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Purpose and Organization of Report

The Project Report was prepared for The University of Texas System Board of Regents through the Real Estate Office, Florence P. Mayne, Executive Director. It documents the work completed in the Analysis and Concept Plan Phases of the Conceptual Master Plan for Development of the Brackenridge Tract. It also organizes the materials gathered and developed by the design team to provide a reference tool for ongoing work, as well as to remain as a source of information and substantiation of the work in the longer term.

Chapters 1 through 10 of the report summarize the Analysis work in ten major categories, generally, in accordance with the major project scope items and the consultants’ specialties. It records what currently exists physically on the site and the physical and non-physical context in which it exists. This context influences and informs what can, and should, be done on the site, as well as how it may be achieved. It records opportunities and potential, as well as obstacles and constraints, and, finally, the principles and assumptions, based on the data and analysis, on which the conceptual plans are predicated.

Chapter 11 summarizes the work of the Concept Plan Phase. It includes alternatives considered in the development of the plans, documents the Final Concept Plans and Design Guidelines, and provides an evaluation of the Plans and recommendations for implementation.

The appendices include documents, or portions of documents, referred to in the report, and upon which the analysis is, at least in part, based. They also contain documents developed by the design team and summarized in the report, and other materials relevant to the project from which information was extracted for the analysis. They are, generally, more detailed than appropriate for the summary report and too large to include.

References are listed after the Appendices. These are documents that are referred to in the Project Report or have excerpts included in the Appendices and have relevance to the project. They are not included in this report, but are public documents readily available for review and reference.

Project Background

In 1910 Colonel George W. Brackenridge donated 503 acres for the benefit of The University of Texas. His original intent was that the land be used for a new main campus for The University of Texas at Austin. This did not come to pass and over nearly 100 years since the gift, the land has been used for a variety of university-related and non-university-related uses. Portions of the tract have been dedicated or conveyed for public and private uses, the proceeds from which have been used to benefit university education.

In 1989, The University of Texas System Board of Regents and the City of Austin entered into the Brackenridge Development Agreement which governs the use of portions of the property for non-university related uses.

In 2007, a Brackenridge Tract Task Force was created by the Regents and given the charge “to review and identify facts and issues that impact the land...to seek input and advice concerning the Board’s stewardship,...to make findings of fact related to the asset, to identify alternatives concerning long term uses of the tract, and to make recommendations concerning the best and most prudent ways to utilize the asset to the maximum benefit of The University of Texas at Austin.”

In 2008, The Board of Regents selected a team headed by Cooper, Robertson & Partners to provide at least two Conceptual Plans for Development of the Brackenridge Tract that will guide the near and long term use of the entire property.

Map of Brackenridge Donations to The University of Texas, by Frank F. Friend, surveyor of University lands, 1940 - Copyright® 1964, Walter E. Long
**Project Description**

The current size of the Brackenridge Tract is approximately 349 acres fronting on either side of Lake Austin Boulevard with frontage of approximately 156 acres on Lady Bird Lake. The site also includes a contiguous parcel owned by The University of Texas with an area of approximately one acre for a total site area of approximately 350 acres.

**Approach:**

Approximately the first half of the project schedule focused on understanding the site, an inventory and analysis of its physical characteristics, including environmental and traffic, as well as regulatory, financial, and market analyses. This first phase was also a period of intensive outreach for input from all interested individuals and groups. Plan and program assumptions, goals, and principles to guide future work have been established from these discussions and the analysis efforts prior to proceeding with the concept plans.

The remaining half of the project schedule included plan and design studies and the development of alternatives for the layout, uses, density, traffic, and utilities. These have been evaluated based on the established goals and principles, and selected alternatives, or combinations of elements from the alternatives, provided the basis for the final concept plans. Each of the final plans was developed in greater detail and documented. Visual and written materials illustrate the plans and describe their intent.

Issues relating to the existing U.T. Austin uses on the site were addressed by working directly with The University of Texas in joint analyses, the Collaborative Planning Studies of the Brackenridge Field Lab and Graduate Student Housing. The studies consider current and future needs, alternative configurations, necessity to be located on the site, alternative locations, costs, and implications for development of the Tract. Public input and involvement were critical to this process. Throughout the entire project, the team has sought input, kept the public apprised of the progress and findings, and was available to answer questions. There were several public sessions and numerous meetings with interested parties, including elected officials, site users, city and community groups, agency personnel, and The University of Texas faculty, staff, and administration. A variety of communication tools have been employed.

CRP has maintained a presence in Austin through frequent trips by principals and staff, working with the local team, becoming familiar with the site, city, and U.T. Austin, participating in meetings and outreach, communicating with designated individuals from The University of Texas, and remaining accessible and available.
Schedule / Status:
The work was divided into approximately two equal phases: Analysis and Concept Plans. The Analysis Phase of the project commenced May, 2008 and was completed in December, 2008. Collaborative planning efforts for the Brackenridge Field Lab and Graduate Student Housing, begun in the Analysis Phase, continued into the Concept Plan Phase. The Conceptual Plans were presented to the Board of Regents in June, 2009.

Team:
The design team is led by Cooper, Robertson & Partners. CRP’s master planning expertise is combined with the local knowledge and proficiency of the partnering firms to create a uniquely qualified team for this historic master planning project.

- **Master Planner and Team Leader:** Cooper, Robertson & Partners, LLP (CRP)
- **Landscape Architects and Environmental Consultant:** TEBG Partners (TBG)

The following project team of experienced and innovative firms has been assembled by Cooper, Robertson & Partners:
- **Traffic/Traffic Analyst:** PSI
- **Landscape Architects and Environmental Consultant:** TEBG Partners (TBG)
- **Infrastructure/Traffic Engineer II:** K Friese & Associates, Inc. (KFA)
- **Financial and Market Analyst:** ERA AECOM (ERA)

**Project Description**

**MAY 08**
- **Listening Session:** 06.25.08
- **Mapping Information Session:** 08.12.08
- **Analysis Weeklong Planning Workshop:** 03.08-11.08

**JUNE 08**
- **Analysis Completion:**
  - Conceptual Planning
  - Plan Update Session: 05.20.09
  - Plan Options: 06.18.09

**JULY 08**
- **Development Scenarios**
  - Design Studies
  - Plan Alternatives
  - Final Plan Options
  - Guidelines /Codes
  - Implementation Strategies
  - Public Involvement

**AUG. 08**
- **Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**SEPT. 08**
- **Listening, Learning and Analyzing**
  - Site and Context
  - University Needs And Opportunities
  - Market Opportunities
  - Traffic Considerations
  - Regulatory Overlay
  - Public Involvement

**OCT. 08**
- **Implementation Strategies**

**NOV. 08**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**DEC. 08**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**JAN. 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**FEB. 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**MAR. 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**APR. 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**MAY 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**JUNE 09**
- **Performance Testing, Planning and Implementing**

**Schedule**
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benchmark potential market-driven uses for the site. ERA’s project principal has both a graduate and an undergraduate degree from The University of Texas at Austin.

Capitol Market Research (CMR) is a sub-consultant to ERA and, as an Austin-based corporation, provides greater efficiency for ERA in completing their local research.

- **Cost Estimator:**
  **HS&A**
  HS&A is based in Austin and has provided services on many prominent Texas projects, including work for The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center. HS&A serves as cost estimator, providing estimates for the cost of implementing various plan options to be used in economic analyses.

- **Zoning and Public Policy Specialist:**
  **DuBois, Bryant & Campbell, LLP**
  DuBois, Bryant & Campbell provides zoning and public policy consulting services. The firm’s project principal has worked extensively with City of Austin land use regulations in his roles as a former City of Austin Planning Commissioner and is a member of numerous City task forces.

  **Clark, Thomas, and Winters**, also an Austin based firm, provides archival research assistance to DuBois, Bryant, & Campbell.

- **Stakeholder Input and Communications Consultant:**
  **Concept Development & Planning, LLC (CD&P)**
  CD&P offers expertise in communication skills with the ability to relate verbally and graphically the most complex issues in easily understood language. Based in Austin, Texas, it brings a comprehensive knowledge of the community, residents and issues. CD&P plans schedules, and conducts opportunities for stakeholder participation in the planning process.

  **Beverly Silas & Associates (BS&A)** is advising and working with CD&P on communications, outreach, and public input. Together, CD&P and BS&A bring more than 90 years of experience to the Brackenridge Tract master planning process.
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