In April of 1994 our University Architect Cab Childress asked me about the long-term future of our Park Hill campus. We were embarking on a very ambitious building program and I replied that it was only a distant hope that one day we would bring all of our core programs to the University Park Campus and therefore we needed to modestly improve the facilities of the former Colorado Women’s College. As music fills Trevorrow hall and the Law School’s clock tower begins to emerge from its construction scaffolding, we are witnessing the culmination of a dream begun 138 years ago.

The University is committed to the belief that the best learning is done together. The inspirational exchanges between jurists and saxophonists are fostered in buildings built to stand the tests of time. Life-long friendships are found on lawns where students can debate citizenship. Teamwork is embraced in facilities that press athletes to perform beyond their expectations. While we are committed to extending the benefit of our learning throughout the world, discovery is sometimes accidental. By bringing all of our students and faculty together on one campus we eagerly anticipate more such accidents.

For this campus to endure, we must cherish it. While we employ thoughtful design and engineering to craft buildings that will serve changing needs for centuries, we are certain that humor is as fundamental as brick and stone—tree and spire. The construction to date has crossed the great variety of programs we offer, improved the living and work environments for our students, faculty, and staff, and reinforced the University’s commitment to the wider community. While we are proud of the work that has been achieved, it compels us to search further for ways to enhance the varieties of learning environments on our campus.

In the last few years we have been encouraged by our neighbors to openly plan for the coming generations and this Land Use Plan affirms our commitment to do so. For the University of Denver to thrive, we must strive to have our neighbors enjoy this institution as much as our students, alumni, faculty and staff. As we look to the future no single project is certain, but each new project can be carefully shaped in light of the principles put forth in this document. While only a guide, it represents a far more considered answer than the one I gave Cab some eight years ago.

Daniel L. Ritchie
Chancellor
Remarks by the University Architect
(reprinted from 2002)

I first met Chancellor Daniel L. Ritchie in early 1992. Dan had asked Cabell Childress to design a "cabin" for his mountain ranch and Cab brought me along to Dan's office to begin the process of understanding what the project could be. Once we arrived and the pleasantries were exchanged, Cab asked Dan to "tell Mark the story of 3-1/2."

Dan looked “humored” and “pained” at the same time, sighed, and then launched into a tale. It seems that a few years previous Dan had been in the four corners area of our state and had met a potter. This fellow had pursued an understanding of Anasazi pottery to the point where not only was he one of the foremost authorities on the nuances of the designs, shapes, and patterns, but also how the glazes and clays were fired to achieve the kind of results found in the archeological digs. After a thorough conversation, Dan asked if he could commission the potter to do two pieces for his new "cabin". The potter replied that he would be delighted, and asked which "phase" would Dan prefer. There are three prime phases of design and the potter was well versed in all three. After a pause, Dan replied "3-1/2". The potter was a little surprised… Dan continued, "You are a foremost authority on the Anasazi, I really do not want a copy, but rather I am more interested in where you think the Anasazi would have taken their design had they continued to thrive."

The two pots are magnificent, respectful to the traditions that they sprang from, but tantalizing in how they reach to a new place in history.

A few months ago in the midst of the Land Use Plan presentations, it struck me that this story was a fine reflection on what we have worked for. One of Cab Childress's first comments to me as we stepped onto the Campus in 1994 was that we need to "fall in love" with each of the buildings and places on campus. The University has four major eras of buildings:

- The initial buildings of University Hall and Chamberlain Observatory by Rauschlaub in a Victorian Romanesque style during the 1880s under founder John Evans' eye.
- The reaffirmation of the University under Chancellor Buchtel with such buildings as the Memorial Chapel, Old Science Hall, the Alumni Gymnasium, and the Carnegie Library in a somewhat southwestern vernacular during the early 1900s.
- The Collegiate Gothic of the 1930s inspired by Charles Klauder's Margery Reed Hall followed by the "old row" fraternity houses along with Mary Reed Hall during Chancellor Hunter's tenure.
- The International style of the post war years under Chancellor Alter's vision with such buildings as Johnson & MacFarlane Halls, Benjamin Cherrington Hall, and Centennial Halls and Towers.

After slightly more than 100 years, the University can no longer afford to "re-image" itself. Much that is worth cherishing is already here. Both Dan and Cab initially walked the Campus and after some discussion, decided that for the most part reinforcing a red brick with white trim architectural fabric was the direction we would follow. A few "jewels" of stone could shine forth. Existing landmarks such as University Hall (our origin) and the Evans Chapel (our spiritual heart) set the standard. The Ritchie Center and the Newman Center welcome both our students and stand as a commitment of our citizenship to the city of Denver. However, as with "3-1/2", the new is neither a copy nor a "next" phase. We have tried to acknowledge the value of what is here along with pursuing a "timeless" design. We have embraced both the indoor and the outdoor environments. Some of the most successful moves include: "cranberry" paint, a consistent pedestrian light pole, the removal of the Penrose ramp that separated Old Science Green from Graduation Green, the use of towers for way finding, a "DU" chair in each building, and the pruning of the spruce trees in the Harpers Humanities Garden. As you read through the Land Use Plan, my assignment is that you embrace the principles given, and take the time to learn why this place has earned a commitment across so many generations.

There is another important lesson in the story of "3-1/2". Dan asked for two pots. A single interpretation is easily criticized. This is a campus, and as such, it encourages interaction, debate, and contrast. No single piece should be held as the prime example.

Mark Elliot Rodgers, AIA
University Architect
Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategies
(reprinted from 2002)
Pedestrian Strategies

The University of Denver should:
- Directly implement the A-frame walks/areas
- Increase pedestrian access to the movement of the pedestrian
- Increase pedestrian safety in the southern and northern portions of campus
- Implement walkways through plazas and parking areas
- In the future, pedestrian paths should be integrated into the campus network and building architecture
- Collaborate with the city of Denver to reduce traffic and improve the walking environment on Buchtel Blvd.

Pedestrian Barriers

- Buchtel Blvd: significant barrier to light rail transit
- Evans Avenue crossing... could be much better.

Campus Bicycling Environment

- The Campus is a perfect bicycle scale
- Entire area of campus is within a 10-min. ride.
The University of Denver should concentrate on improving the quality of the bicycle environment throughout the campus by constructing two primary north-south bicycle corridors, one High Street and one within the central portions of campus. Improvements on campus should include adequate width on pathways to safely accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists.

The University should also work with the City of Denver to traffic calm and improve the cycling environment on Buchtel Blvd., Asbury Avenue, Ill Ave., and Wesley Avenue.

**Bicycle Strategies**

**Campus Transit Environment**

10-minute Walk (10 min. @ 3 mph = 2.640A (.5 miles))

Campus site
- The Campus is not effectively served by light rail transit.
- Due to Interstate alignment, LRT station influence area is diminished.
- Buchtel Blvd. is a significant barrier to walking and bicycling access to station.
- An LRT shuttle would contribute to the success of the station and the viability of transit development near the University, as well as Washington Park.

**Transit Shuttle Alternatives Considered**
Transit Shuttle Alternative _ Not Considered

The Greenward Shuttle was determined to be an unacceptable option for three primary reasons:
1) It does not provide access to all the major edges of the campus core.
2) It is not consistent with the University’s goal of reducing campus car travel.
3) It is deemed an inappropriate alternative by several stakeholders.

Transit Shuttle Evaluation

Persons Served
The number of persons served for each alternative was estimated:
1) Campus buildings and parking facilities within 500 feet of the route.
2) Assumed building occupancy of 25 square feet per person (based on year 2002 estimates provided by the University).
3) Student housing, the population is based on the maximum number of beds available.
4) It is assumed that campus facilities are 70 percent occupied at their peak period.

Transit Shuttle Alternatives _ High Street

Operational Analysis for All Alternatives
- Route length, miles (one way): 1.35
- One-way travel time, minutes: 7.5
- Layover time, minutes: 2.5
- Total one-way travel time, minutes: 10
- Travel speed, mph: 10.8
- Headway, minutes: 10.0
- Buses needed: 2
- Daily no. hours operated: 41
- Arrival no. days operated: 215
- Operating expense per vehicle revenue hour: $65.38

Capital Costs
- Assumed two shuttles to maintain 10-minute headways.
- Assumed a 75% shuttle average cost of 160,000 (source: American Public Transit Association, APTA).

Operating Costs
- Annual operating cost: $31,872
- Annual capital cost: $39,000
- Total annual cost: $43,872
- Total daily cost: $2,000
Transit Shuttle Alternatives _ Evans Avenue

DAILY RIDERSHIP ESTIMATE
Persons Served: 4,173
Students living on-campus: 2,892
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 4,069
Students served off-campus: 3,297
46% of students get to campus daily: 1,916
Student residence (3% mode split: 2 trips daily): 166
Faculty & Staff served: 952
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 23
DAILY RIDERS: 214

Annual Costs: $403,947
Annual capital cost: $38,000.00
TOTAL ANNUAL COST: $441,947.00
Total daily cost: $2,082.55

Transit Shuttle Alternatives _ Evans Avenue

DAILY RIDERSHIP ESTIMATE
Persons Served: 3,420
Students living on-campus: 2,892
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 4,069
Students served off-campus: 3,297
46% of students get to campus daily: 1,916
Student residence (3% mode split: 2 trips daily): 166
Faculty & Staff served: 952
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 23
DAILY RIDERS: 227

Annual Costs: $401,847
Annual capital cost: $39,000.00
TOTAL ANNUAL COST: $440,847.00
Total daily cost: $2,052.55

Transit Shuttle Alternatives _ Buchtel Boulevard

DAILY RIDERSHIP ESTIMATE
Persons Served: 3,698
Students living on-campus: 2,892
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 4,069
Students served off-campus: 3,297
46% of students get to campus daily: 1,916
Student residence (3% mode split: 2 trips daily): 166
Faculty & Staff served: 952
Staff residence (2.5% mode split: 2 trips daily): 23
DAILY RIDERS: 214

Annual Costs: $403,947
Annual capital cost: $38,000.00
TOTAL ANNUAL COST: $441,947.00
Total daily cost: $2,082.55

Transit Shuttle Alternatives _ Analysis

High Street Shuttle

CST: Capital Cost: $320,000 (22-27 Shuttles)
Ext: Annual Operating Cost: $450,847
No: Persons Served: 3,162
Estimated Ridership: 169
Cost per Potential Rider: $2,109

Evans Avenue Shuttle

CST: Capital Cost: $320,000 (22-27 Shuttles)
Ext: Annual Operating Cost: $450,847
No: Persons Served: 3,162
Estimated Ridership: 169
Cost per Potential Rider: $2,109

Buchtel Blvd. Shuttle

CST: Capital Cost: $320,000 (22-27 Shuttles)
Ext: Annual Operating Cost: $450,847
No: Persons Served: 3,162
Estimated Ridership: 169
Cost per Potential Rider: $2,109

Transit Shuttle Strategies

The University of Denver should not concentrate on creating a exclusive campus shuttle because:
- Costs of an exclusive shuttle outweigh the benefits;
- Campus is suited for pedestrian and bicycle mobility;
- Adequate parking supply will exist in the near-term;
- Size of campus limits viability;

The Regional Transit District, the University, and the City of Denver would benefit from a partnership in creating a small area transit shuttle as part of the light rail system. This shuttle should be designed to serve the campus (using the Evans Shuttle route) as need to be expanded to well as serve the Washington Park neighborhood.
Numerous physical improvements are needed to improve the walking and bicycling environment on campus (as well as adjacent streets and neighborhoods). These improvements should focus on physically elevating the status of the public realm and making the AlGreenwardA vision a reality.

In order to improve the quality of the walk and the quality of the bicycle ride, campus and city planners need to concentrate on the details, such as curb radius, pedestrian crossings, traffic calming, pathway dimensions, and campus orientation. Like the campus core the AlGreenwardA vision will greatly aid to campus walkability.

Finally, the University and the City of Denver should focus effort on overcoming the immediate barriers to walking and cycling around the campus. The next several graphics illustrate barriers and possible solutions.
On-street parking and high traffic volumes discourage pedestrians and cyclists.

Pedestrian crossing not visible.

Create raised textured cross-walks.

Narrow vehicular lanes, eliminate on-street parking.

Plant street.

Create visitor parking drop-off area or bus pulloff.

A pedestrian crossing is needed to access campus from LRT station.

Rural design features (open swale, no curbing, high speeds) of Buchtel Blvd separate campus from future LRT.
Additional Traffic calming along High Street

The Campus at I-25 Avenue

The Campus at I-25 Avenue

The Campus at I-25 Avenue

Raised textured intersection w/ roundabout

Raised textured intersection w/ roundabout

Poor visibility, high traffic volumes, high traffic speeds create an unsafe environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

Extend sidewalk and pedestrian areas into the street.

Traffic calm the roadway by narrowing travel lanes, adding texture to the roadway, providing street trees, and eliminating on-street parking in

Raise pedestrian crossing and curb height, slowing cars, improving walking and cycling environment.
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