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## Visit 4 Linkage Review/Sensitivity and Use Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule for Master Plan Visit #4</th>
<th>Tuesday April 20</th>
<th>Wednesday April 21</th>
<th>Thursday April 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media Session</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>CP Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Fetzer Center</td>
<td>President Floyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Group Presentation/Open Campus Meeting</td>
<td>Interviews Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1010 Fetzer Center</td>
<td>a. VP Research Don Thompson – at Walwood 315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy / Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fetzer Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>1030 Fetzer Center</td>
<td>Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Aija Lubavs, WMU Alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Richard Snyder, Dir., Miller Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Greg Dobson, Assoc. Athletic Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Jessica Hurd, Bigelow Res. Hall Dir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Blaine Lam, Interim Director Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy / Advisor Committee (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Students / CP Offices</td>
<td>Outbound Meeting Robert Beam’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Chhrystal &amp; Rick Morata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus-Wide Linkage Alternatives

Independent Area: Linkage Alternative #1

This plan looks to the natural topography, the valley/upland system, as a starting point from which to define developable zones, open space, circulation patterns, and campus edges. In the proposed plan, each subcampus is seen as an independent functioning unit connected by existing city streets. Limited changes to vehicular and pedestrian connections have been proposed. The natural character of the valley floor is reinforced along both fingers (Goldsworth Valley and Stadium Drive) that run through the campus. By allowing this to dominate, the independent nature of each is reinforced.

Connected Campus: Linkage Alternative #2

This alternative plan focuses on pedestrian circulation to connect subcampus areas. Open space systems are used to support the pedestrian connections and to join the campus across Stadium Drive by a proposed elevated pedestrian walkway. A second loop road system is proposed for Oakland Drive Campus.

Unified Campus: Linkage Alternative #3

The third Campus-Wide Linkage Alternative Plan views the campus as a unified whole. A single, internal loop road links the subcampuses. Development on Oakland Drive Campus extends down to the valley floor. Emphasis on the "image" entrance at Stadium Drive and Howard Street visually suggests that the campus entry is here. While moving along Stadium Drive between Howard and West Michigan Ave., a different place is visually communicated. Focus moves centrally to the Stadium Drive edge. Surrounding development takes advantage of existing slopes with views into the valley.
INTRODUCTION - LINKAGE ALTERNATIVES

One of the most significant steps in the campus planning process is the establishment of a framework that allows the campus to function to its highest potential while addressing the needs of the campus community. To this end, three alternative plans have been developed which look at the physical design of the entire campus area and linkages between smaller campus areas, or subcampuses, and along the campus edge where the University interfaces with surrounding neighborhoods.

The term "linkage" refers to campus-wide systems that integrate all of the physical elements of the campus. For example, the Open Space System provides a continuous corridor of open (undeveloped) space through which people move on campus. This system provides a link from one developed campus area to another. The Vehicular Circulation System is a linkage system of paved surfaces or roads that allows vehicles to move through the campus and thereby link campus areas; thus the term Linkage Alternative is used when referring to these plans. By providing clear and logical linkage systems within the campus framework, the campus becomes a more "user friendly" place, and from that, a place where people like to be.

More than one Campus-Wide Linkage Alternative is presented. This provides an opportunity to compare and contrast elements from one plan to the other. The alternative plans are meant to stimulate discussion and to take a new and different look at the campus physical environment. Each has a different approach, but at the same time, addresses major issues identified during the campus analysis. Each plan looks at campus linkages through the following linkage systems: Open Space, Pedestrian Circulation, and Vehicular Circulation. They are conceptual in nature and scale and do not intend to define specific elements within the plan.

Linkage Systems

A. Open Space

A hierarchy has been assigned to the Open Space System in the Campus-Wide Linkage Alternative Plans. This hierarchy communicates the movement into or through a unique space distinguished perhaps by its vegetation, use, or location.

Level 1 Open Space, shown in dark green, is that open space which is most clearly defined and presents a strong campus image. This type of open space may be a more refined landscape type, although this is not necessary and would likely be found in high use areas of campus. Level 1 Open Space easily communicates a sense of importance and significance within the space.

Level 2 Open Space, shown in medium green, is defined by its use and location. It includes campus facilities such as athletic fields, as well as open green corridors.

Level 3 Open Space, shown in light green, is found along campus edges. It provides a visual buffer and transition zone of indigenous plant communities and is maintained accordingly.
B. Pedestrian Circulation
   Orange lines ending in arrows represent pedestrian circulation. These lines are placed to show general pedestrian flows through campus. Line weight is used to distinguish heavier flow from lighter. These represent general flow patterns only and are not intended to show those paths which students most frequently use.

C. Vehicular Circulation
   Internal vehicular circulation is represented by a dark blue line and off-campus streets by black lines.
   The long dashed blue line defines existing internal roadway.
   The short dashed blue line defines proposed internal roadway.
   Dashed circles represent vehicular entrances to campus.

D. Other Symbols
   Dashed arcs represent "image" entrances to campus.
   Yellow bubbles define developed or developable zones.
   Hatched green bubbles represent land not owned by the University, but that contributes to contiguous campus open space and should be acknowledged.
Figure 6-B.4 Linkage Alternative 1 (Web site graphic)
INDEPENDENT AREAS: LINKAGE ALTERNATIVE #1

This plan looks to the natural topography, the valley/upland system, as a starting point from which to define developable zones, open space, circulation patterns, and campus edges. In the proposed plan, each subcampus is seen as an independent functioning unit connected by existing city streets. Limited changes to vehicular and pedestrian connections have been proposed. The natural character of the valley floor is reinforced along both fingers (Goldsworth Valley and Stadium Drive) that run through the campus. By allowing this to dominate, the independent nature of each is reinforced.

A. *Open Space*
   
   **Level 1 Campus-Wide Open Space**
   - Area axially defined on West Campus extends from Goldsworth Valley to the library, and from the east to the west termination of West Michigan Ave.
   - Area defined by East Campus buildings (quadrange).
   - Campus entrances and major arrival nodes.
   - Oakland Drive edge.

   **Level 2 District Open Space**
   - The ridgeline and valley slope on East and Oakland Drive Campuses.
   - The Goldsworth Valley. This open space system pushes up to connect to the Level 1 space in the campus core, visually connects with the contiguous green space (Kalamazoo College property) and to the WMU athletic facilities along the north side of Stadium Drive.

   **Level 3 Buffer & Setback Open space**
   - The campus edges (with the exception of Oakland Drive) including Stadium Drive and Howard Street.

B. *Pedestrian Circulation*
   - Oliver Street links subcampuses across Stadium Drive (at grade crossing).
   - Pedestrian connection is proposed across the internal Oakland Drive Campus linkage road between the two developable parcels on the upland.
   - Pedestrian connections through Level 1 and 2 Open Spaces are clearly defined, respected, and enhanced throughout the campus.

C. *Vehicular Circulation*
   - Proposed roadway modifications to the loop road on West Campus completes the existing loop and addresses pedestrian and vehicular conflicts.
   - Intersections at West Michigan (east end)/loop road and Stadium Drive are reconfigured.
   - Relocation of Oliver Street/Oakland Drive connection south of its existing location.
   - Entrances to Oakland Drive Campus are proposed from Oliver Street and from Oakland Drive.
Figure 6-B.5 Linkage Alternative 2 (Web site graphic)
CONNECTED CAMPUS: LINKAGE ALTERNATIVE #2

This alternative plan focuses on pedestrian circulation to connect subcampus areas. Open space systems are used to support the pedestrian connections and to join the campus across Stadium Drive by a proposed elevated pedestrian walkway. A second loop road system is proposed for Oakland Drive Campus.

A. Open Space

Level 1 Campus-Wide Open Space
- Axially defined campus core open space is extended to include Goldsworth Pond as a focal point and across Stadium Drive (by a "vegetated" pedestrian bridge) to Oakland Drive Campus. The bridge continues the green corridor over the roadway. The axial space also extends east/west out to and along West Michigan Ave.
- East Campus buildings define significant open space.
- Campus Entrances and major arrival nodes.
- Oakland Drive edge.

Level 2 District Open Space
- The existing valley floor complements the Level 1 Open Space defined for Goldsworth Pond, visually connects to the contiguous green space (Kalamazoo College property) and to athletic facilities on West Michigan Ave.
- The Level 2 Open Space along Stadium Drive changes character as pedestrians are circulated above the roadway, and it links West and Oakland Drive Campuses.

Level 3 Buffer & Setback Open Space
- Campus edges (with the exception of Oakland Drive).

B. Pedestrian Circulation
- West and South Campuses connect at Oliver/Stadium at grade and by an elevated walkway over Stadium Drive.
- The major pedestrian corridor from Goldsworth Valley housing extends to Oakland Drive Campus.
- A major pedestrian corridor is proposed for Oakland Drive Campus.
- Pedestrian circulation is extended through the Level 1 Open space system along West Michigan Ave.

C. Vehicular Circulation
- A loop road is proposed for Oakland Drive Campus.
- Proposed roadway modifications to the loop road on West Campus complete the existing loop and address pedestrian and vehicular conflicts.
- Oliver Street is realigned with new connections to Oakland Drive Campus Loop Road and Oakland Drive.
Unified Campus: Linkage Alternative #3

Figure 6-B.6  Linkage Alternative 3 (Web site graphic)
UNIFIED CAMPUS: LINKAGE ALTERNATIVE #3

The third Campus-Wide Linkage Alternative Plan views the campus as a unified whole. A single, internal loop road links the subcampuses. Development on Oakland Drive Campus extends down to the valley floor. Emphasis on the “image” entrance at Stadium Drive and Howard Street visually suggests that the campus entry is here. While moving along Stadium Drive between Howard and West Michigan Ave., a different place is visually communicated. Focus moves centrally to the Stadium Drive edge. Surrounding development takes advantage of existing slopes with views into the valley.

A. Open Space

Level 1 Campus-Wide Open Space
- Core campus spaces are emphasized and extend southward to Stadium Drive.
- The image entrance at Stadium Drive and Howard Street is strongly emphasized.
- East Campus Quadrangle space and the Oakland Drive edge remain as previously stated.
- Campus entrances and major arrival nodes.

Level 2 District Open Space
- Goldsworth Valley open space pushes up toward the Central Campus core and extends eastward to the campus edge, visually connecting to the contiguous green space (Kalamazoo College property).
- This connection extends around the eastern edge and to the existing athletic facilities along both sides of Stadium Drive.
- A strong and dramatic definition of the space along the Arcadia Creek Valley (Stadium Drive framed by vehicular crossings).

Level 3 Buffer & Setback Open Space
- Campus edges (with the exception of Oakland Drive).

B. Pedestrian Circulation
- Two pedestrian connections are provided across Stadium Drive: a combined vehicular/pedestrian above-grade crossing and the at-grade crossing at Oliver Street.
- A major pedestrian corridor is proposed at the intersection of West Michigan Ave. and Howard Street that extends into the commercial development along West Michigan Av.

C. Vehicular Circulation
- A single loop road links West and Oakland Drive Campus areas.
- Proposed roadway modifications to the loop road on West Campus complete the existing loop and address pedestrian and vehicular conflicts.
- Relocation of West Michigan/Howard Street entry to 1) Valley Drive north of West Michigan Ave., 2) in the vicinity of Western Drive south of West Michigan Ave., and 3) Howard Street at Oakland Drive Campus are proposed.
- Reconfigure West Michigan Ave. with no connection to the loop road.
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Discussion:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #5 must be changed. We will meet:

Tuesday, June 15th from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

We hope that this is workable for the committee and apologize for any inconvenience this causes.

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR (JJR) and the East Campus Focus Group to review and discuss three Linkage Alternative Drawings. The Alternatives were presented at a group presentation/open campus meeting at the Fetzer Center (room 1010), WMU, Tuesday, April 20, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. This session was an opportunity for this focus group to review the Linkage Alternatives along with the issues list generated and discussed during previous visits. Committee members were asked to evaluate how the drawings addressed the issues. It was explained that the focus group should look at elements of each plan with a critical eye. These observations and comments will be used to prepare the “Preferred Campus Linkage Drawing” to be presented during Visit #5. It was explained that the latter drawing would not be a final plan, but would serve as a basis of comparison as the subcampus plans are prepared. No specific Alternative would be the “preferred” Linkage Drawing. Rather, elements from each would be combined into a Campus-Wide Plan.

The Oakland Drive Focus Group Committee Chair was asked to present the results of this discussion to the Advisory Committee at their meeting. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. Organizational Items

1. Project status was reported and the purpose of the visit presented.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for upcoming campus visits:

Visit #5 is a Regular Review visit. Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group will meet on Tuesday from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by JJR to receive comments. That address may be made available to any interested parties:

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com
3. The WMU Master Plan Web site was discussed. The site will be used to
distribute pre-visit materials: schedule, agenda, presentation materials, etc.,
as well as to provide a communication link to the campus and community
concerning the master planning effort. Committee members are encouraged
to check the Web site for updates and upcoming events.

A specific Web site address was issued to focus group committee members
in order to provide committees the opportunity to review and discuss the
planning materials prior to their release to the general public.
Any difficulties in retrieving information from the site should be reported
ASAP to the Office of Campus Planning, WMU or to JJR, Ann Arbor. The
Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan.

4. The student survey form was distributed to students through the efforts of
the Campus Planning Office. Results were collected and data sheets were
scanned and presented to the consultants for evaluation.

B. CAMPUS-WIDE LINKAGE ALTERNATIVES

Open Space Observations

1. While each of the three alternatives attempts to enhance the Arcadia Creek
Corridor, it was felt that Alternative 3 did a better job of addressing the
Valley System. In the Goldsworth Valley, Alternative 3 removes the Valley
housing when it has reached the point where its usefulness is questioned and
recommends preserving the Valley as open space.

2. It was suggested that a bridge over Stadium Drive does not necessarily
disrupt the “Valley System.”

3. The “wedge,” where West Michigan Avenue meets Stadium Drive, in
Alternative 3 is preferred for the increased amount of open space shown.
However, the road configuration is not endorsed.

4. All plans addressed improving the campus entrances through landscape
treatment. This was supported as well as the attention to improve the open
space along Stadium Drive.

5. Enhancement of the Stadium Drive corridor between Oliver Street and the
proposed overpass as shown in Alternative 3 was supported.
6. Alternative 3 shows areas that contain buildings and parking lots as “green.” It was noted that this does not mean that parking lots and buildings will be removed from these areas. But regardless of what exists here, the landscape treatment will be of a specific type within the open space hierarchy.

7. Even though the university (Alternative 3) does not own it, the open space along Howard Road, west of the Valley Drive entrance to campus was discussed as important to the Open Space System. It was suggested that this space be protected/preserved, as it contributes in part to the campus image at this entrance. It was suggested that the entire area as shown in the alternative was not necessary. The northern piece, opposite the entrance drive, should be protected.

**Vehicular Observations**

1. The reconfiguration of West Michigan Avenue shown in Alternative 2 is probably better than cutting West Michigan Avenue off at Stadium Drive as shown in Alternative 3. It was suggested that perhaps Alternative 3 would work if limited access was allowed during Western Michigan University and Kalamazoo College events in that location. It was noted, with regard to Alternative 3, that it is important to maintain the connection to neighborhoods and to downtown Kalamazoo.

2. The bridge across Stadium Drive was supported for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic if there is development on Oakland Drive Campus to significantly increase the number of people that require internal access to West Campus.

3. Smoothing out the tight curves in the Loop Road was supported. The committee preferred the road to pass east of the parking ramp on North Dormitory Road as shown in Alternative 3, but would settle for the alignment shown in the other two. It also noted a preference for this road to pass west of Welborn Hall.

4. A realignment of the Loop Road, as it follows the Valley floor, was previously studied by the Campus Planning staff. During this study, it was suggested the road be realigned to follow the topography behind the Bigelow and Hoekje Residence Hall parking lots, overpass the existing road (which would become a pedestrian underpass) and align with the Valley Drive entrance to campus. This option was discussed with this focus group as a possible option. It was noted that such an alignment would serve to further protect the Goldsworth Valley from development if that was endorsed in the Master Plan.
5. Entrances to campus from Howard Street were discussed. Three entrances to west campus from Howard were supported, but their exact location was not resolved.

6. The entrance to Oakland Drive Campus from Howard Street, suggested in both Alternatives 2 and 3, was discussed. The exact location was of concern due to changes in grade, volume of traffic and the difficulty making a left turn from Howard Street. It was noted that there should be two entrances to Oakland Drive Campus, but they should not be from Howard Street. An entrance from Stadium at the bridge was suggested.

7. The realignment of Oliver Street into the single campus Loop Road was supported, but the entrance for Oakland was suggested to be opposite Wheaton Street.

8. An alternate route to East Campus was recognized as West Michigan to Stadium Drive and the small road (Eddy Drive) around the physical plant buildings. It was noted that this is often the most efficient and least congested road to take.

Other
1. The location of a College Town was discussed, but not resolved.

2. The pedestrian bridge on Alternative 2 was seen as positive.

3. The removal of the parking lots in front of the Bernhard Center was supported.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager

cc: Participants
    E. Hallquist / SG JJR
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  - Joseph Monroe, WSA, Integrated Supply Management

WMU Staff:
- Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
- Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
- George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
- David Dakin, Associate Director, Campus Planning and Architecture

Consultants:
- Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
- Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR
- Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
- Chris Luz, Traffic Engineer / HNTB
- Jason Kelly, Traffic Engineer / HNTB

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #5 must be changed. We will meet:

Wednesday, June 16th from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.

We hope that his is workable for the committee and apologize for any inconvenience this causes.

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR (JJR) and the East Campus Focus Group to review and discuss three Linkage Alternative Drawings. The Alternatives were presented at a group presentation/open campus meeting at the Fetzer Center (room 1010), WMU, Tuesday, April 20, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. This session was an opportunity for this focus group to review the Linkage Alternatives along with the issues list generated and discussed during previous visits. Committee members were asked to evaluate how the drawings addressed the issues. It was explained that the focus group should look at elements of each plan with a critical eye. These observations and comments will be used to prepare the “Preferred Campus Linkage Drawing” to be presented during Visit #5. It was explained that the latter drawing would not be a final plan, but would serve as a basis of comparison as the subcampus plans are prepared. No specific Alternative would be the “preferred” Linkage Drawing. Rather, elements from each would be combined into a Campus-Wide Plan.

The East Campus Focus Group Committee Chair was asked to present the results of this discussion to the Advisory Committee at their meeting. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Project status was reported and the purpose of the visit presented.

   Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by JJR to receive comments. That address may be made available to any interested parties:

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

2. The WMU Master Plan Web site was discussed. The site will be used to distribute pre-visit materials: schedule, agenda, presentation materials, etc. as well as to provide a communication link to the campus and community concerning the master planning effort. Committee members are encouraged to check the Web site for updates and upcoming events.
A specific Web site address was issued to focus group committee members in order to provide committees the opportunity to review and discuss the planning materials prior to their release to the general public.

Any difficulties in retrieving information from the site should be reported ASAP to the Office of Campus Planning, WMU or to JJR, Ann Arbor. The Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan.

3. The student survey form was distributed to students through the efforts of the Campus Planning Office. Results were collected and data sheets scanned and presented to the consultants for evaluation.

B. CAMPUS-WIDE LINKAGE ALTERNATIVES

1. The group was informed that concepts for a new indoor practice facility were being developed. Considerations regarding the location of the facility are under discussion. This facility would service collegiate athletics as well as the recreation side of the university community. The need for indoor practice facilities is directly related to Division 1 status of the athletic program.

With regard to site, it was noted that the southeast corner of Stadium Drive and Oliver Street was under consideration. It was also noted that the baseball fields on the northeast corner of the same intersection would not be moved to accommodate this facility.

JJR requested more information with respect to the building as it becomes available.

2. Use of East Campus Buildings
   - Since the future of these buildings seems uncertain, it is important to define a use for these buildings.
   - The Architecture and dramatic topography of East Campus make it an important historical element of the campus.
   - East Campus could be seen as a place of arrival. Its location allows it the opportunity to interface with both the region and Kalamazoo.
It was suggested that the committee consider the use as either 1) self-contained with "independent" functions, or 2) those uses that require the movement of people on and off the campus (i.e., "integrated" with other university facilities).

The committee expressed the opinion that it be integrated in terms of use.

It was suggested that East Campus could support multiple, but not high volume use.

3. East Campus Integration

Concern was expressed that none of the three Alternatives sufficiently linked the East Campus to the other subcampuses or addressed the issues unique to this subcampus. The committee would like to see it integrated with the rest of the campus.

The traffic on Oakland Drive contributes to the isolation. Because of its layout, Oakland Drive becomes a linkage barrier.

It was noted that there is no major access road into East Campus and that bus transportation does help to integrate the campus. There is need for "reasonable" vehicular access.

Concern was expressed that the lack of linkage might contribute to a lack of commitment on the part of the university to preserve East Campus.

4. The perception of JJR is that East Campus is more suited to an "independent" use. This use could be directly related to both the region and the community. JJR will support East Campus as an important part of the Master Plan.

It was noted that its Historic Register status would support the idea of preservation of the entire East Campus area. A public/private partnership effort was suggested as a means to offset the cost of renovation of these buildings.

Concern was expressed that a pedestrian crossing over Stadium Drive at Oliver did not appear on any of the plans. This overpass is needed, particularly for students attending athletic events.

The location of a Campus Town was discussed. The need for many, small coffee shop types of establishments across campus was noted. The idea of a larger, more localized commercial area was discussed, but no conclusions or recommendations were made.
7. Realignment of Oliver Street
   It was reported that while the realignment of Oliver Street should be considered, the realignment of Oliver opposite Wheaton Street was not a good idea. Concern was expressed by the neighborhood that this might encourage cutting through the neighborhood to campus.

8. The concept of a Loop Road that crosses over Stadium Drive and encompasses the entire campus was supported by this focus group.

9. Reconfiguring the “wedge” area, where West Michigan Avenue meets Stadium Drive, was supported, but no particular Alternative was supported.

C. SUMMARY

Several consistent ideas emerged as a result of this discussion with the East Campus Focus Group. None of the plans adequately addresses the integration of East Campus with the Oakland Drive and West Campus. Linkage of the campus to other subcampus areas is prohibited by the placement of Oakland Drive, the volume of traffic that it carries and the existing grade along that portion of Oakland Drive. The East Campus Focus Group is unsure of the commitment of the university to the preservation of East Campus and the subsequent restoration of its historic structures. Definition of the use of these buildings is a significant factor in determining the fate of this subcampus. JJR suggests that East Campus is better suited for a self-contained or independent use. The consultant is committed to a use that relates to the region and the community and supports the importance of East Campus to the university image and campus tradition.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #4 MEETING NOTES
Revised May 13, 1999

Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1030

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, April 21, 1999
              10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 26, 1999

Participants:
Committee: (*not present)
   Paul Pancella, Assoc. Professor, Physics; Chair,
   West Campus Focus Group
   Larry Oppliger, Chairperson Arts and Sciences
   * Paul Wilson, AAUP Liaison; Assoc. Professor, Department
     of Education and Professional Development
   Vernon Payne, Division of Student Affairs
   Stefan Sarenius, Maps Coordinator, Waldo Library,
   PSSO Representative
   Bruce Naftel, Assoc. Professor, Department of Art, Campus
   Planning Council – not present
   Lew Graff, Undergraduate; WSA Campus Design Chair
   * David Jarl, Architect, Eckert-Wordell Architects; Winchell
     Area Neighborhood Representative
   Chris Bakotic, Undergraduate, Integrated Supply
     Management, WSA

WMU Staff:
   Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
   Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
   George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
   Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
   David Dakin, Associate Director, Campus Planning
     and Architecture

Consultants:
   Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
   Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Manager / SG JJR
   Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
   Chris Luz, Traffic Engineer / HNTB
   Jason Kelly, Traffic Engineer / HNTB

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #5 must be changed. We will meet:

Wednesday, June 16th from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

We hope that this is workable for the committee and apologize for any inconvenience this causes.

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR (JJR) and the East Campus Focus Group to review and discuss three Linkage Alternative Drawings. The Alternatives were presented at a group presentation/open campus meeting at the Fetzer Center (room 1010), WMU, Tuesday, April 20, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. This session was an opportunity for this focus group to review the Linkage Alternatives along with the issues list generated and discussed during previous visits. Committee members were asked to evaluate how the drawings addressed the issues. It was explained that the focus group should look at elements of each plan with a critical eye. These observations and comments will be used to prepare the “Preferred Campus Linkage Drawing” to be presented during Visit #5. It was explained that the latter drawing would not be a final plan, but would serve as a basis of comparison as the subcampus plans are prepared. No specific Alternative would be the “preferred” Linkage Drawing. Rather, elements from each would be combined into a Campus-Wide Plan.

The West Campus Focus Group Committee Chair was asked to present the results of this discussion to the Advisory Committee at their meeting. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Project status was reported and the purpose of the visit presented.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for upcoming campus visits:

   West Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesdays from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

   Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by JJR to receive comments. That address may be made available to any interested parties:

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com
3. The WMU Master Plan Web site was discussed. The site will be used to distribute pre-visit materials: schedule, agenda, presentation materials, etc. as well as to provide a communication link to the campus and community concerning the master planning effort. Committee members are encouraged to check the Web site for updates and upcoming events.

A specific Web site address was issued to focus group committee members in order to provide committees the opportunity to review and discuss the planning materials prior to their release to the general public. Any difficulties in retrieving information from the site should be reported ASAP to the Office of Campus Planning, WMU or to JJR, Ann Arbor. The Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan.

4. The student survey form was distributed to students through the efforts of the Campus Planning Office. Results were collected and data sheets scanned and presented to the consultants for evaluation.

B. CAMPUS-WIDE LINKAGE ALTERNATIVES

Open Space

1. Removal of parking lot in front of the Bernhard Center was supported in order to further define and extend Level 2 Open Space as shown in Alternative 3.

2. The extension of Level 1 Open Space along West Michigan Avenue as shown in Alternative 2 was supported.

3. The removal of West Michigan Avenue on the east side of Michigan Avenue was also supported with limited access by bus and car as needed. The difficulty of emptying the parking lots in this location after games/events at Read Fieldhouse and Waldo Stadium was acknowledged as an important consideration.

4. The importance of a downtown link was reported in this focus group.

5. Reference was made to the Gateway Project being conducted by the City of Kalamazoo.

6. Other ways to make Stadium Drive more “friendly” were suggested: slowing speed, addition of a traffic signal, and the creation of a boulevard.
7. The removal of the Valley Apartments at some future time was supported and the preservation of the Valley floor open space.

8. Preservation of the open space west of Howard Street and across from the Valley Drive entrance to campus was supported as a buffer to the campus edge. The exact size and configuration was not determined.

9. Viewing the area called the "wedge," where Stadium Drive intersects with West Michigan Avenue was supported as an entrance to campus and, as such, should be considered a higher level open space as shown on Alternative 3 and encompassing both sides of Stadium Drive.

10. Enhancing the Arcadia Valley system along Stadium Drive was supported. The concept of setting Oakland Drive and West Campus buildings into the hillside was seen as a means to reinforce the Valley.

11. The large Oakland Drive setback as shown in Alternative 1 was favored.

12. The extended Level 1 Open Space shown in Alternative 2 along existing and former West Michigan Avenue was supported.

Campus Town
1. The perceived value of a campus commercial strip on the east side of campus is the connection that it makes to Kalamazoo College and the link that it makes to downtown Kalamazoo.

2. It was acknowledged that the commercial strip on the west side of campus serves a larger student population and directly impacts the university visually. No overall conclusion was reached.

Vehicular Circulation
1. The development of a roadway for Oakland Drive Campus depends on the level of development projected for this area. Caution was expressed regarding too much road proposed for Oakland Drive Campus.

2. In general, this focus group did not support a vehicular bridge across Stadium Drive as shown in Alternative 3.

3. Two issues that should be brought to the attention of the committee are 1) the establishment of a transit mall to accommodate public transportation and thereby establish off-campus links and 2) the possibility of needing to evacuate the campus. The ring road must consider this possibility and be able to accommodate this potential need.
4. The Loop Road design for West Campus as shown in Alternative 3 was supported specifically at two locations: 1) where the road passes behind the parking ramp across from Ellsworth Hall (i.e., outside of the university property line) and 2) where the road passes west of Welborn Center.

**Pedestrian Circulation**

1. A pedestrian bridge over Stadium Drive south of Oliver Street and north of Howard Street was supported. Another such bridge was suggested in the vicinity of Oliver Street and Waldo Stadium. Reasons for such a proposal included: 1) the number of pedestrians required to cross Stadium during athletic events at the stadium and the fieldhouse, 2) discussion of placing an indoor practice facility near the location of Stadium Drive and Oliver Street, and 3) the Recreation Center was designed to accommodate the addition of a pedestrian bridge.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

**SmithGroup JJR**

Linda Lucchesi Cody  
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #4 MEETING NOTES
Revised May 13, 1999

Meeting Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting / Major Review

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1030

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, April 21, 1999
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. / 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 26, 1999

Participants: Committee
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Paul Pancella, Assoc. Professor, Physics;
Chair, West Campus Focus Group
Linda Powell, Asst. Professor, HPER;
Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS;
Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Trudy Verser, Assoc. Professor, Management;
Chair, Campus Planning Council – not present
Jeff Chamberlain, City Planner, City of Kalamazoo
Hannah McKinney, Vice Mayor of City of Kalamazoo;
Professor, Kalamazoo College
Fred Sitkins, Chair, Engineering College Site Committee;
Prof., Dept. of Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering
Dick St. John, Trustee

WMU Staff:
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
David Dakin, Associate Director, Campus Planning and Architecture

Consultants:
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
Jason Kelly, Traffic Engineer / HNTB

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #5 must be changed. We will meet:

Wednesday, June 16th from 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
with additional time scheduled (6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.) as needed*
Dinner will be provided at 5:00 p.m.

*See item #2 in Organizational Items.

The purpose of this meeting was for the Consultant Team and the Advisory Committee to consider the ideas and concerns expressed in the focus group meetings. Discussion of the Alternatives in light of university goals and projections for the future provided the opportunity to further guide the consultant team. The focus group chairs presented a summary of each focus group discussion to this committee. The consultants presented recommendations from a land planning perspective. Consideration of the three (focus group, Advisory Committee, Consultant Team) will lead to the Preferred Campus-Wide Linkage Plan.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. A brief summary of the visit schedule and events was presented.

2. Meeting dates were identified for upcoming campus visits.

   The Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee will combine as one group for future visits in order to avoid repetition and duplication of efforts. They will convene in their respective roles as needed. It was initially suggested that these committees need not meet every campus visit as the focus groups do. For upcoming visits, it is foreseen that this committee (Advisory/Policy) will meet during campus visits 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11.

   Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by SmithGroup JJR (JJR) to receive comments. That address may be made available to any interested parties:

   wm大师plan@aa.smithgroup.com

3. The WMU Master Plan Web site was discussed. The site will be used to distribute pre-visit materials: schedule, agenda, presentation materials, etc., as well as to provide a communication link to the campus and community concerning the master planning effort. Committee members are encouraged to check the Web site for updates and upcoming events.
A specific Web site address was issued to Advisory/Policy Committee members in order to provide committees the opportunity to review and discuss the planning materials prior to their release to the general public.

Any difficulties in retrieving information from the site should be reported ASAP to the Office of Campus Planning, WMU or to JJR, Ann Arbor. The Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/c3pow6/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan

4. The student survey form was distributed to students through the efforts of the Campus Planning Office. Results were collected and data sheets were scanned and presented to the consultants for evaluation.

B. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

After the committee chairs presented their reports, the consultants summarized the findings and discussion followed. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

1. The concepts presented in Alternative 3 received the most support

2. Within the Open Space System, the core open space (Level 1), in the center of campus, was overwhelmingly supported.

3. The Goldsworth Valley and Arcadia Valley systems should be recognized and treated accordingly. The Stadium Drive zone that passes through the university is important as a symbol of the campus. Adding a high level of open space to that area signifies its importance.

4. The recognition of the Oakland Drive edge and the East Campus Quadrangle as important open space areas was supported.

5. The bridge across Stadium Drive is important, but depends on what happens on Oakland Drive Campus and when.

6. Smoothing the Loop Road was supported. The majority of the focus group members supported extending it to encompass the campus north and south of Stadium Drive if sufficient need could be demonstrated to justify a bridge across Stadium Drive. Moving the Loop Road to the Goldsworth Valley slope, south of the pond, was supported as a means of strengthening and protecting the Valley system as open space.

7. Improving the Howard Street entrances was supported. However, the exact location, alignment, capacity, etc. are still under study.
8. The alignment of Oliver Street and Oakland Drive requires further study.

9. Continue to study ways to link East Campus to the rest of the university.

C. OVERALL CONCEPT

There is a commitment to strengthen the Open Space system on campus as evidenced by the support for Alternative 3, the Unified Campus Plan. There is interest in working to protect open space on the campus edge that is not university property, but which impacts on the campus image. Improving the campus image at its entrances was proposed in each Alternative and was supported by the committees.

Internal campus linkage discussions supported an internal loop road to connect the entire campus if sufficient need could be demonstrated. This connection would require a vehicular/pedestrian/bicycle bridge across Stadium Drive. Links to neighborhoods are through high volume, congested roads (Howard, Stadium, Oakland). This problem must be addressed in more detail. However, internal traffic will be kept from city streets as much as possible through an internal loop road(s).

Reconfiguring West Michigan Avenue at Stadium Drive is being studied by the City of Kalamazoo. Each group recognized the importance of improving this campus connection. Looking at the neighborhoods north of this intersection, there is a small neighborhood surrounded by Western Michigan University and Kalamazoo College. From a land planning perspective, it may make sense to try to incorporate this area into the university and thereby create an Institutional Zone.

Subcampus links have been addressed for West and Oakland Drive Campus. However, East Campus requires further study and definition within the university system of vehicular circulation. The use of East Campus buildings is strongly tied to its connection to the rest of the university. It has been recommended that these uses be those which are a single daily destination and not those which are temporary during the course of a day. Single destination uses might be administrative, where individuals enter East Campus and spend the majority of their day there. Temporary uses might be student classrooms where students are constantly entering and leaving East Campus buildings during the course of a day.
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Advisory Committee Meeting
April 21, 1999
Page 5

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #4 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: President Floyd Meeting

Location: President's Office

Meeting Date/Time: April 22, 1999
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 26, 1999

Participants: President Elson Floyd
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance / WMU
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning / WMU
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The first meeting with the President updated him with regard to the Master Plan Project. The three Alternative drawings were presented for his review. The following observations were offered during the discussion:

It was suggested that a space on campus be dedicated to display the Master Plan drawings after they are presented. In this way, the campus community will have another means to follow this process as it develops.

It was noted that this campus has its own culture. Asking students to walk on this campus represents a huge cultural change and would be enormously difficult to accomplish.

Major projects that the university is currently working with or planning for the future include:
- A new indoor practice facility for the athletic teams.
- The Arboretum property may be developed for student housing.
- A new Alumni Center is planned. This is an important facility, perhaps a footprint similar to Fetzer Center; accessibility and drop-off is needed, and connection with athletic event helpful.
- Student Services will probably be located in Welborn Hall.
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
President Floyd Meeting
April 22, 1999
Page 2

- A new Art Center is proposed that would include studios, gallery space and offices.
- Health and Human Services will develop along the Oakland Drive Corridor (Oakland Drive Campus).
- The use and building conditions of East Campus is under consideration.
- Long range projections for student housing.

To give the Master Plan life, it needs an “early hit,” something highly important and visible.

The Board of Trustees will be updated at the next meeting. Schedule this during their regular meeting time and date.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #4 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Open Community Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1010

Meeting Date/Time: Thursday, April 22, 1999
7:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 26, 1999

Participants:
WMU Staff:
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
David Dakin, Assoc. Director, Campus Planning and Architecture

Consultants:
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer / SG JJR
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
Chris Luz, Traffic Engineer / HNTB
Jason Kelly, Traffic Engineer / HNTB

Community:
See Attached List

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION

The three Alternative drawings were presented at an open meeting to which members of the Kalamazoo community were invited. Representatives of neighborhood committees were invited to attend and to address specific issues that impact their neighborhoods. Questions were entertained and the following comments and observations were noted:

1. Concern for closing West Michigan Avenue as shown in Alternative 3 was expressed. It was observed that the commercial strip in this area is a vital part of the neighborhood and would not be able to survive should the road be closed here.
2. None of the Alternative drawings show the neighborhoods contiguous to the University. It is in these neighborhoods that students live and have an impact. These connections should be clarified and addressed. The connections between neighborhoods and campus should show how the traffic would flow in these areas and address the impact to the neighborhood.

3. Alternatives (2 and 3) that addressed the possibility of removing existing student apartments without showing them replaced elsewhere on campus raised the concern that with less housing provided on campus, student populations in contiguous neighborhoods would increase.

4. The link between campus and downtown Kalamazoo must be further addressed. Many visitors to campus arrive from the 94 Business Route, which makes this an important linkage. The City and the University have also studied how to get students downtown. It was observed that a commercial strip along West Michigan Avenue would help, as well as transportation from campus to downtown. A safe means to bike there was also considered.

5. Questions were raised regarding student housing in neighborhoods, and concern was expressed for the development of the Arboretum property that is owned by the University and its potential development as WMU housing. The number of units and quality of construction were of concern to neighborhood residents.

6. With respect to the new development at the Lee Baker Farm, the consultants will not be working with this site, but will look at the need for a link between this parcel and the Main Campus. Concern was expressed that there would be increased student traffic through existing neighborhoods that are between the two sites.

7. Discussion of the area defined as the “wedge,” where West Michigan Avenue meets Stadium Drive, and where Stadium Drive and Oakland Drive meet Lovell Street, emphasized the difficult traffic patterns that complicate development concepts. Interest was expressed to bring business into this area as a vital link to the city and as part of the University image. The possibility of closing Oakland Drive to make East Campus a pedestrian campus was discussed.
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Open Community Meeting
April 22, 1999
Page 3

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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Attachment

cc:     E. Asken / WMU
        S. Kamman / WMU
        D. Dakin / WMU
        R. Rigterink / SG JJR
        P. Berg / SG JJR
        E. Hallquist / SG JJR
        C. Luz / HNTB
        J. Kelly / HNTB
22 APRIL 1999
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
OPEN COMMUNITY MEETING
SIGN-IN SHEET

Fred Sitkins, WMU
M. Pegg Osowski, Vine Neighborhood
Paul Finchem, Kalamazoo (S.A.R.A. Board)
Joan Walters, Knollwood Neighborhood Association
PJ Canonie Bubin, Arcadia Neighborhood
Norman Hamann, West Main Neighborhood
Richard Skalski, City of Kalamazoo
William Teichert, Arcadia Neighborhood
Holly Jensen, Oakland Drive/Winchell Neighborhood Association
Ladislav Hanka, Resident
Sue Stapleton, Arcadia Neighborhood
Jennifer VanConant, WKMI
Amy Remmert, Vine Neighborhood Association
Lauri Holmes, Arcadia Neighborhood
Nelson Nave, Architect, West Main Hill Neighborhood
Hardy Fuchs, West Main/Nichols
Mary Jane Doerr, Arcadia Neighborhood Association
Mack Gill, Arcadia Neighborhood
Mary J. Hosley, Citizen
In April of 1999, a student survey form was distributed to students through the efforts of the Campus Planning Office. This survey was designed in order to gather information and suggestions regarding the campus from students in order to aid in facilitating the Western Michigan University Master Plan. The survey, "Student’s Perspective of the Campus," follows.
STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE OF THE CAMPUS
Western Michigan University, Master Plan Study
Winter Semester 1999

WMU has initiated a Master Plan Study that will guide campus improvements over the next twenty years. In order to facilitate the Plan, we must first understand how you perceive the campus as well as to understand your priorities for improving it. By answering the following questions, you can help shape Western Michigan University’s future. Thank you for your assistance.

1. In which College are you enrolled? (Please select only one, even if you have a double major.)
   (0) Fine Arts  (1) Arts & Sciences  (2) Business  (3) Education  (4) University Curriculum  (5) Health & Human Services  (6) Engineering & Applied Sciences  (7) Lee Honors

2. Please describe your current status (Select only one.)
   (0) 1st Year  (1) 2nd Year  (2) 3rd Year  (3) 4th Year  (4) 4th Year Plus  (5) Graduate Student  (6) Part-time of Continuing Education

Using the following list:
   (0) Academic Excellence  (1) Specific Program  (2) Access to Faculty  (3) Appearance of Campus  (4) Student/Faculty Ratio  (5) Location  (6) Cost  (7) Size of Student Body  (8) Friendly Atmosphere  (9) Intercollegiate Athletics

3. Which factor was the single most important in selecting this University?
4. What was the second most important factor in selecting WMU?

How did WMU compare with the other colleges you were considering in terms of:

5. Campus Housing  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
6. Campus Appearance  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
7. Classrooms and Labs  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
8. Cost  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
9. Location  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
10. Parking  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse
11. Student Facilities  (0) Better  (1) About the Same  (2) Worse

Today, how do you rate WMU in terms of the following characteristics?

12. Academic Excellence  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
13. Academic Programs  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
14. Athletics  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
15. Appearance of the Campus  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
16. Extra-curricular Opportunities  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
17. Parking  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
18. Recreation Facilities  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
19. Social Life  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor
20. Town Surroundings  (0) Very Good  (1) Okay  (2) Not Very Good  (3) Poor

21. How often do you ride the bus?
   (0) Twice or more a week  (1) Once a week  (2) Once or more a month  (3) Never/Rarely

Agree or disagree with these statements: "I don’t ride the bus because...
22. ...it costs too much."  (0) Agree  (1) Disagree
23. ...it’s not convenient."  (0) Agree  (1) Disagree
24. ...it doesn’t go where I need to go."  (0) Agree  (1) Disagree
25. ...I prefer to walk."  (0) Agree  (1) Disagree

26. Do you live on campus?  (0) Yes  (1) No

27. Do you have a car?  (0) Yes...go to the next question  (1) No...skip to question 31
28. What is the *primary* reason you have a car?  
(0) Commute to campus (1) Off-campus job or co-op program (2) Travel home on the weekends  
(3) Shopping (4) Entertainment or recreation

29. If you have a car, how many times a week do you use your car?  
(0) Every day (1) Several times (2) Once (3) Rarely

30. Do you drive your car from class to class?  
(0) Often (1) Sometimes (2) Rarely (3) Never

31. During your first year, did you get lost while walking on campus?  
(0) Often (1) Sometimes (2) Rarely (3) Never

32. Do your parents or friends (who do not attend WMU) get lost driving on campus?  
(0) Often (1) Sometimes (2) Rarely (3) Never

33. When walking campus, do you find automobile traffic a safety problem?  
(0) Often (1) Sometimes (2) Rarely (3) Never

34. Do you feel safe walking across campus after dark?  
(0) Yes (1) No

35. Do you ride a bike on campus during nice weather?  
(0) Yes (1) No

36. Would you ride a bike if bicycle paths were provided?  
(0) Yes (1) No

37. Where are you most likely to go during your free time off campus?  (Please select one.)  
(0) West Main (1) Downtown Kalamazoo (2) Crossroads Mall (3) Other

38. Where are you most likely to go during your free time on campus?  (Please select one.)  
(0) Student Recreation Center (1) Goldsworth Pond (2) Bernhard Center (3) Waldo Library (4) Residence Hall (5) Intramural Fields (6) Other

Where is your favorite outdoor area on campus?  
Why is this your favorite outdoor area?  (Check all that apply.)  
( ) Location ( ) Appearance ( ) Place to Sit ( ) Lots of People ( ) Few People ( ) Good for Study ( ) Good for Relaxation ( ) Good for Socializing ( ) Good for Activities ( ) Other

In general, are the outdoor open spaces (such as sitting areas, parks, plazas):  
39. Adequate in number (are there enough of them?)  
(0) Yes (0) No

40. Well located?  
(0) Yes (0) No

41. Attractive?  
(0) Yes (0) No

42. Provided with adequate seating?  
(0) Yes (0) No

43. Do you think Western Michigan University is a student-friendly campus?  
(0) Yes (1) No

Why do you think this?

44. In general, do you consider the campus building exteriors attractive?  
(0) Yes (1) No

Which campus building do you consider the most attractive?  (Select only one.)
Which campus building do you consider the least attractive?  (Select only one.)

What are the two things you really like about the WMU campus?

a.

b.

Other than parking, what two things would you change relative to the physical campus?

a.

b.

What additional comments would you like to add?
### Visit 5 Subcampus Analysis/Scope Confirmation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN VISIT #5</th>
<th>TUESDAY JUNE 15</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY JUNE 16</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Campus Focus Group 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
<td>Outbound Committee TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preview Meeting Campus Planning Office</td>
<td>West Campus Focus Group 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>NOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Group Presentation Oakland Recital Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
<td>Advisory Committee 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved for Additional Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Student Focus Group 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6-B.7 Interim Linkage Plan (Web site graphic)
CAMPUS-WIDE INTERIM LINKAGE PLAN

The Campus-Wide Interim Linkage Plan is a composite of three alternative drawings that were presented to both campus and community at Campus Visit #4 in April. During that visit, elements of each alternative plan were discussed. Impressions and reactions were carefully considered and incorporated as this new drawing was created. It includes the preferred concepts shown in those three plans as well as new ideas that resulted from the visit. This is a first look at a plan that begins to address the issues and contributes to the concept of a unified and cohesive campus.

ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN
1. Districts
   From the previous study certain campus patterns began to emerge. These patterns resulted from a number of elements: topography of the site, physical barriers, massing of buildings, and open space patterns. A natural division of space, predominantly on West Campus as the present core of the University, is identified with loose, yellow forms. These have been further refined for this drawing and are referred to as Districts. Their origin and value in the planning effort will be described in more detail in the Subcampus Analysis.

2. Open Space
   Identifying a hierarchy of types strengthens campus open space.

   Level 1 Open Space is further refined to include those special places centrally located on campus where students congregate and that contribute most significantly to the campus-wide image. Campus entries and major pedestrian corridors in the campus core fall into this level. A strong central open space corridor supports and enhances movement throughout the campus. This core open space has a unifying function relating each surrounding campus zone (shown as yellow bubbles) to the other.

   Level 2 Open Space includes athletic fields and more natural open spaces such as Goldsworth Valley. The Goldsworth Valley Apartments are of a different character than the other land uses present here. It is recommended that when the time comes, rather than be replaced, they be moved from the valley. This level would be extended and strengthened along both edges of Stadium Drive between Oliver Street and the point where a bridge might cross over Stadium Drive. In this way, the Arcadia Creek Valley is acknowledged and enhanced. Moving along Stadium Drive should be a sequence of open space experiences between Howard and Lovell Streets. In order to accomplish this, Level 2 and 3 Open Space treatments are recommended. Open space that borders the campus also contributes to the campus image. For this reason, some areas outside the campus are addressed. The land across Howard Street from the Valley Drive entrance to West Campus is presently undeveloped. It contributes to the pastoral feel of that campus entry. Commercial development here, for example, would significantly change the character of this entry. Preserving it is a priority.

   Level 3 Open Space addresses the campus edges by the use of indigenous plant communities as a defining edge and a visual buffer where needed.
3. Vehicular Circulation

- The existing internal road on West Campus would become a completed loop road, realigned to service the campus more efficiently, to support pedestrian movement and the preservation of open space. The road is realigned west of Welborn Hall, and West Michigan Avenue terminates at the internal loop road.

- An internal loop road that would connect the entire campus system on both sides of Stadium Drive was supported if sufficient need were demonstrated. For this reason, this loop road has not been shown on the preferred linkage diagram. The possibility of a vehicular bridge over Stadium Drive is shown on this drawing as a reminder to keep this area in reserve should a future need arise.

- The proximity of Lawson Ice Arena to the student residences in the Knollwood Apartments indicates that a vehicular connection would be valuable. This is presented as an item for discussion. Connecting Knollwood Avenue with the internal campus road would allow students to access campus directly and avoid travel through the neighborhood to the West Michigan Avenue campus entrance. It would also relieve some of the vehicular pressure on the West Michigan Avenue entrance.

- The intersection of West Michigan Avenue and Stadium Drive is shown reconfigured so that West Michigan Avenue turns south to access Stadium Drive. The existing West Michigan Avenue roadway would then end in a cul-de-sac and be accessible for local traffic only.

- Circulation through Oakland Drive Campus is dependent upon the predicted growth, type of land use proposed, and existing conditions at the time of development. Entrances from Howard Street initially were not supported and have not been shown. However, two entries from Oakland Drive to Oakland Drive Campus are proposed and connect to an internal road system.

- The realignment of Oliver Street at Oakland Drive is shown south of its present location. This realignment would greatly improve the sight distance required to make a left turn safely.

4. Pedestrian Circulation

At this level of study, pedestrian travel is still shown in very general terms. Access to all campus zones and subcampuses is acknowledged.

- A pedestrian bridge over Stadium Drive at Oliver Street was strongly endorsed and is shown accordingly. Safe crossing for students heading to athletic practice and to and from other activities on East and Oakland Drive Campuses is a serious concern.

- Pedestrian circulation on East and Oakland Drive Campuses is shown in very general terms and will be addressed in more detail later.

- Pedestrian flow from the Knollwood neighborhood is shown crossing the pedestrian overpass to acknowledge the existing route used by students that come to campus from this location.

- As the planning process continues to more detailed analysis of the subcampuses, the focus is refined and the campus analyzed in light of the Interim Linkage Plan.
Figure 6-B.8 Subcampus Analysis (Web site graphic)
SUBCAMPUS ANALYSIS

In order to understand the campus at a greater level of detail, each subcampus was further studied. Because of the great variety of size and level of development, West Campus was further subdivided based on patterns that emerged during the previous phases. A campus is very much like a city with many of the same basic services, a resident population and a daily commuter element as well. This analogy suits the patterns that have emerged as the Master Plan project progresses. A detailed analysis drawing was prepared for each subcampus area. This was useful to an understanding of campus development patterns, but the large amount of data collected was too complicated to be presented. The district diagrams summarize the five critical components that have strongly influenced campus patterns to date. These are referred to as amenities. It is clear that certain zones have developed, such as the Academic Zone, the Athletic Zone, etc. However, when the campus is observed more critically, definitive patterns can be observed. A new designation can be applied to the yellow forms of the linkage diagram. They may be thought of as neighborhoods and will be referred to as districts.

DISTRICTS

Districts were identified based upon the following existing campus features:
1. Topography and open space, the geographic location, and existing barriers (natural or man-made).
2. Architectural massing of the buildings.
3. Similar use of the buildings and spaces found there.

DISTRICT AMENITIES

While each district may vary based on use, five specific characteristics, or amenities, emerged. Just as city neighborhoods may express a different character or feel, within campus districts these amenities may be expressed differently. Yet the districts all relate back to each other to create an overall campus image for Western Michigan University. As city neighborhoods are linked, pedestrian corridors and the open spaces of a campus are the links and the glue that hold the district together. Each district should have a distinct Image. This is most easily observed in an Athletic District. There is a distinguishable entry, or portal, to the district. The vehicular entry should be clear, easy to find, and lead simply to parking or drop-off. The pedestrian entry may be one or more supported by open space corridors. Architectural relationships between buildings and similarity of building details distinguish a district. And finally, each district has a "focus" open space where people gather or a preferred path where students travel. While perhaps not centrally located, this space is of primary importance within the district. A transit system that serves each district is an essential element. It is possible to evaluate each campus district based on these amenities. They provide a set of criteria that may be used to evaluate and organize the physical campus plan.

THE NEXT STEP

A set of alternatives begins to emerge for each subcampus. Links that connect, and the open space "glue" that holds the campus together in a visual and physical manner are explored and tested against the earlier Campus-Wide Linkage Alternative. From this a framework starts to be crafted that solves specific problems and addresses specific concerns. Solutions emerge and the pieces of the puzzle are set in place.
Figure 6-B.10 Subcampus Analysis: Open Space Diagram (Web site graphic)
Subcampus Analysis: Edge Image Evaluation

Figure 6-B.11 Subcampus Analysis: Edge Image Evaluation (Web site graphic)
Subcampus Analysis: Pedestrian Evaluation

Figure 6-B.12 Subcampus Analysis: Pedestrian Evaluation (Web site graphic)
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Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #6 will be:

Tuesday, August 10th from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m., Fetter Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Linkage Alternative and the Subcampus Analysis study presented at the Preview Session in Oakland Recital Hall, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. The Interim Linkage Alternative represents the collective ideas of the focus groups and the study of three previous Alternative drawings. A more detailed analysis of the subcampuses was also presented, and the Interim Plan applied to this analysis.

In this analysis, the campus was further subdivided from the subcampus level for planning purposes only. This approach to the campus viewed “zones” or “districts” as an organizing principle and evaluated the campus physical design in light of this. These districts were identified based on three characteristics: 1) similar use, 2) architectural strengths or massing, and 3) topography, geographic location and barriers. Each district, although not pure in this classification system, was identified with a letter and descriptive name. Five characteristics or amenities were identified for a district and were used as an evaluative tool to aid in the planning of subcampus alternatives. A matrix was created that cross-referenced the districts with the amenities and used a variable scale of 1, 2, or 3, with 1 representing the highest level of compliance and 3 the lowest.

The discussion resulting from this presentation of concepts, plans, and drawings will be used to direct the creation of two Alternative Plans for each subcampus. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. This visit marks the end of Part 2: Campus-wide Alternatives. Subcampus Alternatives will be prepared in Part 3 and presented at Visit #6.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for future campus visits:

Visit #7 is a regular review visit. East Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, October 6th from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

Visit #8 is a regular review visit on Wednesday, December 1, 1999.
A reminder that comments about the Master Plan Project may be sent to the following address:

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

The current status of the WMU Master Plan Web site was presented. Some new site graphics will be forthcoming as soon as the university reviews them. Materials were slow to appear for this visit, and SmithGroup JJR (JJR) will address the problem before the next meeting. Some problems were presented regarding material posted, but not viewable on different browsers. Sometimes reloading the page helps to make new information viewable. This problem is also being addressed.

Please feel free to contact JJR at the above e-mail address if you are having difficulties. The Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan

3. The student survey data was analyzed and a memo summarizing the results will be prepared.

B. TRAFFIC STUDY UPDATE

Chris Luz and Jason Kelly of HNTB summarized their analysis of existing conditions and the recommendations made in the Interim Linkage Alternative. The Level of Service (LOS) for key intersections was evaluated. A level of E or F is considered unacceptable. Most intersections are designed for LOS “D.” The intersections studied are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS – PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Stadium (B)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver and Oakland</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Oakland</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Stadium</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Howard</td>
<td>E, Critical, Left-turns from South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Valley</td>
<td>F, Primary Exit in PM. Left-turns onto Howard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. With respect to the Interim Linkage Alternative:
   • A new signalized intersection at West Michigan and Stadium would greatly improve this area.
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- The realignment of Oliver and Oakland south of its present alignment would greatly improve the safety of the intersection.
- A new signalized intersection along Howard between Lawson Ice Arena and Miller Auditorium would help "event" traffic.
- The improved Loop Road would relieve congestion at campus entries.

2. Response to the question of closing Oakland Drive at East Campus: Oakland Drive carries four lanes of traffic; therefore, it would not be possible to close the road.

3. Response to question of providing a signal at the Oliver Street/Oakland Drive intersection: The value of this proposal depends on the level of development for Oakland Drive Campus.

4. An indirect left was suggested for the intersection of Stadium Drive and Howard Street to alleviate congestion.

C. CAMPUS DISTRICTS

The discussion centered on the identification of districts, their definition, and amenities associated with them. With respect to Oakland Drive Campus, the identification of two districts was acceptable.

1. The identification of specific uses for the existing buildings varied from the Health and Human Services needs to the location of maintenance (Physical Plant):
   - The existing cluster of buildings would be a good location for maintenance services. However, the question arose of whether a central location such as this will be necessary, what are the requirements, and should it be consolidated? Should maintenance be outsourced? Does it need to be on campus at all? These questions were raised but not resolved.

2. The small cluster of buildings occupying the northwest corner of Oliver and Oakland (Vandercook Hall, Spindler Hall and Oakland Recital Hall) was discussed with respect to use and, thus, their district. Presently they are considered part of East Campus. However, their grouping with Health and Human Services or with Athletics was considered. It was agreed that wherever they are located, it should be in a district that does not span Oakland Drive (i.e., they would not be grouped with Walwood, North, East or West Hall).
3. The Telecommunications Building and equipment that is currently on Oakland Drive Campus was considered in conflict with a Health and Human Services District. Its location on the sloping hillside of Oakland Drive Campus may allow it to remain there, yet out of sight.

4. The southernmost district on Oakland Drive Campus (K) was discussed with respect to possible use. Some student residential would complement the academic uses considered for Districts K and J. The building surrounding the water tower might be used for student housing or condominiums for retired faculty.

5. The districts occupying West Campus were discussed and redrawn as follows:
   - District G (events) does not overlap District E, and includes Miller Auditorium and parking ramp
   - The Student Health Center was grouped with District C (Student Services).
   - The Student Rec Center and the cluster of three buildings at Oliver and Oakland were grouped with District H (Athletics).

6. The central core open space (1) should extend south between Districts E and F.

The districts, identified initially by letter and name, are not a pure classification. The names were based on predominant use, but are in no way necessary for their distinction.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

**SmithGroup JJR**

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #6 will be:

August 10, 11 and 12, 1999

Discussion of campus issues that students see as critical are: parking, circulation (bike, bus, car), wayfinding, pedestrian circulation and building conditions.
Comments and opinions are as follows:
Bus System
The transit system is a positive feature of the WMU campus. It is easy to use and connects to the city bus system. Students perceive that there is a stigma to riding the bus, and few students use it. This system needs more support, better map displays at stops, bus shelters throughout campus and safer drivers.

Parking
Not enough student parking is provided. Often “R” designated spots are empty. Students view themselves as customers of the university. If they are expected to park at a distance, then a “drop-off” should be provided. The parking lots by the Business School are basically remote, but it is a good place to catch the bus.

Wayfinding
Students stated that wayfinding on campus was initially confusing but later, easy to navigate. Maps are confusing and difficult to read. Buildings are so large that it is difficult to see around them to get oriented.

Pedestrian Circulation
Pedestrian safety is an issue on both internal roads and public roads. Many campus sidewalks are in poor condition, making them dangerous or difficult to use. The campus needs more broad sidewalks. Campus circulation doesn’t flow. It’s difficult to get anywhere. Snow removal from walks and maintenance of them is poor. Stadium Drive, at 40 mph, is too fast for a school zone.

Bicycles
Use of bikes to navigate campus would be supported if paths were provided.

Building Conditions
East Campus buildings seem forgotten and in poor condition. Living conditions in married student housing (Oakland Drive Campus and Goldsworth Valley) are extremely poor and expensive compared to what is available in the community. Bronco Mall and Brown Hall need improvement.

Accessibility
Many of the older buildings are not accessible, and the poor condition of walks, etc. make movement difficult or impossible. It was suggested that consultants speak to handicapped students.

Positive Aspects of Physical Design
Landscape treatments, open spaces and views, feel of a small town, bus system, easily traversed campus, can walk almost everywhere, public artwork throughout campus, Tent Plaza.
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Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

[Signature]
Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #6 will be:

Wednesday, August 11th from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. / Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Linkage Alternative and the Subcampus Analysis study presented at the Preview Session in Oakland Recital Hall, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. The Interim Linkage Alternative represents the collective ideas and study of three previous alternative drawings. A more detailed analysis of the subcampuses was presented, and the Interim Plan applied to this analysis. In this analysis, the campus was further subdivided from the subcampus level for planning purposes only. This approach to the campus viewed “zones” or “districts” as an organizing principle and evaluated the campus physical design in light of this. These districts were identified based on three characteristics: 1) similar use, 2) architectural strengths or massing, and 3) topography, geographic location and barriers. Each district, although not pure in this classification system, was identified with a letter and descriptive name. Five characteristics or amenities were identified for a district and were used as an evaluative tool to aid in the planning of subcampus alternatives. A matrix was created that cross-referenced the districts with the amenities and used a variable scale of 1, 2, or 3, with 1 representing the highest level of compliance and 3 the lowest.

The discussion resulting from this presentation of concepts, plans, and drawings will be used to direct the creation of two Alternative Plans for each subcampus.

Early discussion concerned questions about the proposed indoor practice facility for student athletes. Siting of the building was addressed. The architect will make recommendations in this regard. Sites under consideration are the current Physical Plant location on Stadium Drive and the hillside on the southeast corner of Stadium Drive and Oliver Street.

The building is one of three priority projects under consideration by the university. Concern was expressed that plans for this building need to be interfaced with the planning for the campus, and the consultants should be kept updated and informed. With regard to planning issues, it was stated that the consultants require the following information: 1) the gross square feet of the building, and 2) special demands of the facility.

The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:
A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. This visit marks the end of Part 2: Campus-wide Alternatives. Subcampus Alternatives will be prepared in Part 3 and presented at Visit #6.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for future campus visits:

   Visit #7 is a regular review visit. East Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, October 6th from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

   Visit #8 is a regular review visit on Wednesday, December 1, 1999.

A reminder that comments about the Master Plan Project may be sent to the following address:

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

The current status of the WMU Master Plan Web site was presented. Some new site graphics will be forthcoming as soon as the university reviews them. Materials were slow to appear for this visit, and SmithGroup JJR (JJR) will address the problem before the next meeting. Some problems were presented regarding material posted, but not viewable on different browsers. Sometimes reloading the page helps to make new information viewable. This problem is also being addressed.

Please feel free to contact JJR at the above e-mail address if you are having difficulties. The Web site address is as follows:

   www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan

3. The student survey data was analyzed and a memo summarizing the results will be prepared.

B. TRAFFIC STUDY UPDATE

Chris Luz and Jason Kelly of HNTB summarized their analysis of existing conditions and the recommendations made in the Interim Linkage Alternative. The Level of Service (LOS) for key intersections was evaluated. A level of E or F is considered unacceptable. Most intersections are designed for LOS “D.” The intersections studied are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS - PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Stadium (B)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver and Oakland</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Oakland</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Stadium</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Howard</td>
<td>E, Critical, Left-turns from South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Valley</td>
<td>F, Primary Exit in PM. Left-turns onto Howard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. With respect to the Interim Linkage Alternative:
   - A new signalized intersection at West Michigan and Stadium would greatly improve this area.
   - The realignment of Oliver and Oakland south of its present alignment would greatly improve the safety of the intersection.
   - A new signalized intersection along Howard between Lawson Ice Arena and Miller Auditorium would help "event" traffic. This larger, signalized entrance would probably replace the several entrances on the north and south sides of Howard.
   - The improved Loop Road would relieve the congestion at the Howard/West Michigan intersection.

2. While realignment of Oliver Street to the south along Oakland would solve safety issues, concern was expressed that this realignment would virtually isolate East Campus buildings that are east of Oakland Drive. Further concern was expressed that this suggests that Oakland Drive Campus is the "place to go."

3. An indirect left was suggested for the intersection of Stadium Drive and Howard Street to alleviate congestion.

4. MDOT has a planning group formed to study the new high-speed rail proposal. As part of this, the intersection of West Michigan and Stadium, and perhaps Stadium and Oliver will be studied. This may be useful information for HNTB.

5. The question was raised to possibly move the new alignment of West Michigan into Stadium Drive farther north to align with Eddy Drive on the east.
6. The question was raised with regard to the realignment of Oliver Street through the area currently occupied by Vandercook Hall, should this building be gone in the future. The grades in this area are so steep that turning onto Oakland Drive in this location would also be dangerous.

C. CAMPUS DISTRICTS

The discussion centered on the "use" for the historic buildings that occupy this campus. In this regard, the following thoughts were expressed:

- The following uses were suggested to create a "public interface" between the university and the City of Kalamazoo: academic (E, W, and N Halls), entertainment (Oakland Recital Hall), dining (Walwood), and residential (Vandercook, Spindler).
- The connection between the university and the community already exists. To take this concept further: The Kalamazoo Public Library could connect with the archives already housed on East Campus, Spindler could provide hotel services, a cafe/restaurant could be located in East Hall facing the city, and art exhibits here already bring members of the Kalamazoo community to the East Campus.
- The location of an Alumni Center here might not meet the needs of alumni to stay connected with the students and be easily accessible to them, as well as host alumni events.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucclesi Cody
Project Manager

cc: Participants
    E. Hallquist / SG JJR
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Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #6 will be:

Wednesday, August 11th from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Linkage Alternative and the Subcampus Analysis study presented at the Preview Session in Oakland Recital Hall, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. The Interim Linkage Alternative represents the collective ideas of the focus groups and the study of three previous Alternative drawings. A more detailed analysis of the subcampuses was also presented, and the Interim Plan applied to this analysis.

In this analysis, the campus was further subdivided from the subcampus level for planning purposes only. This approach to the campus viewed “zones” or “districts” as an organizing principle and evaluated the campus physical design in light of this. These districts were identified based on three characteristics: 1) similar use, 2) architectural strengths or massing, and 3) topography, geographic location and barriers. Each district, although not pure in this classification system, was identified with a letter and descriptive name. Five characteristics or amenities were identified for a district and were used as an evaluative tool to aid in the planning of subcampus alternatives. A matrix was created that cross-referenced the districts with the amenities and used a variable scale of 1, 2, or 3, with 1 representing the highest level of compliance and 3 the lowest.

The discussion resulting from this presentation of concepts, plans, and drawings will be used to direct the creation of two Alternative Plans for each subcampus. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. This visit marks the end of Part 2: Campus-wide Alternatives. Subcampus Alternatives will be prepared in Part 3 and presented at Visit #6.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for future campus visits:

   Visit #7 is a regular review visit. West Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, October 6th, from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated, as information is available.

   Visit #8 is a regular review visit on Wednesday, December 1, 1999.
A reminder that comments about the Master Plan Project may be sent to the following address:

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

The current status of the WMU Master Plan Web site was presented. Some new site graphics will be forthcoming as soon as the university reviews them. Materials were slow to appear for this visit, and SmithGroup JJR (JJR) will address the problem before the next meeting. Some problems were presented regarding material posted, but not viewable on different browsers. Sometimes reloading the page helps to make new information viewable. This problem is also being addressed. Please feel free to contact JJR at the above e-mail address if you are having difficulties. The Web site address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/dgb42s/home2.html

The general public/campus address is: www.wmich.edu/masterplan

3. The student survey data was analyzed and a memo summarizing the results will be prepared.

B. TRAFFIC STUDY UPDATE

Chris Luz and Jason Kelly of HNTB summarized their analysis of existing conditions and the recommendations made in the Interim Linkage Alternative. The Level of Service (LOS) for key intersections was evaluated. A level of E or F is considered unacceptable. Most intersections are designed for LOS “D.”

The intersections studied are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS - PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Stadium (B)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver and Oakland</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Oakland</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Stadium</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Howard</td>
<td>E, Critical, Left-turns from South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Valley</td>
<td>F, Primary Exit in PM. Left-turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onto Howard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. With respect to the Interim Linkage Alternative:
   - A new signalized intersection at West Michigan and Stadium would greatly improve this area.
The realignment of Oliver and Oakland south of its present alignment would greatly improve the safety of the intersection.  
A new signalized intersection along Howard between Lawson Ice Arena and Miller Auditorium would help "event" traffic.  
The improved Loop Road would relieve congestion at campus entries.

2. Oakland Drive carries four lanes of traffic and is currently operating at capacity. One of two proposed entries to Oakland Drive Campus would probably be signalized.

3. An indirect left was suggested for the intersection of Stadium Drive and Howard Street to alleviate congestion.

C. CAMPUS DISTRICTS

1. With respect to the districts on West Campus, discussion regarding their boundaries resulted in the following "redistricting":  
   • District D should include Rood, Everett and Wood Halls.  
   • The Library and Computing Center might become a small central district that serves many others.  
   • It's okay for a building not to be identified with any specific district, such as the Student Health Center.  
   • The Student Rec Center should be grouped with Athletics.  
   • Sangren Hall stays with District C, even though it has a high use as an academic function.

2. For the two residential districts, A and F, a "Student Village Concept" could be promoted. This could become the "character" or image of these districts.

3. The Knollwood Avenue connection to District G (Lawson Ice Arena) was supported, as long as it is not used as a cut-through in the neighborhood. Many pedestrians already cut through, which perhaps suggests the need for a wide, asphalt paved path to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles. Students then might bike to campus rather than drive out onto West Michigan Avenue and, thus, relieve the congestion currently experienced there.

4. Cut-throughs currently exist north of the Valley Road entrance and should be noted in the plan.

5. The use of bicycles is difficult during the winter months, but the development of bike paths was supported.
6. A traffic discussion noted that the current student volume heading downtown is low. The traffic found on Howard, it was suggested, is mostly regional rather than campus driven.

7. Vande Giessen Road could remain at Howard, but with restricted use during events. All major traffic would be directed to the new, major entry along Howard Street south of West Michigan. Possibly a queuing area for events could be provided along this roadway.

8. Concern was expressed that relocating the Loop Road on the hillside instead of through the Goldsworth Valley would isolate the North Campus residences and might also isolate the valley instead of embracing it. This change may not increase its use. It was suggested that by moving the apartments out of the valley, space would be available for intramural sports use, which would bring students to the area.

9. Areas of the plan show student housing removed, but those “beds” will be replaced somewhere else on campus in the Master Plan. It was suggested that students should be distributed throughout the core area of campus.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager

cc: Participants
E. Hallquist / SG JJR
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Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The date of the next Campus Visit 6* will be:

Wednesday, August 11th from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Fetzer Center
   with additional time scheduled (6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.) as needed.
   Dinner will be provided at 5:00 p.m.

* Due to schedule changes, the Advisory/Policy Committee will meet during the
   August visit.

The purpose of Campus Visit 5 was to discuss the Interim Linkage Alternative and
   the Subcampus Analysis Study. The Interim Linkage Alternative represents the
   collective ideas of the Focus Groups and the study of three previous Alternative
   drawings. A more detailed analysis of the subcampsuses was presented, and the
   Interim Plan applied to this analysis.

In this analysis, the campus was further subdivided from the subcampus level for
   planning purposes only. This approach to the campus viewed "zones" or "districts"
   as an organizing principle and evaluated the campus physical design in light of this.
   These districts were identified based on three characteristics: 1) similar use; 2)
   architectural strengths or massing; and, 3) topography, geographic location and
   barriers. Each district, although not pure in this classification system, was identified
   with a letter and descriptive name. Five characteristics or amenities were identified
   for a district and were used as an evaluative tool to aid in the planning of subcampus
   alternatives. A matrix was created that cross-referenced the districts with the
   amenities and used a variable scale of 1, 2, or 3, with 1 representing the highest level
   of compliance and 3 the lowest.

The discussion resulting from this presentation of concepts, plans, and drawings will
   be used to direct the creation of two Alternative Plans for each subcampus.

Although this committee was not originally scheduled to meet during Visit #6, it was
   decided that it should meet in order to ensure consistency of university priorities and
   provide the highest level of decision making relative to the Master Plan.

During Campus Visit #5, the Open Community Meeting was the final meeting of the
   visit. For this reason, the discussion was summarized for the Advisory/Policy
   Committee. There was also a summary of the Student Focus Group meeting of
   Tuesday, June 15th. HNTB, traffic consultants were not present at this meeting. JJR
   summarized their findings. These are reported below. Focus Group chairpersons
   also summarized the discussion from their meetings.

The following comments and observations were offered during this committee’s
   discussion:
A. **Organizational Items**

1. This visit marks the end of Part 2: Campus-wide Alternatives. Subcampus Alternatives will be prepared in Part 3 and presented at Visit #6.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for upcoming campus visits:
   
   Visit #7 is a regular review visit. The Advisory/Policy Committee will meet on Wednesday, October 6th from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

   Visit #8 is a regular review visit, Wednesday, December 1, 1999.

3. Remember that comments about the Master Plan project may be sent to the following address:

   **wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com**

4. The current status of the WMU Master Plan Web site was presented. Some new site graphics will be forthcoming as soon as they are reviewed by the university. Materials were slow to appear for this visit, and JJR will address the problem before the next meeting. Some problems were presented regarding material posted but not viewable on different browsers. Sometimes reloading the page helps to make new information viewable. This problem is also being addressed.

   Please feel free to contact us at the above e-mail address if you are having difficulties. The Web site address is as follows:

   **www.wnmich.edu/masterplan/committees/c3pow6/home2.html**

   The general public/campus address is:  **www.wnmich.edu/masterplan**

5. The student survey data was analyzed, and a memo summarizing the results will be prepared.

B. **Traffic Study Update**

1. JJR summarized the HNTB analysis of existing conditions and the recommendations made in the Interim Linkage Alternative. The Level of Service (LOS) for key intersections was evaluated. A level of E or F is considered unacceptable. Most intersections are designed for LOS “D.” The intersections studied are as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS – PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Stadium (B)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver and Oakland</td>
<td>Safety Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Oakland</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Stadium</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Michigan and Howard</td>
<td>E, Critical, Left-turns from South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard and Valley</td>
<td>F, Primary Exit in P.M., Left-turns onto Howard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. With respect to the Interim Linkage Alternative:
   - A new signalized intersection at West Michigan and Stadium would greatly improve this area.
   - The realignment of Oliver and Oakland south of its present alignment would greatly improve the safety of the intersection.
   - A new signalized intersection along Howard between Lawson Ice Arena and Miller Auditorium would help to relieve the traffic congestion at West Michigan and Howard by providing another efficient entry to campus as well as "event" traffic congestion. This single, larger intersection would become a main entry to campus. The existing smaller entries such a Vande Giessen would not be removed, but could be restricted to handle traffic during events.
   - The improved Loop Road would relieve congestion at campus entrances.
   - Oakland Drive carries four lanes of traffic and is currently operating at capacity. One of two proposed entries to Oakland Drive Campus would probably be signalized.

An indirect left was suggested for the intersection of Stadium Drive and Howard Street to alleviate congestion.

It was noted that during peak time at the intersection of Oakland and Howard, traffic congestion was severe, and was much worse than a “D” rating.

It was noted that in the past, the Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study group looked at the connection to Knollwood Avenue. It was previously investigated as a “buses” only route to bring students to campus. HNTB was encouraged to review the KATS information, which should tell them all they need to know about city traffic.

HNTB may talk to the City regarding proposals for the Campus Master Plan, but it will not make application to the City or layout the design.
C. Interim Alternative and District Designation

Concern was expressed for naming the districts as well as for the boundaries as shown on the Interim Alternative. The discussion that followed led eventually to a charrette in which the committee worked to redraw the districts on West Campus in a way that they considered more suited to the existing physical layout of buildings and open space. The discussion contained the following points:

- The need to coordinate planning now with projections for growth and development in 20 years is important. The consultants will use this information as provided by the university.

- JJR explained that housing is becoming a concern for many universities experiencing an increase in demand for on-campus housing, but with fewer dollars available to meet that need. The view was expressed that it is important to keep a certain amount of student housing within the Campus Core. Where housing is found off campus, it will affect entry and arrival paths. Concern was expressed at previous meetings for the availability of on-campus student housing if older housing units are demolished in the future. This concern prompted the response that the planning effort will respond to the amount of space identified as required for students to live on campus.

- JJR explained that using the concept of “zones” is helpful to restrict or limit what use is found there. The committee was not in concert with this opinion.

- Parking – The addition of new housing to campus requires additional parking. Remote parking seems to be a problem for students who want to park as close as possible to their residence. In JJR’s opinion, putting parking at the front door of a residence hall promotes the concept of the campus as a parking lot. It was noted that if residence halls were on campus, there would be parking, and that parking must be designed, not merely provided. One way to discourage parking in close proximity, or at all, is perhaps to place a high price tag on it.

- JJR commented that the campus bus system is a viable alternative to driving around campus, that students must be encouraged to use the bus, but that these changes must occur gradually. There was discussion as to whether there should be buses or not. WMU is a commuter campus, and students use their cars. It was noted that the Master Plan must address this issue.

- Concern was also expressed regarding:
  1. Why was Sangren being forced into a student services district?
  2. Why are districts forced into shapes by open space definitions?
  3. Why is so much emphasis given to visitor orientation?

- The list of District Amenities should also include Parking and Function.
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Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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cc: Participants
    E. Hallquist / SG JJR