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Note on the Highlighted Edition:
In this edition of the campus facilities master plan, all text that has been changed from the 2004 master plan is printed in dark blue, so that such changes are evident.
The University of Alaska Anchorage has an important role in providing higher education opportunities for the State of Alaska, the Municipality of Anchorage, and Southcentral Alaska.
University Mission

The mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage is to discover and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, engagement, and creative expression.

Located in Anchorage and on community campuses in Southcentral Alaska, UAA is committed to serving the higher education needs of the state, its communities, and its diverse peoples.

The University of Alaska Anchorage is an open access university with academic programs leading to occupational endorsements; undergraduate and graduate certificates; and associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degrees in a rich, diverse, and inclusive environment.

Approved by the University of Alaska Board of Regents September 19, 2007
Dear Friends and Colleagues,

Welcome to the UAA’s Campus Facilities Master Plan 2009. The UAA Master Plan is a living document; it is our guide for how, where and why we expand the UAA campus. It’s about how people move about campus and how people see the campus. It has to be flexible enough to support changes in our strategic and academic plans yet disciplined enough to respect the sense of place UAA is and not allow expedient decisions that are inconsistent with the plan.

UAA’s 10 year horizon is bright with opportunity and growth. As we grow to meet the demands of the State’s workforce we must do so sustainably, in harmony with our master plan and in cooperation with our U-MED and community partners.

Our 2009 Master Plan is the product of past planning’s guiding principles and objectives, current strategic and academic plans and many conversations and discussions carried on across the university and the Board of Regents and the community since the 2004 Plan was inked. I want to thank all of the members of the university community who devoted their time, minds, and good will to this task. I especially want to thank Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle, Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Turletes of Facilities and Campus Services, Director of our Facilities Planning and Construction department Mike Smith, and our consultant ZGF Architects who have been involved with UAA master planning since 2002. I would also like to thank the members of the PBAC Facilities Subcommittee for taking the lead in bringing this plan to successful completion.

I am excited to present UAA’s Campus Facilities Master Plan 2009. Questions, concerns and comments should be directed to the Associate Vice Chancellor Facilities and Campus Services at 786-1110.

Fran Ulmer
Chancellor
SUMMARY OF CHANGES REFLECTED IN THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Purpose
Since the UAA Campus Master Plan was drafted in 2003, a number of significant decisions have been made, four building projects have been undertaken, and a number of personnel and policy changes have occurred. The purpose of this master plan update is to respond to all of these changes with amendments to the text and graphics of the campus master plan approved by the Board of Regents in 2004. The intention is to present to the Board of Regents, for their approval, an updated version of the master plan that provides a sound and current basis for future decisions affecting the fabric of the Anchorage campus.

While the master plan was being updated, the Board of Regents Twelve Principles 05:12:003.B was adopted in October 2008. This prompted a further round of amendments and revisions to ensure full compliance.

A. Intent
The administration will develop and present to the board for adoption, a campus master plan for each campus. The purpose of a campus master plan is to provide a framework for implementation of the academic, strategic and capital plans.

B. The Board of Regents Twelve Principles 05:12:003.B
A campus master plan will contain, at minimum, maps, plans, drawings or renderings, and text sufficient to portray and describe the following elements. Projections will be developed for 10 years and may be developed for other intervals.

1. Projected enrollment and other factors affecting the need for facilities and infrastructure;
2. General areas for land acquisition and disposal;
3. The general location of new or upgraded infrastructure, including roads, parking, pedestrian circulation, transit circulation, and utilities
4. Demolition of buildings, structures, and facilities;
5. General location, size, and purpose of new buildings, structures, and facilities;
6. Guidelines for landscaping;
7. General location and intent for open spaces, plazas, etc.;
8. Guidelines for signage, both freestanding and on buildings and structures;
9. Architectural guidelines for all buildings, structures, and facilities;
10. Environmental and cultural issues, ADA access, and energy conservation;
11. The relationship of the campus to its surroundings and coordination with local government land use plans and ordinances; and
12. General priorities for capital projects.

C. Development, Review and Update, Revision, and Amendment
1. Development: The administration will implement a process for development of the campus master plan that allows for participation by the local government and members of the university community, to include faculty, staff and students.
2. Review and Update: A campus master plan will be reviewed and updated on a five to seven year cycle.
3. Revision and Amendment: A campus plan may be revised or amended from time to time. An amendment to accommodate a proposed specific capital project shall be considered and approved by the board prior to consideration of the proposed capital project.

D. Purpose and Function: Renovations
1. Purpose and Function: When adopted by the board, the campus master plan governs the capital improvements plan and budget request for the campus, and approval of all proposed capital projects on the campus. The board may not grant schematic approval for a capital project request unless it implements the adopted campus master plan.
2. Renovations: When a capital project consists of the renovation of an existing building, structure, or facility, as part of the renovation, the exterior and immediate environs of the building, structure, or facility should be brought into conformance with the campus master plan to the extent reasonably possible.

Recent Changes
The goals, objectives and principles that form the basis of the 2004 campus master plan rest on an extensive series of consultations in 2003. We held a series of 65 meetings with the various constituencies that have an interest in future campus facilities. This foundation of the plan is not concerned with individual projects and improvements, but with the underpinnings of the whole institution, and so remains unaltered in the 2009 update.

Changes since 2004 are both physical and organizational. Physical changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the near future include the following:

- ANSEP Building completed and occupied;
- Integrated Science Building and adjacent parking garage completed;
- Health Sciences Master Plan amendment completed, approved, and ground broken for the first new building;
- Staging and preliminary design for the new Sports Center completed;
- Implementation of the campus core loop road begun;
- Municipality of Anchorage (MoA) plans extension of a road from AFU across UAA property to connect with Providence South Loop Road. The new road would intersect with Elmore (formerly Braggov) and Providence East, passing north of UAA residence halls on Sharon Gagnon Lane.
- Sports and Housing Sector Master Plan amendment completed and approved.

Organizational and policy changes include:

- Changes in Senior Administration at the University;
- Changes in enrollment projections;
- The 2005 Parking Study conducted by the Walker Company;
- The 2006 Utilities Study, conducted by HGA;
- Changes in the State economy and thus of campus improvement funding prospects;
- Changes in regional political leadership that may reopen arguments for northward extension of Elmore (formerly Braggov) to Northern Lights Boulevard with consequent division of the campus;
- The UAA 2017 Strategic Plan;

Summary of Updates
All plans of the campus in the 2004 master plan have been updated to reflect changes that have occurred or have been confirmed as of the date of corrections. Thus all the proposed Health/Science building footprints are shown although none has yet been constructed. A current aerial photograph of the district has also been included (see page 22).

In order to clarify the potential for siting new development and redevelopment on campus, a new plan has been added on page 73. The Long Term Development Opportunities plan depicts remaining tracts of developable land, and large sites that could be assembled from previously developed land, comprising surface parking lots, obsolete structures and under-developed sites. It complements plans prepared in 2003 that show wetlands and proposed conservation areas.

Notable among new plans in this 2008 update of the master plan are those showing potential siting of new and expanded facilities phased over three periods: 2008-2018, 2018-2028, and after 2028. These reflect changes in the priorities for improvements as they currently stand. A composite of these plans appears on page 11.

As stated above, no changes have been made to the goals, objectives and principles that form the basis of the campus master plan. Minor amendments have been made to the ‘Master Plan Recommendations’ section to render them consistent with the master plan as a whole.

Documents relevant to these master plan revisions can be found at www.uaa.alaska.edu/masterplan/support-plans/

ZGF.
A view of the Chugach Mountains from the UAA campus.
Executive Summary of the Master Plan Provisions

**Purpose**
Since approval of the 2004 Campus Facilities Master Plan, a number of circumstances have changed, and relevant new information has become available. These changes, listed on page 4, prompted substantial updating of the master plan in 2008. In October of that year, the Board of Regents adopted twelve principles that should be addressed by the campus master plan. This 2009 Campus Facilities Master Plan includes all the updates made in 2008 and has been further amended to conform to the recently revised UA Board of Regents Policy on Master Planning.

**Campus Identity**
The UAA campus gains a powerful identity from its natural setting; from the Chugach peaks to the east and the more distant Aleutian range to the west, the creeks, lakes and bogs with stands of black spruce and birch that occupy half the campus, and the sub-Arctic flora and fauna that inhabit the land. There is broad agreement among the University community and its neighbors that these valuable assets should be safeguarded. Nowhere else is a major university set in both a wild, northern landscape and a major city.

A challenge for the campus master planners has been to find a way to match this magnificence with the built environment. The linear campus core extends over a mile from Lake Otis Parkway to the Fine Arts parking lot in the northeast. Student housing is grouped half a mile southeast of the Library.

Since the master plan of the mid-1970s, The Spine has been an organising feature of the campus core. Successful though this has been, an unfortunate consequence is that parking lots and the backs of buildings confront most visitors as they approach the campus along Providence Drive. An objective of the master plan is to orient new buildings towards Providence Drive and views of the Chugach, and to remove parking to locations that are inconspicuous yet convenient.

There are elements of the campus of iconic quality that help to organize its overall form. The Spine for enclosed pedestrian circulation is one, the lawns and gardens at the center of the western campus provide another. Remodeling, replacement and addition of new buildings will provide an opportunity to create greater density at the campus core, and to make it more pedestrian-friendly. The view from the street will be of a vibrant university in place of today’s parking lots.
Goals & Guiding Principles

The Master Plan identifies five goals and a series of guiding principles derivative of them. Arising from these are a series of objectives and key design guidelines. The goals and principles on page 30 have directed the master plan process; the objectives and key design guidelines beginning on page 32 are intended to steer implementation of the master plan to fulfill the goals and principles.

Facility Master Plan and Project Priorities

Analysis of the condition and disposition of campus facilities was followed by a lengthy series of meetings with faculty, administration, students, staff and neighbors. The purpose was to understand the many dimensions of the University in its academic, cultural and community functions. Enrollment history and projections were studied to establish the probable pace of growth over the next ten and twenty year periods. Longer-term needs were also considered to ensure that potentially important opportunities for future improvement are not lost.

A useful product of this process of analysis, deduction and projection of facilities needs is the Facilities Master Plan. This superimposes on a plan of the campus today the approximate location of new buildings anticipated between now and 2019, 2019 and 2029, and more than twenty years into the future. Each category is distinguished by a separate color in the plan on page 11.

Features that can be discerned in this plan include clustering of new buildings around the established campus core, and displacement of parking to the perimeter of the core, orientation of new buildings towards daylight, views and Providence Drive. Respect of iconic campus spaces such as Chester Creek, the cultivated quads of West Campus, and the wilderness lands of the North Campus are all evident in the updated campus master plan.

The following paragraphs summarize some of the important ideas that have emerged from the collaborative master plan process. Initiatives are suggested for implementation of these ideas.

Consistent signage is a way to promote a clear identity for the University in an otherwise diverse campus.
Campus Identity - Place and Architecture

As UAA and its neighboring institutions continue to grow, the whole Li-Med district will assume the appearance of a single huge and diverse campus. There are aspects of this that will benefit UAA, such as the practical training opportunities available to students at PAMC, API, MYC, ANTHC and APU. The collective strength of these institutions, together with UAA, give the whole a scale and importance of national significance. However, it is nonetheless important that UAA should maintain its identity within this complex. Because street access to UAA is shared by other institutions, it would be inappropriate to span them with UAA gateways. However, other strong visual signals can distinguish the University from its neighbors. One means is the recently adopted wayfinding system that will visually unify everything from monument signs and banners to building and room identification.

Architecture offers one of the strongest means of conveying the pride and purpose of an institution. Consistency in the scale and orientation of buildings can be achieved through careful orchestration of new building and remodeling efforts.

UAA has a very rich mix of architectural heritage, styles, and is about to embark on two decades of building and rebuilding that have the potential to transform the appearance of the campus. Discussions of values among the University community have confirmed a conviction that the architecture of the campus should remain diverse, yet express an appropriate hierarchy and order. The architecture should be expressive of its functions. The buildings should be unequivocally of a northern, sub-Arctic city. They should welcome scarce winter daylight, yet should moderate the heat of the summer sun. Buildings should be attached to the natural landscape through sweeping views of it and more intimate, close-in views of nearby trees and glades.

Some buildings should be taller than others to conserve space near the dense core of the campus, and provide visibility to the campus from outside the district. Building materials should be sustainable, should blend with the environment and be able to cope with climatic extremes. The architecture should properly represent the University’s aspirations to increasing excellence in all that it does.

This plan provides a set of Design Guidelines for campus development. The Guidelines both critique existing principal facilities, and respond to the desired characteristics of future buildings outlined above. They address issues of siting, orientation, functionality, sustainability, and maintenance as well as image and scale. Consistent signage is a relatively inexpensive way to confer consistent identity on a diverse campus.

The new library addition is an imaginative example of northern sub-Arctic architecture.
Growth and Campus Land Use

UAA enrollment is projected to increase by a third over the next twenty years, and similarly vigorous growth can be expected of neighboring institutions and communities. Pressure will mount for the development of any and all legally developable land. An immediate priority, therefore, is for UAA to determine which parts of its campus can and should be developed, and which should be kept in their natural state. Are there any adjacent properties that should be acquired to maintain key natural buffers? The adopted U-Med Plan has imposed zoning protections on certain high value natural areas, such as Chester Creek and its wooded margins. The campus master plan determines what other areas merit long term protection, and conversely, how new facilities can be sited, oriented and configured to complement the natural landscape.

The campus master plan locates facilities projected to be needed over the next twenty years so that they can function efficiently with existing facilities. In some cases it locates compact groups of facilities within the landscape that are effectively interconnected. Parking is sited peripherally to these so that it is convenient yet unobtrusive. Long winters demand close proximity of buildings for easy and comfortable circulation between them. Parking will be peripherally located so that it does not lengthen trips between buildings. While buildings should be close to one another, they should be sufficiently spaced to take full advantage of winter daylight and views.

Major features of the natural landscape are important to the identity of UAA, and views of them that should be protected have been identified. Major features include the Chugach peaks, Goose Lake and its surrounding wetlands, Mosquito Lake, Chester Creek and associated woodlands. Views of these are valuable assets to be exploited by appropriate orientation of buildings and placement of windows.

Long term edges of campus development are identified in the master plan, and it is recommended that green buffers be conserved or planted to protect and separate facilities from future outside encroachments. The image of an urban university in a wild Alaskan landscape is compelling, but incomplete. By extending the natural landscape as a green buffer around the perimeter of development, the identity of the campus will be strengthened. In some places, plantings will literally extend the natural landscape; in others, more controlled, man-made landscaping will be appropriate.

Alumni Drive forms an edge to Mosquito Lake and its surrounding wetlands. Glimpses of the lake from nearby buildings enrich the sense of place that is unique to the University.
Many institutions have chosen peripheral locations for pragmatic reasons as availability of parking and flexible development sites. Some have subsequently regretted the lost opportunities that integration with undergraduate programs can bring. Among those lost opportunities are better student retention, due to engagement with research and with workplace-experienced peers, and access to special equipment. Other potential benefits include raised undergraduate instruction standards through exposure to post-graduate faculty and equipment; the availability of quality adjunct faculty drawn from advanced degree students and researchers; the ability of researchers to attract funding from sources not otherwise available to the University.

Prioritizing Facility Improvements
The Facilities Master Plan (opposite page) reflects a consensus on the facilities that are likely to be necessary to meet academic and student life needs over the next twenty years. There are many variables that could change the mix and priority of improvements. Notable among variables is a significant change in enrollment growth rates, and the unpredictability of project funding. That being so, it would be prudent for the University to be in a position to implement any of its high priority improvements whenever favorable circumstances might occur. It is recommended that the top priority projects be confirmed, and programming of space needs for each be undertaken immediately. Also, that site alternatives analyses for top priority facility improvement projects be conducted, and that ancillary improvement costs be identified. Advance site selection will provide important cost information on site related costs, such as replacement of displaced circulation, parking and other facilities.

Long Range Planning
Academic and Strategic Plans are periodically updated, and changes in them will direct updates in the campus facilities master plan. As the University grows and matures, programs will necessarily become broader in their reach; graduate and post-graduate programs can be expected to gain in importance. Keeping and retaining quality faculty sometimes requires a commitment to research, either within the University or in nearby public or private ventures. These changes should be anticipated, and some are already being addressed. The University should be very deliberate in its policy to encourage graduate schools and research facilities to develop in locations peripheral to the undergraduate core of the campus, or should purposely and carefully integrate them.

It may be decided that certain graduate programs and researchers belong within the campus proper, and that others properly belong elsewhere in the community. Clearly this decision will have a direct effect on the disposition of building sites and facilities over developed portions of the campus.

Until the nature of each program is known, a decision cannot be made, so it is recommended only that inclusion of such facilities be anticipated, and that efforts be made to understand their nature and imminence as each major decision on land use is made in implementation of the campus master plan.