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SUBCAMPUS ALTERNATIVES

The Alternative Plans for each subcampus are based on changes proposed in the Interim Campus-Wide Linkage Plan. By applying one to the other, testing of the overall campus framework was studied in the greater detail provided by the Subcampus Analysis. Ideas and observations made during Campus Visit #5 and workshops with the Campus Planning staff provided valuable insight and feedback used in the preparation of the subcampus plans. While each subcampus was studied independently, the two alternatives for each are presented within the context of the overall campus framework in two independent campus plans. Attention to the needs of each subcampus was then integrated with the needs of the overall campus plan. Building use, projected growth, residential, parking, and circulation needs, and the campus/community interface were important considerations in the development of these plans. Two drawings are presented, but like the overall Campus-Wide Linkage Alternatives, elements from each may be chosen in the process of defining an Interim Alternative Plan for each subcampus. These interim plans will again be related to the overall Campus-Wide Linkage Plan.

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

A study of the campus showed three different development patterns: 1) a north-south grid appears across most of the academic core on West Campus and on East Campus, 2) a radial pattern spirals about the Bernhard Student Center and The Oaklands, and 3) an axial pattern intersects both the north-south grid and the radial. The latter is the path of West Michigan Avenue where it passed at one time through West Campus. More recent campus building patterns, such as the Student Recreation Center and the Hayworth College of Business support the north-south grid, while some student residence halls, Waldo Library, and McCracken Hall seem to spiral about the Bernhard Student Center and The Oaklands following the topography of the hillside. Sangren Hall, Wood Hall, and Haenicke Hall, among others, reinforce the axial street pattern of West Michigan Ave.
ALTERNATIVE A

West Campus, the academic core, shows an axial central mall that is reinforced by building edges. This mall forms a strong, central, formal, open space element that relates the various surrounding districts. The districts within the West Campus are defined independently. Patterns may be grid, axial, or radial depending on such factors as topography, location, use, existing buildings, and circulation. A very formal central space spans Stadium Drive. Academic buildings nestled into the hillside visually link the subcampuses.

- The continuous loop road alignment deviates from the Interim Campus Wide Linkage Plan where it drops into Goldsworth Valley. It continues into the valley from the existing North Dormitory Road alignment across existing surface parking to meet Goldsworth Valley Drive. Access to Goldsworth Valley Residence Halls 1, 2, and 3 is shown from two access roads (rather than three) to provide safer pedestrian circulation to academic buildings.
- Student housing is concentrated on Oakland Drive Campus with a 15-minute walk to academic and athletic districts. Access to West Campus is from a pedestrian and vehicular bridge over Stadium Drive.
- Parking decks at Schneider Hall and the Fetzer Center, and by Read Fieldhouse replace surface parking. East Campus buildings east of Oakland Drive are shown housing administrative functions next to an expanded athletic district. In addition to the existing athletic fields and buildings, this alternative suggests the new indoor practice facility and two soccer fields be placed in close proximity to existing athletic fields on what is currently Oakland Drive Campus, south of existing Oliver Street.
- Intramural fields would be located on the campus east of Stadium Drive as part of the Athletic Campus and in close relationship to student housing.
- Oliver Street terminates at an internal loop road. Access roads are provided from the loop road to Oakland Drive (2) and Howard Street (1).
- Academic buildings and student housing units are shown in close proximity to the bridge connection to West Campus.
- Health and Human Services would be located on Oakland Drive Campus.
Subcampus Alternative A
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Figure 6-B.13 Subcampus Alternative A (Web site graphic)
ALTERNATIVE B

In this alternative, architectural relationships help to define the physical plan for the subcampuses using the predominant north-south grid pattern. Informal open space moves throughout to create a park-like setting. Stadium Drive is shown as a boulevard between West Michigan Avenue and Howard Street. No bridge is shown connecting West Campus and the Oakland Drive Campus; however, the space is reserved. Housing needs are accommodated independently within each subcampus.

- The realigned internal loop road on West Campus is shown along the Goldsworth Valley at the toe of the wooded slope and bridging over a pedestrian path connecting the Goldsworth Valley Residence Halls to academic core buildings.
- Parking decks are proposed to replace surface parking by Schneider Hall and the Fetzer Center, and by Read Fieldhouse. An expansion to the existing deck by the Bernhard Center is also proposed.
- Intramural fields are retained on West Campus, with additional fields placed in close relationship to student housing.
- Within East Campus, existing athletic facilities are shown in their current layout.
- The facilities located east of Oakland Drive are proposed to be renovated and used as an assisted living facility where close proximity to the College of Health and Human Services would serve both residents and the college.
- The College of Health and Human Services includes buildings on both sides of existing Oliver Street (Oliver Street is realigned) in close proximity to the clinic, KCMS, and to the existing buildings on the east side of Oakland Drive.
- Student housing to accommodate Oakland Drive Campus needs is located in the existing historic KRPH quad.
- The building envelopes shown on Oakland Drive Campus represent further growth to accommodate potential academic/research needs.
- A parking deck is proposed behind the existing Waldo Stadium.
- Oliver Street terminates at an internal road that provides access to Oakland Drive at two locations. Access from Howard Street is also provided.
Subcampus Alternative B
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Figure 6-B.14 Subcampus Alternative B (Web site graphic)
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #6 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Campus Visit #6, Major Review
Open Campus Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center Auditorium

Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, August 10, 1999 / 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Issue Date: August 24, 1999

Participants: Bettina Meyer / University Libraries
Regina Buckner / University Libraries
Mary Bullock / Education Library
Sandy Blanchard / Engineering
J.W. Barton / Advanced Services
Lynn Kelly Albertson / Career and Student Employment
Ray Kezenius / Campus Planning
Carol Eddy / Sincere
Norman Hamann / Resident
Bob Warner / University Bookstore
Loreene Broker / OVPR
Dave Lemberg / Assoc. Professor, Geography
Jay Means / Chemistry
Michele Moe / HCOB
Dan Rathka / Student
George Dales / Emeritus HPER / Athletics
Sara Wick / University Libraries
Kay Wick / University Libraries
Kay Chase / University Libraries
Brian Burch / WIDR – FM 89.1
Mark Murphy / College of Aviation
Sean McCann / Vine Neighborhood Association
Dave Houghton / Chairperson, Arts & Sciences
Robert Brown / Director, Dept. of Public Safety
John Goes / Physical Plant
Jon VanderMeer / Telecommunications
Dan Litynski / Dean, Coll. of Engineering & Applied Sciences
Sai Ravichandran / Director, CAE Center
Greg Moorehead / Director, Student Support Program
Carrie A. Jordan / Waldo Library – Circulation, Resident
David McKee / Waldo Library, East Campus Focus Group
Pamela Rups / Computing Services
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to present the Subcampus Alternatives to the campus community. The following comments and observations were recorded during this presentation.

Q: Residential students are the soul of campus. In Alternative A, students are removed from the core. Housing all students on Oakland Drive Campus isolates them. What do you project the enrollment to be?
A: No significant increase is projected.

Q: What consideration is given to the movement of students and faculty who commute to and from campus?
A: The planners are looking at roads, entrances and transit linkages. This is a significant concern.
Meeting Notes
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Q: Is the Power Plant shown as existing?
A: Yes, the Power Plant will stay in its present location and will accommodate rail lines.

Q: Comment: Bridge in Alternative A seems to interrupt Sacred Space.

Q: In Alternative B, housing is noticeably segregated; is this the case?
A: Yes. It is because there is no bridge to link the campuses, housing is shown on Oakland Drive Campus to support that campus, and so on.

Q: This is not a resident campus or a pedestrian campus. What is important here is access on and off campus. The Ring Road seems to make it worse and more difficult to enter and leave campus.
A: Problems exist with the current Ring Road because it is not complete. The goal is to improve access in the perimeter edge, but the plan must continue to accommodate service and faculty access.

Q: For clarification, Goldsworthy Pond is not shown on one of the alternatives; is it being removed?
A: No, this was just a graphic slip. It should be shown in both alternative drawings.

Q: The traffic problems at Valley Road and Howard, and West Michigan and Howard don't seem to be alleviated.
A: We recognize the problem and are working on a solution. The timing of traffic signals favors West Main and Stadium Drive.

Q: Will Sindicuse (Student Health Center) have proper vehicular access?
A: Yes.

Q: Have you planned for students entering campus from the west with regard to traffic volume and timing?
A: Vehicular systems don't operate independent of city, neighborhoods, etc. These are all being studied.

Q: Why don't students use the bus?
A: Students don't feel that it is reliable. Students need to be given an incentive to ride the bus.
Meeting Notes
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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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Meeting Subject: Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, August 10, 1999 / 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Issue Date: August 17, 1999

Participants: Committee: (*not present)
* Janet Pisaneschi, Chair; Dean, College of Health & Human Services
  Mick Hanley for Janet Pisaneschi, College of Health and Human Services
* Gary Mathews, AAUP Representative, Professor, School of Social Work
  James Barton, Data Entry Operator, Development Office
  Marcia Ellis, Coordinator of Clinical Services, Sindecuse Health Center
  Patricia Viard, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Science
  David Lemberg, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Geography
* Ronald Coleman, Graduate Student, GSA
* Tom King, Attorney, Kreis Enderle Callendar & Hudgins, PC
* Shanetha Goss, Student, School of Nursing
* Kelli Talicska, Student, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology
* Benjamin Malek, WSA, Undergraduate Student, Biology/Spanish

WMU Staff:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants
Richard Riggerink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Manager / 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 #7 will be:
Tuesday, October 5th from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m., Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Alternative Subcampus Plans as they were presented at the General Preview Sessions/Open Campus Session, Tuesday, August 10th, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in Fetzer Auditorium.

This discussion focused on the Oakland Drive Campus specifically, but also West and East campus as they related to Oakland Drive Campus. From this meeting, elements, ideas and issues were to be recommended to the Advisory/Policy Committee for inclusion in the Interim Subcampus Plan for Oakland Drive Campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3: Subcampus Campus Alternatives. During Part 4, a more detailed study of the Campus-wide Framework Plan will be conducted, testing ideas from the Interim Subcampus Plans and looking more specifically at plans for vehicular, pedestrian and open space systems.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:
Visit #8 is a regular review visit. Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group will meet on Tuesday, November 31st from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

Visit #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

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

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

Please continue to visit the master plan Web site. The 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 was presented.
B. COMMENTS
The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

1. Housing
   - As shown in Alternative A, concentrating housing on Oakland Drive Campus might not be good for those who use the library late at night and then must walk back to residence halls across the pedestrian bridge.
   - It was suggested that as Alternative A presents housing, students may stay on campus to study because of the distance back to their residence halls. Students might be encouraged to leave the residence halls and to use university facilities.
   - Parking might be easier to provide to residents if housing is located on Oakland Drive Campus.
   - Safety at night on campus: Classes occur at all times of the evening in the Academic Core. The perception that the campus is unsafe may be related to parking far from the residence halls. The creation of major pedestrian corridors would contribute to a safe campus. Isolating housing areas as in Alternative A may reduce evening activity in academic areas and may increase the perception of campus as unsafe.
   - Removing student housing from the activity centers of campus is cause for concern. For this reason, clusters of housing as shown in Alternative B would be supported. However, it was noted that one advantage to grouping residence halls together on Oakland Drive Campus would be to encourage students to walk or bike to classes.

2. Bicycles
   - At one time, a student planning class laid out a trail system. This system could tie into existing bike trails and could connect the campus to Knollwood and Arboretum neighborhoods.
   - The use of bicycles in the winter is difficult and bicyclists may use the bus instead. However, maintained bike trails are easy to use year round.

3. Stadium Drive
   - It was suggested that the Boulevard as shown on Alternative B be combined with the formal Open Space shown in Alternative A. The open space on "A" was seen as a strong, positive statement.

4. Loop Road
   - The question of number of lanes for the Loop Road was raised. It was suggested that it might be three lanes, one in each direction with a turning lane in the center. It was felt that the number of lanes is important if the road is to be effective in relieving traffic congestion.
5. Bridge
- The value of a bridge over Stadium Drive would be to keep traffic on campus roads.

6. College of Health and Human Services
- The population consists of between 2,000 and 3,000 students. The college would need food service if it were housing students on Oakland Drive Campus. It would also house all clinical activities, thus there is a need for parking and patient access to the clinics.
- The Loop Road proposed (Alternative A) for Oakland Drive Campus would have to support a constant flux of patients. Because the curriculum for students is closely tied to clinical services, there is a circulation problem. The ideal situation would be for classes to be in close proximity to the clinic. And for alumni of this college, it is also a plus to have a distinct identity.
- The Health and Human Services clinic should be placed in close proximity to public transit that runs along Oakland Drive. Patient-oriented facilities are usually placed on the community edge.
- It was suggested that clinics found in other locations on campus be consolidated within the College of Health and Human Services on Oakland Drive Campus.
- It was also suggested that East Campus buildings might be used as academic facilities for the College of Health and Human Services.

7. Vehicular Circulation
- The circulation pattern for Oakland Drive Campus shown in Alternative B was seen as disconnected, and Alternative A was described as providing the "cleanest" circulation routes.
- The question of a transit mall was raised. Will one be proposed that will connect the students at Baker Farm with the main campus?
- The question of the feasibility of a pedestrian bridge over Oakland Drive was raised. Such a bridge would further link the campus and provide a safe pedestrian crossing.
Positive Aspects of Alternatives A and B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cleaner&quot;</td>
<td>Clustered student housing throughout campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More connected</td>
<td>Boulevard treatment of Stadium Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond as central feature; add boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Road alignment north of pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus (Spindler &amp; Vandercook)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Road north of Goldsworth Pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add bike paths to this scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services location in close proximity to the KCMS building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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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Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, August 11, 1999 / 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.
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Participants:

Committee (* not present)
Linda Powell, Asst. Prof., HPER; Chair, East Campus Focus Group
* Debra Berkey, Chair, HP ER
* David McKee, University Libraries, AAUP Liaison
* Kathy Beauregard, Director of Athletics
  Dave Corstange, Assoc. Director Intercollegiate Athletics, Alternate
* Sharon Seabrook Russell, Asst. Director, Alumni Relations
* Paul Solomon, Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art, Campus Planning Council
* Tom Carey, Prof., Dept. of Management
  Mary Godfrey, Community Volunteer
* Elton Weintz, GSA, Department of Sociology
* Charles Tischler, WSA, Department of Political Science
* Joseph Monroe, WSA, Integrated Supply Management

WMU Staff:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants:
Richard Rigerink, 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 #7 will be:

Wednesday, October 6th from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. / Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Alternative Subcampus Plans as they were presented at the General Preview Sessions/Open Campus Session, Tuesday, August 10th, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in Fetzer Auditorium.

This discussion focused on the East Campus specifically, but also West and Oakland Drive Campus as they related to East Campus. From this meeting, elements, ideas and issues were to be recommended to the Advisory/Policy Committee for inclusion in the Interim Subcampus Plan for East Campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3: Subcampus Campus Alternatives. During Part 4, a more detailed study of the Campus-wide Framework Plan will be conducted, testing ideas from the Interim Subcampus Plans and looking more specifically at plans for vehicular, pedestrian and open space systems.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:

Visit #8 is a regular review visit. East Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, December 1st from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

Visit #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

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

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

Please continue to visit the master plan Web site. The 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 was presented.
B. COMMENTS

The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

1. Athletics
   The presence of the indoor practice facility on Oakland Drive Campus as part of a consolidated “Athletic” campus was supported:
   - Use of this facility for tailgate parties after a football game was suggested.
   - If the facility were located on top of Oakland Drive Campus, then appropriate walks would need to be provided.
   - Athletics and health seem to be a natural marriage. This refers to the joint presence of the College of Health and Human Services on Oakland Drive and East Campus.
   - Intercollegiate and intramural functions should be separated.

2. Stadium Drive
   - It was suggested that one way to alter the traffic pattern of this road would be to move the “business loop” from Stadium Drive to another street, perhaps West Main.
   - If Stadium Drive became a boulevard as shown in Alternative B, it would be a more informal space than shown in Alternative A. The question was raised: Could Stadium Drive become both as shown in Alternative A and B? (This will be studied for the Interim Subcampus Plan to be presented at Visit #7.)
   - Creating a boulevard is seen as a means of slowing traffic and creating a safer crossing for pedestrians.

3. East Campus
   The East Campus Focus Group positively received the placement of Administration in the original East Campus buildings.
   - It was suggested that another connection be made to the existing East Campus entry road that would allow another access point to city streets. One specific suggestion was a road behind Walwood from Austin Street.
   - It was suggested that the practice field on Davis Street have an intramural function when it is no longer used as a football practice field. This use is seen as compatible with the location of Administration on East Campus.
   - Further, it was suggested that when not being used by students for scheduled intramural games, the fields be available for public use by neighborhood groups. It was recommended that these fields not be lighted for playing purposes, but for safety.
4. Parking Decks
   - Tucking a parking deck away behind the fieldhouse as shown in
     Alternative B makes access difficult and may contribute to congested
     traffic patterns in this area.
   - Deck placement must be convenient for faculty, staff, students and fans
     attending athletic events. This presents the problem of function vs.
     aesthetics of the deck.
   - Expanding the existing deck on West Campus by Angel Field was
     supported, as well as the placement of a deck on East Campus.

5. Health and Human Services
   If KCMS could relocate farther south, then the college could remain as a
   whole in close proximity on Oakland Drive Campus.

Positive Aspects of Alternatives A and B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration on East Campus with better circulation pattern</td>
<td>Parking Deck behind Waldo Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Campus expansion</td>
<td>Expand existing parking deck (near Angel Field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Practice Facility location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Street Fields w/scheduled activities, security lighting and no playing lights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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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Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, August 11, 1999 / 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Issue Date: August 17, 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
* 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

Consultants:
* Richard Rigerink, 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 #7 will be:

Wednesday, October 6th from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Fetzer Center
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
West Campus Focus Group
August 11, 1999
Page 2

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Alternative Subcampus Plans as they were presented at the General Preview Sessions/Open Campus Session Tuesday, August 10th, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in Fetzer Auditorium.

The discussion focused on the West Campus specifically, but also East and Oakland Drive Campus as they related to West. From this meeting, elements, ideas and issues were to be recommended to the Advisory/Policy Committee for inclusion in the Interim Subcampus Plan for East Campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3: Subcampus Alternatives. During Part 4, a more detailed study of the Campus-Wide Framework Plan will be conducted, testing ideas from the Interim Subcampus Plans and looking more specifically at plans for vehicular, pedestrian and open space systems.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for future campus visits:

   Visit #8 is a regular review visit. West Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, December 1st, 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 #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

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

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

Please continue to visit the Master Plan Web site. The 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. COMMENTS

The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:
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The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Alternative Subcampus Plans as they were presented at the General Preview Sessions/Open Campus Session Tuesday, August 10th, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in Fetzer Auditorium.

The discussion focused on the West Campus specifically, but also East and Oakland Drive Campus as they related to West. From this meeting, elements, ideas and issues were to be recommended to the Advisory/Policy Committee for inclusion in the Interim Subcampus Plan for East Campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3: Subcampus Alternatives. During Part 4, a more detailed study of the Campus-Wide Framework Plan will be conducted, testing ideas from the Interim Subcampus Plans and looking more specifically at plans for vehicular, pedestrian and open space systems.

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for future campus visits:

   Visit #8 is a regular review visit. West Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesday, December 1st, 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 #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

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

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

   Please continue to visit the Master Plan Web site. The 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. COMMENTS

The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:
Housing
With respect to Alternative A, which shows housing concentrated on Oakland Drive Campus:

- It was suggested that, like the University of Virginia, housing might be considered along the central West Campus Mall as proposed in Alternative A.
- At the present time, there does not seem to be a sense of student life in the core of campus. There is little or no evening campus activity on West Campus. It was also observed that the WMU student today differs from students in previous eras whose student life was concentrated on campus.
- Concern was voiced that if housing were concentrated as shown in Alternative A, it would lead to an overflow of housing into the surrounding neighborhood. In light of this, it was felt that the neighborhood would probably not support this alternative.
- Housing, as shown in Alternative B, clustered throughout campus, was supported, but housing in Alternative A seemed better for promoting bus transit use.

Michigan Mall
This central open space was supported with the suggestion that smaller pockets of a similar "formal" open space be added, possibly as pockets off of the mall.

Stadium Drive
The treatment of Stadium Drive in both alternatives was supported. The question was raised whether Stadium Drive could become a boulevard and have a vehicular/pedestrian bridge crossing over it. The bridge would promote movement across Stadium Drive.

Those elements of Alternatives A and B that were supported are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Stadium Drive</td>
<td>Ring Road on West Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Alumni Center on East Campus</td>
<td>Boulevard on Stadium Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Michigan Mall with Pockets of Formal Open</td>
<td>Housing in Smaller Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space; Highlight The Oaklands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Facility/Athletic Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival Area at the &quot;Wedge&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern: Power Plant is Featured!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
West Campus Focus Group
August 11, 1999
Page 4

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 #6 MEETING NOTES
Revised September 14, 1999

Meeting Subject: Advisory/Policy Committee

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: August 11, 1999
3:00 – 5:00 p.m./6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Issue Date: August 17, 1999

Due to conflicts, this committee was not able to hold its Visit #6 meeting as scheduled. A summary of the major comments provided by focus group committees is provided here as well as a summary of the major concepts and principles to be used in the next phase of the planning project.

Committee members are encouraged to view the Web site documents, which have been updated as of this posting, and to send comments to SmithGroup JJR at our e-mail address and to the Office of Campus Planning at the University.

Participants:

Committee:
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Paul Pancella, Assoc. Prof., Physics; Chair, West Campus Focus Group
Linda Powell, Asst. Prof., HPER; Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS; Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Trudy Verser, Assoc. Prof., Management; Chair, Campus Planning Council
Jeff Chamberlain, City Planner, City of Kalamazoo
Fred Sitkins; Chair, Engineering College Site Committee;
Prof., Department of Industrial and Mechanical Engineering
Hannah McKinney, Vice Mayor of City of Kalamazoo;
Professor Kalamazoo College
Lew Graff, Undergraduate, WSA Campus Design Chair
Dick St. John, Trustee

Campus Planning Staff:
David Dakin, Assoc. Director, Campus Planning and Architecture
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
Doug Lloyd, Campus Architect
DISCUSSION:

The date of the next Campus Visit #7 will be:

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

The purpose of Campus Visit #6 was to discuss the Subcampus Alternative Plans with the focus group committees, collect their comments, observations and recommendations to be presented to the Advisory/Policy Committee. This committee would, after review and discussion, recommend those elements to be included in the Interim Subcampus Plans.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3: Subcampus Campus Alternatives. During Part 4, a more detailed study of the Campus-wide Framework Plan will be conducted, testing ideas from the Interim Subcampus Plans and looking more specifically at plans for vehicular, pedestrian and open space systems.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:

Visit #8 is a regular review visit that will occur the week of November 29, 1999. The Advisory/Policy Committee will meet on Wednesday, December 1st from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. The location may change depending on room availability and will be updated as information is available.

Visit #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.
A reminder that comments about the Master Plan Project may be sent to the following address:

wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

Please continue to visit the master plan Web site. The address is as follows:

www.wmich.edu/masterplan/committees/c3pow6/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 was presented.

B. FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

These are the guiding principles for shaping the Master Plan. These concepts have been generated during focus group and committee meetings throughout the process and will continue to be updated.

1. Use valleys to create a distinctive setting.
   • Treat the valleys as major open spaces.

2. Provide convenient and appealing routes to campus.
   • Make I-131/Stadium Drive the major visitor approach route.
   • Create major campus arrivals.
   • Modify the Michigan Avenue/Stadium Drive intersection.

3. Add open space in the Campus Core.
   • Convert West Michigan Avenue to open space.
   • Link Goldsworth and Arcadia Valleys.

4. Achieve connectivity.
   • Connect valleys with a pedestrian corridor.
   • Create a pedestrian overpass.
   • Protect vehicular bridging.

5. Upgrade perimeter access.
   • Reconfigure the Loop Road.
   • Modify West Michigan/Stadium intersection.
   • Reconfigure Oliver Street/Oakland Drive intersection.
C. SUMMARY OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Overall, Alternative A was most widely supported. Those elements that were supported are as follows:

- The formal open space aligned axially through the center of the Academic Core and referred to as the Michigan Mall was supported. More pockets of formal open space on West Campus were suggested, as well as giving more attention to the Oaklands.
- Reserve the space presently occupied by Physical Plant buildings as a major arrival area.
- Provide a vehicular and pedestrian bridge over Stadium Drive.
- Add new parking decks and expand one existing deck on campus.
- Maintain and improve the transit system.
- Create an Athletic Campus on what is currently Oakland Drive and East Campus.
- Create a CHHS campus on Oakland Drive Campus.
- Treat West Michigan Avenue entrance from Howard as the academic entrance and Oliver Street from Stadium as the athletic entrance.
- Increase the number of intramural fields on campus.
- In general, more favor was shown to Alternative B. Housing was shown here as clustered and distributed throughout campus so that there was an integration of residence halls with academic uses.

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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The Student’s Perspective
SURVEY SUMMARY
Western Michigan University Master Plan
21 July 1999

Introduction

The student perspective is important because the University places a high priority on attracting quality individuals. To foster its academic goals, the University strives to provide a learning environment of the highest quality. The Master Plan needs to be responsive to student needs and expectations. In the master planning process, a variety of techniques are being utilized to more accurately understand the student perspective. These include student participation in focus group and discussion meetings, student interviews, open campus sessions, and to ensure an even broader perspective, a student survey.

The survey was initially distributed April 15, 1999. Ninety percent (90%) of the survey participants completed the forms in twenty-four classes. The remaining participants (10%) participated as individuals or small groups.

Participant Profile

The survey results were tabulated by specific question and cross-tabulated according to four major categories. These include:

- Class (first year, second, third, forth, fifth and graduate)
- Residency (on or off campus)
- College affiliation
- Having a car on campus

Of the 563 participants, approximately two-thirds were in their third or higher year. This distribution was considered desirable because it allowed a more mature and knowledgeable participant level. Participants were classified as listed below.

Percentages, shown in parentheses, reflect existing campus-wide breakdowns.

- First Year 7% (18%)
- Second Year 7% (17%)
- Third Year 25% (18%)
- Fourth Year 25% (24%)
- Fourth Year Plus 20%
- Graduate 16% (23%)
- Part-Time or Continuing Education 1%
Approximately twenty-two percent (22%) of the participants live on campus. This is comparable to the total number of students (23%) who reside on campus today. Ninety-two percent (92%) of surveyed students currently have cars on campus. Automobile use by students living on campus increased from seventy-one percent (71%) of first year students to more than ninety percent (90%) amongst second to fourth year students.

College affiliations among the interviewees are as follows. General campus-wide distributions are shown in parenthesis.

- Arts and Sciences 20% (29%)
- Business 14% (18%)
- Education 25% (18%)
- Engineering and Applied Sciences 12% (11%)
- Fine Arts 8% (5%)
- Health and Human Services 19% (6%)
- Other 2% (16%)

**Observations**

Survey information is presented in two formats.

**Part 1 Summary**

Student responses presented for review include the boxes checked as well as the fill-in-the-blank answers. Following the summary of these responses, the findings were then considered and interpreted in terms of physical planning recommendations.

**Part 2 Detailed Responses**

The questionnaire, as well as numerical responses to each of the survey questions, including check boxes and fill-in-the-blank responses, are presented as percent of total responses.
Part 1 Summary

The Student's Perspective of the Campus

1. Specific programs and geographic location are the primary reasons most students attend WMU. Ninety-five percent (95%) of first year students find the campus very friendly, while seventy-three percent (73%) of all students surveyed share this observation. Cost is not as important a consideration as is program and location in influencing a student's decision to attend WMU. The things students like best about the University are: the flowers, trees and landscaping (19%), followed by the size (15%), and location (11%) of the campus.

- Landscaping is an important and noteworthy characteristic.
- Travel on campus should be direct and efficient in order to convey an accessible and comfortable campus scale.

2. Most students consider campus social activities and extra-curricular opportunities to be very good. Regional opportunities are considered to be acceptable. Crossroads Mall is the most popular regional attraction with downtown Kalamazoo rated as being of little interest, particularly among first year students. The Student Recreation Center is a major spare time destination for forty percent (40%) of the students surveyed. The Bernhard Center (20%) and Waldo Library (12%) are also important spare time destinations.

- The appeal of Crossroads Mall may help explain the on-campus resident's desire for having an automobile.
- Does downtown Kalamazoo offer a social and commercial mix that appeals to college students? If students learned more about downtown during their first year, would they be more inclined to go there during the ensuing years? If students went downtown, would they drive or take the bus?
- The Student Recreation Center functions as the single most important gathering place on campus. It is more heavily utilized as a major gathering place than the Bernhard Center. Do major walks provide ease of access to this critical destination? Should the Bernhard Center be renovated and a greater variety of facilities offered in order to achieve a more interesting and exciting gathering place that would appeal to a more diversified clientele?

3. Students surveyed did not find wayfinding to be a problem, as most rarely get lost. Walking and the automobile are important forms of transportation. There is a significant jump in the number of students who have a car on campus between the first (71%) and second (+90%) years. Seventy-two percent (72%) of students surveyed justify having a car on campus because of commuting needs. Seventy-five percent (75%) of those surveyed who have a car use it daily, although only fifty percent (50%) commute to campus daily (only twenty percent
(20%) of first year students commute. Forty-four percent (44%) never drive to class, while sixteen percent (16%) of the students surveyed often drive to class and sixteen percent (16%) do so sometimes. Most students consider parking at WMU to be considerably worse than at other institutions.

- Students do not have an accurate perception of parking conditions on similar university campuses.
- A number of students between their first and second year conclude that having a car on campus is necessary/desirable. Alternative modes of travel (bicycle, transit and foot) should be encouraged by upgrading necessary facilities in an attempt to reduce automobile utilization.
- Many students view automobile usage as an appropriate means for traveling from class to class. The significant jump in automobile use as a mechanism to travel from class to class between the first and second years may result from a perceived opportunity that others are doing so or because alternative opportunities are not well developed.

4. **Public transit is not currently perceived to be an attractive means of travel.** Students who were surveyed registered strong negativism to riding the bus despite the perception that it is both inexpensive and convenient. However, a significant number currently travel the campus by bicycle (23%). Of those who do not currently use a bicycle, almost half (47%) would do so if a comprehensive campus bicycle trail system were available.

- It will be difficult to get students to utilize public transit as long as other means of travel are equally convenient or relatively inexpensive.
- Creation of a comprehensive bicycle system warrants serious consideration. Increased bicycle use can 1) reduce dependence on the automobile and the need for expensive and land consuming roads and storage lots, while 2) reducing pedestrian/vehicular conflicts in the core area of campus.
- Pedestrian safety caused by pedestrian/vehicular conflicts is only sometimes a problem.
- A significant number of students (41%) feel uncomfortable walking the campus after dark. It is important that a safe environment is both perceived and realized, particularly with expanding evening hour activities. Consideration should be given to lighting improvement, placement of emergency call boxes, close parking opportunities for late arrivals, and creation of major pedestrian corridors that concentrate travelers into well-defined routes.
Facilities

1. *The campus presents a very positive appearance and students surveyed consider this to be comparable to the other institutions they considered.* Adequate open space is available (59%) and most (77%) consider outdoor spaces to be well located and (60%) appropriately sited. Three-quarters (77%) perceive these areas to be attractively designed and laid out. More than half (56%) expressed the opinion that adequate seating is available. The most popular outdoor spaces are Library Plaza /fountain (46%) and Goldsworth Valley (38%).

- There are only two really special outdoor places on campus (Library Plaza/fountain and Goldsworth Valley). Increasing the number and variety of these spaces may contribute to a more positive campus experience.

2. *Building renovation (22%) and adding flowers and trees (19%) were identified by surveyed students as being the best way to improve the campus, excluding the parking.* These were closely followed by the desire to remove the "ugly" sculpture (16%). The next most frequently expressed ideas were clustered together and included the need for more seating areas and restaurants, better lighting, more open spaces and improved snow removal.

- Trees, flowers and landscaping are important to students.
- Open space treatment and building interiors are important student concerns.

3. *The existing recreation facilities were identified as the best facilities on campus.* Classrooms and teaching labs, as well as student facilities were rated as being of the same quality as on other campuses. Half expressed the opinion that university buildings in general were attractive, but one quarter challenged this observation. Waldo Library was identified by most as being the most attractive building (48%), followed by the Student Recreation Center (14%), Schneider Hall (13%) and Wood Hall (11%). Sangren Hall was ranked as the least attractive building (24%), followed by McCracken Hall (19%), then Kohrman Hall (9%) and Dunbar Hall (7%).

- Recreation facilities distinguish the campus, but primarily from a facility and not a design perspective.
- Residential units were frequently mentioned, but rarely proved to be a dominant concern.
**Part 2 Detailed Responses**
Numerical responses to each of the survey questions including checkboxes and fill-in-the-blank responses.

**STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE of the CAMPUS**
Western Michigan University Master Plan Study
Winter Semester 1999
Revised Results 4/22/99 Total: 563

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.)
   - 8% Fine Arts
   - 20% Arts & Sciences
   - 14% Business
   - 25% Education
   - 1% University Curriculum
   - 19% Health & Human Services
   - 12% Engineering & Applied Sciences
   - 1% Lee Honors

2. **Please describe your current status** (Select only one.)
   - 7% 1st Year
   - 7% 2nd Year
   - 25% 3rd Year
   - 25% 4th Year
   - 20% 4th Year Plus
   - 15% Graduate Student
   - 1% Part-time or Continuing Education

Using the following list:
- 7%/10% Academic Excellence
- 35%/17% Specific Program
- 2%/3% Access to Faculty
- 4%/10% Campus Appearance
- 3%/3% Student/Faculty Ratio
- 27%/25% Location
- 9%/18% Cost
- 4%/5% Size of Student Body
- 7%/8% Friendly Atmosphere
- 2%/1% 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**
   - 21% Better
   - 59% About the Same
   - 12% Worse

6. **Campus Appearance**
   - 39% Better
   - 46% About the Same
   - 11% Worse

7. **Classrooms and Labs**
   - 18% Better
   - 59% About the Same
   - 19% Worse

8. **Cost**
   - 40% Better
   - 46% About the Same
   - 11% Worse

9. **Location**
   - 45% Better
   - 42% About the Same
   - 10% Worse

10. **Parking**
    - 10% Better
    - 28% About the Same
    - 58% Worse

11. **Student Facilities**
    - 27% Better
    - 60% About the Same
    - 8% Worse

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

12. **Academic Excellence**
    - 27% Very Good
    - 66% Okay
    - 6% Not Very Good
    - 1% Poor

13. **Academic Programs**
    - 31% Very Good
    - 60% Okay
    - 8% Not Very Good
    - 1% Poor

14. **Athletics**
    - 8% Very Good
    - 66% Okay
    - 19% Not Very Good
    - 3% Poor
    - 4% blank

15. **Appearance of the Campus**
    - 50% Very Good
    - 42% Okay
    - 6% Not Very Good
    - 2% Poor

16. **Extra-curricular Opportunities**
    - 33% Very Good
    - 54% Okay
    - 9% Not Very Good
    - 4% Poor

17. **Parking**
    - 18% Very Good
    - 24% Okay
    - 55% Not Very Good

18. **Recreation Facilities**
    - 63% Very Good
    - 33% Okay
    - 3% Not Very Good
    - 1% Poor

19. **Social Life**
    - 33% Very Good
    - 58% Okay
    - 7% Not Very Good
    - 2% Poor

20. **Town Surroundings**
    - 24% Very Good
    - 58% Okay
    - 13% Not Very Good

21. **How often do you ride the bus?**
    - 8% Twice or more a week
    - 4% Once or more a month
    - 86% Never/Rarely

    2% Once a week

Agree or disagree with these statements: “I don’t ride the bus because…
22. …it costs too much.” 6% Agree 87% Disagree 7% blank
23. …it’s not convenient.” 41% Agree 52% Disagree 7% blank
24. …it doesn’t go where I need to go.” 27% Agree 66% Disagree 7% blank
25. …I prefer to walk.” 43% Agree 50% Disagree 7% blank

26. Do you live on campus? 22% Yes 78% No
27. Do you have a car? 92% Yes... go to next question 8% No... skip to question 31

28. What is the primary reason you have a car?
48% Commute to campus 24% Off-campus job or co-op program 10% Travel home on weekends
3% Shopping 8% Entertainment or recreation

29. If you have a car, how many times a week do you use your car?
75% Every day 14% Several times 3% Once 1% Rarely

30. Do you drive your car from class to class? 16% Often 16% Sometimes 15% Rarely 44% Never 9% blank

31. During your first year at WMU, did you get lost while walking on campus?
6% Often 26% Sometimes 36% Rarely 32% Never

32. Do your parents or friends (who do not attend WMU) get lost driving on campus?
13% Often 39% Sometimes 32% Rarely 14% Never 2% blank

33. When walking on campus, do you find automobile traffic a safety problem?
10% Often 35% Sometimes 34% Rarely 21% Never

34. Do you feel safe walking across campus after dark? 59% Yes 41% No

35. Do you ride a bike on campus during nice weather? 23% Yes 77% No

36. Would you ride a bike if bicycle paths were provided? 47% Yes 53% No

37. Where are you most likely to go during your free time off campus? (Please select one.)
16% West Main 14% Downtown Kalamazoo 37% Crossroads Mall 33% Other

38. Where are you most likely to go during your free time on campus? (Please select one.)
40% Student Recreation Center 4% Goldsworth Pond 20% Bernhard Center 12% Waldo Library
6% Residence Hall 0% Intramural fields 18% Other

Where is your favorite outdoor area on campus? Library Plaza 46% / Goldsworth Pond 38% / Other 16%

Why is this your favorite outdoor area? (Check all that apply.)
( ) Location ( ) Appearance ( ) Place to eat ( ) 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?) 59% Yes 38% No 3% blank
40. Well located? 78% Yes 19% No 3% blank
41. Attractive? 77% Yes 20% No 3% blank
42. Provided with adequate seating? 56% Yes 41% No 3% blank

43. Do you think WMU is a student-friendly campus? 81% Yes 19% No

Why do you think this? Those answering yes: Friendly people 47% / Social activities 12% / Size 12% / Faculty & staff 8% / Responsive to students 7% / Access & layout 5% / Other 9%
Those answering no: Unfriendly people 42% / Students not treated well 32% / Faculty parks closer than students 5% / Too many student fines 5% / Other 16%
44. In general, do you consider the campus building exteriors attractive?  
   52% Yes  24% No  24% blank

Which campus building do you consider the most attractive? (Please select only one.)
   Waldo Library 48% / Rec Center 14% / Schneider 13% / Wood 11% / Other 14%

Which campus building do you consider the least attractive? (Please select only one.)
   Sangren Hall 24% / McCracken 19% / Kohrman 9% / Dunbar 7% / Rood 6% / Residence Halls 5% / Other 30%

What are the two things you really like about the WMU Campus?
   Flowers, trees, and landscape 19% / Size 15% / Location 11% / Rec Center 10% / Diversity 8% / People 7% / Other 30%

Other than parking, what two things would you change relative to the physical campus?
   Renovate buildings 22% / More trees and landscaping 19% / Remove ugly sculpture 16% / Other 43%

What additional comments would you like to add?
   improve management of student housing / nice place to walk around / fix parking / lacks school spirit / fix steps of Kohrman Hall / architecture on buildings all different (negative) / people movers (negative) / street hockey and basketball courts (negative) / more social activities / good landscaping
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #6 MEETING NOTES
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Meeting Subject: College of Health and Human Services
Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060
Meeting Date/Time: Thursday, August 12, 1999 / 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.
Issue Date: August 17, 1999
Participants: Hazel Starcher, Assistant to the Dean, CHHS  
Bill Wiener, Blind Rehabilitation, CHHS  
Cindy Peterson, Occupational Therapy, CHHS

WMU Staff:
Evie Askren, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants:
Richard Rietkerk, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to meet with members of the College of Health and Human Services to better understand the planning goals and needs of this part of the WMU community. The following ideas and observations were recorded:

- Question: Has there been a review of consolidation of the clinics?
  Answer: Yes, it has been discussed.
- Support was shown for Alternative A... unites the campus.
- Has there been any discussion on a snowmelt system on campus sidewalks?
- Safety on campus is viewed as an important issue.
- The perception was expressed that Oakland Drive Campus as it is today is somewhat remote from the rest of the university.
- The location of the new indoor practice facility on Oakland Drive Campus is a good idea.
- The perception of one campus is important to convey.
- The location of Administration on East Campus was supported.
Circulation, Transit and Parking
- Concern was expressed for good transportation across campus. A better bus schedule and more reliable service would contribute to efficient transportation. Cross campus mobility is viewed as very important.
- Making parking more expensive would provide incentive to use commuter lots.
- CHHS students must have mobility (i.e., an efficient connection to West Campus). Perhaps bus with dual uses... transfer materials/library materials.
- Proximity of CHHS to Oakland Drive is very important. Clinic visitors must have easy access to their facility.
- Six minute walk between KCMS and HHS is okay.
- Incentive to use bus might be heated shelters.
- As part of freshman orientation, the university might take students on the bus to provide an introduction to the transit system.
- The current alignment of the Oliver/Oakland Intersection presents a safety concern.

Buildings
- Concern was expressed for the current physical placement of CHHS facilities. Presently, they are very scattered throughout campus. The Oakland Drive Campus location shown on both Alternatives is fine.
- Computer lab access is needed on Oakland Drive Campus for CHHS faculty and students.
- As part of their curriculum, usually at school for the blind, CHHS students require access to Oakland Drive.
- It was suggested that the university use existing residence halls for visiting workshops.
- It was recommended that new housing be air-conditioned.
- In terms of facilities, the college needs large meeting rooms - 150 people maximum. The Oakland Recital Hall is functional except that there are no writing surfaces.

The College of Health and Human Services
- There are approximately 1200 students enrolled in the College of Health and Human Services.
- It would be valuable to make the program accessible during evening/weekend hours year round.
- The college must keep the program competitive. It cannot be made longer, so the alternative needs to be to go year round.
- Most students are here for the CHHS program.
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
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #6 MEETING NOTES
Revised September 14, 1999

Meeting Subject: Student Services Focus Group
Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060
Meeting Date/Time: Thursday, August 12, 1999 / 10:00 – 12:00 p.m.
Issue Date: August 17, 1999
Participants: David W. Parrott, Assoc. Dean of Students
Suzie Nagel, Judicial Affairs
Sandy Barry-Loken, Student Activities
Lynn Kelly Albertson, Career & Student Employment Services
Martha Warfield, Director of Minority Affairs
Amy Seth, University Recreation Programs & Facilities
Bonnie Hanson, Office of Campus Life
Carol Eddy, Health Center
Kathy Kanz, Residence Life

WMU Staff:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants:
Richard Rigerink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to meet with members of university offices concerned with Student Services in order to provide a more informed understanding of the planning needs of the WMU community. The following ideas and observations were recorded:

- The tennis courts are somewhat underutilized. It was suggested that perhaps they could support mixed uses such as basketball, roller hockey, etc. Restrooms and night lighting might increase use.
Meeting Notes
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- The idea of opening up Goldsworth Valley was supported.
- Housing on Oakland Drive Campus in Alternative A is perceived as too isolated from the Academic Core. The opinion was expressed that upperclassmen are unlikely to remain on campus under any situation. In general, the staff felt that there might be a demand for campus housing above current levels and that campus could support higher levels.
- It is necessary to have good/easy access to the healthcare center. Adjacent parking is needed.
- Improving safety or the perception of safety on campus was stated as a concern.
- Both Alternatives should show more housing integrated into the Campus Core.
- Concern was expressed that locating Administration on East Campus would make it too isolated. The offices that are grouped under this heading would be Budget, Administration, Finance, President.
- The concept of one stop shopping for student services would include financial aid, cashier, admissions, and registration placed in one location for convenience to students.

Circulation, Parking and Transit
- Concern was expressed that wayfinding is very important. People arriving on campus for the first time do get lost.
- There is concern for the bridge proposal across Stadium Drive. It was noted that it must be carefully conceived and integrated to be well utilized.
- If easy access were provided via Knollwood Avenue, this could make the neighborhood too attractive and compete with university housing.
- The question was raised: Can we get people out of cars? Most students will not ride the bus. The creation of bike paths was supported.
- The opinion was expressed that parking does not have to be adjacent to residence halls.
- The question was raised of the need for another connection to Howard near Fetzer.
- Concern was expressed for more efficient snow removal from walks.
- Support was expressed for the creation of more outdoor interactive spaces.

Buildings/Student Facilities
- It was felt that more integrated housing (within the Academic Core) would help to "anchor" cars (i.e., reduce the need to drive a car on campus).
- The students' perception is that they need to have convenient housing
- The proximity of housing to academic areas is more important than quantity of housing.
- Social interaction is very important to the college experience. With regard to housing, there is a critical mass needed to accomplish this.
- Single occupancy housing in a suite or apartment arrangement was noted as a new trend on campuses.
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- Housing must be integrated into the rest of campus activities.
- Residence halls at Stadium Drive near Oakland are the most convenient.
- Residence hall life is viewed as a part of learning process.
- It was suggested that the university explore nontraditional learning environments such as residential colleges.
- Graduate housing: WMU needs to be competitive for family housing. They should provide affordable, efficient housing.
- Residence halls in order of student preference are as follows:
  1. Davis, French, Zimmerman
  2. Valley Residence Halls
  3. Residence halls surrounding the Bernhard Center
  4. Burnham, Moore, and Draper-Siedschlag
- Goldsworthy Valley residence halls are very useful because they are organized in suites, there are adequate common areas, and they are in the best physical shape.
- The Student Recreation Center is perceived to function as a Student Center more so than other campus facilities.
- As a Student Center, the Bernhard Center has a number of deficiencies: it is not multicultural, student activities/leadership programs are needed, student organization meeting rooms must be more user friendly and easily accessible to student groups, satellite medical facility should be provided, more healthy choices for food, more parking, expand bookstore and expand lounge area.
- The Bernhard Center attracts commuter students.

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
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Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #6 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Campus Visit #6, Major Review
Open Community Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center Auditorium

Meeting Date/Time: Thursday, August 12, 1999 / 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Issue Date: August 24, 1999

Participants:
Donald Biscomb / Retired
Claus Globig
Tony Givhan / City of Kalamazoo Metro Transit
Rodger Parzych / Planning Comm/Historical District Comm.
Phyllis Marsh / West Main Hill Neighborhood Association
Pat Klein / Environmental Concerns Committee
Lynn Houghton / Kalamazoo Historical District Commission
John Van Stuart / Miller-Davis Co.
Kevin Elzinga
Mark Hoffman / Kalamazoo City Planning Commission
Sue Stapleton / Arcadia
Phil Grabowski / Arcadia Neighborhood
Amy Remment / Vine Neighborhood Association
Mike Matthews / University Relations
Jeffrey Lamb / Resident
Kay Chase / Transportation Action Strategy for Kalamazoo
Nathan Stonerock / Resident
Gary Wood / Kalamazoo Resident
M. Peggy Osowski / Vine Neighborhood Association
Mary Hosley / Transportation Action Strategy for Kalamazoo
Susan Edgerton / Faculty, Greenlawn Resident

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

Consultants:
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
Chris Luz, Traffic Engineer

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to present the Subcampus Alternatives for the Master Plan to the community at an open session. Opportunities for questions were held at the end of the presentation.

Comments, observations and questions were recorded and are as follows:

Q: Oakland Drive Campus, along Oakland Drive is a favorite spot of the neighbors. Will the trees here have to go?
   A: We will preserve as many trees and stands of trees as possible.

Q: With respect to the intersection of West Michigan and Stadium Drive, when will this change take place, and will it be independent of the Master Plan?
   A: The City of Kalamazoo has proposed this change to the intersection, and the Master Plan will show it, but we do not know exactly when it will take place.

Q: I was hoping to see more effort to retain important historic pieces of Oakland Drive and East Campus. Will Noble Lodge be turned over to the university as well as the other state property?
   A: The Correctional Facility (Noble Lodge) is different. There is ongoing litigation regarding the continued use of this property by the Department of Corrections. There is a high probability that it will be vacated, and the university would have some interest in that property at that time. But for now, it is subject to ongoing litigation.

Q: With regard to the realignment of Goldsworth Valley Road as shown in both Alternatives A and B, could you explain the difference?
   A: The road would have less impact on the valley as it is shown in Alternative B, crossing south of the pond.

Q: We, on Greenlawn Avenue, are concerned that if intramural fields are placed in Goldsworth Valley south of our street, there will be an increase in noise and lights as students use the fields.
   A: These fields will not be lighted for evening play.

Q: Concern is expressed that if the road goes through the valley as in Alternative A, there will be increased impact on the valley and ponds.
   A: With regard to Alternative B, 3000 students are housed in the North Campus residence halls. Using a pedestrian underpass would help students safely get to classes.
Q: A Greenlawn Avenue resident expressed concern for placing intramural fields in the valley. She would like to see the valley remain open, and would like students not to cut through her property.

Q: What is the philosophical difference between Alternative A and B?
A: Alternative A presents a unified campus. Oakland Drive Campus relates to West Campus by the bridge over Stadium Drive. It concentrates academic and housing on different subcampuses.

Q: What is the impact of traffic on Oakland Drive of this development of Oakland Drive Campus as shown on the alternatives?
A: We will be able to answer that when we study the amount of gross square feet of new buildings and the amount of parking required. We aren't there yet.

Q: Comment was made requesting removal of inappropriate sculptures on campus.

Q: How wide is the Loop Road, and will there be more stop signs and traffic signals?
A: The objective of the Loop Road is to reduce the number of stop-starts, but some will need to remain.

Q: Comment was made that sports fields down in the valley would not be good, especially if lights are added.
A: We have had a positive response from the university community with respect to intramural fields in the valley. There is a great need for fields, but they will not be lighted.

Q: Comment was made to encourage that the plan make provision for pedestrian and bike pathways and more suitable access for both.

Q: Comment was made regarding historic buildings on Oakland Drive and East Campus. All of these buildings are valuable. With regard to Sacred Space, the hillside behind East Hall is an historic landscape and people would like to see it restored to the original Olmsted Plan.
A: Use of the current football practice field could relate to the use defined for the East Campus buildings. If intramural fields are placed there, we will try to maintain the historic character.

Q: Alternative A shows administration on East Campus. Where would Administration be in Alternative B?
A: The location of Administration on Alternative B is not yet determined.
Q: Comment: If the bus and pedestrian circulation systems are improved, that would make East Campus more accessible. Support for the pedestrian underpass in Alternative B.

Q: Alternative A shows the Loop Road connecting to the bridge across Stadium Drive. Could we keep the bridge for pedestrians?
A: Yes.

Q: Comment: Housing on Oakland Drive Campus must provide a safe way to cross Stadium; therefore, you need a bridge.

Q: What type of student housing is proposed?
A: It will be up-to-date.

Q: With regard to the Sacred Space shown in Arcadia Valley in Alternative A, could you also show that in Alternative B?
A: Yes. They were shown separately to present different focus. In Alternative A, the focus is to Stadium Drive, the Arcadia Valley, and in Alternative B the focus is to Oakland Drive.

Q: Will this Sacred Space be a storm water run-off area?
A: The level of development will determine this.

Q: Will you talk about the outer edge? For example, how does the plan "fit" with the adjoining areas?
A: We will study the movement of traffic, and this helps determine if the Loop Road works and if we need an expansion of the transit system. We look at the region, town and university and study this to work together. If one is "healthy" and the other is not, then there is a problem. The university is demonstrating an interest in working together.

Q: Have you or will you do intensive studies to identify student needs to reduce students moving into the community? How can the university bring the students back to campus?
A: The survey is our source of identifying the needs of students. Most institutions don't understand how students respond to the physical environment. No, this is not our specific task; that is a programmatic issue. With regard to student housing, we will replace what we remove.

Q: How can we ask that this be done (the above)? There is no specific plan in place right now. If the students must go off campus to have housing needs met, won't the university respond to keep them on campus?
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A: By replacing housing units with more up-to-date ones, the situation should improve.

Q: In the long term, are you looking at other buildings for housing? Would you use these buildings to keep students on campus and correct the problem?
A: We (WMU) don't have a "parietal" rule. Students can live where they want, and this deals with driving decisions about where students live. The university is interested in replacing old residence halls, but past this, an increase in housing units is doubtful. Students want to live off campus to avoid the rules of the university. Currently the university houses 95% freshmen and 50% sophomores. The decision is independent of the type of housing provided by the university.

Q: Concern was expressed regarding the grade of the realigned Oliver Street. Bike riders would have difficulty negotiating such a steep grade. Request to minimize grades here.

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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E. Hallquist / SG JJR
P. Berg / SG JJR
C. Luz / HNTB
## Visit 7 Subcampus Review/Scope Confirmation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN VISIT #7</th>
<th>TUESDAY OCTOBER 5</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 6</th>
<th>THURSDAY OCTOBER 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</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>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Preview Meeting</td>
<td>West Campus Focus</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td><em>Oakland Recital Hall</em></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td><em>Bernhard Center</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>2040 Fetzer Center</em></td>
<td><em>3rd Floor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOON</td>
<td></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>Campus Services Focus Group</td>
<td>Physical Plant Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td><em>2040 Fetzer Center</em></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>Advisory / Policy Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>1060 Fetzer Center</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group</td>
<td>Buffet Supper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td><em>2040 Fetzer Center</em></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>Meeting with Dean College of H &amp; HS Janet Pisaneschi</td>
<td>Advisory / Policy Committee (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Student Services Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td><em>2040 Fetzer Center</em></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>
INTERIM SUBCAMPUS PLAN

Campus Visit #7 marks the end of Part 3 of the Master Plan project. Focusing on the specific issues related to each subcampus, the Master Plan process constantly incorporates the plan into the existing site context: the neighborhood, the city, and the region. As the process continues, campus systems are examined in greater detail. The plan continually reflects the broader picture of the University as a neighbor, as an institution within the city and region, while it solves internal physical design issues and conflicts.

Issues have not been completely resolved, and as new issues are identified, they become a part of the process. Input from the University community continues to provide a sounding board for potential solutions. Following an exploration of subcampus alternatives during Visit #6, a "Revised Subcampus Plan" was created. From this plan, each subcampus was further refined and plan elements more clearly specified. Placement and orientation of buildings, road, bike and walk alignments were studied with respect to site topography. Vehicular circulation and campus links, further definition of open space requirements, and setbacks, as well as campus entry layout were examined.

The result was the Interim Subcampus Plan for each subcampus. These have been presented on a single drawing to observe how they interrelate.
FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

Early in the Master Plan process, these concepts were established and supported as guiding principles for shaping the Master Plan. It is with these concepts in mind that the Interim Subcampus Plans have been developed.
1. Use the valleys to create a distinctive setting.
2. Provide convenient and appealing routes to campus.
3. Add open space in the campus core.
4. Achieve connectivity.
5. Upgrade perimeter access to campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Summarizing from Visit #6, when subcampus alternatives were presented, the following concepts were noted and used as a basis from which to prepare an Interim Subcampus Plan for each subcampus.

- Preserve the central focus to the Arcadia Creek Valley.
- A formal open space in the academic core aligned axially through the center of the academic core and referred to as the Michigan Mall was supported. It was suggested that more pockets of formal open space be created on West Campus and that more attention be given to the Oaklands.
- Reserve the space presently occupied by Physical Plant buildings as a major arrival area. Respect the historic nature of the buildings in this area while evaluating their use.
- Reserve a location on West and Oakland Drive Campuses to accommodate a vehicular and pedestrian bridge over Stadium Drive, and explore the addition of a substantial green median to make Stadium Drive a boulevard.
- Balance parking on campus as new buildings are proposed. Explore the addition of new parking decks and expansion of one existing deck on campus.
- Improve and maintain the campus transit system.
- Consider the potential of an Athletic Campus east of Stadium Drive.
- Create a College of Health and Human Services campus on Oakland Drive Campus
- Treat West Michigan Ave. entrance from Howard as the academic entrance and Oliver Street from Stadium Drive as the athletic entrance.
- Increase the number of intramural fields on campus.
- Distribute housing throughout campus so that there is an integration of residence halls with academic uses.
- Explore new access to East Campus buildings.
REFINEMENTS

As these recommendations were integrated into a single plan for each subcampus, further refinements were made to road alignments, building placement, and campus entries to accommodate the changes.

- Redistribution of housing and parking complements the preservation of open space and natural features.
- East Campus parking, drop-off to buildings, and access were studied and some modifications to buildings and parking proposed.
- Athletic indoor practice facility was realigned. This allowed accommodation to steep grades and proper road alignment, maintained a presence on Oakland Drive Campus, and accommodated three outdoor practice/game fields in close proximity. Oliver Street was realigned to meet a proposed loop road for Oakland Drive Campus and to accommodate steep grades.
- Future building envelopes grouped on Oakland Drive Campus allow the growth and development of related uses that may include the College of Health and Human Services, the Athletic Department, or other academic uses. Housing is proposed here to accommodate residential students who will primarily study on this campus.
- Space reserved for a vehicular/pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Stadium Drive preserves the Valley Path and connects the academic core from Waldo Library to proposed development on Oakland Drive Campus. The central focus on the Arcadia Creek Valley is accomplished by respecting natural grades and incorporating the placement of buildings and natural features such as water, trees, and stone.
- Preservation of Goldsworth Valley retains existing parking and athletic fields and proposes daylight-only intramural fields.
Figure 6-B.15 Interim Subcampus Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.16 Revised Subcampus Plan (Web site graphic)
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Campus Services Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2040

Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 / 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Issue Date: October 12, 1999

Participants:
Richard Cole, Campus Planning and Architecture
Paul MacNellis, Landscape Services
Lowell Rinker, Asst. VP Business
Rick Piper, CSB
Don Penskar, Purchasing
Phil Roekle, Physical Plant/ Trans.
John Goes, Physical Plant
Tom Tungate, Maintenance Stores
Pete Strazdas, Maintenance Services
Ken Fifelski, Remodeling Services
Umar Abdul-Mutakallim, Mgr. Building Custodial Support Services/Rec/Spo

WMU Staff:
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants:
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
Eric Hallquist, Site Designer, Team Designer / SG JJR
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to meet with members of Campus Services. Related service facilities are currently being relocated to accommodate the indoor practice facility. The location of this division in the Master Plan has not been determined. This meeting was an opportunity to assess the needs of this group. The following ideas and observations were recorded:
1. Relocation of landscape and custodial services to the former laundry building on Oakland Drive Campus was noted.

2. Currently the department is fragmented with respect to function: Physical Plant, Maintenance Building, Campus Services, Logistic Services/Purchasing, and Accounts Payable. Because this is a complex campus, one building to house all of these functions would be desirable.

3. Functions:
   - Central Receiving/Warehousing (postal, shipping = Logistical Services):
     Need to be together; need sufficient docks; can't be shoehorned into old buildings
   - Maintenance/Trades: Near Recreation/Warehouse
   - Landscape/Custodial/Physical Plant: Custodial is largest of the sections of Physical Plant; 240 people; have moved around; no good facilities
   - Transportation: Service of vehicles; storage of vehicles

4. Lots of these functions need to be mobile, thus a lot of parking is required.

5. Equipment, etc. is ugly; need to get it out of center.

Zone Maintenance Shop: Breaks campus down into zones and shops to handle the building in these zones; parking for a couple of cars near to these zone maintenance shops; easy access to roads is necessary; extra wide sidewalks will not be sufficient.

Departmental Office is a place for mobile employees that includes a time clock and requires parking for employees' private vehicles and university vehicles (1.5 times the number of employees).

Storage and Warehousing:
1. Office supplies warehouse; custodial supplies; maintenance supplies warehouse
2. This doesn't currently exist alone, but is part of Physical Plant; includes various sizes as well as non-standard issues and non-frequent items.
3. If a non-central off-campus warehouse is to exist, delivery vehicles are needed that make daily trips which take a few hours to half a day.
4. Warehouse needs to service 300+ people. The further away, the less time efficient and more expensive it will be. Field laborers can't get things done as quickly. Travelling from a remote location is very costly and increases with distance. If the university can keep something 20 minutes away, then they don't need to own it.
5. Remote location: May not diminish necessary square footage.
7. Local: Dispatch fleet (rental cars) could easily be located on Parkview Campus; currently very convenient to be on campus. Fueling will begin to change to non-combustion fuels.
8. On Campus: Salt dome, re-fueling station – gas and eventually non-combustible
9. Satellite farms; no building proximity
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Campus Services Location:
1. Major roadway access is critical.
2. Christian HS property
3. Current location
4. Old family housing, Stadium/Howard: Howard is better to travel than campus roads; semi-access necessary.
5. Off new Oliver Road
6. Behind Lawson Ice Arena, Knollwood Apartments location

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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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2040
Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 / 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Issue Date: October 12, 1999
Participants:
- Committee: (*not present)
  - Janet Pisaneschi, Chair; Dean, College of Health & Human Services
  - * Gary Mathews, AAUP Representative, Professor, School of Social Work
  - James Barton, Data Entry Operator, Development Office
  - Marcia Ellis, Coordinator of Clinical Services, Sincdecuse Health Center
  - * Patricia Viard, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Science
  - * David Lemberg, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Geography
  - * Ronald Coleman, Graduate Student, GSA
  - Tom King, Attorney, Kreis Enderle Callendar & Hudgins PC
  - * Shanetha Goss, Student, School of Nursing
  - Kelli Talicska, Student, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology
  - * Benjamin Malek, WSA, Undergraduate Student, Biology/Spanish

WMU Staff:
- Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
- George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
- Chris Pyzik, Campus Architect

Consultants
- Richard Riggerink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
- Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Manager / SG JJR
- Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
- Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Site Designer / 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 #8 will be:
      Tuesday, November 30th from 3:30 – 5:30 p.m., Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Subcampus Plans for each subcampus area. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, October 7th. Oakland Drive Campus was the focus of study for this group and comments/recommendations to be made to the Advisory/Policy Committee were recorded. As Part 4 progresses, individual systems, such as Vehicular, Pedestrian, Open Space, etc., will be studied in greater detail, and recommendations will be presented graphically through perspective and character sketches, as well as plan drawings.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings study of System Plans:
   Vehicular/Bicycle/Parking, Open Space/Pedestrian, and Utility
   Corridors/Buildings, to the fore.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:
   Visit #9 is a Major Review visit that will occur about the fourth week of
   January. This date and those following have not been confirmed.
   Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

3. For the information of focus group committees, Open Campus and Open
   Community meetings will be held on campus, Wednesday, November 17th.
   The main topic will be parking. Further information will be available
   through the Office of Campus Planning.

B. COMMENTS

1. With regard to the Interim Plan, the question was raised whether we could
   request permission for the university to maintain the railroad right-of-way.
   This would give the university more control over the open space in the
   Arcadia Valley.

2. On the Oakland Drive Campus Plan, the location of the entrance from
   Howard Street was limited by the existing grade.
3. It was noted that Spindler Hall and Vandercook Hall are currently used as residential buildings and should have the corresponding color applied. Spindler houses graduate students, and the first floor is leased to Ferris State Pharm. D. students.

4. The College of Health and Human Services could occupy the cluster of buildings north or south of the current Psychiatric Hospital. The northern cluster would place the college in close proximity to KCMS.

5. Support was expressed for converting the State Psychiatric Hospital to residential use.

6. Concern was expressed for the need to make all buildings and areas on campus handicapped accessible.

7. It was noted that students need places, activity nodes, as destinations between classes.

Walking

While the distance committee members were willing to walk varied from under 5 minutes to 10 minutes, the overall consensus was ten minutes as a maximum time people were willing to walk from parking space to building.

Parking

1. Concern was expressed for the amount of surface area given over to parking. Traffic engineers will study what drives parking and the relative cost.

2. Parking north of KCMS is necessary and must be replaced as close to the building as possible.

3. Access to the proposed parking lot on Oakland Drive Campus (in the valley) from Howard would have to be right-in and right-out. It must show access to the bridge. How it would help West Campus was questioned.

4. It was suggested that more parking be added north of the football stadium.

Vehicular Circulation

1. The proposed secondary Loop Road coming from realigned Oliver would probably be right-in and right-out.

2. Concern was expressed that further development on Oakland Drive Campus will add vehicles to roads (Oakland and Howard) that are already operating at capacity. This concern was further expressed with respect to the new road
alignment of Oliver Street. Since campus vehicles cannot travel easily across
Oakland Drive Campus on Oliver, they might be forced out to city roads, adding
to traffic.

3. It was suggested that the drop-off from the bridge to the library be extended
further into West Campus and that the entrance from Howard at Miller
Auditorium be further studied.

4. Concern was expressed regarding access to Oakland Recital Hall as shown on
the current plan.

East Campus
1. If parking is an issue for East Campus buildings, this could be provided on the
west side of Oakland Drive with the provision of safe pedestrian crossing.

2. The question of use of East Campus buildings was raised.

3. A shuttle would still be necessary for students traveling back and forth from the
Academic Core.

4. It was noted that students feel that the Davis Street neighborhood is very unsafe.

Sindicuse
1. This building is not shown on the current plan because of interest in placing
housing along the Valley Path and the need for easy access by ambulances. This
committee expressed concern that Sindicuse be shown in its current location for
the following reasons:
   • The current building has just been renovated.
   • The current location is central to student movement, and many users come
from the North Campus Goldsworth Valley Residence Halls.

2. It would not be good to incorporate the Student Health Facility into another
building, such as the ground floor of a residential unit or in an academic
building. Student confidentiality is an important issue that is supported by the
current single-use facility.
Meeting Notes
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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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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Student Services Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2040

Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 / 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Issue Date: October 12, 1999

Participants:
Emily Bohn, Draper/Siedschlag
Otis McGresham, Draper/Siedschlag
Brad Kemner, Bigelow
Ben James, Bigelow
Scott Crary, Fox
Keliann Leonhardt, Henry
Sam Genson, Henry
Nichole Ohm, Bigelow
Kellee Crim, Bigelow
John Prusinski, Ackley
Erik Lee Hartwick, Smith/Burnham
Sarah Isenberg, Ackley/Shilling
Mark Hughes, Eicher
Janet Gniadek, Britton
Barb Beste, LeFevre
Lynnae Sale, Eicher
And others

WMU Staff:
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

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
Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Team Designer / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of this meeting was to continue a dialogue with students about the campus and the current Master Plan drawing. Student ideas and insights are crucial to the planning process. Some comments are relayed in question and answer form.
Q. There are too many stop signs on campus. Will they stay? Could traffic signals be installed?
A. The realigned Loop Road should ease travel around campus. Lights might be possible, depending on the volume.

Q. How will the proposed new residence halls look? What design and form will they take?
A. A new layout for residence halls is being considered, such as suites. New design will aim to be more appealing and to draw more students to live on campus.

Q. Will the valley residence halls, where freshmen live, be renovated?
A. The Master Plan does not deal with building renovation. It simply projects future opportunities.

Q. Will the residence halls of the future be segregated with respect to majors?
A. It is felt that students need to interact across disciplines and grades so the tendency would be to mix students in residence halls.

Walking Distance: One of the reasons expressed for coming to WMU is that it is small and it is possible to walk everywhere on campus. The view that freshmen should not have cars on campus was expressed.

Parking: When existing parking structures are used for events on campus, students might wait as long as 25 minutes to find a space.

Architecture: It was noted that there is no similarity of building form or materials. Each one looks unique. The desire to have some similarity among campus buildings was expressed. Consultants can prepare aesthetic guidelines and recommend details, but are not charged with this task right now.

Q. Are there plans to plant more trees that might function as a windbreak when crossing the valley from residence halls to classes?
A. Yes, along with open green space to create green pedestrian corridors.

Wood Hall: Concern was expressed that sidewalks have been removed and lawns added, but it currently looks poorly maintained.

East Campus: Many former students are proud of this campus, perhaps it could be used for residence halls. Archives could be in a renovated North Hall.

Q. What about placing residence halls on the east side along Lovell and Davis streets?
Meeting Notes  
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A. Pro: Good idea for senior (student) housing; use an apartment/townhouse type of dwelling unit; could still walk to campus.  
Con: Location is too far from the rest of campus, not a good place to put freshmen; perhaps for older students or married students.

A housing request was made for a hotel/guest house type of unit for visiting families.

Desirable characteristics for campus: Courtyards, fountains, big trees, heroic buildings, sprinkled throughout campus.

Q. Are you planning to renovate or remove any buildings?  
A. The university is looking at the cost of renovating existing buildings vs. building new ones.

Q. How many residence halls are planned? Does the university want students to move off campus?  
A. The Master Plan will replace exactly what we have removed. The look and design of the building may change, but it will be replaced.

Comment: The car exhaust is not pleasant.

Q. Will there be housing in Battle Creek? This is frustrating to students who are paying to attend school here, but must commute.  
A. Not at the present time.

Q. Will the soccer fields be moved here?  
A. Yes, the plan shows them on Oakland Drive Campus.

Q. Will all of the residence halls be gone? Each has a unique character and setting even though they are old, and students would like to preserve this quality.

Housing: The comment was made that diversity in type of residence hall is important, that students should be mixed with regard to years, majors, etc. It is good to show the residence halls distributed around campus.

Q. Will there be more internal student spaces? The Bernhard Center is not good. It is too big, unappealing, old and needs an update. More activity nodes are needed throughout campus.

Q. It is difficult for students to reserve ice time at the arena. Can anything be done?  
A. An addition is planned, and the location could change. A shuttle would help.
Q. Are there any plans to separate bike paths from pedestrian paths?
A. We are looking at this.

Related comment: Some students would rather walk. It is too steep to ride, there are too many pedestrians, and bikes get stolen.

Q. Will there be roads to allow access to buildings in the interior of campus?
A. Yes, there will be roads provided for ADA access, service to buildings, and emergency vehicles.

Q. Where did Sindecuse go?
A. This plan does not show Sindecuse in its current location. This plan suggests that it might be relocated to a location more easily accessible to emergency vehicles.

Q. Parking Deck: It was suggested that a parking structure be built underground.
A. The cost of building such a deck would be about $22,000 per space.

To reduce traffic on campus, students and faculty must take the shuttle bus to and from residence halls and parking spaces, and be willing to walk ten minutes from their parking space to building. The perception by some students is that walking ten minutes at midnight is too far.

Bus: It is perceived to be unreliable. The buses are dirty, too big for the roads. It is faster to walk. Schedules change and routes are confusing. Students are not given any orientation to using them as freshmen. It is suggested that the university consider other forms of transportation.

Incentive to walk: Promote walking by beautiful surroundings; the more people that you see, the more you will walk. People ignore how easy it is to walk. It raises tuition to pay for parking and transit.

Q. Will the university provide shuttle service to satellite campuses?

Overall the plan is good. The university needs to make necessary changes and enforce them (e.g., freshmen can't have cars and 1.5 permits per space).

Bring the tent back to tent plaza and add more "common space" to campus buildings.
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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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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: East Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2040

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, October 06, 1999 / 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.

Issue Date: October 12, 1999

Participants:

Committee (* not present)
- Linda Fowell, Asst. Prof., HPER; Chair, East Campus Focus Group
- Debra Berkey, Chair, HPER
- David McKee, University Libraries, AAUP Liaison
- Kathy Beauregard, Director of Athletics
- Dave Corstange, Assoc. Director Intercollegiate Athletics, Alternate
- Sharon Seabrook Russell, Asst. Director, Alumni Relations
- Paul Solomon, Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art, Campus Planning Council
- Tom Carey, Prof., Dept. of Management
- Mary Godfrey, Community Volunteer
- Elton Weintz, GSA, Department of Sociology
- Charles Tischer, WSA, Department of Political Science
- Joseph Monroe, WSA, Integrated Supply Management

WMU Staff:
- Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
- George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
- Chris Pyzik, Campus Architect

Consultants:
- Richard Rigerink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR
- Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Designer / SG JJR
- Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
- Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Project Designer / 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 #8 will be:

Wednesday, December 1\textsuperscript{st} from 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. / Fetzer Center

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Subcampus Plans for each subcampus area. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, October 7\textsuperscript{th}. East Campus was the focus of study for this group, and comments/recommendations to be made to the Advisory/Policy Committee were recorded. As Part 4 progresses, individual systems, such as Vehicular, Pedestrian, Open Space, etc. will be studied in greater detail, and recommendations will be presented graphically through perspective and character sketches, as well as plan drawings.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings study of System Plans: Vehicular/Bicycle/Parking, Open Space/Pedestrian, and Utility Corridors/Buildings to the fore.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:

Visit 9 is a Major Review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

3. For the information of focus group committees, Open Campus and Open Community meetings will be held on campus, Wednesday, November 17\textsuperscript{th}. The main topic will be parking. Further information will be available through the Office of Campus Planning.

B. COMMENTS

1. Vehicular Circulation

a. It was noted that the traffic problems already existing at Oakland and Howard seem to have been intensified with the recent widening of Howard. Concern was expressed that development on Oakland Drive Campus will further increase problems of heavy traffic on surrounding roads. It was noted that this is an issue that the traffic engineers will study, and accommodations will be made accordingly.

b. It was noted that when roads are improved (i.e., increased capacity), addition of traffic follows. The Master Plan will work to balance land
use vs. traffic. Current turning counts are higher than the 1991 study, but by a minimal amount. It is suggested that there is growth occurring, and the result is a longer "peak period" (the peak spreads out over time). Traffic engineers will look at total access times into and out of campus.

c. It was suggested that Oakland Drive and West Campus be served from Stadium Drive rather than from Oakland or Howard.

d. The entrances to Oakland Drive Campus from Oakland Drive as shown on the Interim Plan might have to be right turn out, southbound only.

2. East Campus
a. Concern was expressed for the East Campus Plan. Removal of the end additions to East Hall appears to lead directly to more surface parking. The amount of parking on East Campus depends on the use that these buildings will have assigned. Many uses have been suggested in past meetings, but none has been adopted. SmithGroup JJR will look at different concepts and respond with requirements necessary for each.

b. The question was raised as to the number of students living near East and Oakland Drive Campus in the area known as the Student Ghetto. It was suggested that it would be good to know these numbers.

c. It was noted that the restoration of East Hall would be sufficient to revive its use. Uses suggested in the past include a single, low volume use, housing, a public/private venture, and a recreational/cultural use.

d. The proposed parking ramp behind Vandercook Hall would be difficult to access across Oakland Drive for East Campus use.

e. It was suggested that current residential property that sits north and south of the football practice field be purchased by the university and used as university housing. Opinions ranged from “This would be a good idea and might stimulate gentrification of the neighborhood” to “Would the neighbors object to an increase in the number of students living there?”

3. Bicycles
The question was raised with regard to a bicycle plan as part of the Master Plan. SmithGroup JJR will work up a plan. It was noted that if students were provided with good bike paths and connections to city bike paths, the use of bikes on campus would be a viable option.
4. Issue Summary
   The main issues facing East Campus are summarized as parking, traffic on Oakland Drive, and a use for East Campus buildings.

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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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2040

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, October 06, 1999 / 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Issue Date: October 12, 1999

Participants: Committee: (*not present)
- Paul Pancellia, 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 Saremius, Maps Coordinator, Waldo Library, PSSO Representative
- Bruce Naftel, Assoc. Professor, Department of Art, Campus Planning Council
- 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
- George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
- Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
- Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

Note: The date of the next campus Visit #8 will be:

Wednesday, December 1st from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Fetzer Center
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Subcampus Plans for each subcampus area. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, October 7th. West Campus, the Academic Core, was the focus of study for this group, and comments/recommendations to be made to the Advisory/Policy Committee were recorded. As Part 4 progresses, individual systems, such as Vehicular, Pedestrian, Open Space, etc., will be studied in greater detail, and recommendations will be presented graphically through perspective and character sketches, as well as plan drawings.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings study of System Plans: Vehicular/Bicycle/Parking, Open Space/Pedestrian, and Utility Corridors/Buildings, to the fore.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits: Visit #9 is a Major Review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

3. For the information of Focus Group committees, Open Campus and Open Community meetings will be held on campus, Wednesday, November 17th. The main topic will be parking. Further information will be available through the Office of Campus Planning.

B. COMMENTS

1. Housing
   a. It was noted that the Interim Subcampus Plan for West Campus shows the removal of all existing residential buildings, with the exception of the North Campus, Goldsworth Valley Residence Halls.

   b. Recommendations for new housing were to provide "Educationally Purposeful Environments" that focus on living/learning environments. This concept supports the dispersal of housing throughout the subcampus as shown in the current plan. It was suggested that the university might have to take a more active role in providing housing opportunities on campus or risk losing students to off-campus housing.
c. Residential units that are shown surrounding The Oaklands received support that this would be an ideal location in which to live. Concern was also expressed that surrounding The Oaklands with housing will eliminate significant vistas across the valley. It will also identify as private space what should be public space.

d. Concern was expressed that residential units by the Business College and by Miller would be too isolated.

2. Walking
   a. The five-minute walking distance circles are based on a walking speed of 3 mph. Concerns related to walking were as follows:
      • This is a driving campus
      • This is a snowy campus, which makes walking difficult.
      • Using a bus to parking is not practical for a single parent who may be called off campus at a moment’s notice.
      • Walking a 600 ft bridge in inclement weather is not realistic.
      Encouraging students and faculty to walk must be accompanied by efficient snow removal.

   b. A maximum walking distance of ten minutes from parking to building was supported by this focus group. It was also agreed that sight lines help to diminish distances.

3. Parking
   a. Parking at present is provided as close to residence halls as possible for safety reasons. The current policy forces students to park at the Business School lots or the Miller lots.

   b. Concern was voiced for the layout shown for the Business College area on the Interim Plan. Parking in this location must be closer to Fetzer Center and Schneider Hall.

   c. Married housing requires parking close to the building.

   d. Concern was expressed that the significant amount of parking by the entrance at West Michigan Ave. may create traffic issues at that location; it may be too concentrated.

   e. It was noted that the City of Kalamazoo is restricting parking on front lawns in university neighborhoods and that it is crucial to improve the transit system.
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f. The location of parking related to Sangren Hall was questioned. It was noted that this building is highly used by faculty and staff. It houses clinics and needs easy access from parking.

g. Concern was expressed that with the residential area that is proposed near Sangren Hall, there does not seem to be adequate parking.

4. Miscellaneous  
a. A question was raised with regard to the term "Athletic Entrance" and "Academic Entrance." It was noted that these were merely terms of convenience used in the planning process and that there is no intention to label or identify these entrances as such.

b. It was noted that the Master Plan should address the President’s Vision and the mission of the university. It was requested that this connection be noted in the presentation.

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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E. Hallquist / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #7 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Advisory/Policy Committee

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: October 06, 1999
3:00 – 5:00 p.m./6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Issue Date: October 12, 1999

Participants:

Committee: (* not present)
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
* Evie Askew, Director, Campus Planning
Paul Pansella, Assoc. Prof., Physics; Chair, West Campus Focus Group
* Linda Powell, Asst. Prof., HPER; Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS; Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
* Trudy Verser, Assoc. Prof., Management; Chair, Campus Planning Council
Jeff Chamberlain, City Planner, City of Kalamazoo
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Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The date of the next Campus Visit #8 will be:
Wednesday, December 1st from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m., Fetzer Center
with additional time scheduled (6:00 – 8:00 p.m.) as needed.
Dinner will be provided at 5:00 p.m.
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Interim Subcampus Plans for each subcampus area. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, October 7th. Comments and recommendations are brought to this committee through focus group summaries. As Part 4 progresses, individual systems, such as Vehicular, Pedestrian, Open Space, etc, will be studied in greater detail and recommendations presented graphically through perspective and character sketches, and plan drawings.

During this session, it was important to continue to reach consensus on issues related to the Master Plan and to extend those fundamental concepts on which the plan is based.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings study of System Plans: Vehicular/Bicycle/Parking, Open Space/Pedestrian, and Utility Corridors/Buildings, to the fore.

2. Meeting dates were reviewed for future campus visits:
   Visit #9 is a major review visit that will occur about the fourth week of January. This date and those following have not been confirmed. Information regarding these will be forthcoming.

3. Open Campus and Open Community meetings will be held on campus, Wednesday, November 17th. The main topic will be parking. Further information will be available through the Office of Campus Planning.

B. CURRENT ISSUES

Parking
- This topic is an issue for both the campus community and the neighborhoods. A special meeting has been planned to discuss parking and traffic on Wednesday, November 17th as noted above. More information will be forthcoming.

Housing
- The university needs to determine if the amount of residential units provided on campus will increase, decrease, or remain the same.
- It was noted that there is a national trend to bring students back on campus and to create a campus community.
- The university wants to keep the freshmen housed on campus, but most students choose to live off campus after the first year. In general it is felt that they wish to be out from under the rules regulating campus living.
It was noted that the community perceives the students as a negative element of the campus neighborhoods and that this will increasingly become an issue. The university would like to listen to the community and to respond if possible.

- Some parents find it cheaper to purchase a home in the community and place their child and other renters in it for the academic year. This was noted as a trend that the neighborhoods do not support.

- The City of Kalamazoo is making an effort to identify family neighborhoods and to maintain them as such and stop the tide of rentals.

- It was noted that the university must make a commitment with regard to the amount of housing it will provide and with limited land available.

- The numbers of students living in surrounding neighborhoods is pervasive and increasing. This has a direct affect on property values.

- The university will not require upperclassmen to live on campus.

- One solution used in some communities is for the university to establish rules governing students living off campus.

Traffic
- Concern was expressed for the reality of proposed changes to city streets. The question of who would absorb the costs of these changes was raised. It was then recommended that HNTB stay in touch with John Stark of the City of Kalamazoo as the plan progresses.

C. INTERIM SUBCAMPUS PLAN

It was noted that this Interim Plan is a very aggressive and dollar intensive plan that may require public/private ventures. The following comments were specific to this Interim Plan.

Housing
- With regard to housing, which the plan currently recommends replacing, the issue becomes the cost of housing students vs. the importance of having students live on campus. Currently, about 25% of the undergraduates are housed on campus.

- It was suggested that university housing is placed near Davis Street on land north and south of the football practice field, which the university might purchase from the City or possibly leave the land as open green space. It was also suggested that housing be placed on the practice field at the north and south ends, reducing but leaving open park-like space between them.

- It was suggested that the Noble Lodge building, should it become the property of the university, be used for married student housing.

- The need for a daycare facility for both married students and faculty was stated.
• It was suggested that in order for the university to compete with housing that is being offered off campus, a new and better type of housing must be provided.

Parking/Walking Radius
• A plan showing the walking radii from each parking deck indicated that about four central buildings are not within a five minute walking radius of a parking deck. Of these, it was noted that Sangren has multiple uses, needs better accessibility and thus closer proximity to parking. Waldo Library, it was noted, is a building with regional use and needs close parking as well. Dunbar also requires parking close to the building. It was suggested to possibly blend a parking deck with a proposed building. Changing the radius to an eight minute walk would cover all buildings in the Central Core.
• It was noted that most faculty would walk ten minutes to their building if a drop-off could be provided. One Master Plan goal is to share drop-off and service dock locations.
• The parking deck behind the stadium would have huge peak time uses. Concern was voiced that the roads couldn't handle this volume of traffic and that the average daily use was too low to pay for the deck. The question was raised: Could it be moved closer to the Indoor Practice Facility?
• The large surface parking lot shown on the southwestern edge of Oakland Drive Campus requires further study in terms of its connection to the rest of the campus and location at Stadium and Howard.
• The location of the Physical Plant still must be determined.
• Concern was expressed for the location of the proposed parking deck by the Student Recreation Center. It was noted that this location would block views and is too "internal."

East Campus
• An academic use here would be limited by parking. However, with the proposed deck on the west side of Oakland Drive, these buildings are viewed as more useful.

• A single, daily use is recommended. The existing physical layout of this campus does not support a use such as "student academic" that would require a constant flow of automobiles into and out of campus. A single, daily use refers to users that come to this campus in the morning, park and generally don't need to move their cars until the end of the day. Multiple disciplines could be accommodated.
D. FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

**Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group**
- It would be valuable to be able to control the vegetation around the existing rail line.
- Sindecuse Health Center should remain in its current location. Access would be improved by the new road alignment.
- Concern was expressed regarding accessibility to East Campus buildings east of Oakland Drive and for the larger parking proposed in this area.
- Concern was expressed for improving handicapped accessibility throughout campus.
- The transit system should be improved and students encouraged to use it. It should be accessible across the proposed Stadium Drive bridge. A shuttle bus system might be a good alternative.
- Maximum walking distance from parking space to building was agreed to be ten minutes. But more activity/study nodes throughout campus were recommended.
- Continue to study:
  - The entrance to Miller from Howard
  - Increase parking on the Athletic Campus and KCMS
  - Lower SC parking lot must show access to the bridge
  - Extend the road from the bridge closer to the library
- Location of the College of Health and Human Services
  - Not at Bronson Hospital
  - Northern proposed building cluster is easily accessible
  - Southern proposed building cluster would work if clinics moved there from KCMS
- The double ring road was supported.

**West Campus Focus Group**
- With regard to the placement of parking and housing, it was noted that it should be possible to park close to the building. Views to the valley should also be taken into account when placing buildings.
- Parking must be closer to the buildings at the Business School. Housing units and buildings in this area as well as Sangren Hall are not well served by parking.
- The proposed housing cluster by Miller Auditorium appears too isolated.
- The proposed housing cluster at the Oaklands was supported as a good idea and was critiqued as making a public space into a private space and blocking views into the valley.
- Encouraging people to walk will be easier if the pedestrian paths are clean, efficient and pleasant to walk.
• It was suggested that the Master Plan try to integrate the University Mission as well as the President's Vision.

**East Campus Focus Group**

The key issues for East Campus that were expressed at this meeting are:

• The location and amount of parking on East Campus. It appears that parts of East Hall were removed and replaced with parking. It was suggested that more planning strategies be used to determine the amount and location of parking here. This would depend on the designated use for these buildings.

• Parking on the west side of Oakland Drive was discussed as an alternative to parking on the east side with the proviso that a safe method of crossing Oakland Drive is provided.

• Oakland Drive is currently operating at high capacity. Concern was expressed that increasing development would exacerbate this problem. It was noted that the traffic engineers would assess the level of development and its impact on the road system.

• The determination of appropriate and realistic uses for the historic buildings east of Oakland Drive has yet to be decided. Concern was raised that until this is decided, it is very difficult to plan for the campus. It was suggested that the focus group meet soon after this visit, propose several alternative uses and provide them to the consultants who will assess the necessary characteristics for each.

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 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Open Campus Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2020

Meeting Date/Time: November 17, 1999 / 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

Issue Date: November 19, 1999

Participants:
- David Jarl, Oakland Drive/Winchell Neighborhood
- Chris LaLonde, Western Herald
- Chuck Boos, UCS/OIT
- Pam Miller, College of Education
- Paul Pancellia, Physics Department
- Dick St. John, Trustee
- Katie Ill, URPF
- Amy Seth, URPF
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- Samuel Genson, WSA
- Scott Rolando, WSA
- G.G. Dales, Emeritus
- Melissa Milton, WMU Archives/Undergraduate
- Melissa Gilbert, Student/Employee Archives
- Chris Wright, Historic/Traffic Interests
- Sue Husband, WMU – Regional History Curator
- Dale Pattison, WMU History, Retired
- Dick Tanner, Alumni

Campus Planning Staff:
- Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
- George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
- Susan Kannman, Campus Planning

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
Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to present the Refined Interim Subcampus Plan and the Vehicular Circulation/Parking Study to the campus at large. This presentation provided the Campus Community with the opportunity to participate and review the progress of the Master Plan at a critical stage in the process.

Presentation

The consultants presented the Refined Interim Plan as well as vehicular circulation and parking projections for the future Master Plan based on current growth. HNTB, Traffic Consultants presented a discussion of critical campus entries and intersections that would be impacted by this new plan and projected growth and solutions to problems that may arise at these critical points.

DISCUSSION:

The following observations were recorded during the meeting:

Q: When traveling north on Oakland, it is difficult, almost impossible to turn left onto Howard. What solution is proposed for this problem?
A: The traffic consultants focus their efforts on traffic movements into and out of campus and their impact on city roads. This particular problem has not been studied. However, it does impact on traffic flow around the university and should be part of a discussion between the consultants and the City of Kalamazoo.

Q: Traffic along the West Michigan Avenue corridor is currently heavy, and with new growth, it will become heavier. Would the Master Plan consider replacing this road along its historic route through the center of campus?
A: Concern for pedestrian safety in this dense Academic Core was the reason the road was removed from the center of main campus.

Q: When placing buildings and parking on campus, did you consider weather conditions in Kalamazoo?
A: Every attempt was made to provide parking close to buildings. However, in an effort to provide parking at the current rate that is found on campus, buildings had to be removed and replaced with surface lots. There is an increased cost to "close at hand" parking resulting from increased paved surfaces, more access roads, and realignment of existing roads to accommodate new buildings. However, attempts were made to link buildings to each other and to decks where possible.
Q: Why is there an entrance to Oakland Drive Campus from Howard Street?
A: This entrance is provided to reduce the traffic impact on the Howard-Oakland Drive intersection. It provides another exit/entrance to this campus.

Q: Why is a large surface lot placed at the intersection of Howard and Stadium Drive? This is a major arrival point and would have a significant aesthetic impact on the campus.
A: This surface lot is not desirable, but necessary to provide sufficient parking at the current demand to accommodate new growth. This area is already disturbed and could be screened sufficiently from view along the roadway.

Q: What is the character of the Loop Road? Will there be signals or stop signs?
A: The Loop Road will have traffic devices. They will mostly be stop signs, but signals will be used in areas where they are required.

Q: Has any thought been given to linking parking decks to the buildings?
A: Yes. This has been done on other campuses and may be possible here.

Q: Why have the wing additions to East Hall been removed?
A: A 1996 study showed that both wings are in need of repair. No firm decision has been made for any of the East Campus buildings. East Hall does not have a dedicated use at the present time. Administration is one use that is being considered. The renovation of this and other East Campus buildings has been studied.

Q: The Stadium Drive Apartments are not shown on this plan. Will they be torn down and why?
A: These buildings have many problems that cannot, or are too cost prohibitive to be corrected. For this reason, at some point in the future, they will be removed.

Note: The uses for East Campus buildings must be carefully chosen, as the parking for this campus is very limited. Because of their historic nature, any changes proposed would be considered in light of their preservation status.

Q: The Aviation Buildings are not shown on the plan. Will they be saved?
A: They will be saved if a use for these buildings can be demonstrated. Concern for the historic nature of these buildings has been expressed, and where possible, all or parts of buildings will be saved.
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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      G. Wilson / WMU
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Open Neighborhood Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2020

Meeting Date/Time: November 17, 1999
7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Issue Date: November 19, 1999

Participants:
Bob Totten, Arcadia Neighborhood Association
John Bolger, Knollwood Neighborhood Association
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Sean McCann, Vine Neighborhood Association
B.J. Shell, Vine Neighborhood Association
Mike Matthews, University Relations, WMU

University Staff:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning

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

Purpose
The purpose of this meeting was to present the Refined Interim Subcampus Plan and the Vehicular Circulation/Parking Study to the campus at large. This presentation provided the neighborhood representatives with the opportunity to participate and review the progress of the Master Plan at a critical stage in the process.
Presentation
The consultants presented the refined Interim Plan as well as vehicular circulation and parking projections for the future Master Plan based on current growth. HNTB, Traffic Consultants presented a discussion of critical campus entries and intersections that would be impacted by this new plan and projected growth and solutions to problems that may arise at these critical points.

DISCUSSION:

The following notes and observations were recorded during the meeting:

The discussion centered around two issues: vehicular circulation and the campus/community interface, as well as the status of historic buildings on campus and their future consideration.

Traffic and Campus/Community Interface
Concern was expressed for the existing traffic problems at the intersection of West Michigan and Howard. At peak PM hours, traffic exiting the university tends to back up on Knollwood Ave. In the new plan, a traffic-regulating device would address the difficulty of moving from the Loop Road to West Michigan Ave. to exit. Making the road at Crane Lane across Howard a true intersection will reduce the volume exiting at West Michigan Ave.

Concern was expressed for students who are parking in neighborhoods contiguous to the university. They often block sidewalks. Students who ride bicycles often ignore traffic signals and this is seen as a dangerous situation. The Master Plan creates a bicycle system plan with specific hierarchy of paths intended to protect pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. This plan suggests a code of conduct for cyclists to improve safety while riding.

Historic Buildings
Concern was expressed for the historic buildings that currently exist on campus and their future status in the Master Plan. The historic nature of campus buildings is considered in the process. Other factors that impact these buildings are their use and the cost of renovation. Buildings that are not shown on the plan are not necessarily to be removed in the near future. These buildings will be removed at such time as the university determines that they are not safe, efficient, or able to be renovated to meet code. The Stadium Drive Apartments are currently in very poor condition. They will not be renovated when they can no longer be revitalized.
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