University/community interactions and Master Plan developments that could guide the Regents in how to better interact with the community. – *Keith Rasmussen, Summit Park Neighborhood Association Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Neighborhood/ Stakeholder Communication and Involvement: The impact that UNM has on surrounding neighborhoods cannot be overstated, and as the largest institution of higher education in the state and one of the largest employers in Albuquerque, UNM has a significant daily impact on city facilities and services, such as roads and the transit system. We feel that the greatest oversight of this Master Plan update process was a failure to engage the City of Albuquerque and the neighborhoods, including neighborhood businesses, which stand to be most affected by UNM's long-term development plans in a meaningful way. 1) The City of Albuquerque is not listed and was not engaged as a partner/ stakeholder in the 2009 Master Plan Update process, yet numerous proposals and concepts, specifically those related to transportation and transit, will require the cooperation of City agencies. For example, "Proposed Road Network and Circulation Improvements: for each of the campuses in the Land Use Districts chapter of the Plan will require City of Albuquerque cooperation, approval, and, very likely, capital. However, without formal consultation with and agreement from the City to construct these improvements, the university cannot simply assume that they will happen, which may impact the university's own plans for development in certain areas. 2) The neighborhoods that surround North, Central, and South Campuses are not listed and were not engaged as partners/stakeholders in the 2009 Master Plan Update process but they stand to be most impacted by UNM's long-term development plans: The measures to improve communication with the greater community listed on page 77 of the Plan are good ideas; however, why were

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Community Engagement (cont'd.)***

they not used as part of the Master Plan Update process itself? 3) The 1996 "Campus Development Plan" by Barton Myers Associates lists four City of Albuquerque representatives, including then-City Councilor Angela Robbins, and twenty-two neighborhood representatives as "Study Participants" The 2009 Plan contains no mention of specific City and neighborhood participants. Why were representatives from these groups not invited to participate as they were in 1996? RECOMMENDATIONS: Engage City and neighborhood representatives in discussion about UNM's plans for future development. Invite the District 3 City Councilor, other City representatives (e.g., Planning Department, Municipal Development, Transit), and at least one official representative from each neighborhood to attend official meetings regarding the Master Plan Update and specific projects. View the City of Albuquerque and neighborhoods as partners and resources, not adversaries, in planning for the future of UNM. – *Isaac Benton, et. Al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009*

- Regarding public comment: During the August 11 presentation I saw a couple of slides showing several people looking at posters that illustrated planning ideas. These to me are insufficient evidence that adequate provision was made for ongoing and inclusive public review and comment. As a full-time employee, I never heard of any such opportunities, nor did I even know that a master-planning process was underway. And yes, I routinely read university media and e-mail announcements. – *Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009*
- The opportunity to have ongoing input as a neighbor or as a member of a neighborhood association board could be more democratic, giving us neighbors a permanent seat at the real table. The notion of running ideas by neighbors at meetings suggests to me an institutional lack of faith in meaningful partnership with neighbors to address challenges jointly. The basis of my feelings here is the meeting I attended regarding a Proposed Parking Structure. – *Whitney Durrell, Spruce Park Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Community Relationships: The Master Plan should be an opportunity to improve community relations not just by including community members in the planning process, but also in its material, spatial, and cultural vision for campus development. Initiatives such as light rail stop, bike paths, free parking, and more community/family friendly events (e.g. Grower's Market on Johnson Field on the weekend) will invite community members onto campus. Preserving and reclaiming green space will also encourage people to come to campus to commune, discuss intellectual ideas, enjoy the shade, and play. – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*

### ***General***

- I really like the ideas that are proposed. As a student I can see how it would be a win-win situation that would of course take time. I think it would be cool if the students could be involved somehow to make things a little more sped up. But overall I hope that this works because I love UNM! Go Lobos! -- *Ryan Simon, UNM Student; 8/13/2009*
- As a student in the master's of urban design and planning at the University of Washington and a son of Albuquerque, I am disappointed by the lack of foresight and imagination that was put into this plan. UNM, Albuquerque, and their students and citizen have high aspirations of becoming something truly special. This plan is sheer mediocrity. Perhaps that's what you get when you hire an architecture firm with no experience in campus planning, much-less a history of tasteful architecture. – *Tim Trujillo, Community Member; 8/28/2009*

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### General (cont'd.)

- There are several versions of the UNM Master Plan. Does the plan presented to the Regents on August 11, 2009 represent a compilation of all previous plans? If not, what previous plan is still considered viable for implementation? Because there is not DEFINITIVE AUGUST 11th MASTER PLAN that supersedes all previous plans, I urge the Regents to extend the date for Community Input until their October Meeting. -- Judith Binder, Neighborhood Resident; 8/31/2009
- A more connected campus: I don't have much to comment about this, but establishing a solid corridor from South to Main to North campus makes a lot of sense. Promoting alternative transportation to connect these campuses is absolutely in the right direction. I'm excited to see the additional steps the University is taking to increase sustainability programs. – Jake Wellman, UNM Student; 9/7/2009
- As discussed with Dale Dekker and President Schmidly I propose the renaming of the streets that lead into the UNM campus. The Stanford name should change to Lobo Way. Yale should change to Zia Way and Cornell should change to ???. The point is the name should reflect UNM and New Mexico. These changes would not impact residential addresses. Why should I turn on Stanford to enter UNM? I have asked this question for 40 years. Please give this positive consideration. – Vince Murphy, Community Member/ Alumni; 9/9/2009
- As the representatives of the Summit Park area, a residential community of 12000 homes just east of the North Campus, (our borders are Lomas, Girard, Indian School and Carlisle) we applaud the goal of a Master Plan for UNM, and see many positive ideas within the proposed plan, however we also have many concerns. Therefore we do not support adoption of the Master Plan at this time. – Keith Rasmussen, Summit Park Neighborhood Association Resident; 9/11/2009
- I am impressed by the comprehensive nature of the 2009 Master Plan. I realize that there are many different perspectives to which this plan can be approached, but from every vantage point it is obvious that UNM is expanding in integral directions. As an active UNM student, I believe the biggest priorities are new housing and more classroom space. UNM is actively striving to create a "Live, Learn, Work, Play" environment; when students are crowded and uncomfortable on campus, none of these important initiatives can be attained successfully. Growing pains are an unavoidable part of an expansion process. I understand the neighborhood concerns with the "Wall of UNM", etc. But to continue to thrive as the keynote of Albuquerque and New Mexico, traffic patterns and views must change. Change has a direct relationship to the movement of time and progress. Please continue to keep in mind the "Live, Learn, Work, Play" goal of UNM campus development and foster students futures for years to come. – Theresa Rogers, UNM Student; 9/11/2009
- It is clear from the 1996 report that the accommodation of 35,000 students was to be at the Albuquerque campus alone. No mention was made of the branch campuses. Indicating branch campus enrollment in the current report that only studies the Albuquerque campus is confusing and should be omitted (Page 3); Description of projects occurring since 1996 is incomplete. Renovation of Old Bookstore into CERIA space; Communications & Journalism, Mitchell Hall (current), Davalos Basketball Practice Facility, Women's Softball Facility; to name just a few (Page 5); Why isn't the Native American Learning Center mentioned under Student Success? (Page 10); After what I must admit was a quick read through, I don't recall seeing discussion of placement of future buildings of certain types. I don't see the continuation of the "Precinct" discussions of the 1996 report which develops specific building types in pre-determined areas. This would seem to be a short-coming of this report. I would have expected more direction from

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### General (cont'd.)

this report, so that each new building site study begins with some general definition. – *Bob Notary, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*

- This is a very comprehensive document and seems well thought through. I am very respectful of your work in assessing connections to the city and through the campuses. – *Catherine Page Harris, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009*
- Academic Space: Spaces should match with specific academic needs (wet labs for chemistry, stable buildings for physics, movable chairs for small group discussion in communication classes). – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*
- The University Heights Association (UHA) supports the various initiatives on pages 77-78 as ongoing communications with neighborhoods and will continue to actively participate in such initiatives. UHA supports the “big ideas” of sustainability and connecting the three campuses. UHA also supports the draft plan’s proposal for an additional 2,000 student beds on-campus (p. ix). However, the draft Plan will not achieve these goals without more effectively including the surrounding neighborhoods, including UHA. The UNM-owned buildings map should be corrected: The map on page 43 shows that the existing Tamarind Building on Cornell south of Central is UNM-owned. UHA’s understanding is that the building has been sold and will not be UNM property during the timeframe of the Master Plan update. Thus, the map is currently inaccurate in showing the building as UNM-owned, and that building should be deleted from the map. – *Ben Roberts, University Heights Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Our Goal: Working together to create a health, safe, sustainable community. There is no doubt that UNM is an essential part of the Albuquerque community, as a center of knowledge and learning as well as a major contributor to the local economy. But there can also be no doubt that UNM’s North, Central, and South Campuses have a significant and daily impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. This impact will continue to grow, especially if UNM’s prediction about student population increasing by over 30% in the next nine years is accurate. UNM needs to take an active role in addressing the impacts that it creates – impacts such as traffic, noise, crime, and parking – and that a calculation of these impacts must be factored into the 2009 Master Plan Update. We feel that the Regents have an opportunity to model for UNM students a real collaborative engagement with all stakeholders in building a sustainable environment for the university, the heart of Albuquerque. Rushing approval of an incomplete plan would be a poor example to set. While we understand the need for a master plan to have flexibility in order to adapt to changing conditions, we implore the university to understand that the residents of the city – specifically those in neighborhoods adjacent to UNM’s campuses, but also all taxpaying citizens of Albuquerque – need to know that there will be predictability and order in how the university continues to grow and impact the entire community. We respectfully request that the Regents not approve the 2009 Master Plan at this time but rather direct that this planning effort continue and that input from all stakeholders, namely the City of Albuquerque and neighborhoods adjacent to UNM, be gathered and incorporated in a revised draft. – *Isaac Benton, et. al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009*
- Regarding accuracy of data used in planning: I wonder about the usefulness of the employee and student counts that I saw being used by the planners. The planners seemed to be combining the main campus with south campus, HSC and extended university counts. I wonder whether that gives a useful picture of the quite different challenges that each of these groups face. – *Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009*

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Greek Life***

- Just wanted to give feedback that the master plan looks great. I graduated from UNM in 1977 and now my children attend currently. You have really thought of a lot of needs with this big undertaking and I am proud we are constantly making improvements to our campus, and have a plan to work toward. It is nice to see that the planners heard the requests from the GREEK community and that they are reflected in this portions of the plans as well. I know it will be inconvenient as the construction and changes are put in place, but I look forward to the end result of the more pedestrian friendly campus, but with parking areas and on campus transportation provided. – *Donna Haggerty, UNM Alumni; 9/11/2009*
- A renewed and revitalized Greek Life environment: I came to UNM skeptical about fraternity life and Greek life in general. I joined a start-up fraternity in order to help grow a better student experience and now I sincerely believe in the value of the experience offered by Greek Life. However, the current "Greek Row" on Mesa Vista and Sigma Chi Rds is not conducive to building an inviting community. I like the possibility of smaller Greek organization (like the Multi-Cultural Fraternities and Sororities) having room to build townhouses on a new cul-de-sac connecting Mesa Vista and Sigma Chi on the East side. I think there needs to be additional property set aside for additional, larger Fraternities and Sororities to come on campus such as the new Alpha Tau Omega Colony started at UNM in February 2009. The cul-de-sac on the west end of Mesa Vista Rd. Seem like a logical location for this growth to take place, although I couldn't tell what the current plans for that area are in the proposed Master Plan. – *Jake Wellman, UNM Student; 9/7/2009*
- As an alumnus of the University of New Mexico, as well as, a proud alumnus member of the Greek community on campus, the UNM Master Plan was met with great anticipation. I am extremely pleased to see that the current location of Greek housing on Mesa Vista and Sigma Chi roads have been unchanged and included on the draft plan that was presented on August 11, 2009. This positive result allows for our housing corporations to move forward with necessary repairs, maintenance and improvements to the existing structures. In addition, I would like to personally thank the planning committee for allowing the Greek community to be heard during this planning process. – *Steven A. Kmatz, UNM Alumni/ Greek; 9/11/2009*
- Greek Housing: Although we do already have a "Greek Row" I feel that a lot of the houses are secluded from the University, and a lot of times those houses are off on their own. I think it would cool to see an incorporation of the Multi-Cultural Sorority and Fraternity groups on Greek row, and maybe just connect the whole Greek experience to more of the University life. – *Monica Irene Roberts, UNM Student; 9/11/2009*

### ***HSC Fitness Center***

- Finally, regarding possible facility changes, there is great need on the HSC campus to have an accessible and up-to-date fitness center. The current fitness center available to faculty, staff and students of the HSC is unacceptable and likely underutilized by the very community that works to promote healthy New Mexicans. The fitness center is in the basement, very crowded with equipment that appears unsafe. There are excellent facilities at Johnson Center but we also have busy students, residents, staff and faculty here with little extra time that need a safe and adequate facility that would encourage them to be more active. As the facility is now, it is not a welcoming environment with inconvenient hours which are

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***HSC Fitness Center (cont'd.)***

not conducive to busy schedules. I request consideration be given to the master plan including a larger fitness facility on this campus. – *Emily Piltch, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*

### ***Law School***

- On behalf of the School of Law, I have a suggestion that could expand office space available to our School for the cost of remodeling without new construction. The draft master plan at page 34 acknowledges that the law school doesn't have much room to expand (the only suggestion it offers is the Bernalillo County health facility across the street, which the County still owns), it does not consider buying out the lease on the first floor of the New Mexico Law Center. I suggest that the plan be modified to encourage UNMH to buy 1401 University Blvd. and the purchase money used to buy the Center for Civic Values out of the remainder of its lease. Since UNMH appears to be increasing the area on University Blvd. where it is building facilities and parking spaces, right up to the adjoining lot, it seems only a matter of time before the land under this building also becomes of interest to UNMH. Since the purchase of the first floor of the NM Law Center lease would allow the Institute of Public Lease to relocate its staff to offices in the same building as the rest of IPL that should take place soon, while the opportunity presents itself. CCV has lost its long-term tenant and has yet to find a replacement, although the Real Estate Office has proposed a one year sublease for the Alumni Association to house them temporarily while their own building undergoes renovations. Should CCV meanwhile succeed in finding a suitable longer term tenant, they might lose interest in selling out their lease, depriving use of this opportunity to add office space to the school of law. – *Kevin Washburn, UNM Faculty; 8/28/2009*

### ***Master Plan Implementation***

- Once the master plan is approved, it should not be allowed to be placed on a dusty shelf to fade and be forgotten. This is what, all too often happens at universities. In an attempt to keep the plan breathing, I suggest the following: (1 & 3) 1. Include verbiage in the final plan requiring a quarterly report of progress be made to the Regents and President by the Planning Office. 3. An annual audit report needs to be generated and published listing parts of the plan on schedule, parts that are not on schedule and explanations for each. It would be best to make such an audit an activity conducted by a contracted firm, giving particular preference to the firm that helped generate the new master plan. They would need the least amount of time to become familiar with the plan and to make recommendations for keeping it on track. – *Michael Kenney, Community Member; 8/11/2009*

### ***North Golf Course***

- As a longtime resident of the University neighborhood, I was alarmed to see that the Master Plan did not contain a commitment to preserve the North Golf Course and vacant fairways as open space. After attending several meetings between University representatives and the neighborhood association, I was under the impression that the University recognized the value of the North Golf Course as a critical part of the North Campus. UNM has been a good neighbor to the residents of Albuquerque and the development of this beautiful green space would do irreversible harm to the North Campus Community. I hope that the Regents will stay committed to preserving the North Campus Golf Course for the long term benefit and enjoyment of the

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### **North Golf Course (cont'd.)**

University community and the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods. – *Barbara McGuire, Neighborhood Resident; 8/19/2009*

- I live on the 1500 block of Wellesley, not far from the UNM Golf Course. We are both UNM Alumni, and my wife has held several jobs at UNM over the years. I would like to see long term preservation of the UNM Golf Course as a green space. It is probably the main feature, in my opinion, that makes the north campus area such a desirable place to live. It generates little or no traffic of its own, can be used by visitors, and proves many forms of use. People walk, jog, play there, and I have even seen falconers use the area to exercise their birds. – *Zack Stauber, Neighborhood Resident; 8/19/2009*
- As a near neighbor of Main campus UNM, and a frequent user of the North Golf Course walking paths and recreational opportunities, I strongly recommend that you follow the Neighborhood Advisory Committee's direction and implement the following: 1. Provide permanent, final "hands-off" status to the entire North Golf Course area; this means, do not plan now, next year, the following year or ANYTIME thereafter to use the golf course area for any other purposes than it now has. 2. The so-called Barrens area is part of this highly used recreational open space: do not build roads, parking areas, building or any other structures on this valuable open space - we need it included with the protected golf course, in order to retain the only open and green space nearby to provide some environmentally restorative area near UNM Campus. – *Susanna de Falla, Neighborhood Resident; 8/20/2009*
- Preserving the golf course as it is now will really help keep the community alive. It is rare to find a neighborhood where neighbors have a place to go to walk, run, play, and talk together. People meet one another. It's an oasis for so many city-bound animals. It's a precious place. A lot of alumni would be very unhappy if it goes away, and very happy if it remains. I think you could actually raise money by asking for donations in the name of preserving that golf course. Revenge is always an issue. People love that golf course enough that they would help pitch in to preserve it, I am sure. – *Cammie Nichols, Neighborhood Resident; 8/21/2009*
- After all the neighborhood meetings, expressed desires of resident, city and state officials, etc. and even professed value of 'campus open space' within the Master Plan itself, the North Golf Course is still labeled as "future reserve lands" (developable). To reiterate, this is not acceptable to a large portion of the city's residents. Their feelings in this regard will not change and will thus continue to place the university at odds with ITS COMMUNITY. It has been made clear that preservation of this open space in its entirety is the only acceptable option. The Master Plan very transparently tiptoes around the subject of the North Golf Course and this crucial issue. – *Richard Borkovetz, Neighborhood Resident; 8/25/2009*
- I understand some of the stated issues concerning modifications to the trends from the 1990s such as a modified interest interchange and growth in the north campus area. However, I see very little correlation between the plan completed in 1996 and this plan. The plan completed in 1996 has a much more simple and elegant approach in tying the two areas together around a common public space. This feature was significant piece of the old plan. Universities around the world have such features that have become major draws as iconic public space that is utilized by both students and citizens alike. To eliminate this feature would be a significant loss to the university and the city. – *Tim Trujillo, Community Member; 8/28/2009*
- As a resident of the North Golf Course area I feel that the use of the word "reserved" for the golf course is very weak. Indeed it leads you to ask reserved for what? I see the golf course as it now exists as a heritage golf/open space facility. In the past it has been nipped away to its current configuration but is a long-existing facility open to UNM staff, students and city inhabitants. It is

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### **North Golf Course (cont'd.)**

used for track and field events for APS and UNM and irreplaceable. The Regents and the planning committee should pledge to keep the open space/golf course as is in a way to confirm their devotion to the greening of the campus and concern for the environment. – *Ellen Evans North Campus Neighborhood Resident; 9/3/2009*

- I am writing to voice my concerns about the treatment that the UNM Golf Course has in the UNM Master Plan. The proposed Master Plan fell short on several key areas: The Golf Course and Barren Fairways were described as "reserved lands" Their preservation did not review firm commitment. Parking and traffic management requires additional and substantive study and planning. No articulation of a mechanism for transparent communication between the University and the neighborhoods. While there were areas of agreement on the Master Plan, these three areas are of strong concern to the neighborhoods and are critical to a successful and holistic approach to the future of UNM and the City. – *David Treeson, UNM Faculty/ Alumni/ Neighbor; 9/9/2009*
- There is no commitment to preservation of the North Golf Course area and barren fairways. The citizens of Albuquerque and their representatives have spoken out very clearly on this issue. If there is no clear commitment for their preservation in the Master Plan, then the whole idea of UNM and community cooperation is called into question. – *Keith Rasmussen, Summit Park Neighborhood Association Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Sustainability/ Preservation Issues: While the 2009 Master Plan contains the laudable goal of attaining carbon neutrality by 2030, it stops short of making the type of commitments that are necessary to achieve that goal. Preservation, an issue related to sustainability, is also not adequately addressed in this plan. 1) There is no commitment to permanent preservation of the North Golf Course and Barren Fairways. The plan seems to intentionally leave the door open for future development of the golf course by saying, "For the time frame of this master plan, the North Golf Course will remain as reserve lands for UNM" (DMP, 34). 2) With regard to landscape developments, one proposed "improvement" is to introduce "some formal geometry and patterning to the [path's surrounding the Duck Pond]" (DMP 26). However, the UNM campus landscape is the vision of Landscape Architect Garrett Eckbo. The curves and delineated diagonals match the buildings' traditional Southwestern style. Eckbo incorporated studies of pedestrian traffic in order to provide fluid walkways for students. He worked to move vehicular circulation and parking out toward the edge of campus, leaving the campus center as a student safe zone. He also worked to balance beauty with an arid climate and urban growth by researching comparative studies of weather conditions with native plant biology. The landscape architecture of the university is part of the historic character of the place and should be considered carefully before changes are proposed. Improvements that are made to the Duck Pond area should be consistent with and employ Eckbo's techniques and design principles. RECOMMENDATIONS: Designate the North Golf Course and Barren Fairways as permanent open space lands. Reclaim the Barren Fairways for educational and environmentally sustainable uses. Honor and preserve the traditional landscape design principles of Garrett Eckbo and the historically significant structures on campus. – *Isaac Benton, et. al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009*

### **Physics & Astronomy**

- Feedback from Physics & Astronomy: As a major academic and research component of UNM (at least we think so), and after all the initial planning that proceeded last year, we are of course rather disappointed to find no mention of a new building for us in the entire plan, unless I

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Physics & Astronomy (cont'd.)***

overlooked something. Parenthetically, we did notice on the "Master Plan Exhibit" Facilities Condition Index that our building is in the "removal" category, as it should be, of course. Pages 47 to 50: no mention of the physics building and its replacement (under proposed facilities improvements). On the other hand and as an example, relocation of the physical plant is mentioned. This raises one obvious question - where do we rank? Don't we deserve at least a statement like #17?

Map on page 51: Our current location is labeled UNMHSC yet the lot still shows the current layout of our building. On the other hand, there are a number of maps/figures throughout the document showing a seemingly random assembly of small building-like structures in our current location (also the case on the "illustrative Master Plan 2009" on the "Master Plan Exhibits" webpage). Seems a bit inconsistent.

5-Yr Capital Plan Document: P&A is listed for a new building to start in 2011 (would be nice!), but where does the amount of \$49.5M come from? Has certainly never been discussed with us. In fact, last year at some point \$60M was mentioned, which appears more realistic. And presumably replacement Regner Hall and the Campus Observatory are not included here. Or are they? We are very concerned that corners might be cut this early in the planning process without the department being involved. – *Bernd Bassalleck, UNM Faculty; 8/31/2009*

### ***Relocation of Mental Health***

- I do understand the need to relocate and improve the mental health center. I think that is crucial in our community as well. So, to the extent that might impact the barren fairways, I personally depart from my fellow NCNA members on this point. I am not fearful of the mentally ill, especially not the mentally ill who have access to and are obtaining treatment. They need help, and they need a good facility. – *Cammie Nichols, North Campus Neighborhood Resident; 8/21/2009*
- The plan to relocate the Adult Psych. Unit to the barren fairways area has been openly criticized by several physicians at neighborhood meetings as ill-advised. As they have conveyed, most referrals are made at the ER and thus this unit should be adjacent to an existing or proposed ER. Further, to place it as proposed seems extremely unwise and inconvenient for both the patients, staff and neighborhood. This is not simply a "NIMBY" issue, but one of good medicine. – *Richard Borkovetz, Neighborhood Resident; 8/25/2009*

### ***Relocation of Physical Plant Department***

- There is much more to the Physical Plant Dept. than indicated here. This report should identify those portions of PPD that are suited for moving, and those that are not. The negative impacts regarding travel to campus should be part of this discussion. Also, the building now houses more than just PPD, as OCP also resides here. The interface between both of these departments and other entities on campus is significant. It should be acknowledged that moving to the South Campus may prove to be less convenient, less efficient, and less sustainable in regards to servicing a customer base that will require travel by vehicle in a non-parking friendly environment. Also, why wouldn't Planning & Campus Development be included in such a move since collaboration between the groups can be improved with common locations. – *Bob Notary, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Safety***

- Regarding safety: UNM incurs liability when it puts a female employee in a position of having to walk long distances to get from her desk to her car after dark. The fact is that our jobs sometimes do require that we work a little late. The option of requesting a campus-police escort is not workable: the truth is that campus police typically do not respond to such requests for 20 minutes or more. Ditto shuttles. – *Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009*

### ***Student/ Staff Health***

- Overall, the Master Plan is a very nice piece of work. However, in the Master Plan, suggestions for meeting the needs of the Millennial student includes offering mental health counseling and support. I see student life and student success as a theme in the Master Plan, but I see no mention of plans for improvement of facilities for medical or mental health services for students. I see increasing faculty and staff access to healthcare as a goal in the plan, but nothing about student healthcare. Student Health and Counseling has 35,000 outpatient visits per year plus a Pharmacy in the building. Nearly 40% of the individual students enrolled see us at least once during the year. We deliver these medical and mental health services with a staff of about 50 employees, out of a building constructed in the 1960's. My bias is that we should at least be mentioned as a part of the plan for the mesa vista complex development/ renovation. – *Beverly Kloeppe, UNM Staff; 9/9/2009*
- A broad component of the conceptual framework (p. 7) is "Healthy Communities" with bullets including: Urban/Rural Health; Education and Training; Research, Outreach and Intervention; and Health Policy. There are no other mentions of "health policy" throughout the master plan document and so I wonder how this is defined and implemented throughout the plan? I recommend that consideration is given to the process of Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as one method of analyzing the human health impacts of project and policy decision making. HIA is "a multidisciplinary process within which a range of evidence about the health effects of a proposal is considered in a structured framework, ...based on a broad model of health which proposes that economic, political, social, psychological, and environmental factors determine population health" (Northern and York Public Health Observatory, 2004). <http://www.ph.ucla.edu/hs/hiaclit/index.htm> There is a significant amount of web-based information on HIA and I would be glad to provide more information upon request. – *Emily Piltch, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*

### ***Student Housing***

- The proposed location for student housing west of the Pit may have some drawbacks you have not considered. A) Bordered by a hill, I-25 and Cesar Chavez, it will be extremely noisy, the air quality will be poor and walk ability will be minimal. B) Access will be less than optimal; the 16/18 bus has no stops between I-25 and University Blvd. and no evening service. c) The proposed area is void of basic amenities -- not even a convenience store in a safe, walk able distance. A location closer to Yale Blvd. would better serve students. -- *T'Brin E. Back/ Mardon Gardella, Neighborhood Resident; 9/3/2009*

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Student Housing (cont'd.)*

- Housing: Affordable, available, conveniently located housing for students, staff, and faculty will promote less SOV use, improve university-community relations, and promote or more lively and sustainable campus culture. *On Campus and Off Campus Housing: On Campus* - Affordable, safe, clean, wireless Internet, healthy food, community oriented, child friendly (non-dorm style – each unit includes its own kitchen and bathroom, etc.). Right now on-campus housing is expensive and low quality. *Off Campus: University housing needs cannot be met with on-campus housing alone. UNM must work to promote quality affordable off-campus housing as well. Rents are going up immediately off campus and some housing is not up to code and is poorly maintained by out-of-state landlords. Consequently, increasing numbers of students are moving further from campus and accepting longer commutes for lower rents; this exacerbates traffic and parking issues, undermines UNM's stated goal of a "live, work, learn, play" campus and is environmentally unsustainable. We propose that UNM Work with the City, neighborhoods, and landlords/property managers to develop an "approved housing" program that can be incorporated into the overall Master Plan strategy for addressing student housing needs. The idea is that the university, working with the City of Albuquerque and property managers, could provide parents with a list of approved, quality housing in the neighborhoods, thus making the university a partner in the provision of safe, near-campus housing. Housing West of Pit: None of us would want to live next to the Pit or the Freeway. Would be great for a park and ride/parking structure or commercial uses. Not family friendly. We suggest that student housing west of the Pit be reconsidered and that the Master Plan provide a greater level of detail of proposals for developing on-campus housing on Central Campus. – GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*
- Student Housing: We fully concur with and support the university's desire to develop on-campus student housing. However, we do not feel that the issue of student housing – both on- and off-campus – has been adequately fleshed out in this Master Plan update. 1) The plan does not provide enough information about the location, and quantity by location, of new on-campus housing that is proposed. 2) One of the "Proposed Facilities Improvements" in South Campus includes, "developing upperclassmen and graduate [sic] student housing in the area between the Pit and I-25" (MP 46). We question whether this is really the most appropriate location for student housing given the amount of noise from the interstate and the Pit that residents would have to deal with. We feel that a more appropriate and beneficial use for that area would be structure parking with improved shuttle service to Central Campus. 3) During the facilitated meetings between UNM, the City, and the Spruce Park and Sycamore neighborhoods, the idea of 'approved off-campus housing' was discussed. The idea is that the university, working with the City of Albuquerque and landlords/ property managers, could provide parents with a list of approved, quality housing in the neighborhoods, thus making the university a partner in the provision of safe, near-campus housing. This would ultimately further the common goal of the university and the community to provide convenient, quality housing supply for UNM students. RECOMMENDATIONS: Reconsider building housing between I-25 and the Pit. Provide a greater level of detail of proposals for developing on-campus housing on Central Campus. Work with the City, neighborhoods, and landlords/ property managers to develop an "approved housing" program that can be incorporated into the overall Master Plan strategy for addressing student housing needs. – Isaac Benton, et. al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Student Recreation Center*

- The discussion for the new student recreation center has been underway for some time, the proposed location/site for this major facility has not received due and objective consideration through the normal planning processes and with the engagement of key stakeholders. It is not entirely clear that physically linking this new facility with the already functionally convoluted Johnson Gym is either necessary or desired. Previous additions to Johnson Gym have contributed to an extraordinarily complicated pattern of circulation for the different venues - difficult for users and visitors as well as compromising control and security. One would expect that the anticipated future life and use of parts (or all) of Johnson Gym will be significantly fewer in years than the new Student Recreation Center. Regardless of functional limitations imposed by the site and unknown future of Johnson Gym, there is reason to question the rationale of locating this major facility at the NE corner of Stanford and Central Avenue. Specifically: 1. The site is a resides within the academic core of the main campus - where are relatively few options for expansion of classroom/research needs. With further anticipated student enrollment increases for the main UNM campus, this specific site should be reserved for a future academic use, not student recreation. 2. If the Student Recreation Center is located on this site, a significant number of critical parking places - serving visitors, staff and faculty will be permanently lost. Regardless of other site issues, if UNM is to proceed with this as the designated site, replacement (structures) parking must become an integral part of this project (and project cost). 3. The majority of students live off campus. These off-campus students will also be paying for this facility, and should have reasonable access. The highest demand for use of this type of facility can be anticipated to be in the evening hours. There will be a very high demand by students for parking within walking distance to this facility; there is none at this location. – *Roger Schluntz, UNM Faculty; 8/31/2009*
- A New Student-only Recreation Center: I considered many schools before coming to UNM and at first was not happy with my choice, but was forced into it for financial reasons. After a year on campus I appreciate the immense amount of opportunities and academic potential on our campus, but I recognize that it is difficult to attract high-achieving students. A recreation center would not only improve life on campus and build the student resident community exponentially, but it would also serve as a major selling point when students are comparing UNM to schools like NMSU, ASU, etc. The Johnson facilities are unacceptable and deserve better than that as a student body. With a new recreation center, students would stay on campus, get involved in student organizations, and have a much more meaningful educational and life experience while enrolled at UNM. I understand the process has come a long way (almost up to design and development stage if I remember correctly) and I hope that you are able to recognize the importance it serves to the University's primary constituent. – *Jake Wellman, UNM Student; 9/7/2009*
- The recreation center needs to be adjacent to Johnson Field and Central Avenue. The Honors Program needs to be located in Hokona Hall. Mesa Vista will be very costly to bring up to code and for it to be truly functional. – *Walt Miller, UNM Staff; 9/9/2009*
- With the hopes to add 2000+ beds, I think that with this addition of so many people, there has to be stuff for them to do on Campus. I know there has been talk of perhaps building a recreational center. I think that this would be a perfect addition to go along with the building of new dorms. The facilities that we currently have (Johnson Center) are okay, but I don't really feel that they are adequate enough for the student body. A lot of people have to schedule their

## **Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update**

### ***Student Recreation Center (cont'd.)***

lives around Johnson, so they can work out and use the facilities that their student dollars are going towards. I see a lot of students who will buy outside gym memberships because they're schedule simply can't work with that of Johnson's. If we have a facility that is only for recreation, I truly believe that students will want to stay more on campus, and students will be more satisfied with their University Experience. –*Monika Irene Roberts, UNM Student; 9/11/2009*

- More students living on Campus, including both housing and better recreation/health facilities sounds like something students would be delighted to enjoy. Selling that to taxpayers seems a little trickier, perhaps; but, I would support the initiative. I believe more people are coming to understand the essential need to integrate various types of health into learning environments. Mostly, of course, most students need jobs. A really first-rate University would be able to offer lots of jobs to its students. I note that this point is nowhere a part of the master plan. – *Whitney Durrell, Spruce Park Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009*
- Athletic Facilities and the Recreation Center: Some grad students feel that the proposed investment in a new recreation center is way too much money that could be better spent elsewhere. We are concerned about losing parking. The priority should be housing first then entertainment. Many people believe these funds could be used better elsewhere. It's for entertainment rather than having a direct academic benefit. Those that oppose don't want to be forced into paying a mandatory tax for this. With respect to the athletic facilities expansion proposed in the Master Plan, many graduate students do not think athletic venues are a priority. Effective master plans must be built on community engagement and do not happen in a vacuum. This plan does not include enough implementation strategies including funding sources. We cannot provide recommendations on the ideas presented here if we do not know what the comparative cost/benefits are (e.g. who is going to pay for it, what will not be built if this is, etc.). – *GPSA, Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009*

### ***Sustainability***

- One of the goals of the master plan is to aid the campus in becoming carbon neutral by the year 2030. Yet, much of this plan further encourages a commuter style campus. The placement of significant student housing at the farthest end of the planned area isolated from retail and transit. A north campus designed around a motor vehicle road system. No parking structures to appease those who will not give up their vehicles. A true, flagship, urban-campus, university encourages students to live on campus or near campus to take advantage of the amenities that typically are associated with such a moniker. This plan runs counter to that concept. 2,000 new beds over 10 years is a drop in the budget toward the goals of reaching carbon neutrality and increasing retainment. Not to mention creating a true academic atmosphere in an urban setting in and up and coming city. -- *Tim Trujillo, Community Member; 8/28/2009*
- (Page 12) We suggest that inclusion under "Promote the health, productivity, etc." of a statement that "Where appropriate, consider Historic Preservation or Adaptive Reuse of existing buildings rather than their removal and replacement by new buildings." Potential sustainability benefits and savings of embodied energy in existing buildings are recognized by current draft LEED guidelines on the reuse of existing buildings. The Master Plan should acknowledge the importance of always assessing the efficacy of this option. – *UNM Historic Preservation Committee/ Richard Chapman, Chair; 9/8/2009*
- Under the Sustainability Section (p.12)...that states "Promote the health, productivity and safety of the University community through design and maintenance of the built environment,"

## Inventory of Public Comments on the DRAFT 2009 Master Plan Update

### *Sustainability (cont'd.)*

bullets under this heading address topics such as: incorporating energy and water efficiency principles, considering life-cycle costs (what does this mean?) and placing value in facility programming and design that is flexible"; however no bullet specifically calls out the impacts of the built environment on health. The tool of Health Impact Assessment could once again be considered as a strategy for looking at the impacts planning and development decisions have on human health and assist in minimizing harm to human health and maximizing strategies for promoting health. Also under the Sustainability Section, it states: "Develop planning tools to enable comparative analysis of sustainability strategies and to support long term economic, environmental, and socially responsible decision making." Please consider including the phrase "health and public health" in this sentence to continually stress that practices of sustainability have impacts on human health in addition to the already mentioned dimensions of a well functioning community. Again, HIA could be a planning tool to assist in this comparative analysis of sustainability strategies. – *Emily Piltch, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009*

- I notice an interest in diversifying food choices on campus. I would like to propose a fundraising effort to create an "Edible Schoolyard" project here. Such a project would provide food to be sold throughout campus, an internship/fellowship for a gardener or two, a student affiliated with Art and Ecology, Geography, Landscape Architecture, Sustainability Studies or other programs interested, and exciting alternative to trucked in food. Students could learn about season, food resources, biodiversity and water wise urban gardening. Such a program would also provide a think tank for similar programs around the city and the state in elementary and high schools. Many places around the state are utterly dependent on trucked in foods. I appreciate the focus on bicycles, sustainability and solar power. Great work! – *Catherine Page Harris, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009*