NOTES FROM MARCH 28 COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING

Community Forum Structure Changes
Coralie Alder, Executive Director, Public Relations

The new structure and schedule of Community Forum meetings was discussed at the annual meeting in January. It was decided that the meetings will be held on Tuesday due to conflicts on Wednesday evenings and be held quarterly instead of every month. Coralie asked how the neighbors felt about the new location in Research Park for the meetings and received a positive response. The meetings will continue to be held in 540 Arapeen in Research Park. The remaining dates for this year’s Community Forum meetings are:

- May 23 at 5 p.m.
- August 22 at 5 p.m.
- October 24 at 5 p.m.

Presentation/Discussion of University Growth Data
Mike Perez, Associate Vice President, Administrative Services, Facilities Management

Mike announced the U will be facilitating a discussion about traffic issues in the immediate area of campus with a number of key stakeholders. Traffic has been a big issue at the Community Forum meetings but it is not the right forum to tackle the issue and offer solutions. The U would like to plan a special meeting to focus on traffic and to allow the Community Forum meetings to focus on other issues. The U extended invitations to UDOT, UTA, Wasatch Front Regional Council, Salt Lake City transportation office, Mayor’s office, the VA Hospital, community members, etc. to participate in this traffic meeting and identify traffic issues in this part of the city. Transportation is such a large issue and there are so many players involved that it should be a separate meeting and more people than those who participate in the Community Forum meetings need to be included. It is not just a U problem, it is one that everyone shares.

The first meeting was held Friday, March 31 at 1:30 p.m. in the Annex building conference room. It was the first gathering to strategize and formulate the mission of the group, its goals, and time frames. Information about this group’s efforts will be made available via a future Web site.

As Mike began his presentation on the university growth data he reinforced that these Community Forum meetings are meant to be a dialog between the U and its neighbors and he welcomed comments. The U wants to break away from the mode of presenting. He also mentioned that the materials presented at the annual meeting did not include some information the neighbors had requested, so this meeting would include more thorough and current data.

Mike then presented the information through a PowerPoint presentation that can be viewed at: http://www.facilities.utah.edu/facplan/CF_Presentation_03-28-06.pdf

Slide #1 showed the net square feet of the University, starting in 1997. The total included the net square feet on main campus, including Research Park and remote location leased space beyond campus, which includes clinics throughout the state. In 2005, there is approximately 10.2 million square feet at the University of Utah. The amount peaked in 2002 due to the construction of the new housing and acquisition of Fort Douglas properties. It dipped in 2003 when some of the buildings in Fort Douglas were demolished. The graph showed the totals from 1997 to 2005. The net space includes everything usable inside a building such as hallways, classrooms, and common areas. It does not include mechanical space.

Slide #2 showed the statistics of students and employees on campus from 1997 to 2005. The graph had separate bars for students (using peak fall student enrollment numbers), campus, remote location, and Research Park employees.

There was a comment that there should be a statistic for how many patients are going up to the hospital. Mike commented that we can attempt to get those numbers but this presentation did not count visitors. All generally agreed that the normal population on campus during the 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. hours is the biggest impact on traffic, especially at the peak times. What makes it difficult to count visitors is the amount of venues that contribute to this number (museums, Red Butte, the hospital, etc.) which have numerous variables that will skew any count.

Slide #3 counted permitted parking spaces. The number of permits purchased by students, faculty and staff has remained fairly steady over the years.

Slide #4 illustrated data generated by UDOT. Representatives from UDOT were unable to attend this meeting. The data is from their traffic counts and shows annual average daily traffic from 1997 to 2005. Mike mentioned that the Sunnyside and Foothill intersection possesses a permanent UDOT traffic counter. He pointed out declines at three intersections which occurred around the time that the university TRAX line opened. He also pointed to the increase at 100 S. via North Campus Drive which may be the result of a number of increased chal-
Challenges such as driving in and around the TRAX line, the round-about on South Campus Drive, and the opening of the Eccles Critical Care Pavilion. Another theory is the extension of the medical center opened up in 2003. The Foothill and Wakara intersection showed a steady and slow increase over the time frame being measured.

Slide #5 compared the percentage of students driving cars, using transit or using another method to get to campus (walking, riding bikes, etc.). In 2002, 66% of students drove a car and 21% used transit. In 2005, 51% of students drove a car and 37% used transit. The U encourages students, faculty and staff to ride transit by investing into the Ed Pass program which allows anyone with a pass to ride for free.

Slide #6 combined much of the data from previous slides onto one graph, including space, people, & traffic to illustrate trends and any correlation amongst this information. The graph shows that although the net square feet increases, occupants and traffic do not necessarily go up at the same rate. The U’s mitigation strategy is to encourage people to use mass transit.

The final slides of the presentation included the 2006 Physical Facilities Community Impact Report, which included each construction project, the phase of the project, project size, expected incremental increase of university traffic & parking needs, expected project-related changes in student environment & employment, other community impacts, and mitigating actions. The community appreciated the additional information included with each project, such as additional traffic and occupants, which had not been included in past reports.

Questions asked by neighbors:

- How many people does the museum employ? Sarah George, director, Utah Museum of Natural History, answered about 100 after the expansion.
- The community asked if there would be a time in the project phase that the community could comment earlier in the project. Mike said that the U will bring project managers to the meetings to have a discussion about building issues.
- When will the U say that the campus is full and start satellite campuses? Mike commented that all projects presented today are from a 1997 master plan. The University, though, is considering the opportunity of engaging in a campus master planning exercise in the not too distant future.
- The topic of satellite campuses was discussed and the 4th south corridor was brought up because of rumors about the university expanding onto 4th south. Will the university keep expanding into the surrounding neighborhoods? Will the U expand onto 4th south? What is the university going to do when it runs out of room? Could SLC planners attend a meeting to explain the city’s plans for 4th south? Mike thanked the community for these questions and offered that the University will attempt to address these issues at a future meeting.

Mike mentioned that the Neuroscience and BioMedical Technology Research Building, approved by the state legislature and championed by the business community, will likely be built somewhere on or near the University golf course. In most recent master plans the University golf course has been identified as the land bank for future central campus development. Development of what is thought to be the “Interdisciplinary District” will be performed in ways that will attempt to create and maintain open spaces, view corridors, and quality environments.

The neighbors commented that it is nice that the meetings will be more project oriented and appreciate the efforts that have been made to improve communication. It makes for better planning and is an integrated approach. They would like to see Research Park part of this planning policy.

The entire PowerPoint presentation is available at: http://www.facilities.utah.edu/facplan/CF_Presentation_03-28-06.pdf