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INTRODUCTION
Kennesaw State University is a dynamic growing comprehensive university in Cobb County, located just outside the perimeter of Atlanta, Georgia. Rapid change has defined the university’s history, and this is exemplified by its recent consolidation with Southern Polytechnic State University. Post-merger, the university now has two campuses: its southern Marietta campus and its northern Kennesaw campus.

The pressures of growth and consolidation have created a complex planning environment in which resolving near-term exigencies has required significant time and attention. The university literally has not had the time or bandwidth to wrestle with important questions concerning its identity or to create a strategic framework to support decision making – until now.

While memories of the university’s commuter college origins are still relatively fresh, the university now strives to articulate its evolving character. This character is defined by two key ingredients. The first is size: by any measure the university is large. In fact, it is one of the fifty largest place-based institutions in the United States. The other is its mission, which combines excellence in teaching and learning with a growing research profile. These ingredients make for a unique and complex institution, one that cannot function without relatively sophisticated systems to support it. These systems have three primary purposes: to support the student experience, to forge connections within and between campuses, and to guide decisions on the optimal location of programs across KSU’s geography. They have academic, student life, and facilities implications.

A significant benefit of consolidation is that KSU can provide its students with access to multiple experiences. The predominant character of the Marietta campus is defined by a nurturing intimacy. This character is beloved by faculty, staff, and students. The master plan therefore devotes itself to the enhancement of this character. The big idea is to clearly define the campus’ heart – student surveys revealed just how ambiguous this heart is today – and to focus on regeneration of the campus core. Transportation systems are clarified so that refinements to the loop road clearly define the campus core and provide better access to it, while also minimizing bicycle-vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Student life amenities, particularly recreation, are significantly improved, and repositioned to better support the campus’ residential population. Academic program adjacencies are optimized with a focus on increasing opportunities for collaboration while also maximizing the use of existing space in accordance with Board of Regents directives. Perhaps most excitingly, the
plan identifies a mixed-use partnership and innovation zone where university, industry, developers and other partners could come together to take advantage of the campus’ science and engineering focus, creating opportunities for student internships, offering more diversity in retail and residential options, all while increasing available resources for reinvestment in the campus core. Detailed analysis of parking demands and strategic planning for parking is essential for assuring good functionality of all future KSU projects (especially for Student Housing and partnership zones). The reduction of parking demand and efforts to fully utilize existing facilities should be the first priority. If those efforts are insufficient, KSU should consider acquisitions or construction of additional parking to accommodate growth and development.

The key idea for the Kennesaw campus is to focus academic activity in the core of campus and avoid dispersing this activity across a wide geography. Historically, the university has felt constrained by its core geography. The plan convincingly refutes this argument, and shows significant growth potential within the campus core. Kennesaw’s strong existing open space framework is enhanced and expanded, with the wonderful north-south spine acting as the principal organizing idea. Existing residential districts should be enhanced, with their capacity expanded (while the idea of an increased residential population must be treated sensitively in the context of the university system’s on-going P3 initiative, we believe KSU’s size and mission profile require further exploration of this question). Athletics functions should be consolidated in and around the Sports Park, and more student recreation facilities should be provided closer to residential populations. The plan focuses campus development west of I-75, along the natural ridgeline defined by the campus’ historic spine. Transportation and parking systems are also critical to the university’s long-term success, and the plan details how these systems should continue to mature, primarily by emphasizing the importance of new pricing models, and the better utilization of more remote areas of the university’s parking supply.

This is an exciting time for Kennesaw State University. The master plan describes a bold path for the university’s continued development and principles, priorities, and ideas to support on-going decision making, including recommendations on the plan’s governance, and broader connections to university planning. It is a celebration of all that makes KSU unique and positions the university for future success by linking its physical plant directly to its mission.
INTRODUCTION: UPCOMING MAJOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
INTRODUCTION: UPCOMING MAJOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

- Student Center Renovation
- Johnson Library Renovation
- Crawford Lab (E) Renovation
- Proposed Material Science & Engineering Building
- Engineering Lab (G) Renovation & Science Lab Addition
- Atrium (J) Renovation
- W. Clair Harris Textile Center (M) Renovation
- Administration Building (B) Renovation
- Norton Hall (R2) Renovation
- Howell Hall Renovation for Intensive English Program
- Proposed Construction Management Building
- Recreation Center Addition & Renovation
Kennesaw State University is the 45th largest place-based university in the country by enrollment. At the same time, the institution has a specific mission profile as a comprehensive public university in Georgia. This combination is unusual in the United States, particularly when Kennesaw’s two campuses are factored into the mix. The master plan investigates the integrated systems necessary to sustain an institution with these characteristics.

Size, by itself, has consequences. Compared to the largest 50 institutions, Kennesaw State has a relatively low percentage of students living on-campus, a low core-campus density (in part, because of significant surface parking), and a small percentage of graduate students (although it must be noted that the vast majority of the other large institutions are more research intensive). Rapid change has defined Kennesaw’s existence over the last twenty years, and these factors speak to KSU’s continuously evolving identity – it is clearly no longer a commuter college! – and have day-to-day implications. A larger on-campus residential population, for example, could potentially impact student success and RPG metrics while also reducing traffic and parking pressures.

The master planning process kicked off in September 2015, the first school year for the newly consolidated institution. While the intention of consolidation was to allow students to complete their studies on one campus or the other, many students are already taking advantage of both, taking courses at both locations and online, and embracing student life opportunities in both Kennesaw and Marietta.

At the same time, each campus has a unique character. The master plan therefore seeks to capitalize on the strengths and personalities of the individual campuses. At Marietta, where students and faculty value the intimate family-like atmosphere, the plan embraces a nurturing cozy experience and emphasizes the revitalization of historic assets. At Kennesaw, where rapid enrollment growth and space pressures have led to land acquisition and diffusion, the plan emphasizes the strategic importance of the academic core, reorganizing functions to create clear land-use zones, maximize core density and building opportunity sites, and build upon the already strong organizing framework of the historic heart of campus.
We analyzed student course enrollment by campus to explore how students were choosing to experience Kennesaw’s multiple geographies. Students relationships to each campus were determined using network-analytic tools based on the number of courses taken on each campus. The big green circle represents the Kennesaw campus, the big yellow circle represents the Marietta campus. Each ray in the diagram represents an individual student. The rays are colored by the students “home” campus with its length and direction determined by the students measured affinity for the two campuses. Rays that terminate near to a particular campus’ circle represent students who take all or most of their courses at that campus. The “dust ring” that surrounds the picture represent students who only take courses online. Although only one semester’s worth of data was available, the picture clearly demonstrates students’ willingness to travel between the campuses, and provides a beautiful illustration of the campuses “reaching out to one another”.

CONCURRENT STUDIES

The university has several ongoing planning processes that informed the master plan and can provide additional depth in certain areas. These include the strategic plan, the IT department’s infrastructure technology plan, CFP’s space analysis, and Croy’s traffic studies. The strategic and infrastructure plans are ongoing, and the space and traffic studies can be found in the appendix.

KSU ONGOING CAMPUS PLANNING

Recommended Next Steps

This campus master plan was written to allow for some flexibility as concepts are developed for each project. Next steps for more detailed planning should include, but are not limited to:

- Implement a space planning work group to continue planning process and track most important growth and utilization data.
- Develop detailed migration plans for both campuses. In Kennesaw, the focus should be on accommodating growth and also planning for projects and moves that will be needed after the new Academic Learning Center is occupied. Planning will also be important for College of the Arts expansion in Chastain Pointe, and also Athletics expansion and consolidation at the KSU Sports Park and former BrandsMart. In Marietta, the focus should be on accommodating growth and also planning projects and moves to consolidate academic units from the same colleges in closer proximity to provide more functional adjacencies.
INTRODUCTION: PLANNING CONTEXT

Kennesaw Campus
Marietta Campus
• Create a conceptual plan for a multi-phase buildout of the former BrandsMart building to accommodate KSU Receiving and Distribution, Athletics, and the marching band. Inclusion of an expansion for Public Safety should also be considered if that is feasible.

• Begin preliminary programming and financial planning for a new Public Safety building. This should be completed in conjunction with ongoing campus safety strategic planning. A possible location for the new Public Safety building is shown in this Master Plan near the 3391 Town Pointe Drive building. It is also possible that sufficient space could be created in the overall plan for the former BrandsMart building. Other options for this important facility should be evaluated.

• Do a detailed program for Recreation improvements on the Marietta Campus and determine phasing and funding plans for existing gym renovation (possibly state funded) and future additions (Recreation funded), as well as exterior field improvements such as ropes course, multi-use trail, converting baseball fields into multi-use fields, etc…

• Once a final determination is made, if Recreation facilities can all be accomplished at the existing gymnasium site, the short and long term options for the existing Recreation Facility should be determined. All recreation sites should be evaluated for planning purposes. While it is possible to maintain the existing Recreation facility, renovation and expansion of the existing gym is highly preferred to consolidate recreation activities in one location.

• Complete preliminary programming, planning, and market studies for future phases of campus housing. Consider plans that could allow a freshman live-on requirement.

• Create a detailed plan to assure significant campus parking and increase utilization and inventory of perimeter lots as needed.

• Complete preliminary programming for a future Material Science and Engineering building. This is anticipated to be KSU’s next large capital request that is added to the current list for possible design funding as early as FY22.

• Determine other departments that could relocate to Marietta.

• Strengthen connection between Marietta and Kennesaw through use of technology and virtual communications.

• Consider strategic land acquisitions to accommodate future growth and expansion.

• Develop a funding plan and strategy to accommodate growth and new programs for both graduate enrollment and research.

• Continue to improve partnership and planning between Kennesaw State University and Georgia Highlands College. USG should consider a renovation of the Rose Drive property to allow GHC to expand in Marietta. USG should also consider a renovation of the Wynn building to allow KSU to expand at the Paulding Instructional site.

• Analyze quantity and goals for all KSU Campus Events. Consider a more centralized management process and possibly a future Conference Center, if feasible.
• Continue to seek local partnerships and economic development opportunities such as the business incubator project, Ignite HQ.

• Consider further planning that would enable Culinary to consolidate from its current seven locations down to two, with an emphasis on Kids are Kids and the Academic Learning Center locations.

SUSTAINABILITY

This plan fosters integrated and sustainable systems. For example, an increased residential population will decrease daily student commuting; a compact academic core with peripheral parking will improve existing campus landscapes and promote a pedestrian-friendly environment. Investments that improve energy efficiency, in new-build project and retrofits, will decrease operating costs associated with energy.

The plan preserves natural assets, such as forest areas and water systems. We find abundant potential development sites on both campuses that do not encroach upon forests within the campus core. Stream corridors, especially the Rockwood Creek corridor, have great regional potential as pedestrian and bike corridors, separated from vehicular traffic. Shaded areas, such as the sycamore grove in Marietta’s main quad have great aesthetic value and should continue to be maintained and reinforced.

A pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment is crucial for a vibrant and navigable campus. The university should continue to plant canopy trees that add shade, especially along main pedestrian corridors. The university should also continue working with the city to advance bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in areas surrounding the campus. The Skip Span Bridge sets a great precedent for future improvements that consider multiple transportation modes.

The university is pursuing WaterHub implementation to reduce consumption of potable water for landscape maintenance and other uses. This innovative system has the potential to reduce water costs and serve as a living lab for science courses.

Finally, one of the most important sustainability measures the university can take is to reduce the growth of its physical footprint. The university’s rapid growth has put pressure on existing space and has forced it to think differently about efficient space use. To maximize office efficiency, the university should continue to incentivize office sharing, teleconferencing, and telework programs. A stronger central scheduling mechanism may become essential if the university continues to feel pressure in its instructional spaces. Strong policies and innovative design can make KSU a leader in sustainability through space efficiency, without compromising a high-quality learning and working environment.
MARIETTA CAMPUS
New Building Construction
Existing Building Renovation
Partnership Potential
MARIETTA CAMPUS

PRIORITIES

• Concentrate investment in the historic core
• Simplify landscapes and clarify the arrival experience
• Engage students to assess student life and recreation investment priorities
• Promote safety through lighting upgrades and ring road realignment
• Preserve natural assets, especially forest areas and Rottenwood Creek
• Promote research and student co-ops, with potential housing and retail diversity, with partnership zone on northeast landholdings
LANDSCAPE & CIRCULATION FRAMEWORK

Marietta’s core has a strong landscape structure, so improvements to the arrival sequence and the recreation of the historic, simplified, unified open space aesthetic can make the campus remarkable.

Topography and hydrology systems define the campus and its outlying areas. The highest land is near the historic core, and drainage flows south and southwest into Rottenwood Creek, stream system that extends north to the Kennesaw Campus. Planning for bike and pedestrian trails along Rottenwood Creek makes this a valuable transportation route, potentially extending continuously to the Kennesaw Campus 10 miles to the north.

Currently, the first impression at Marietta campus is a confusing network of small parking lots near the main northern entrance, giving visitors no strong sense of place or orientation. The plan addresses this through realignment of the northeastern portion of the loop road. This change returns the road to its original configuration, bringing visitors directly to the globe, with a glimpse into the historic quad. For the most part, vehicular circulation via the loop road works well, keeping traffic and parking out of the central pedestrian core and reducing multimodal conflicts. We propose to enhance this function by relocating the loop road to the periphery of the Machinist Union. This addresses unsafe, low-visibility crossings for students parking in the Machinist Union lot and crossing the road into the main campus. We also propose a rerouting of the loop road to clearly define the northeast partnership and innovation zone. The resulting vehicular network will better orient visitors to campus, provide clear parking locations, and minimize pedestrian conflicts.

The plan identifies four primary landscapes within the campus core: the woods between Building N and Howell Hall, the lawn between Norton and Howell Halls, the former building K site, and the historic landscape from the globe to Building G. The woods provide a natural oasis within the campus and should be preserved. Framed by buildings and located along major pedestrian corridors, each of these remaining open spaces has iconic potential. Recommendations vary for each space, but the overall idea simplifies the landscape in order to make it unifying and usable. Howell Lawn, already used for spontaneous student frisbee games, should remain open for informal recreation. Proposed improvements include regrading the amphitheater, leveling the lawn, and improving drainage throughout the site. A lawn on the current Building K site will provide an outdoor focal point for the surrounding mixed-use district, including residential and dining venues. The edges of this space should include ample plazas with seating that can support outdoor dining and studying. The lawn provides recreation space for Hornet’s Village residential as well. The variety of surrounding uses will activate the space.

The idea for the historic quad simplifies the landscape to strengthen the primary landscape features and unite what now functions as separate spaces. Just as the Building D renovation stripped away additions to reveal the strong design of the original building, the landscape contains additions and barriers that detract from the power of the original unifying space. Currently the globe plaza, sycamore grove, and the lawn feel like separate spaces, in part because of the shrubs, planters, and abrupt grade changes that halt navigation and limit visibility. The ground plane should unify, first with a plaza that extends under the canopy, and then a lawn that merges with the sycamore grove through an accessibly-graded slope.
INVEST IN THE CORE

PROPOSED ROTTENWOOD CREEK TRAIL

New Building Construction
Existing Building Renovation
LAND USE FRAMEWORK

Marietta’s loop road fits within a 10-minute walk circle, creating an intimate and navigable campus. The campus should continue to cluster academic buildings within the core of campus. Residential districts function well. While additional beds are not currently contemplated, if they are needed at a later date, they should reinforce the existing residential districts next to the academic core. Recreation facilities should maximize residential adjacencies wherever possible, hence the plan’s suggestion to renovate the old gymnasium as the new student recreation facility. The university’s landholdings west of Rottenwood Creek are outside the 10-minute circle, and topographic challenges separate this area from the core, suggesting against substantial development. Athletic and recreation uses, including access to the developing Rottenwood Creek trail system, are ideal for this district. The university should continue to monitor demand for residential in the Columns. These houses will always feel isolated from campus life and complicate transportation needs. It may be appropriate to decommission these beds in the future.
CAMPUS CORE INVESTMENT

LEGEND
1. Revised Loop Road & Entry Drive
2. Connect Lawn to Entry Drive, Organize Student Center Plaza
3. Student Center Renovation
4. Administration Building Renovation
5. Historic Quad Renovation
6. Library Renovation
7. Building G Priority Renovation & Lab Addition
8. Building E Renovation
9. Norton Hall Renovation
10. Regrading at Terrace to New Open Space
11. Green Space Improvements
12. Howell Hall Renovation
13. Building J Addition
14. Green Space Improvements
15. Building H Renovation
16. Future Materials Sciences Site

New Building Construction
Existing Building Renovation
ACADEMIC

Proposed building projects revitalize the campus core through historically respectful renovations. The recent Building D project provides the perfect template for renewal—it celebrates and restores the historic character, modernizes building systems, and improves the formal and informal learning environments. This focus on renovation demonstrates a commitment to preserve the assets documented in the campus’s historic plan and to maximize the usability of current space.

Space analysis shows that the Marietta campus has adequate square footage to accommodate its current and anticipated population; however, the distribution and uses of those spaces do not maximize efficiency. For example, Marietta has excess classroom space but a shortage of offices. The planning process included conversation with Marietta deans, in which an optimal program distribution was defined. The College of Science and Math should concentrate in the northwestern portion of the quad, with strong proximity to the Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, which reaches from Building Q east into Buildings I and H. In the future, these two colleges may share a materials science building, described below. The College of Computing and Software Engineering will expand its presence in Building J. The College of Architecture and Construction Management will consolidate in Buildings M and N through a phased relocation.

Near-term projects demonstrate the university’s commitment to campus preservation and renewal, through realistic small-cap projects and logical sequencing. Targeted new build projects either provide essential labs in a cost-effective way, or maximizes the potential for donor dollars in a way that advances the goal of asset preservation.
RELOCATE EXISTING STUDENT REC CENTER PROGRAM TO GYMNASIUM

RENOVATION & ADDITION TO GYMNASIUM TO BECOME NEW REC CENTER WITH REC FIELDS

New Building Construction
Existing Building Renovation
RECREATION

Marietta currently has two facilities that serve athletic and recreation purposes, but should only invest in improvements in one, to make efficient use of capital dollars. The Recreation Center has significant building envelop issues and is not located centrally with respect to on-campus residential districts. We propose renovation and expansion of the Alumni Gym to serve recreation needs. A small addition to the front of the building can strengthen the connection to the loop road, improve internal circulation, and expand capacity for weights, cardio equipment, and group fitness rooms. The tennis courts provide an opportunity site for future expansion, and the building’s adjacencies to outdoor recreation (currently the baseball field), the Rottenwood Creek Trail system, and a potential ropes course in the woods provide diverse outdoor fitness options. The baseball field should be converted into multi-use fields.

A detailed program for the renovation requires further study and student engagement to determine which amenities are most valued at Marietta. The campus has the opportunity to develop a unique recreation and fitness niche that complements the new recreation center at Kennesaw. Additional work should weigh the relative importance of E-Sports, competition spaces, swimming, and other options. The university should also continue to advance a scheduling and management system to maximize field use between recreation, club sports, and athletics on both campuses.
PARTNERSHIP POTENTIAL

Relocating recreation unlocks exciting potential for the northeast parcel. This key corner has maximum land value, and may appeal to a variety of private partners. These include private industry partners that may offer student internships or enhance tech transfer relationships with faculty, or developers that can diversify near-campus housing and retail options. Land leases on this parcel can monetize additional improvements to the campus core. The Highway 41 corridor along the campus boundary consists of over 20 parcel owners, making a university-controlled acquisition strategy time and cost prohibitive. If the university spurs high-quality development on its land, the improved value will likely create ripple effects along Highway 41, encouraging private partners to upgrade development in ways that serve university interest and align with Marietta’s city planning.
1. Revised Loop Road & Entry Drive
2. Student Center Renovation & Addition
3. Administration Building Renovation
4. Historic Quad Renovation
5. Library Renovation
6. Building G Priority Renovation & Lab Addition
7. Building E Priority Renovation
8. Building H Renovation
9. Norton Hall Renovation
10. Green Space Improvements
11. Howell Hall Renovation
12. Building J Addition
13. Future Materials Science & Engineering Site
14. Building M Renovation & Addition for Architecture and Construction Management (Privately Funded)
15. Recreation Renovation and Potential Addition
16. Rec Field Conversions and Upgrades
17. Potential Partnership Opportunities
18. WaterHub
POTENTIAL FUTURE PROJECTS

Five-Year Capital Request
Building G Addition—KSU needs to reinvest in Marietta’s wet labs to support science programs on this campus. Because it is more cost effective to build new science labs and downcycle other facilities, we propose relocating four high-intensity biology and chemistry labs, currently in Building E, to an efficient Building G addition. The quad location will put science on display, celebrating Marietta’s academic strength.

Building E Renovation—The university should next renovate Building E and transition it to general academic use (potentially including dry labs for physics). Buildings go through a natural downcycling process, starting as high-intensity labs and then transitioning into lower intensity uses such as classrooms and offices. Building E would require major mechanical upgrades to support intense science, and its low floor-to-floor heights and small structural grid decrease the cost effectiveness of such improvements. A renovated building E will have a character very similar to Building D. When designing this project, the university should consider including open office areas to serve adjuncts and professors that teach on both campuses. This will maximize current utilization and future flexibility, especially if the university sees an increase in the demand for collaborative faculty space.

Building G Renovation—Building G should be renovated for engineering (its current occupants). This project will require thoughtful phasing that minimizes disruption to current research labs within the building. For the G Building Lab Addition, it is understood that $5 million is a modest budget. Other locations for the addition should be evaluated, if needed, even though the proposed location is preferred.

Given the emphasis on reinvestment in the historic core, the optimal solution is to bundle several renovation projects (potentially with the science addition) into a single major capital project. This will allow for synergistic planning and move sequencing, and will maximize impact on the university’s STEM campus.

Near-Term Privately Funded Projects
The Construction Management department has begun a fundraising process for a building addition. Building M is an ideal location: it promotes collaboration with architecture in Building N and provides phased expansion through building M renovations when the department grows. The addition can reach toward the loop road, giving the building a stronger street presence and access to a shuttle stop.

Major Project Capital Request
Material Science and Engineering Building—Kennesaw State continues to experience strong growth in its physical science and engineering programs, and anticipates the Marietta campus will be the long-term home for these programs. The plan therefore reserves a large-scale footprint for a potential interdisciplinary material sciences building. This building is located north of Building Q, and will be a joint effort of the College of Science and Mathematics and the Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology (SPCEET). It would support the continuous and sustained growth on the Marietta campus, especially in SPCEET and will also allow adequate space for various science activities and research initiatives.

Future Capacity
The key planning idea for the Marietta campus is to enhance its intimate character by renovating and reestablishing the historic campus heart. This approach allows the university to maximize a diversity of experiences for its students, and to nurture the long-standing traditions of the Marietta campus. While this idea set a clear direction for the near-term, the plan must also promote long-term optionality. For this reason, we have identified long-term building sites that could be used at a later date if Marietta enrollment were to increase significantly or program needs were to change. The identification of these sites is critical, because they ensure alignment with infrastructure corridors, and other long-term planning opportunities.
KENNESAW CAMPUS
KENNESAW CAMPUS

PRIORITIES

• Prioritize academic functions within a 10-minute walk circle

• Concentrate development potential west of I-75

• Reinforce existing pedestrian corridors through infill, especially the north-south spine

• Distribute student life functions (including future recreation fields) along the north-south spine to serve potential future residential south of Chastain Road

• Use pricing incentives to better utilize remote parking and prioritize shuttles that serve these lots

• Concentrate athletic functions east of I-75 to free land within the 10-minute walk circle

• Maximize long-term parcel potential (especially for BrandsMart site) by creating a rational street-and-block network

• Preserve natural assets, such as forest areas and water systems
The Kennesaw campus has a strong circulation structure, with a primary north-south spine along
the natural ridgeline and clear east-west connectors that create an organized block system that
organizes circulation and potential future development. The campus’s major landscapes—the
oval and historic green—have central locations along the north-south spine, creating a clear heart
for the campus. The plan proposes extending that structure along key pedestrian connections: the
new Skip-Span Connector across I-75, and an extension of the north-south spine across Chastain
Road. This spine follows the ridgeline of the campus, and the southern extension of this corridor
is key to future growth potential. Redevelopment on the BrandsMart site should establish a street-
and-block network to maximize developable parcels and create a clear circulation system. The
Sports and Entertainment Park plan focuses on the game day experience, proposing the creation
of a grand promenade that provides an address for multiple venues and becomes home to a
vibrant and active zone. The plan includes a strategy for consolidated peripheral parking for a
variety of venues.

Because the roads surrounding the campus are heavily trafficked and unfriendly to pedestrians
and cyclists, the natural systems which surround the campus can provide an alternate network.
The university should support continued development of the Rottenwood Creek Trail network and
its potential connections to other university landholdings, and to the greater bike and pedestrian
paths in the county and beyond. The university will also continue working with Cobb County to
promote implementation of its current complete street policy on roads in the campus vicinity.
The university should organize and strategically distribute functions in order to promote efficiency and flexibility. Because of its rapid growth, the Kennesaw campus has had to respond opportunistically to land and facility acquisitions, without necessarily first establishing an overall “big picture”. The plan reorganizes these functions in order to clarify future development patterns.

Kennesaw should consolidate academic activities, especially undergraduate instruction, within the core campus, in order to promote collaboration and allow students to efficiently schedule classes without having to get in their cars. Our infill studies detail capacity for over 1.4 million additional square feet of development within the academic core (assuming only four-story heights), without compromising (in fact, enhancing) major open spaces.

Existing residential zones are located at the northern and southern edges of the academic core. This is a good pattern. Redevelopment should increase density on these parcels, especially in the north. In the southern area of campus, residential should eventually cross south of Chastain to preserve long-term academic expansion potential within the core.

Student life amenities, especially dining, should be distributed along the north-south spine to serve both residential and academic populations. Student life amenities, such as the dining hall, student center, and recreation center, currently frame the Oval with a strong presence on the spine. Future amenities, such as the next dining hall, should extend this pattern. The next dining hall, for example, should be located southeast of the science building in order to maximize the availability of these services. Future buildings and renovation projects should continue to incorporate lounge and study space, especially in ground floor space along major pedestrian corridors, to activate the corridor, and provide needed opportunities for informal collaboration. Athletics and operational support services are most appropriate for parcels east of the highway.
ACADEMIC

The academic core has ample infill potential. Capital, not land, is the major limit on potential growth. Current core density, calculated using the ratio of total building space to total land area, or floor-area ratio (FAR), is 0.43. This number is significantly lower than other campuses with large student enrollments (although we do note that many of these institutions have a research mission that drives additional square footage). Kennesaw should target core densities of 0.8 to 1.0. The vast majority of Kennesaw’s land bank currently serves as surface parking lots, a remnant of KSU’s commuter college origins. Adding buildings on these sites will strengthen the vitality of the academic core, improve the civic realm, and provide ample capacity for growth. This development will, of course, be paired with a transportation and parking strategy, as described below.

The Academic Learning Center is the next major academic project, now in the design phase. Additional near-term academic projects either need alternate funding sources or a phased approach. For example, the College of Science and Mathematics is building out shelled floors of the Science Building, and the graduate school has potential to use research indirects to fund facility acquisition or reuse. The plan does not anticipate significant program redistribution, with the exception of additional College of the Arts space at Chastain Point (where dance is currently located). The idea for Arts redistribution is to design a sequence of (approximately) $2 million Chastain Point renovations, especially for arts maker spaces. The master plan explored preliminary capacities and adjacencies, but the university will require an Arts Master Plan to ensure optimal program needs are established, and to finalize reuse strategies for vacated facilities. This plan could also benefit philanthropy efforts.
ATHLETICS & RECREATION

Consolidate Athletics

Athletics does not necessarily require adjacencies to other campus uses; recreation, in contrast, benefits from close proximity to student residential populations. Athletics facilities today are widely distributed, creating logistics challenges for student athletes. A football player, for example, has to juggle weight training at Chastain Point, practice at the Perch, tutoring at the Student-Athlete Success Center on Chastain Road, plus classes. Coaches’ offices are in a separate building on Barrett Lakes Blvd. Additional athletic sites include the Convocation Center, Tennis Courts, and Bailey Park, all within the campus core. The primary idea is to consolidate athletics functions east of I-75 and to increase academic, residential, and recreation space in the campus core. Kennesaw has a great track record of collaboration between athletics and recreation, and the idea here in no way proposes exclusive zones, but rather suggests a framework for simplification and convenience.

Bailey Park currently occupies a key gateway parcel, adjacent to residence halls and recreation, and proximate to the academic core. The master plan relocates baseball and softball east of I-75 to free up the critical gateway parcel next to the academic heart. The baseball field needs significant investment, making relocation feasible. The Owl’s Nest offers an optimal site because it creates a consolidated athletic district that can share amenities with other sports and provides a cohesive game-day experience for fans, without interfering with logistic considerations for large Sports and Entertainment Park events held at the stadium.

The plan organizes the Sports and Entertainment Park through a pedestrian concourse that gives each venue a distinct address.

BrandsMart can continue to function as a mixed-use facility, and can incorporate weight training and coaches’ offices, bringing these functions closer to the Sports and Entertainment Park.
REC FIELDS & CLUB SPORTS FACILITY NEAR REC CENTER & STUDENT HOUSING

ADDITIONAL REC FIELDS

3 NEW CLUB / REC FIELDS

RELOCATE OWL'S NEST PROGRAM TO CAMPUS CORE

RELOCATE OWL'S NEST PROGRAM TO CAMPUS CORE

NEW BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING BUILDING RENOVATION
Recreation to the Core
The current Bailey Park parcel can then be converted for recreation and club sport use, accommodating up to four fields. If the site is developed for academic or residential use in the future, it can still include two fields. However, the university will need to develop replacement fields south of Chastain Road to continue fulfilling recreation and club sport needs.
ATHLETICS AND RECREATION: LONG TERM BUILDOUT

1. New Baseball Stadium
2. New Softball Stadium
3. New Baseball / Softball Complex
4. Athletics District Promenade
5. Expanded Football Stadium
6. New Soccer / Lacrosse Competition Field
7. Expanded Parking
8. Club Sports Building
9. Football Complex / Rec
10. BrandsMart Shared Use Renovation

LEGEND
1. New Baseball Stadium
2. New Softball Stadium
3. New Baseball / Softball Complex
4. Athletics District Promenade
5. Expanded Football Stadium
6. New Soccer / Lacrosse Competition Field
7. New Track Stadium Seating
8. Future Potential Building Site
9. New Football Complex / Rec
10. Expanded Parking
11. BrandsMart Shared Use Renovation

New Building Construction
Existing Building Renovation
ATHLETICS AND RECREATION: LONG TERM BUILDOUT

1. New Baseball Stadium
2. New Softball Stadium
3. Baseball / Softball Complex
4. Athletics District Promenade
5. Expanded Football Stadium
6. New Soccer / Lacrosse Competition Field
7. Expanded Parking
8. Club Sports Building
9. Football Complex / Rec
10. Brandsmart Shared Use Renovation
NORTH RESIDENTIAL (1,000 NEW BEDS)
EXISTING RESIDENTIAL (1,796 BEDS)
CORE RESIDENTIAL (1,200 NEW BEDS)
POTENTIAL LONG TERM RESIDENTIAL EXPANSION
EXISTING RESIDENTIAL (1,147 BEDS)
SOUTH RESIDENTIAL (1,200 NEW BEDS)
The University System of Georgia is currently exploring how best to structure P3 partnerships for delivering student residential options. The issues are complex, and the environment is dynamic. KSU respects this macro-environment, but recognizes that its long-term future likely requires significant increases in bed counts. This is motivated primarily by the national literature on student success rates for residential students, but will also benefit other campus systems, particularly transportation and parking.

The Kennesaw campus has only 3,494 beds, providing housing for approximately 13% of the Kennesaw-based student population. In contrast, the Marietta campus has capacity for 25% of its students and, before consolidation, had a first-year live-on requirement. A future first-year student live-on requirement is desirable for both campuses, but the university needs significantly more beds if it wants to accommodate all freshmen, as well as some sophomores and other students. The private sector has responded to this latent demand, providing over 6,000 beds in apartment complexes just off I-75 and 16,000 beds within a 3-mile radius. The BOB shuttle serves some of these complexes but most students drive to campus.

One of the primary reasons to provide on-campus housing is student success, particularly for retention and progression of first-year and sophomore populations. The residential experience must be more than just beds: support services and programming, such as living-learning communities, are key to helping students connect with the institution and establish support networks. For first-years, the goal is typically to connect students with communities and to get them out of their rooms, which is why traditional units are often recommended for this group. As students progress, their housing typologies typically offer opportunities for more independent living, with suite and apartment options being popular. At Kennesaw, most beds are apartments: only the 915 beds in University Village Suites provide an alternate configuration. Determining the optimal mix of typologies should be a near-term priority for the university, as should a market study that investigates student preferences, off-campus housing options, appropriate price points, etc..

The master plan provides the potential for up to 7,400 total beds at Kennesaw. This assumes redevelopment of KSU Place Apartments, and additional beds at Town Pointe and the Bailey Complex sites. The KSU Center / BrandsMart location may also include residential in a long-term, mixed-use redevelopment scenario.

Partnerships and strategic land acquisitions could also be utilized to expand the total number of beds for either campus. A market study and more detailed housing analysis is needed to carefully plan future housing projects.
PARTNERSHIP POTENTIAL

Future Kennesaw campus expansion will likely be south of Chastain Road on either side of I-75. West of I-75 could pull graduate and continuing education programs, residential, auxiliary and Sports / Recreation functions. East of I-75 where the current KSU Center is located presents potential opportunities for partnerships, mixed use development and perhaps even in the long term, a conference center.

Strategic planning for parking and transportation demand management and expansion will be important for all residential and partnership developments. Utility planning and expansion will also be important to consider for any major development.
SHUTTLE LOOP USING SKIP SPANN
BIKE / PEDESTRIAN TRAIL NETWORK
EXTEND GREEN CAMPUS SPINE
BIKE & PEDESTRIAN TRAIL NETWORK
TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY

KSU currently has an adequate system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, multiple existing shuttle routes, ample amounts of parking, and loop roads surrounding both campuses; however, improved connections between modes and alternate incentive structures are important to reduce vehicular traffic into and out of the campus core.

Both campuses cores are compact and relatively easy to maneuver internally as a pedestrian or cyclist; however, the roadways surrounding both campuses are suburban and auto-centric. Most Kennesaw campus gateways are continuations of higher speed roadways or have suburban-style intersections with channelized right-turn lanes. Additionally, the Campus Loop Road has large gaps between crosswalks which makes pedestrian pathways less desirable and results in an environment that does nothing to curb speeding vehicles. The university should work with local agencies to determine if any public roads surrounding the campus would be acceptable candidates for road diets or traffic calming. Campus Loop Road has been identified as a roadway that would greatly benefit from traffic calming mechanisms. According to the community, this roadway sees a lot of cut-through traffic which degrades the residential roadways leading up to it. It also serves as a primary university pathway way connecting the campus core and student residences to Chastain Pointe.

Both campuses would benefit from increased focus on connections between modes. Shuttle routes should focus stop locations at major activity centers near acceptable pedestrian pathways. Parking lots along the direct perimeter of the campuses should provide efficient and inviting pedestrian pathways into campus.
Although the Kennesaw campus has 12,399 parking spaces, an ample quantity for the campus population, not all of these space are in the campus core, where most people would like to park, causing a perceived parking shortage. Perimeter parking is separated from the campus by large suburban roads without attractive pedestrian pathways and is not well-connected to the existing shuttle system. Additionally, the existing area-based parking permit and pricing system, with no distinction between faculty, staff, and students, leads everyone to compete for the same spaces and provides little financial incentive for parking outside the core. An analysis of existing parking demand at the Kennesaw Campus, and planned surface parking lot reductions, and population growth shows that a parking demand reduction of 10% for faculty/staff and 30% for students would allow for the implementation of the entire master plan (nearly three million additional square feet within the core campus parcel) without the need for additional parking. Changing the payment structure so that core parkers pay extra will help to redistribute demand, but a remote parking system will only work with strong pedestrian infrastructure and efficient shuttle routes.

The university should implement a monitoring program to assess and modify parking pricing, shuttle routes and headways, and potential incentives for alternate mode use. If these efforts fail to reduce demand, and if growth significantly outpaces current projections, it may be appropriate for the university to consider increasing their parking supply. Any increased parking should be in remote locations, such as the KSU Center site, to mitigate traffic impacts at campus entrances and to provide a critical mass of riders utilizing the shuttle.

Parking quantity was not a major concern at Marietta during this study, though if the university sees continued growth on this campus, demand may outpace current supply without demand-management planning. The monitoring program should include Marietta, so that both campus’s needs are known and addressed. In the long-term, if parking demand increases significantly, an addition to the south side of the existing Marietta parking deck could increase the parking supply without the cost of additional ramping. The addition could also provide an ADA accessible route from lower campus to upper campus.
A Kennesaw BOB route should run on a loop to parking facilities such as the KSU Center or partnership parking locations, such as the previously utilized Bank of America garage.
The current Big Owl Bus (BOB) shuttle system serves as an intra-campus circulator, an inter-campus connection, and a service to apartments and activity centers near the Kennesaw Campus. It’s a very useful way to get around and between campuses. The campus circulators at the Kennesaw campus, connecting the campus with nearby apartments and activity centers have redundant routes. As they pass through the Kennesaw campus they provide a limited amount of intra-campus circulation, although not all campus locations are represented on the routes (e.g. residence halls, East Lot). The inter-campus shuttle double as the Marietta Campus’ intra-campus circulator.

The main existing concern with BOB service is congestion causing long delays at times on the inter-campus route. At times, the BOB shuttle takes too long to go between campuses due to regional congestion (mostly centered around commuting rush hours. Fortunately, the Skip Spann Connector provides an opportunity to reexamine some shuttle routing to and from locations near the Kennesaw campus, taking advantage of a connection that avoids congestion surrounding the I-75 interchange. Also, the current express lanes project on I-75 will help alleviate the inter-campus shuttle’s rush hour issues. With that project complete and the express lane operational, shuttle routes should be altered to take advantage of the lanes, although this is expected to result in having multiple routes between campuses (as the express lanes are not always available in both direction). Since the inter-campus shuttle does not make stops between campuses, multiple routes should be employed, with drivers taking advantage of several pre-set routes depending on traffic conditions.

When connecting to remote parking sites, it would be optimal to use one high-quality low headway transit route. The plan therefore recommends the inter-campus shuttle add a remote parking lot to its route. Combined with incentivizing remote parking and requiring first-year students to park remotely, the ridership will increase to a level that makes a high-quality shuttle a convenient and efficient option.

The current inter-campus shuttle also serves as a campus circulator on the Marietta Campus. Although it is not ideal for this route to serve two different purposes (it would be quicker for the shuttle not to circulate the entire Marietta campus) it is desirable to maintain some circulation. This plan recommends reducing the number of stops on the Marietta campus and improving pedestrian pathways to the consolidated stops.
Near-term Priorities
Academic Learning Center—The Academic Learning Center will provide much needed instructional, office, and student support space, including classrooms, advising services, career services, and culinary laboratories. Primary academic tenants will include University College and Business School. The university is currently seeking design funding, in order to finish construction for the 2019-2020 academic year.

Chastain Pointe Renovation / COTA—We worked with college leadership to develop a preliminary capacity test for an increased College of the Arts presence at Chastain Pointe. Like many schools at KSU, College of the Arts has grown rapidly; however, the nature of their programs requires specialized spaces, limiting flexibility and the ability to share instructional spaces with other programs. Fortunately, many of the college’s primary space needs are low-cost maker spaces, such as visual arts studios. The dance program already occupies portions of Chastain Pointe, and the location provides opportunities for piecemeal conversion in realistic increments. Receiving and Distribution can relocate to Brandsmart and/or to other locations to free up additional space for COTA to expand.

Consolidated Health Services—Health Services currently has fragmented sites and prefer a consolidated clinic where they can provide comprehensive services. They require 10,000-15,000 SF in a central location. We suggest converting the Public Safety building and adding a small addition. Other undesignated project sites could also be considered for this new facility. This location provides proximate parking, a central location, and an appropriate conversion for an existing structure inadequate to its current function. Marietta’s population is too small to support a full-time health clinic, so space needs on that campus will be minimal.

Future Dining Hall Location—The plan identifies a future dining hall site which is proximate to the academic core while also serving the southern residential population. Dining demand projections are in flux: commuter students are currently required to purchase meal plans, which drives much of the dining hall use. Board of Regents’ changes to this rule would likely reduce demand and delay the need for this facility.

Public Safety / Expansion—Public Safety currently lacks a facility adequate to their needs. We recommend an addition to and/or renovation of Town Pointe, a location near campus where they will have adequate parking for their fleet. Other undesignated project sites could also be considered for this new facility.
Future Welcome Center / Transit Stop—Admissions currently has no core campus location. Instead, prospective students first travel to Town Pointe and then travel independently to the student center, where they meet their tour guides. We recommend a small addition to the East Parking Deck to provide a highly visible meeting place for first-time visitors. Kennesaw campus tours could also be accommodated short term in the University Village Housing area shared event space.

WaterHub—WaterHub is a natural wastewater system that recycles wastewater and cleans it for non-potable uses. Successfully piloted by Emory University, this system has the potential to reduce potable water demands, advance the university’s sustainability goals, and serve as a living lab for biology students. We identify potential sites on both campuses.

BrandsMart Renovation—The BrandsMart / KSU parcel provides significant long-term growth for KSU, but in the interim, the university requires both buildings to meet programmatic needs. BrandsMart modifications should minimize investment and house functions not core to the undergraduate academic mission. Ideal uses include warehouse functions, band practice, and athletics and athletics (in a mixed-use scenario). The minimal renovations needed to accommodate these uses will help to preserve the future flexibility of this key parcel.

**CAPITAL RENEWAL**

The university is committed to meeting its stewardship obligations, and within the limitations of its budget, to responsibly considering capital renewal obligations. The lynchpin of its strategy in this regard is to establish life cycle replacement needs for services, core systems and structures, and to engage in preventive maintenance strategies, rather than incurring the risks inherent in a run-to-fail strategy. The major areas that will require significant continuing investments in life cycle replacements and upgrades are related to UITS and Facilities Services as described below.

UITS has many challenges related to life cycle replacements and upgrades that should be funded now and in the future. Technology is mission critical on both campuses, and the infrastructure needs significantly more investment to expand as well as keep up with current demand. Major components and equipment need a continuous funding stream for life cycle replacement, and UITS has already developed prioritized lists but has not been funded adequately to provide what is needed.
Facilities on the Marietta Campus are in particular need of upgrades and replacements. Many systems have not been maintained well and/or have reached the end of their useful life. Accessibility is also a major concern in Marietta and a separate ADA study has recently been completed. Significant investments in facilities on the Kennesaw Campus will also be required long term, especially since this northern campus is so large but also because major system components continue to reach the end of their useful life and need to be replaced. The primary concerns on both campuses are mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, but there are also many sidewalks, parking lots and roadways that need to be prioritized for refurbishment. Building interiors also need to be well maintained on both campuses, and due to budget limitations basic painting and flooring projects have been postponed or unfunded. Facilities will need to be a larger priority for funding from any source that is available, or the image and functionality of KSU will be negatively impacted in the future. Facilities regularly submits requests for major repair and rehabilitation (MRR) funding, but this has not been sufficient and significantly more funding is needed. Energy efficiency projects should also be considered, with energy saving directed to help fund additional infrastructure projects.

GOVERNANCE

The master plan’s success depends on the university adopting an integrated structure for on-going planning. It is critical that the university integrate academic, student life, financial, and physical planning. An effective technique in this regard can be to form an integrated planning group with representatives from the relevant administrative offices. This group can then be staffed through the facilities team so that relevant data can be made available to support decision making, and a clearly articulated venue exists through which planning decisions should pass. This group can set relevant policies on everything from how space is assigned to how capital projects are requested. In this regard, it can be helpful for individual groups to state program needs, and to allow the integrated planning group to translate those program requirements into facility terms. A space planning working group is currently being formed.
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INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISONS

Size of the 50 Largest Universities by Enrollment

Percent Undergraduate On-Campus Residential

ASU 23%
Ohio State 25%
UT-Austin 19%
FIU 8%
Penn State 35%
Florida 23%
Arizona 20%
Purdue 37%
UGA 36%
Mason 28%
GSU 17%
KSU 18%
PHYSICAL ANALYSIS: KENNESAW CAMPUS

Primary Building Use

- Academic
- KSU Center / BrandsMart
- Student Life
- Athletics / Recreation
- Facilities / Support Services
- Residential
- Parking
**APPENDIX**

**CIRCULATION & PARKING**

1. **Circulation Routes**
2. **Parking Lots / Structures**

**CENTRAL DECK: 2,700 SPACES**

**CORE SURFACE: 1,350 SPACES**

10 MINUTE WALK
1. Natural Drainage Routes
2. Ridgeline
3. Campus High Points

Topography and Hydrology

- Natural Drainage Routes
- Ridgeline
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1. Roads
2. Parking
3. Structures
4. Forest
5. Athletics & Recreation
6. Structured Open Space
7. Interstitial Open Space

Existing Land Use
1. Electrical
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3. Sanitary Sewer
4. Stormwater
5. Water

Composite Utilities Map
1. Blue Route
2. Green Route
3. Black Route
4. Red Route
5. Yellow Route
Existing Parking Quantities
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**10 MINUTE WALK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Max Permits (Max%)</th>
<th>Spaces Available</th>
<th>Vehicles Enrolled (Enrolled%)</th>
<th>Max Permits (Max%)</th>
<th>Spaces Available</th>
<th>Vehicles Enrolled (Enrolled%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>2,100 (111%)</td>
<td>1,896 (93%)</td>
<td>1,490 (79%)</td>
<td>2,100 (111%)</td>
<td>1,896 (93%)</td>
<td>1,490 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL PARKING</td>
<td>6,508 (222%)</td>
<td>6,508 (222%)</td>
<td>2,929 (71%)</td>
<td>6,508 (222%)</td>
<td>6,508 (222%)</td>
<td>2,929 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>1,094 (165%)</td>
<td>893 (82%)</td>
<td>512 (56%)</td>
<td>1,094 (165%)</td>
<td>893 (82%)</td>
<td>512 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST PARKING</td>
<td>5,500 (373%)</td>
<td>3,818 (69%)</td>
<td>2,104 (38%)</td>
<td>5,500 (373%)</td>
<td>3,818 (69%)</td>
<td>2,104 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU CENTER</td>
<td>1,000 (132%)</td>
<td>754 (76%)</td>
<td>80 (8%)</td>
<td>1,000 (132%)</td>
<td>754 (76%)</td>
<td>80 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN POINT</td>
<td>2,634 (211%)</td>
<td>2,631 (100%)</td>
<td>1,246 (47%)</td>
<td>2,634 (211%)</td>
<td>2,631 (100%)</td>
<td>1,246 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Parking Enrollment

1. Spaces Available
2. Vehicles Enrolled
3. Max Permits Per Area
TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Kennesaw State University’s transportation network has many strengths and weaknesses. When on campus both become readily apparent, through using the various transportation options, talking with University staff, students, and members of the community. For as many benefits are found, frustrations are also expressed. Accommodating growth while building the existing network will be essential for a successful Master Plan.

At KSU, parking is the core of the transportation system. At both the Kennesaw and Marietta campuses parking was observed in abundance, primarily consisting of parking decks within the main campus and lots outside of the perimeter of campus. Based on observations and parking data received from the University, the parking supply is higher than demand at both campuses; however, some parking is not located in ideal locations and issues with permit and pricing lead to the illusion of deficiencies in supply. There is an existing inter and intra-campus shuttle system that consists of multiple routes primarily serving off-campus residences, academic buildings, athletic facilities, and shopping centers, in addition to creating a connection between the two campuses. The shuttle system is a great amenity for the University, but it can be improved upon to better connect the two campuses and serve additional activity centers while eliminating redundancy in the overall system.

Both the campuses are dense and provide an environment that primarily caters to walking and biking. Sections of each campus provide wide tree-lined sidewalks, buffers between vehicular travel lanes, bicycle lanes, and bicycle parking. However, there are also many areas on the campuses that do not provide adequate walking and bicycling environments, particularly along the perimeter of the campuses. There are few efficient pedestrian and bicycle connections to areas outside of the main campuses and suburban style intersections and arterial roadways along the perimeter of the campuses create a less inviting pedestrian and bicycle experience. Kennesaw State University is growing and will continue to grow at a rapid pace, but growth opportunity on the campuses are lost due to an excess of parking on campus and maintaining a growth in parking equivalent to the student population growth is not sustainable. That being said, the growth of the University leads to many opportunities to alter the atmosphere of the campus and engage a more multi-modal experience for students and staff. In order to do this, the University must change its parking culture and pricing strategies, collaborate with local agencies to improve multi-modal connectivity between the campus and primary activity centers, soften the transition between external suburban roadways and campus roadways, and improve upon the urban fabric of the campus roadways in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

The following sections outline the proposed transportation-related recommendations for the University. The stimulus for each recommendation is described as well details on why each recommendation addresses current issues and accommodates growth.
Recommendation: Increase efficiency of current parking supply

Current Issues
Kennesaw State University dedicates a significant amount of resources to parking, with a current inventory of over 16,300 spaces spread across dozens of parking lots. The estimated peak demand for these spaces is around 12,600 each day, or 77% of the total supply. Although this would indicate that parking is well balanced and available on campus, frustration with finding parking spaces are common complaints at the Kennesaw Campus. This indicates that the current supply, although sufficient isn’t being used optimally to serve the demand. There are several reasons for the current disconnect between supply and demand with parking complaints at the Kennesaw Campus. First, the more remote parking lots are not desirable. They are not well connected to the central campus, there are no amenities in the lots for people waiting for shuttles, and the pricing structure doesn’t incentivize their use. Even the East Lot, which is within walking distance of central campus is underutilized. Second, many students complain that the permit system doesn’t work well, as they can’t find spaces within their areas but there’s ample space in other areas. Finally, the presence of reserved spaces limits the ability of part of the parking supply to serve multiple sources of demand.

The majority of the parking supply is dedicated towards students. Currently, 78% of the parking supply is dedicated to student parking, of which 58% is dedicated towards commuter student parking. Moving forward, solutions to decrease current frustrations with parking and provide the ability for the campus to grow should focus on accommodating the student demand, particularly commuting student demand, more efficiently.
Changing the Parking Culture

One of the roadblocks to increasing parking efficiency on the Kennesaw Campus is the current parking culture. Unlike many other Universities of its size, parking is centralized in large parking garages in the center of campus, which are heavily subsided to provide low costs for students. This pattern of accommodating parking demand becomes less efficient as a University grows, since providing parking centrally creates a less dense and efficient campus, and consolidating parking in garages is financially burdensome, especially when charging low parking fees. As KSU grows, a change in parking culture will be necessary.

Parking on campus is an emotional issue for many people, making changes to parking fees and cultures are very difficult. The current student parking fees are $52 for an academic year. This price isn’t high enough to establish incentives for using less desirable lots. Remote lots are currently free, but not enough students opt for them because the difference isn’t significant enough. Increasing this fee is almost a non-starter though, because of the emotion tied to parking and the desire to be attractive to student.

The path forward to change culture begins with removing emotion from the parking discussion. The recommended way to set parking policies around a cost-neutral model with goals, allowing the parking policies and fees to change yearly to meet the goals. A cost neutral parking and transportation system is one where all costs (parking garage construction, operations, shuttle
operations, staff, etc…) are offset entirely by revenue (parking fees, rental fees, etc…). This cost neutral system is often paired with demand based pricing, where parking fees are set to maximize the efficiency of lots. The fees for the most desirable parking lots are increased to a point where demand peaks at 90% supply, and then fees set for the remaining lots are priced as low as possible while still meeting the cost neutral target.

The goal of changing the parking pricing system is to break the cycle of having to get approvals for every slight change in fee, but instead establish a system where goals are set and outlined, and the University can alter fees as needed to meet those goals. This also provides the benefit of having the parking and transportation costs be disconnected from other University costs and budgets.

**Incentivizing Remote Parking**

As stated above, students comprise the highest percentage of parking demand, and thus strategies to increase parking efficiency should focus on student parking. Thus, this plan recommends that faculty and staff parking can remain in the core campus, utilizing the existing supply. Students should be encouraged and incentivized to use remote parking via several strategies.

Freshman students should only be allowed to have remote parking for vehicles they bring to campus. This accomplishes two main goals: it increases the chances that freshmen will use other modes to get around campus and between campuses, and it helps create a higher demand for remote parking and thus makes shuttling more efficient. Combined with the parking pricing incentives described above, which would increase commuting student use of lots, there would be sufficient remote parking demand (both to and from campus) to justify an efficient, high-frequency route that connects these lots to the campus core. Based on the current parking supply counts, the remote parking the University already owns should be sufficient to handle initial changes. Future growth may necessitate use of additional lots.

**Accommodating Growth**

The Master Plan calls for removal of surface lots and densification of the campuses. A supply and demand analysis of the first phases of recommendations shows that with increased efficiency on the Kennesaw Campus, the removal of smaller lots in the first phase can be accommodated without additions to the parking supply. Over time, in later phases of the Master Plan, new parking will likely be needed when larger lots such as the East Lot of KSU Place are removed. If additional parking needs to be added, a parking deck should be planned as a last resort as part of the KSU Center / BrandsMart land development, or as part of a future partnership zone. Additional remote parking could also be purchased or leased if needed near either campus.

Another way to accommodate future growth on campus is not just to increase parking supply, but to reduce demand. The next recommendation explores that concept. If additional parking needs to be added, a parking deck should be planned as a last resort as part of the KSU Center/BrandsMart land development, or as a part of a future partnership zone. Additional remote parking could also be purchased or leased if needed near either campus.
Recommendation: Use Transportation Demand Management to Reduce Parking Demand

The Opportunity Cost of Parking
Parking lots and garages occupy a significant amount of space that otherwise could be potential building sites. A campus parking culture that desires cheap, readily available parking in the central campus does not allow for the types of density and adjacencies that a growing campus needs to be successful. Although there are many arguments about the financial costs of building parking garages, there is also significant opportunity cost of not using the land the garage occupies for a use that would enhance the university.

One common solution that universities employ is increasing the percentage of parking supply that is located remotely, freeing up space in the core campus. Another solution is to reduce the amount of parking demand on campus, allowing for the removal of lots without the need for additional supply. This plan calls for the combination of the two strategies, focusing on reducing demand. An analysis of existing parking demand at the Kennesaw Campus, and planned surface parking lot reductions, and population growth shows that a parking demand reduction of 10% for faculty/staff and 30% for students would allow for the implementation of the entire Master Plan without the need for additional parking.
Although it’s not likely the University could reduce demand that significantly, goals should be established and demand tracked as the Plan is implemented to try to reach aspirational targets. The addition of more remote parking supplies could bridge any gap.

**Transportation Demand Management**

The transportation planning industry refers to strategies that decrease travel and parking demand at peak times as Transportation Demand Management (TDM). In essence, TDM focuses on the demand side of the supply/demand problem. KSU already employs some TDM programs, such as the BOB, zipcar, and carpooling options. In order to obtain the reductions needed to not build more parking, these programs would need to be expanded and enhanced. More staff and resources will be needed to support those programs, but those costs would be offset by the reduction in the amount of parking constructed over the life of the Master Plan, and lower operations costs from having fewer spaces per student.

TDM strategies come in several forms. There are infrastructure and facilities upgrades, such as improving bicycle routes, assigning bicycle parking, improving sidewalk and lighting. There are also policy, program, and marketing strategies, such as bikesharing, subsidizing transit use, and allowing students to opt out of any parking fee/costs.

**Implementation and Monitoring**

Reducing parking demand doesn’t have to wait for implementation of the Master Plan. It can start now with a thorough study of campus population transportation, and assembling a TDM plan that outlines target goals, costs and implantation priorities. TDM plans are coordinated with local transportation agencies, creating partnerships that enhance programs on and off campus.

A successful TDM plan monitors the goals (i.e. peak parking demand) yearly, or by semester. The plan’s elements are then tweaked to try to increase the program’s efficiency. Based on progress on meeting goals, decisions can be made on whether to build more parking or not as the population increases and lots come offline as part of the Master Plan.

**Recommendation: Improve Intra- and Inter-Campus Bus Service**

**Current Issues**

The current Big Owl Bus (BOB) shuttle system serves as an intra-campus circulator, an inter-campus connection, and a service to apartments and activity centers near the Kennesaw Campus. It’s a very useful way to get around and between campuses.

The main existing concern with BOB service is congestion causing long delays at times on the inter-campus route. At times, the BOB shuttle takes too long to go between campuses due to regional congestion (mostly centered around commuting rush hours), and many students drive between campuses as a result.

The campus circulators at the Kennesaw campus, connecting the campus with nearby apartments and activity centers have very redundant routes. As they pass through the Kennesaw campus they provide a limited amount of intra-campus circulation, although not all campus locations are represented on the routes (e.g. residence halls, East Lot). The inter-campus shuttle double as the Marietta
Campus’ intra-campus circulator. There is a great opportunity to use the BOB service to help implement other recommendations, including accommodating more use of remote parking, reducing parking demand, and making the campus more multi-modal.

**High Quality Intercampus Service**
Fortunately, the current express lanes project on I-75 will help alleviate the inter-campus shuttle’s rush hour issues. With that project complete and the express lane operational, shuttle routes should be altered to take advantage of the lanes, although this will result in having multiple routes between campuses (as the express lanes are not always available in both direction). Since the inter-campus shuttle does not make stops between campuses, multiple routes should be employed, with drivers taking advantage of several pre-set routes depending on traffic conditions.

When connecting to remote parking sites, it would be optimal to use one high-quality low headway transit route. Thus, this Plan recommends the inter-campus shuttle add a remote parking lot to its route. This would emphasize how the University is making it a priority to enhance connectivity between campuses and remote parking. Combined with incentivizing remote parking and requiring freshmen to park remotely, the ridership will increase to a level that makes a high-quality shuttle a convenient and efficient option. The current inter-campus shuttle also serves as a campus circulator on the Marietta Campus. Although it is not ideal for this route to serve two different purposes, as it would be quicker for the shuttle not to circulate the entire Marietta campus, it is also desirable to maintain some circulation. This Plan recommends reducing the number of stops on the Marietta campus and improving pedestrian pathways to the consolidated stops.

**Enhancing Campus Connectivity**
As it is today, the main inter-campus route should be supplemented with other routes to circulate within the Kennesaw Campus and local activity centers. Ideally, these routes would all meet at a central location where transfers could be made to the inter-campus shuttle at a single point. The Skip Spann Connector provides an opportunity to reexamine some shuttle routing to and from locations near the Kennesaw campus, taking advantage of a connection that avoids congestion surrounding the I-75 interchange.

**Recommendation: Improve Multimodal Circulation, Connectivity, and Transitions**

**Current Issues**
KSU currently has an adequate system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, multiple existing shuttle routes, ample amounts of parking, and loop roads surrounding both campuses; however, the overall circulation, connectivity, and transitions between these different modes of transportation are less than ideal for promoting multiple modes of transportation, a strategy that could help lower the amount of students and staff members driving into and out of the campus core.
Both campuses are dense and relatively easy to maneuver internally as a pedestrian or cyclist; however, the roadways surrounding both campuses are of suburban nature and are therefore more auto-centric. Noonday Creek trail and Big Shanty Trail provide non-vehicular connectivity between Kennesaw campus and the Sports Park, Town Center Mall, and many apartment complexes. However, more needs to be done to highlight this infrastructure (i.e. signage, completing gaps in last 50 feet near Town Point). Currently, the transitions from these suburban roadways to the campus roadways do not adequately alert vehicles that they are entering an area in which there will be more pedestrians and/or cyclists, and thus create a less inviting pedestrian and bicycle environment for students at these locations – locations in which an abundance of the student housing is located. Most of the Kennesaw campus gateways are continuations of higher speed roadways or are located at suburban-style intersections with channelized right-turn lanes. Additionally, the Campus Loop Road has large gaps between crosswalks which makes pedestrian pathways less desirable and results in an environment that does nothing to curb speeding vehicles. Photos of these existing issues are shown below.

Parking at the Kennesaw campus is typically located in the campus core or along the perimeter. The parking along the perimeter is separated from the campus by large suburban roads without attractive pedestrian pathways and is not well-connected to the existing shuttle system. For these reasons, and due to the existing parking permit and pricing system, parking along the perimeter of the campus is not attractive and much less utilized than parking in the campus core, despite many student concerns of a lack of parking.

Similarly, on the Marietta Campus parking is located in parking decks near the campus core and large lots along the perimeter of the loop road. Generally the location of the parking lots are advantageous because they are outside of the building perimeter and
an easy walking distance to the campus core; however; the location of the loop road acts as an unnecessary barrier between the parking lots and the campus core. Instead of having the loop road surround the outside of the parking lots, the road cuts across the primary pedestrian paths, resulting in unnecessary conflict points between primary pedestrian pathways and primary vehicular pathways.

Finally, the lack of gathering spaces on or near campus, and the lack or insufficiency of existing multimodal connections to existing spaces results in unnecessary vehicular trips off campus. This issue is further exacerbated by the convenience of student parking on campus. In the choice between driving and other non-auto modes, there is very little incentive not to drive. The convenience and low cost associated with driving and parking between campus and off-campus destinations is greatly outweighed by the inconvenience of any other mode.

**Transition Spaces**
Transition spaces surrounding both campuses should be improved to better alert roadway users that they are entering a campus space where more pedestrians and bicyclists should be expected. Improved transitions can be in the form of better gateway treatments and the implementation of more urban design standards at intersections leading into and within the campuses. Gateway treatments and intersection design standards can include more prominent Kennesaw State University signage and/or structures, the implementation of University-specific signage and striping color schemes, a reduction in lane widths entering into the campuses, the removal of channelized right turns where possible, and an increase in sidewalks and crosswalks at all access points to campus. The intention of transition strategies should be to slow vehicular speeds and create a higher sense of awareness for all roadway users, including pedestrians and bicyclists.

**“Urban” Connections and Circulation**
Urban connections between campus and University-related spaces should be based on urban design standards rather than suburban design standards. As such, the Skip Spann Connector should be utilized to bypass suburban roadways and if possible, new University-related development should be constructed around roadways that have a more urban feel.

The University should work with local agencies to determine if any public roads surrounding the campus would be acceptable candidates for road diets or traffic calming. These strategies would benefit the surrounding community because it would reduce cut-through traffic as well as promote a more multimodal urban environment leading up to the campus. Campus Loop Road has been identified as a roadway that would greatly benefit from traffic calming mechanisms. According to the community, this roadway sees a lot of cut-through traffic which degrades the residential roadways leading up to it. It also serves as a primary University pathway way connecting the campus core and student residences to more remote sections of the University such as Chastain Pointe.

**Connections between Modes**
Both campuses would benefit from increased focus on connections between modes such that students can make trips using multiple modes. Shuttle routes should focus stop locations at major activity centers, but also focus on being in locations near
acceptable pedestrian pathways. Parking lots along the direct perimeter of the campuses should provide efficient and inviting pedestrian pathways to campus in order to make these parking areas more attractive to students and ultimately taking vehicles out of the center of campus. At the Marietta campus in particular, it would be beneficial to move the loop road outside of the parking lots such that pedestrians walking from the lots and circulating vehicles are not conflicting with each other. Remote parking lots should be served by frequent and reliable shuttle service in addition to providing acceptable pedestrian pathways where possible. Overall, the focus should be on intercepting more vehicles along the perimeter of the campus and creating effective shuttle, pedestrian, and bicycle connections from these locations to the campus core.

**Recommendation: Implement Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements**

**Current Issues**

Although both the Kennesaw and Marietta campuses are dense with the ability to easily walk or bike between academic buildings, there are several road blocks that impede a multimodal culture on campus. As discussed previously, the amount of parking in the Kennesaw campus core incentivizes driving as opposed to walking or biking. Further, many primary pedestrian and bicycle pathways on campus do not provide adequate space for a University of this size and connections between athletics and recreation centers do not cater to pedestrians and bicyclists.

In the central and northern area of the Kennesaw campus some wide pedestrian pathways with landscaped buffers have started being implemented, particularly as new buildings have been constructed, as shown in the photos below.
However, much of the Kennesaw campus remains auto-centric and could benefit from more multimodal design elements in order to increase non-auto modes of transportation throughout campus. The photos below illustrate a few of the issues observed on campus including narrow sidewalks without buffers, crosswalks without ADA compliant curb ramps, and faded or missing crosswalks.
Outside of the main campus, pedestrian and bicycle connections at the perimeter of the Kennesaw campus and between the campus and major activity centers are lacking. Although the campus itself maintains an urban fabric, the suburban roads surrounding the campus do not promote a suitable pedestrian and bicycle environment, which discourages non-auto travel between the main campus and areas such as off-campus residences, athletic facilities, and commercial zones. Pedestrian and bicycle pathways are typically less convenient than vehicular pathways and many surrounding intersections cater to vehicular operations and give little to no priority to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Many of the existing intersections surrounding the campus provide channelized vehicular right-turn lanes which increase the distance and time it takes for a pedestrian to cross the street and decreases the sense of safety. The following photos show examples of intersections and roadway conditions directly surrounding the Kennesaw campus.
Multimodal Improvements on Campus
In order to help shift the modal split of students and faculty on campus, multimodal facilities should be improved throughout to match the urban fabric seen currently in pockets of the Kennesaw campus. Many campus improvements can be made in the near term including increased sidewalk widths and buffer zones between the walkway and roadway, improved ADA functionality along walking paths, crosswalks at all intersections within campus and along all major access points to campus, and more bicycle parking throughout the campus. Specific areas identified for near term improvements include, but are not limited to, an improved pedestrian connection between the East Lot and the Kennesaw Campus in order to make the East Lot more desirable, pedestrian focused facilities and operations at intersections accessing the football stadium, and pedestrian crosswalks and signage at Big Shanty Road where Campus Loop Road ends to improve non-auto connectivity to Chastain Pointe.

In the long-term, pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be heavily considered as the campus grows and changes. Bicycle lanes throughout campus and more space dedicated to pedestrian walkways should be considered when planning and constructing new buildings. As parking in the core of the campus is replaced with academic buildings, pedestrian and bicycle connections between these buildings and existing activity centers should be a focus.

Working with Others
In order to improve multimodal connections outside of the main campus, the University should work with local agencies to implement multimodal improvements as part of existing plans. These connections should target existing and planned off-campus activity centers near campus such as residences, athletic and recreation facilities, and social gathering places. As changes to the surrounding area are being planned, the University should work with local agencies to promote pedestrian and bicycle friendly treatments along roadways and at intersections, particularly those near campus.
## KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY
### AREA WIDE TRANSPORTATION

**AREAS OF INTEREST AS PRIORITIZED BY KSU AND NEIGHBORHOOD REPRESENTATIVES**

April 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Traffic Concerns</th>
<th>Upcoming Projects Benefiting These Locations</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Campus Loop Road at Chastain Road</td>
<td>Improve the traffic at Campus Loop Road, Chastain Road and Big Shanty Road.</td>
<td>Chastain Pointe driveway at Big Shanty Road and Campus Loop Road (INT 5)</td>
<td>Elevation difference between Campus Loop Road and Chastain Road presents challenges to providing a direct connection to Chastain Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Frey Lake Road at Campus Loop Road</td>
<td>Reduce the cut-through traffic via Frey Lake Road.</td>
<td>Skip Spann Connector (N3) - GDOT's Northwest Corridor HOT Project (M1)</td>
<td>Multiple access/egress issues should be evaluated with a comprehensive traffic study. The Skip Spann Project, Wade Green DDI and the GDOT NWC HOT project will help make Frey Lake Road less appealing as a cut-through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Big Shanty Road from Chastain Road to McCollum Parkway</td>
<td>Congestion and turning movements at existing intersections</td>
<td>Chastain Pointe driveway at Big Shanty Road and Campus Loop Road (INT 5) - Roundabout at McCollum and Big Shanty (INT 3)</td>
<td>The upcoming 2016 SPLOST project will fund a Roundabout at McCollum and Big Shanty. Pedestrian and bicycle improvements to the corridor should also be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chastain Road from Busbee Drive to Big Shanty Road</td>
<td>Congestion and turning movements at the existing intersections</td>
<td>Skip Spann Connector (N3)</td>
<td>Slip ramps for Chastain Road at I-75 are projected to reduce traffic by as much as 19% upon completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>McCollum Parkway from Cherokee Street to Big Shanty Road</td>
<td>Congestion and turning movements at the existing intersections</td>
<td>Skip Spann Connector (N3) - GDOT's Northwest Corridor HOT Project (M1)</td>
<td>The Skip Spann Project, Wade Green DDI and the GDOT NWC HOT project will improve the efficiency of the I-75 route to KSU which will help make McCollum Parkway less appealing as a cut-through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northbound Cherokee Street at Shiloh Road</td>
<td>Congestion related to right turns on to Shiloh Road</td>
<td>I-75 and Wade Green Road Diverging Diamond Interchange (I2) - Kennesaw's Cherokee Street Improvements (S5)</td>
<td>Cemetery in southeast corner prevents widening of the roadway to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-75 and KSU Campus</td>
<td>Providing more direct access to the KSU campus from I-75.</td>
<td>Skip Spann connector will provide new slip ramps which will separate traffic destined for Frey Road from traffic on Chastain Road. (N3)</td>
<td>Additional traffic studies are needed after completion of current projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL ANALYSIS: KENNESAW CAMPUS
Faculty & Staff Residential Locations

- Downtown Atlanta
- Kennesaw
- Marietta
- Rome
- Canton
- Alpharetta

0 - 2
2 - 9
9 - 20
20 - 32
32 - 51
51 - 78
78 - 108
108 - 178
178 - 294
294 - 523
On-Campus and Off-Campus Bed Count, Fall 2015

students living on campus  2,985
                         37%
                         63%
                         total  7,970

Freshmen

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Grad
ATHLETICS & RECREATION ANALYSIS

- 7 MENS & 9 WOMENS SPORTS
- FOOTBALL IS IN THE BIG SOUTH CONFERENCE AT THE NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION LEVEL
- 2 MENS SPORTS AND 5 WOMENS SPORTS IN THE ATLANTIC SUN CONFERENCE AT THE NCAA DIVISION I
Existing Recreation Venues and Sports

- Racquetball
- Basketball
- Men's and Women's Tennis
- Wellness Programs
- Nature Bound Programs
- Student Recreation Center
- Convocation Center
- Soccer
- Flag Football
- Kickball
- Ultimate Frisbee
- Sand Volleyball
- Rugby
- Trails
- Athletic Training
- Owls Nest
- The Perch
- Indoor Training Facility

Softball
Soccer Fields
Recreation Center
Kennesaw Campus Athletics Program & Facilities

KEY ISSUES

- CONSOLIDATE FOOTBALL PROGRAM
- GROWTH OF SPORTS PROGRAMS & PHYSICAL SPACE NEEDS
- FLEXIBILITY & MULTIPLE USES
- IDEA OF A "SPORTS & RECREATION PARK"
Kennesaw Campus Recreation Venues & Facilities

Convocation Center
Student Recreation Center
Tennis Courts
Bailey Park & Recreation Field

The Owls Nest
Two Synthetic Fields
Track & Field Sand Volleyball Courts

The Perch
3 Synthetic Fields
Kennesaw Campus Athletics Venues & Facilities

**KEY ISSUES**

- Single-use field
- Lifecycle & Maintenance of fields
- Field type to allow multiple uses
- Expansion in seating
- Long term vision for softball and baseball program

**Bailey Complex**
- Softball & baseball lockers, training, offices
- Completed in 2007

**Convocation Center**
- Basketball & volleyball lockers, admin. offices, training
- Seating capacity 4600

**Bailey Park**
- Softball, completed in 2004, natural turf, sports lighting
- Athletics and recreation use
- Seating capacity 600

**Stillwell Baseball Stadium**
- Baseball, completed in 2004, natural turf, sports lighting
- Athletics and recreation use
- Seating capacity 1200

**Recreation Field**
- Athletics warm-up (tennis, golf, BBall & SBall)
- Natural turf, sports lighting

**Tennis Courts**
- 8 courts, completed in 2014
- Athletics & recreation use
KEY ISSUES

- Consolidate football program
- Repurpose existing facilities for stronger adjacencies
- Growth, new uses – long throwing events
- Additional recreation uses
- Field type & lighting for longer use
- Flexibility & multiple uses
- New venues
- Life cycle & maintenance of fields
PHYSICAL ANALYSIS: MARIETTA CAMPUS

Primary Building Use

Academic
Student Life
Athletics / Recreation
Facilities / Support Services
Residential
Parking
Circulation & Parking

1. Circulation Routes
2. Parking Lots / Structures
1. Black Route

Existing BOB Shuttle Routes
1. Natural Drainage Routes

Topography and Hydrology

Natural Drainage Routes
1. Roads
2. Parking
3. Structures
4. Forest
5. Athletics & Recreation
6. Structured Open Space
7. Interstitial Open Space

Existing Land Use

- Roads: 37%
- Parking: 12%
- Structures: 8%
- Forest: 6%
- Athletics & Recreation: 5%
- Structured Open Space: 30%
- Interstitial Open Space: 2%
APPENDIX

10 MINUTE WALK

1. Electrical
2. Gas
3. Sanitary Sewer
4. Stormwater
5. Water
On the Kennesaw campus
- 9%

Within 2 miles of the Kennesaw campus
- 12%

Farther than 2 miles from campus
- 71%

On the Marietta campus
- 6%

Within 2 miles of the Marietta campus
- 2%

~12,380 icons placed

~700 respondents placed icons at Kennesaw

~260 respondents placed icons at Marietta
KENNESAW CAMPUS: COMAP ANALYSIS

Residential Locations

Driving Routes & Residential Locations
Driving Routes

Walking Routes
I live in ARC phase one. The buses drive past my apartment and I find myself chasing them. please put a bus stop by the Austin residence complex.

Really convenient bus stop, actually! – Student Center

I need a handicap accessible route between the Social Sciences Building and the English Building.

Student Center/Book Store Doors are often broken, making it a struggle to get inside the building.
Great parking at Town Point!

East Deck is packed—cannot leave during business day or no place to park.

Parking for staff is very, very limited and difficult to find during the day. It sometimes takes upwards of 20 minutes of circling the campus. I have noticed that students are parking in staff spaces with no repercussions.

I think incorporating bike paths on campus would help drastically with transportation issues. Keeping bikes off sidewalks and providing a safer lane to travel in. Also incorporating the Noonday Creek Trail to create a bike route to Marietta Campus from Kennesaw Campus would be ideal.
Areas with lots of tree cover seem to be more popular places for students to relax outdoors. The Arboretum is nice for a quick get away to the woods.

I would LOVE for this space to become a social area where people can hang out. But the artwork needs to be taken down, remove the sewer drains, take out the ugly bushes, and put grass down where there are wood chips. It could be a great place, but no one hangs out there.

Where all the fun happens - The Oval

Love the Perch. It is not advertised or utilized enough by the everyday student.

Commons or the student center. People always go to these places especially commuters since they don’t have a specific place to go to while they wait for their next class.

I would LOVE for this space to become a social area where people can hang out. But the artwork needs to be taken down, remove the sewer drains, take out the ugly bushes, and put grass down where there are wood chips. It could be a great place, but no one hangs out there.

“The Nest” is what it should be called. Protect. The. Nest.
Chick fil A is best
I've gained weight from the amount of food I eat here. It's great!
- Commons

PLEASE let us eat outside. It would be awesome to have pretty spaces designed for us to have a meal in the beautiful Kennesaw weather. After being in a class for who knows how long a little break during our meals would be nice.
- University Village

Fix the wifi!
- University Village

I've gained weight from the amount of food I eat here. It's great!
- Commons

Normally I eat here, but this semester I wasn't allowed to purchase a meal plan because I only had 8 credits.
- Commons

Residential Locations

Dining Locations
I thought this was the Library; if it is - that’s where I study. It’s the quietest.

I love the tables next to the Math and Stats building!

Poor place to study because lack of outlets for my computer to study with. But I spend time here when on campus because I have to eat.

There is a great student area with pool tables and a TV. – University Village

THE CUBES! They are the best place ever for socializing and hanging out with friends. – Student Center

The Marching Facility Center (known as Bandsmart by Band students) is the “home” of my band family. I love it here.

My Fraternity uses a classroom in this building every week for chapter. – Social Sciences

Eno, sports, and friends… also FOCUS Pray on the campus green!
I like the lab building. It's shiny and nice. Newer buildings are contemporary and uplifting; lots of natural lighting helps learning to be more inspired. Classrooms in BB are mostly awful, both in absolute terms and compared to those in Phileman. This building is a dark, creepy hellhole - Math/Stats. I like the lab building. It's so shiny and nice.
Very dangerous intersection. Kids walk across to Chastain point between cars, can't see oncoming traffic either direction.

To many cars going too fast around blind turns.

- East Parking Deck

I feel unsafe in Social Sciences and other buildings that do not have gender-neutral restroom options. I am genderqueer, and have to leave my building (where my office is located, and all of my classes are) if I want to use a restroom not marked "men" or "women."

Feral cats. – Office Annex
This seems like it was meant to be the heart of the campus but that was in the past. The structures are in poor shape and actually a safety hazard, it can be improved on.

Uncomfortable. Only two benches. Nothing to cover you from rain.

The BOB Shuttle route stops on campus don't cater to academic buildings on campus, with the exception of the student center stop. The stops are more around the residential halls versus academic...

Where most of our outside events happen. It's usually where we are able to get the most people involved on campus.

Seems like everything takes me to the J building, from CS tutoring, to grabbing a snack, to a school event or visitor like Turner.
I feel on-campus housing is rather expensive. It is also a hassle that you have to pay for year-round living. Yes, you could break your housing contract but that is rather costly. If I get an internship in the summer somewhere else, it is a punishment for me to have to turn it down because I have to pay to live on campus.

Outdoor field between Howell and Norton Halls is great for a game of ultimate frisbee.

My Apartment required at least 5-10 work orders before it was really livable.

I like the squirrels here.

Sycamore grove is great for hammocking.

Its a bit of a crazy thought but we have this runoff pond anyway, why not make it nice and a focal point like Life university has. It is not nearly as big but it would still be something nice our campus would have instead of a hole in the ground with a puddle at the bottom and an unattractive fence surrounding it.

Nice house with a lot of space

Favorite Outdoor Locations

Residential Locations
The student center is decent, but could use updates. Many people prefer to spend time in their rooms (myself included), on the internet, which does not work between the hours of 8pm-1am due to constrictions on housing internet (this is incredibly annoying).

More often then not most of my friends in I get together in stingers, and hang out, socialize, and eat.
Normally I would work in the Mac lab but now that it has limited hours I have to just stay after my class that ends at 7:45. I will be in that room for 6 or so hours because if I leave I know I can't come back even though I need the resources. I'm always paranoid I'm going to leave something and not be able to get back in.

When the internet isn't working in my dorm, I have to study in the library when it is open. Having a full load of classes and working part time doesn't always mean I can be there while it is open.

The student center is decent, but could use updates. Many people prefer to spend time in their rooms (myself included), on the internet, which does not work between the hours of 8pm-1am due to constrictions on housing internet (this is incredibly annoying).

More often then not most of my friends in I get together in stingers, and hang out, socialize, and eat.
The Q building is great and modern. I enjoy my classes in this building, as well as the computer labs which are excellent for classes and projects.

H is my least favorite building. Water tastes weird from this building only, bathrooms are smaller, and there is no place to sit and study/relax.

The much needed renovations really help! Ten times better!
This parking lot is INCREDIBLY dark at night. It's very unsafe, and it really needs better lighting. – Lot 23

Closest lot to the Arch building. It has changed configurations EVERY year and there still seems to be empty Faculty spots and students having to go across campus to find a spot.

I am disabled and park in the lot by the J building. I would love to see additional parking created here so that I don't park illegally when it is full.

The campus needs some updating to the outdoor lighting.

This parking lot is INCREDIBLY dark at night. It's very unsafe, and it really needs better lighting. – Lot 23