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## Visit 8 Framework Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN VISIT #8</th>
<th>TUESDAY NOVEMBER 30</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Campus Focus Group 1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Preview Meeting</td>
<td>West Campus Focus Group 2040 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>1040-50 Fetzer Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1040-50 Fetzer Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory / Policy Committee 1069 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Oakland Drive Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>1060 Fetzer Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffet Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Advisory / Policy Committee (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAMPUS SYSTEM PLANS

The system plans show individual campus systems. The latter, taken as a whole, comprise the Preliminary Composite Master Plan. The integration of the whole plan is facilitated by the separate study of each system. Where interrelated or complementary, systems are presented together. The following systems were studied:
1. Building
2. Open Space
3. Bicycle
4. Pedestrian
5. Vehicular
6. Parking
Figure 6-B.17 Preliminary Composite Plan (Web site graphic)
PRELIMINARY COMPOSITE PLAN AND CAMPUS SYSTEM PLANS

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS REVISITED

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 Master Plan continues to be refined.

- Use the valleys to create a distinctive setting.
- Provide convenient and appealing routes to campus.
- Add open space in the campus core.
- Achieve connectivity.
- Upgrade perimeter access to campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Summarizing from Visit #7, when Interim Subcampus Plans were presented, the following concepts were noted and used as a basis from which to prepare the Composite Plan and System Plans.

- Create a formal open space in the academic core (Michigan Mall) aligned axially through the center of the academic core.
- 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 locations 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.
- Add a pedestrian bridge across Stadium Drive in close proximity to Oliver Street to facilitate safe crossing.
- Add a vehicular bridge to the loop road to allow pedestrians to pass safely underneath.
- Balance parking on campus as new buildings are proposed. Relocate parking decks while still maintaining the current level of parking. Relocate surface parking that is in valley.
- Maintain open feel of existing Oakland Drive Campus.
- Improve and maintain the campus transit system.
- Continue to preserve land for an Athletic Campus east of Stadium Drive.
- Create a College of Health and Human Services campus on Oakland Drive Campus.
- Balance and distribute housing throughout campus. Reconfigure housing on West Campus and add family housing to hillsides of Oakland Drive Campus.
REFINEMENTS

In light of these recommendations and others, refinements were made to the subcampus plans. In most cases, these refinements contribute to the progress of the Master Plan. However, some recommendations have yet to be resolved from a planning standpoint and in light of the future growth and parking needs of the University. For this reason, the current plan has left certain elements in place to encourage further discussion and to offer several alternatives that may be considered. In general, parking and campus housing have been maintained at the current level.

- Redistribution of housing and parking complement the preservation of open space and natural features. Housing was removed from the major pedestrian path heading to the academic core from Goldsworthy Valley. It was reconfigured on the west edge of West Campus, and units were removed from The Oaklands perimeter. However, some units remain at a distance from The Oaklands to preserve balance and distribution of housing on West Campus.
- Family housing was added to the hillsides of Oakland Drive Campus.
- Create Davis Street "neighborhood" with addition of family housing on current football practice field on East Campus as step toward revitalizing this campus and neighborhood.
- Sindecuse was replaced in its current location with access from the realigned loop road.
- The athletic indoor practice facility was realigned to correspond to the architectural plans. This new orientation allows for two rather than three outdoor practice/game fields in close proximity. Oliver Street was realigned in response to recommendations that access to Oakland Drive be facilitated.
- Future building envelopes were reconfigured on Oakland Drive Campus to preserve open space.
- Buildings were removed from West Campus for aesthetic and functional reasons. The vista down the Michigan Mall to the east was maintained by removing the proposed building that terminated this space. Four buildings and one building addition were removed in order to add needed parking to West Campus.
- Parking decks were relocated. At the Business College, the proposed deck was located closer to the college buildings. The proposed deck located near the West Michigan Ave. and Howard Street entrance was relocated to the south side of the proposed vehicular bridge. And the proposed deck near fieldhouse was relocated in close proximity to the library.
- Open space and vistas from The Oaklands have been preserved and enhanced by the careful placement of buildings and parking in this area.
SYSTEM HIERARCHY

**Vehicular Circulation**
- Major campus roads
- Campus access to groups of buildings (district entries)
- Access to individual buildings and service access routes

**Parking Guidelines**
- Redistribute both surface and deck parking throughout campus
- Maintain the current level of parking for the future (ratio of 1 space/550 gross square feet)
- Create walk distances from parking to buildings that range from and are not to exceed five minutes for visitors, ten minutes for faculty and staff, and fifteen minutes for commuters – walk radii are shown at an average eight minutes

**Pedestrian Circulation**
- Primary pedestrian corridors, twelve feet wide, link the entire campus
- Secondary walks, eight to ten feet wide, provide access to major building groups and to contiguous campus neighborhoods
- Minor walks, eight feet wide, aligned along roads provide access to individual buildings
- Paths, of natural materials, lead through natural areas on campus

**Bicycle Circulation**
- Major bicycle corridors provide separate paths for bicycles along roads and pedestrian walks
- Secondary paths integrate pedestrians and bicycles on the same path with dedicated bike lane
- Mixed access does not distinguish between pedestrians and bicycles
- A bicycle walk zone identifies that area where bicycles may not be ridden

**Open Space System**
- Level 1 Open Space identifies formal corridors of broad formal lawns and plantings that incorporate stately trees; these areas may use landscape materials to define edges
- Level 2 Open Space is less structured, although clearly identified open spaces that are preserved and usually complement the pedestrian circulation paths
- Level 3 Open Space is passive space which is not used on a daily basis
- Level 4 Open Space provides a perimeter buffer and soft edge of low maintenance, native planting

**Building System**
- Academic/administration/service buildings are proposed at an institutional scale
- Campus housing consists of residence halls and family housing at a more intimate scale and suite arrangement than traditional campus housing; housing is distributed throughout the campus and makes connections to contiguous neighborhoods where possible
Figure 6-B.18 Tentative Vehicular System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.19 Tentative Open Space, Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan (Web site graphic)
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Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Preliminary Composite Plan and the System Plans. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, November 30th, 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. in the Fetzer Center, Room 1040-50. Oakland Drive Campus was the focus of study for this group and comments and recommendations to be made to the Advisory/Policy Committee were recorded. Individual System Plans were discussed. However, the focus of discussion concerned location of the Physical Plant, location of surface parking at Stadium Drive and Howard, surface parking on Oakland Drive Campus to support both Oakland Drive and West Campus needs, family housing and layout of proposed academic buildings, and road alignment in the vicinity of KCMS. Issues facing the entire campus were also discussed.

Other major issues not yet resolved were discussed. These included: location of the Physical Plant facilities, location of parking decks on West and East Campus, and use of a parking ratio of 1 space per 650 gross square feet (gsf) of building space. The latter was necessary in order to achieve the level of development shown in the current plan and still support parking on campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings refinement of the following: Preliminary Composite Plan, System Plans, cross-sections (two per subcampus) and perspective drawings.

2. Campus Visit #9 is a Major Review visit including Open Campus and Open Community sessions. Committee members are invited to share these special meeting dates, locations and times with members of the Kalamazoo community.

B. COMMENTS

1. Preliminary Composite Plan
   a. It would be beneficial to create a bus loop that includes stops along the Loop Road and remote lots. It was suggested that buildings be positioned to provide waiting space for the bus. This would be especially helpful northeast of the large 500-car lot.

   b. Concern was expressed about converting the State Hospital building and quad to a residence hall.
      • The key to its success would be the level of renovation.
Meeting Notes
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- The Administration (central, front section) is useful, but the wings are in poor condition. This would make renovation expensive.
- The decision will be political rather than financial.
- An alternative would be to save the front face or front portion of the building and rebuild the structure behind it.
- Who would live here? The majority of residents are freshmen and sophomores. They want to be located on West Campus. It would be a good idea for graduate housing. Health and Human Services is moving toward a graduate program.

2. **Realignment of Oliver and access to Oakland Drive**
   It is preferred that the road not align opposite Austin Street. Cars back up on Oliver today. Road as shown is through existing parking and a cooling unit. The road must be removed here.

3. **Physical Plant Location**
   Of the three locations presented (A/B/C):
   - Site A - viewed as good in that it doesn't disrupt the northern portion of the site, but visibility of the Physical Plant from Stadium Drive and Howard was a concern.
   - This site is viewed as prime real estate because of its location and access from Stadium Drive, as well as Howard Street.
   - Siting next to the Power Plant is a problem due to existing utility lines and steep slopes, although this location would be preferred to Site A.

4. **Parking Deck at Waldo Stadium**
   a. Crossing Oakland Drive presents a problem, but more parking would be available for East Campus.
   b. The Stadium events need room for concessions, media equipment and vehicles.
   c. Interrupted view from Spindler – overlooking parking deck vs. a surface lot.
   d. If deck is moved opposite the indoor practice facility within the Loop Road, academic buildings would be lost, and unified labs would move to the south.

5. **Parking Ratio: 1 space/650 gross square feet**
   a. Student to teacher ratio is changing/student to gross square foot ratio is declining.
b. Technology = stay at home and use the Web.

c. Monitor these changes in the future.

d. The committee seemed to support the ratio of 1 sp/650 gsf.

6. **Howard and Stadium Drive**
   a. If Physical Plant is not located here, then what use would work in this location?

   b. Student Services was suggested for this location. It was noted that this is the farthest point from all other campus activities and would not be a good use here. A Welcome Center at this location could be part of another structure, such as a parking deck or building. However, even though this is an arrival node and would have ample parking, it is very isolated.

   c. Exiting onto Howard from this location would be a problem.

   d. Parking here would be considered too far away. However, this parking is necessary to achieve the target capacity with the proposed gross square feet of new building.

   e. If there are only 1500 commuter spaces, this is a small percent of the total commuter spaces.

   f. A good shuttle system must be in place for this to work.

   g. Evening classes require lots, and decks are available.

7. **Michigan Mall Treatment**
   Soft, irregular planting along the axis was supported.

8. **West Michigan Avenue/Loop Road Intersection**
   a. Check configuration - may not handle traffic loads.

   b. Add a stop sign on the Loop Road at intersection.

   c. Add a loop to entry to ease left turn from south Loop Road to exit campus.
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d. Concern was expressed regarding the blind corner at Crane Lane. HNTB proposes making Crane Lane and Howard a full intersection with a light to facilitate entry and exit to campus.

9. Housing
a. Housing along the east side of Davis Street was supported.

b. Residence halls by The Oaklands disrupt view from Oliver up to The Oaklands. It was suggested that these buildings be reconfigured to open up this view. The northern two units could be moved to the south.

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

p:\23456\wmufinalrpt\appendix\9-1130scfg.doc

cc: Participants
P. Berg / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #8 MEETING NOTES
Revised January 18, 2000

Meeting Subject: East Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060
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Linda Powell, 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:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
Chris Pyzik, Campus Architect

Consultants:
Richard Risterink, Vice President, Team Leader / 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

Other:
Dick Tanner, University High Alumnus
Lynn Houghton, Historian, Historic Preservation

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Preliminary Composite Plan and the System Plans. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, November 30th, 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. in the Fetzer Center, Room 1040-50. East Campus was the focus of study for this group, and comments and recommendations to be made to the Advisory/Policy Committee were recorded. Individual System Plans were discussed. However, the focus of discussion concerned opportunities for East Campus and narrowing the focus of potential uses for this historic campus. Other major issues not yet resolved were discussed. These included: location of the Physical Plant facilities, location of surface parking at Stadium Drive and Howard, location of parking decks on West and East Campus, and use of a parking ratio of 1 space per 650 gross square feet of building space. The latter was necessary in order to achieve the level of development shown in the current plan and still support parking on campus.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings refinement of the Preliminary Composite Plan, System Plans, cross-sections and perspective drawings.

2. Campus Visit #9 is a Major Review visit including Open Campus and Open Community sessions. Committee members are invited to share these special meeting dates, locations and times with members of the Kalamazoo community.

B. COMMENTS

1. It was noted that the land north of the power plant and along Stadium Drive might help to solve some of the parking needs.

2. The question was raised regarding access to the proposed parking deck behind Waldo Stadium and whether it would be possible to have direct access onto Oakland.

3. Alternative locations for the Waldo Parking Deck might be on the Davis Street side of East Campus or south of the indoor practice facility.
4. **Alumni Center**: Discussion concerned the needs of this center and its location on campus. It is thought that this facility should be located near the student center and in the heart of the campus. Currently in Walwood, the center could use more space. The question was raised regarding the potential use of Oakland gym as an Alumni Center.

5. It was suggested that Physical Plant might be located close to the power plant.

6. The need for more recreational space was noted.

C. **EAST CAMPUS**

**Potential Uses**

Campus buildings east of Oakland Drive:
- Alumni Center in Oakland Gym
- Regional Visitor Center in West Hall
- Archives, Natural History Museum, North Hall
- Administration in East Hall

Usage suggestions:
- Use for Interdepartmental Research
- Art Galleries (existing gallery in East Hall is already on a community gallery tour)
- Small Art and Performance Space
- Restaurant on the East Side of East Hall Overlooking the City
- Headquarters for a College
- Large Collection of Medieval Art and Books, as well as a Permanent Art Collection that is Not Exhibited
- Athletic Department Administrative Offices, Possible in Vandercook
- East Hall Could Function as a Convocation and Banquet Hall
- Walkways from Vandercook, Across Oakland Drive, Would Improve Access and Parking

It was noted that the entire East Hall building was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978.

Renovation of East Campus buildings is further complicated by the need to have them meet ADA compliance.
D. SUMMARY

Auxiliary uses are most suited to the East Campus, such as: Administration, museums, Fine Art Center, Interdisciplinary Research Center, Alumni and Student Services. Suggestions that were preferred include:
- University/Community Center
- Permanent Collections/Archives ("Showcase" of University Collections)
- Administration
- Acropolis: Academic Specialties Center, Interdisciplinary Seminars
- Art Museum/Performance Space
- Archives
- Walkway Over Oakland Drive

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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Robert Brown, Director of Public Safety / WMU
Sharon R. Fenan, Kalamazoo Historic Resource Survey

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Preliminary Composite Plan and the System Plans. These were presented at the General Preview Session, Tuesday, November 30th, 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. in the Fetzer Center, Room 1040-50. Individual System Plans were discussed. However, the focus of discussion concerned major issues not yet resolved. These included: a use for East Campus buildings, location of the Physical Plant facilities, location of surface parking at Stadium Drive and Howard, location of parking decks on West and East Campus, and use of a parking ratio of 1 space per 650 gross square feet (gsf) of building space. The latter was necessary in order to achieve the level of development shown in the current plan and still support parking on campus. Discussion included reports from each focus group and was directed toward achieving consensus on the issues and the integrity of the plan.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

1. The next visit to campus brings refinement of the Preliminary Composite Plan, System Plans, cross-sections and perspective drawings.

2. Campus Visit #9 is a Major Review visit including Open Campus and Open Community sessions. Committee members are invited to share these special meeting dates, locations and times with members of the Kalamazoo community.

B. GENERAL COMMENTS

1. General
   a. It was suggested that the Bicycle and Pedestrian plans show connections to the community system.

   b. It was noted that entrance roads to Oakland Drive Campus do not align with city streets. Aligning the streets is a safer option and provides the necessary orientation for future traffic signals, but concern was expressed from the Vine Street neighborhood that it would lead to increased traffic through the neighborhood.

   c. Questions were raised regarding the placement of Intramural Fields in Arcadia Valley and the effects of the lights and related noise.

   d. Concern was expressed for the West Michigan and Loop Road intersection on West Campus and how this would function as shown.
e. The effects of high-speed trains and freight trains were discussed:
   • City ordinance for ten minute train stopping traffic questioned as to enforcement.
   • Desire to sit down with the City of Kalamazoo, MDOT, the university, HNTB, and SmithGroup JJR to take traffic beyond the conceptual framework. It was expressed as desirable to get issues stated and discussed openly as soon as possible.

f. Locating Administration on East Campus, but not in West Hall was supported.

2. Architecture
   a. It was suggested that the Davis Street housing be oriented to the street, with parking to the side or behind.
   b. Renovation of the Psychiatric Hospital must take into consideration the psychological connotations of the existing hospital. It was suggested that the entire building be preserved, but if this were not possible, it would be reasonable to preserve the section that faces Oakland Drive.
   c. Discussion of the Oakland Drive Campus buildings and layout noted that most views from the Oakland entries were through spaces between the buildings.

3. Parking
   a. Concern was expressed regarding the large surface parking lots and the visual aesthetics of their location.
   b. The question of the size of the parking deck behind Waldo Stadium and the number of spaces necessary was raised and the possibility that it be smaller. Parking is needed for East Campus, and it was suggested that East Campus people would not like to see the deck moved to be replaced by a soccer field.
   c. It was suggested that this deck be moved to a location south of Oliver and the current surface parking remain. Athletic fields will probably be sacrificed for parking.
   d. Replace one building on the north end of Oakland Drive Campus on the west side or on west parking lot. The parking deck will make up lost spaces.
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e. The Vice President for Finance and the Police Chief supported the 1sp/650gsf ratio for parking.

f. Handicap access to Kanley Chapel, and the Computer Center and Waldo Library on West Campus was noted.

g. Break up remote parking with landscaping.

4. Physical Plant
a. West Campus supports site A as a location, but would like the site by the Antenna Farm studied.
b. It was suggested that the southernmost parking deck be "hybridized."
c. It was noted that placing the physical plant or parking in the valleys violates the very principal the plan tries to promote.

d. The question was raised as to whether Physical Plant could fit up on the knoll north of the power plant. Maintenance could be placed up on the plateau and logistical services at Stadium and Howard. It was noted that logistics and transportation (47 cars) don't really need to be located near the Physical Plant.

e. It was agreed that the consultants would study three locations: Stadium and Howard, the knoll north of the power plant, and a combination between the two.

f. More input is needed from Physical Plant and others to study possible locations.

5. Health and Human Services
It was noted that this college has great potential for growth. The facilities should be unified and a new clinic provided. If H & HS is placed to the south, the bridge has to be built within one year.

Overall, the committee supported the "user friendliness" of the Preliminary Plan with some minor changes. The System Plans were accepted pending changes to Vehicular, Bicycle, and Utilities Plans.
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
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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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E. Hallquist / SG JJR
P. Berg / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Workshop

Location: Bernhard Center, Room 211

Meeting Date: January 14, 2000

Issue Date: January 26, 2000

Participants:
University:
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Bob Brown, Police Chief
John Goes, Physical Plant
David Dakin, Assoc. Director, Campus Planning and Architecture
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
Chris Pyzik, Campus Architect
Doug Lloyd, Campus Architect

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

Members of the Campus Planning staff, Police Chief Bob Brown, Physical Plant Director, John Goes, and Vice President Bob Beam met with the consultant team to discuss observations of the Master Plan, master plan process, and the progress to date. This was an opportunity to confirm direction and issues that have been resolved and to identify those aspects of the plan that still require investigation. For the purpose of this meeting, it was suggested that the discussion of the Master Plan focus on broader issues and avoid specific details. The University Campus Planning staff presented a guide for this discussion. It reads as follows:
1. **A master plan provides a foundation and is a tool for the ongoing development of the university.**
   What will ensure that the Master Plan will be utilized by future University Campus Planning staff in the way that it was intended? Will it be comprehensible by future planning staff? Will it be a viable tool for future staff? Will it sit on the shelf?

2. **A master plan must be flexible.**
   What are the premises for the functional aspects of the plan?

3. **A master plan project looks forward 15 years and must be flexible to meet unknown cultural changes.**
   What are the premises for the functional aspects of the plan?

4. **A master plan considers the location of a campus.**
   Is this a plan for a campus that can weather four seasons?

5. **A master plan anticipates how a campus will be used.**
   Has the required interaction of pedestrians and vehicles been addressed?

The consultants presented a list of specific issues culled from university documents, the current plan, and university and Master Plan Committee discussions. These issues addressed the current plan as well as items from Part 3 that are still being investigated. The purpose of this list was to identify those issues that have been resolved and those that still require study. The revised issues list will be attached to this document with the results of the workshop discussion.

**Observations:**

The following, in conjunction with the attached Issues List, represents concepts and topics discussed during this workshop:

- It was suggested that there is a need for clarification of the guiding philosophy.
- The plan should address both functional and physical aspects of the campus.
- The Campus Planning staff noted that they had conducted one-on-one interviews with members of the focus group committees during the past two weeks in order to collect opinions of the current Master Plan. The overriding comment was the need for "a reason" or "justification" for future decisions made on campus.
- A review of the Fundamental Concepts was suggested as a reference point for discussion. They were noted and recorded. They will be listed as "Propositions" and included in this document. It was noted that these concepts were reviewed during previous visits, and as they were endorsed, the plan progressed.
- Fundamental administrative issues that must be addressed: culture of the campus, freshmen parking, and commuter parking.
• The basic philosophy of the university is to be to the citizens of Michigan, whatever the market "needs them to be."
• The philosophy of the Master Plan has been to function as a guide or a tool. It must have flexibility.
• The question was raised that perhaps the Fundamental Concepts should be tested again, that perhaps they might not still be valid. For example, the severe weather experienced in Kalamazoo is a factor that is not specifically addressed in the current plan.
• Concern was expressed that as the university staff changes, the future leaders may not understand the plan and its implementation.
• The question was raised regarding the urban nature of the campus. Could it become more urban?
• Where is the center of campus? It was noted that the tent is the hub, but it is void of a center. This area could have connections (covered and enclosed?) to the far reaches of the campus. Should the campus have a center or should there be "regional centers"? A central hub must focus on all seasons and must be a vital and active space - not just plazas.
• It was suggested that a transit center where the tent plaza currently exists could function as an activity hub. Transit opportunities should be protected as a way to connect subcampuses in the future. Concern was expressed that bringing transit into campus will allow everyone to bring cars into the heart of campus, which violates an original premise of the Master Plan (i.e., to maintain parking on the edge).
• A parking density of 650 must be maintained.
• The plan has been sensitive to walking distances.
• The Master Plan should preserve visual links from one subcampus to the other.
• Development on Oakland Drive Campus should preserve trees/atmosphere of the campus.
• It was suggested that Physical Plant be relocated to or behind the Bernhard Center. If the ice arena is relocated, its current site would suit the needs of Physical Plant services.
• Parking Decks: It was suggested that expanding the existing deck (Parking Structure 1) would not function as well as placing a full, 1000 car deck in the vicinity of Bernhard Center and Sangren.
• Proposed buildings flanking the proposed intercampus bridge should be studied.
• Concern was expressed for the safety of a proposed signalized intersection at Howard and Crane Lane. This should be examined and discussed with the traffic consultants.
• It was suggested that the existing intersection of Oakland and Oliver be preserved and become a right-in, right-out intersection.
• Storm water must be carefully studied for West Campus development.
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- Keep the Valley as shown on the current plan with parking on the west end and fields on the east. Where possible, add more recreation fields.  
- Spindler and Vandercook should not remain as housing on the Master Plan.

**Propositions:**

It was suggested that the original propositions on which the Master Plan be based be reviewed and recorded. Further items were added throughout the workshop. These Propositions are as follows:

- Preserve the Valley systems.  
- Provide convenient and attractive campus approaches.  
- Provide open space in the core of campus.  
- Achieve connectivity between zones.  
- Upgrade perimeter circulation.  
- Maintain variety of building massing patterns/grids.  
- Allow each district to develop in a pattern independent of other districts. All buildings within a specific district will relate to each other.  
- Distribute housing throughout campus.  
- Extend the Athletic Campus in East Campus.  
- Place parking on the perimeter of campus.  
- Protect opportunities for alternate forms of transportation.  
- Maintain a parking density of 650.  
- The central core of campus should serve as a focus for activities for the campus community.  
- Building sites are limited and should maximize their use of space (e.g., typical height should be four stories).  
- Development patterns and density levels are distinct in each zone/campus. Each subcampus should have its own identity.

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

Respectfully submitted by:

**SmithGroup JJR**

Linda Lucchesi Cody  
Project Manager
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cc: Participants

Attachment
# ISSUES LIST

## GENERAL

1. Review the March 17 Campus Perspective Issues as they relate to the plan to date.
   
   *Clarification needed.*

2. Is the plan user friendly?
   
   *Advisory/Policy Committee plus focus groups agreed with this (Visit 8).*

3. Review of the preliminary aerial perspective sketch (Michigan Mall) and determination of the two special graphic sketches.
   
   *Extend drawing southward; building envelopes too strong, too formal, too much green.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL

4. Storm water retention requirements for the proposed new development.
   
   *Rough calculations of the storm water requirements are underway.*

5. Affect of the coal pile on surrounding soils (collect data).
   
   *Problem area, can't be used.*

## PARKING

6. Confirm parking deck locations on all subcampuses.
   
   *After Campus Visit 7, decks were relocated on West Campus to improve the distribution of parking.*

   - Relocate Waldo Stadium Deck south, inside the Loop Road (Visit 8).
     
     *Discussion at Campus Visit 8 led to suggestion that other locations be considered. One consideration was to move the deck south of Oliver within the Loop Road.*

   - Shift Library Deck northward.

7. Eliminate proposed surface parking at Stadium and Howard.
   
   *Parking is required to support a ratio of 1/650. These 500 spaces support approximately 330,000 gsf.*

8. Clarify the parking requirements for the District Service Centers for the Physical Plant services.
   
   *Not needed.*

## PHYSICAL PLANT

9. Relocation site for the Physical Plant.
   
   *Three plant locations to be considered: 1) on the knoll north of the Power Plant, 2) Stadium Drive Apartment location, or 3) a combination of the two sites.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>ADVISORY/POLICY COMMITTEE</th>
<th>JIR</th>
<th>INVESTIGATE</th>
<th>RESOLVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Residential buildings placed too close to The Oaklands. Move buildings to south; same number maintained.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consider the Davis Street practice site as a neighborhood site. Residential units and open space proposed in this location.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Howard Street Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consider using the South Campus hillside as future building site. Housing proposed for hillside overlooking Stadium Drive/Howard Street entrance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Continue further unification of the Intercollegiate Athletic Campus on East Campus (Oakland Gym, Vandercook, Spindler).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The need for additional Recreation Fields.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maintain the multiple grid concept (on West Campus), but consider the vistas and building massing. Issue needs clarification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Is Oakland Drive Campus losing the existing open feeling? Place buildings around existing tree masses to preserve open, wooded feel of campus. Refine plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The relocation of the Goldsworthy Valley recreation fields to the east end of the valley and replacement with surface parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Investigate appropriate use for the wedge shaped site at the intersection of Stadium Drive and Oakland Drive. A multiple-use option was expressed. This is viewed as an entry to the University and could also accommodate an athletic practice field as well as parking. Leave as open space.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEHICULAR CIRCULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Proposed Stadium Drive boulevard should be a continuous spine (south of Oliver and north of Oliver). Yes. Issue needs clarification. (HNTB) From Howard Street to Oliver Street, two main issues exist: 1. Planted boulevard width suggested by MDOT is a minimum of 30 feet. To determine the width issues to be considered, include size of vehicle, turning radius, cost of the ROW acquisition and roadway speed. 2. Any ROW acquisition must be southeast of Stadium Drive. The existing center lane in this section of the roadway would be included in the proposed median width to reduce the total ROW amount required.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ISSUES LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
<th>JIR</th>
<th>Investigate</th>
<th>Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The intersection of West Michigan and the Loop Road at the Howard Street entrance and treatment of this entrance road must work. Another recommendation is the creation and signalization of an intersection at Crane Lane and Howard Street to open access from all directions for users entering and exiting the West Campus area. The alignment of Knollwood Avenue and Rankin Avenue at this intersection would also help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Accommodate the link between the realigned Oliver Street and Oakland Drive. Would Montague House be relocated, removed or maintained as sited? Investigate Oliver as R-in/R-out only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Refine vehicular systems plan to assure vehicular access to clusters of buildings within each campus district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Intersection configuration at Stadium and Howard needs to be modified. (HNTB) Future traffic projections put this intersection at an unacceptable level of operation, LOS of F. Indirect left turns or the addition of turning lanes achieves an acceptable D LOS. Add extra turn lane first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O= JJR's Interpretation

● represents Workshop discussion
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Western Michigan University Master Plan
Presidential Update

Location: Seibert Administration Building

Meeting Date: February 01, 2000

Issue Date: February 07, 2000

Participants: University:
Elson S. Floyd, President, Western Michigan University
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION

Consultants met with President Elson Floyd, Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning, and Bob Beam, Vice President of Business and Finance, for the purpose of updating the President to the current status of the Master Plan. SmithGroup JJR distributed a two-page handout listing the Fundamental Concepts of the Master Plan and Outstanding Issues (see attached). These Fundamental Concepts were the basis of the consultant presentation to President Floyd.

The President enthusiastically supported the Master Plan and acknowledged commitment to its implementation.

The following comments, observations and discussion were recorded:

OAKLAND DRIVE CAMPUS

It was noted that the two most valuable elements of the Oakland Drive Campus are the water tower and the State Psychiatric Hospital building, and the Oakland Drive setback with its many stately trees.
EAST CAMPUS

The Master Plan should show Administration moving to the historic East Hall. The exact elements of Administration would not be specified in the Master Plan.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The President expressed interest regarding the removal of historic buildings. The university acknowledged commitment to the preservation of the State Psychiatric Hospital building and the water tower, but does so with the understanding that it reserves the right to make determinations in other parts of campus where development is needed.

PHYSICAL PLANT

The President concurred that the Physical Plant should be shown at the current Ice Arena location on the Master Plan.

TRANSIT

The President stated that there should not be a transit center/transit shuttles in the center of the Academic Core on West Campus.

HOUSING

Student housing as shown on campus does not reflect plans to develop student housing on the Arboretum property. Communication on this issue is important. Student housing includes three types: freshman dormitory type, upper class dorms/single bedroom apartment type, and graduate and married housing. Trends indicate that in the future, student housing will require and increase in the amount of gross square feet of space required per student.

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

1. This description should be included in the Master Plan report and will be prepared by the university. There needs to be a "keeper" of the Master Plan as well as a sequence and process for its implementation over the next 20-25 years. This process should be designed in such a way as to ensure that the principles of the Master Plan are respected and implemented throughout the years and changes in administration.

2. A strong message should be sent to the community that the university intends to take the recommendations of the Master Plan seriously.
INITIAL PROJECT

1. It is desirable that an initial Master Plan project be identified that can be carried out in the near future. The Michigan Mall was again identified as a major opportunity.

2. Other projects might be:
   - College of Health and Human Services facility
   - Renovation of Sangren Hall and removal of parking in the front
   - Removal of the Stadium Drive Apartments and replacement with housing built on the hillside above
   - West Michigan/Howard Street/Loop Road entry to campus

The President supported the overall direction and Key Concepts of the plan as reflected by the Fundamental Concepts and the related drawings.

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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    E. Hallquist / SG JJR
    P. Berg / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Review of Sketch Plan Refinements of Visit #8 Master Plan
Location: Bernhard Center
Meeting Date: February 02, 2000
Issue Date: February 15, 2000
Participants: University:
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning

Consultants:
Richard A. Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader / SG JJR

Prepared By: Richard A. Rigterink

DISCUSSION

Initial comments regarding the revised sketch plan, entitled Tentative Revisions, dated February 01, 2000, were initially shared following an informal lunchtime review with Bob Beam, Susan Kamman, Evie Asken, Linda Cody, and Dick Rigterink on February 01 following the Master Plan Update Presentation to President Floyd.

At Ms. Asken’s request, SmithGroup JJR (JJR) staff met with University planners to hear additional comments on February 2nd. The recommendations conveyed by the Sketch Plan are acceptable with the following modifications.

General Observations

1. The building envelopes look larger than existing buildings. JJR will prepare a diagram to communicate the difference between the envelope and the building that might fit inside it.

2. JJR will review and confirm storm water run-off calculations, particularly in the vicinity of The Oakland’s. JJR shows the Loop Road being shifted northward to accommodate storm water retention needs.
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Oakland Drive Campus

1. The surface parking lot shown just north of the stadium bridge will be switched with the playing field to the north to provide parking closer to the historic State Hospital Quadrangle and to reduce the impact of parking at the bridge.

2. The entry drive that passes the gatehouse is shown intersecting with the proposed Loop Road in a perpendicular configuration. Because of the level of detail communicated by the Master Plan, it was agreed it was not necessary to convey lane configurations or other specialized treatments.

3. JJR expressed a major concern regarding the recent decision to locate a new chiller plant immediately south of the indoor practice facility. While the proposed location (directly on top of the existing utility tunnel) is cost efficient, it is not an appropriate site because it is contiguous to the main north/south pedestrian corridor (noisy) and in a highly visible location (contiguous to the Loop Road and directly in line with the entry to the indoor practice facility). JJR has sent a separate memo expressing this concern to Vice President Beam, Evie Asken, and George Wilson.

East Campus

1. JJR will continue to show Oliver dead-ending before it joins Oakland Drive. This position has been taken because of the strong consensus that this intersection is a significant safety concern. This has been confirmed by JJR, HNTB, and the WMU police chief, City of Kalamazoo representatives and by members of the focus committees and Advisory/Policy Committee.

The layout will be modified to keep future land uses on existing university property. Oliver will be used to provide access to the existing surface lots and the previously proposed development zone removed.

2. It was agreed to show east of Oakland Drive, the Speech and Hearing Building removed and parking expanded.

3. It was agreed that the existing Print Shop located on Stadium could be used as a visitor center. However, rather than showing this recommendation on the Visit #9 Master Plan, we will consider the recommendation in light of the comments the historic representatives make and protect our future negotiating position.

4. JJR recommended that the parking deck proposed to be located near the indoor practice facility should be located inside the Loop Road rather than next to the practice building. This recommendation was made to protect future building opportunities next to the practice facility and to minimize pedestrian/vehicular
conflicts as deck users walk to classrooms and residence halls. A surface parking lot outside the Loop Road and contiguous to the practice facility would not be a concern because it does not prohibit placing a building on this site in the future.

**West Campus**

1. A more traditional building zone will be shown just south of the library drop-off.

2. In the southeast quadrant of West Campus, the northern-most housing unit shown south of The Oaklands will be shifted to an east/west configuration.

3. JJR will investigate ways to avoid placing major surface lots contiguous to the deck proposed to be located just south of the library.

4. In the Master Plan Report, JJR will include the statement that the back or northern side of the Bernhard Center could function as a back-up location for physical plant offices, assuming an alternative student center site can be found. It will be important that the facility is screened from contiguous areas.

5. Based upon comments made at the previous WMU Planning Group workshop session, JJR sited a deck just west of the Bernhard Center. Campus planners requested that this site be retained for academic uses and that the existing deck east of Bernhard be expanded as previously shown.

6. Fetzer Center expansion will be accommodated in the building envelope shown to the southwest rather than to the east. JJR will investigate shifting the east/west pedestrian corridor that currently terminates in the proposed Business School deck to the south. An additional building zone may be shown south of the proposed pedestrian corridor.

7. The Business School deck is acceptable in its current location and configuration.

8. It was agreed that the Bernhard Center is not centrally located and an alternative Student Center location should be considered.

9. Considerable discussion took place related to the future building site shown at the intersection of Michigan Mall and Valley Trail. JJR pointed out that this site may be best suited for a high intensity classroom building. It is not a good site for a relocated student center because it is not visible from the Loop Road and vehicular accessibility is poor. Vehicular access is crucial because of the need to provide public access (drop-off) and convenient food and bookstore service.
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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**

Richard A. Rigerink  
Vice President
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cc:  Participants  
Linda Cody / SmithGroup JJR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN VISIT #9</th>
<th>TUESDAY MARCH 21</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY MARCH 22</th>
<th>THURSDAY MARCH 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Preview Meeting</td>
<td>East Campus Focus Group</td>
<td>1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Open Campus Presentation</td>
<td>West Campus Focus Group</td>
<td>1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOON</td>
<td>Workshop Campus Planning</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory / Policy Committee</td>
<td>1060 Fetzer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>1060 Fetzer Center</td>
<td>Advisory / Policy Committee (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffet Supper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Open Community Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fetzer Center Auditorium</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>
Campus Visit 9 System Plans

- Click To View **Illustrative Master Plan**

*Read accompanying text*

- Click To View **Vehicular System Plan**

- Click To View **Transit System Plan**

- Click To View **Bicycle System Plan**

- Click To View **Pedestrian System Plan**

- Click To View **Building System Plan**

- Click To View **Open Space System Plan**
THE ILLUSTRATIVE MASTER PLAN

The following list of concepts is graphically conveyed on the Preliminary Master Plan and related system plans. These drawings were presented and discussed during Campus Visit #8 on November 30 and December 1. The Fundamental Concepts are critical to understanding Master Plan priorities and recommendations. They have been developed based on the support of the review committees and final approval by the Policy Committee. Additional items have been added during workshops with the WMU Planning Group and will be refined. They will be considered for approval during the final Master Plan presentations.

Fundamental Concepts

1. Create a physical framework that defines long-range patterns yet allows refinements as future needs become more clearly defined.
   - Building envelopes
   - Level of detail

2. Strengthen and supplement existing building patterns.
   - Achieve patterns and density levels that are appropriate for each campus zone (West, Oakland Drive, and East).
   - Cluster buildings to create visual relationships and offer all-weather connections.
   - Allow each district to convey a distinctive image, yet jointly ensure a sense of campus continuity.
   - Respect the multiple building grid orientation found on West Campus.

3. Preserve future capacity by recognizing that buildable areas are limited, and therefore buildings should typically be four stories.

4. Achieve a parking to gross square feet ratio of 1 space per 650 gross square feet and maximum walking distance of 5 minutes for visitors and 10 minutes for faculty, staff and campus residents. Commuting students should be within a 15 minute combined transit and walk distance.

5. Recognize and strengthen existing land use patterns.
   - Distribute housing across campus.
   - Extend the Athletic Campus south of Oliver.
   - Place parking on the perimeter of campus.
6. Achieve visual and physical connectivity between major campus zones (West, Oakland Drive and East) as well as between districts within each zone.
   - Bridge over Stadium Drive
   - Bridge over Oakland Drive
   - Pedestrian bridge over Stadium at Oliver

7. Preserve and promote the natural character of the Goldsworth and Arcadia Valleys.
   - Restrict building placement within these corridors (Indoor Practice Facility)
   - Emphasize the open space quality by upgrading quality of the landscape.
   - Create critical campus arrival zones.
   - Create a boulevard along Stadium Drive.

8. Create a campus core that functions as the focal point of the campus and contributes to a distinctive campus image.
   - Accommodates facilities and activities that are of interest to the entire campus community.
   - Utilizes open space to create a distinctive pedestrian-oriented area where the campus population can gather and interact.
   - Achieves a concentration of high use facilities that are important campus destinations.
   - Reflects the highest quality of design and materials.
   - Locates facilities that accommodate high intensity uses.

9. Protect opportunities for alternate forms of transportation including bicycle, transit and travel by foot.
   - Bridge over Valley Path (West Campus)
   - Bridge over Oakland Drive and Stadium Drive
   - Bicycle connections to city bike paths, lanes, etc.
   - Transit system connections with city transit system

10. Provide convenient and attractive vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian approaches and entries onto campus. Upgrade the perimeter loop road to facilitate wayfinding and increased traffic utilization.
    - Identify major campus entries and define an appropriate treatment level.
    - Define comprehensive systems that focus on specific linkage opportunities such as open space, vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle.
    - Make loop road distinctive, dominant route: landscape planting, simple and direct configuration.
Special Issues

- Placement of parking deck on West Campus proximal to Bernhard Center
- Stormwater accommodation
- Transportation Issues:
  - Transit system to link campus district.
  - Freight train utilization requires bridging the railroad tracks
  - Intersection improvements
  - Master Plan Implementation process
  - Physical Plant location
- Freshmen and cars on campus?
- Relocating Administration to East Campus (historic preservation and restoration)

District Concept

Districts are used as a planning tool to organize the campus. Each district (zone, neighborhood, etc.) is studied for the following elements. Applying each of these concepts to the campus helps to organize the physical plan.

Image: Distinct, unique
Major Entry: Access from loop road along secondary street
Signature Building: Distinctive use/architecture, of institutional size and importance
Primary Open Space: Formal, structured open space
Secondary Open Space: Passive, transitional space, transitions between different development grid patterns
Transit: At least one transit stop provides access to district, 5-10 minute walk
Parking: Within the district, ideally sufficient to support district use
Architecture: Buildings within district relate to one another, create open spaces, housing available within district

Subcampus Characteristics

West Campus

Michigan Mall:
- Strong central open space forms spine along which campus is organized.
- Linear central space provides visual connection to major entries (West Michigan and Howard, West Michigan and Stadium).
- Central space provides gathering/activity nodes intermingled with passive transitional spaces.
- Spine reflects historic route of West Michigan Avenue through the campus.
- Major pedestrian path intersects with north-south Valley Path.
- Buildings along this spine form high use, major academic and social activity centers; architecturally significant buildings reinforce importance of space and intensive use.
Valley Path:
- Major north/south pedestrian artery through central campus.
- Reinforced by raising loop road above pedestrians and removing road into valley.
- Major pedestrian connection to Oakland Drive Campus; path extended beyond library to form north/south organizing spine to West Campus.

Goldsworth Valley:
- Buildings removed from valley and intramural fields added.
- Loop road passes south of the valley along the north edge of the academic core.
- Access from Arboretum property and new student housing to the west of campus is provided for both pedestrian and bicycle.
- Day-lighting existing water flow through the valley on the western end to form stream that leads to Goldsworth Pond and accommodates path for pedestrians and bicycles.

West Michigan Entry (at Howard):
- Michigan Mall extends to West Michigan and Howard Street entrance.
- Entry expanded to accommodate campus traffic at peak hours.
- Plaza-like entry with broad green median accommodates drop-off and provides information kiosk for visitors.
- Entry road efficiently intersects loop road.
- Transit stop in close proximity to entry.

West Michigan Entry (at Stadium):
- Entry is reconfigured with access road to intersect Stadium and provide safe and efficient access for vehicles and bicycles. Pedestrians are accommodated as well, although this is not a significant pedestrian path.
- Drop-off provided in front of Bernhard Center and The Oaklands.

East Campus

Historic District:
- Administration will relocate here in historic buildings of original Normal School.
- Other appropriate uses that also serve the Kalamazoo community may be accommodated, such as University Archives, museum, and art galleries.
- Vehicular/bicycle/pedestrian/transit connection by bridge over Oakland Drive.
- Visual connection across Oakland and to the city of Kalamazoo.
- Housing along Davis Street to accommodate married/graduate students.
- Pedestrian promenade along hillside with view to the city reflects original intent of this hilltop campus.
Oakland Drive Campus

Stadium Drive Bridge:
- Vehicular/pedestrian/bicycle bridge connects campus north and south of Stadium Drive.

Hilltop Campus:
- Development primarily on top of ridge.
- Accommodates hillside housing, College of Health and Human Services, research/academic use and athletics south of Oliver.
- Acknowledges historic character of campus (retains Gatehouse, Chapel, Montague House, State Hospital and Water Tower).
- Acknowledges grand stands of trees along Oakland Drive, providing generous setback.
- Visually connects to West Campus across Stadium Drive, preserving and opening views to the campus.

Arcadia Valley:
- Buildings removed from valley floor (Stadium Drive Apartments).
- Intersection of Stadium Drive and Howard Street improved to accommodate traffic.
- Stadium Drive becomes green boulevard between Howard north to Stadium/West Michigan intersection, acknowledging valley while passing through it.
- Major visitor entry at Stadium Drive and Howard acknowledged by entry treatment at northeast and southeast corners of intersection.
- Arcadia Creek acknowledged with addition of ponds/detention basins along both sides of Stadium Drive. Landscape at entry more formal and responsive to nature of entry feature/sign/wall/fountain, etc. Landscape along ponds native vegetation.

East Campus

Historic District:
- Administration will relocate here in historic buildings of original Normal School.
- Other appropriate uses that also serve the Kalamazoo community may be accommodated, such as University Archives, museum, and art galleries.
- Vehicular/bicycle/pedestrian/transit connection by bridge over Oakland Drive.
- Visual connection across Oakland and to the city of Kalamazoo.
- Housing along Davis Street to accommodate married/graduate students.
- Pedestrian promenade along hillside with view to the city reflects original intent of this hilltop campus.
Figure 6-B.21 Illustrative Master Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.22 Vehicular System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.23 Transit System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.24  Bicycle System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.25 Pedestrian System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.26 Building System Plan (Web site graphic)
Figure 6-B.27 Open Space System Plan (Web site graphic)
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Campus Visit #9, Major Review Visit
Open Campus Meeting

Location: Oakland Recital Hall, WMU

Meeting Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Issue Date: April 10, 2000

Participants:
WMU Staff:
Evie Askem, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Karnman, Campus Planning
David Dakin, Assoc. Director, Campus Planning
and Architecture
Raymond Kezenius, Campus Engineering
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

Consultants:
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SmithGroup JJR
Eric Hallquist, Site Planner / SmithGroup JJR
Chris Luz, Traffic Engineer / HNTB
Jason Kelly, Traffic Engineer / HNTB

Campus:
See Attached List

Prepared By: Linda Cody, Project Manager

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of this meeting was to present the Illustrative Master Plan to the campus community. In the introduction to the presentation, it was noted that the Master Plan is a compilation of elements: the Fundamental Concepts, the Master Plan drawing, the System Plan drawings, perspective and eye-level sketches, section drawings, the Implementation Plan and final reports. The Master Plan provides a framework that will guide future growth. The Illustrative Master Plan represents the collective ideas of focus group committees, the Advisory/Policy Committee, and the Campus Planning staff.
The following comments and observations were recorded at this presentation:

The City of Kalamazoo adopted the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. The Bicycle System Plan presented by the consultants is based on connections with this city-wide plan.

Q: How long is the plan going to last?
A: This plan is designed to be implemented over the next 20-25 years. Along the way, the plan will direct the pattern of growth, but will need to be updated to reflect changes within the university and community that impact the plan as it is shown today.

Q: Is the Stadium Bridge to become a cut-through for the community?
A: The goal of the master plan is to provide internal routes for campus traffic so that there is an efficient system for vehicular circulation within the campus. The goal of the bridge is to connect the campus across Stadium Drive primarily for an internal transit system, bicycles and pedestrians.

Q: How has the Davis Street housing evolved?
A: It was intended to: 1) distribute housing throughout campus; 2) provide housing for non-traditional/graduate-married students; 3) contribute to the community by providing "neighborhood" types of housing and residents who will work to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood; and, 4) open university green space to the neighborhood for passive recreation.

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

p:\23456\wmufinalrpt\appendix\0-0321opcamp.doc

Attachment

cc: Susan Kamman / WMU
    Evie Asken / WMU
    Richard Rigterink, Eric Hallquist / SGJJR
    Chris Luz, Jason Kelly / HNTB
21 MARCH 2000
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
OPEN CAMPUS SESSION
SIGN-IN SHEET

Kelly Lenaghan, Public History Student
Sue Husband, WMU
Joy (Van Hoften) Miller
Dorothy Schlobohm Ubbes, WMU
William Cox, State High and WMU
Bill Ryan, State High
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Bob Brown, Public Safety
Wes Carpenter, Public Safety
John Goes, Physical Plant
Paul MacNellis, Physical Plant
Merrion Mader, AFSCME
David Jarl, Oakland Drive
Marcia Ellis, Health Center
Steve Hassevoort, Diekema/Homann
Paul Pancella, Campus Planning Council
Mickey Rutz, Campus Construction
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach
Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
David Dakin, WMU
Linda Powell, Campus Planning Council
Janet Pisaneschi, WMU Health & Human Serv.
Ken Dahlberg, Campus Planning Council
Mona Harris, Public History Student
Jen Courser, Public History Student
Amanda Musolff, Public History Student
Melissa Milton, Public History Forum
Patrick Thompson, Public History Student
Kathryn Curtis-Smith, Dept. Languages & Ling.
Cynthia Addison, OBWNA
Ron Coleman, Grad College (GSAC)
Rodger Parzyck, Kalamazoo Historic & Planning Council
Sean McCann, Vine Neighborhood Assn.
Holly Jensen, Oakland Drive/Winchell Assoc.
Jeff Chamberlain, City of Kalamazoo
Pamela Hall O’Connor, Resident
Dave Lemberg, Geography
Jeremiah Podleski, Geography
Louise Forsleff, SCHS-Emerita
Richard Weaver, Interested City Planner
Lynn Turner, Kalamazoo Gazette
21 March 2000
Western Michigan University
Open Campus Session
Sign-In Sheet

John Disbro, Landscape Services
Emily Mullen, Western Herald
Bruce Naftel, Campus Planning Council
Bruce Hekman, KCSA
Chris Pyzik, Campus Planning and Architecture
Jo Morrison, Campus Planning and Architecture
Dale Pattison, Emeritus Prof. History
George Dales, Emeritus Prof. HPER/ATH
Joan O'Bryan, Telecommunications
Bob Warner, University Bookstore
Jacquelyn Styrna, Student
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES
Revised April 25, 2000

Meeting Subject: Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060
Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, March 21, 2000 / 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Issue Date: March 27, 2000

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, Sindecuse Health Center
* Patricia Viard, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Sciences
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:
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Chris Pyzik, Campus Architect
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

Consultants
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Site Designer / SG JJR
DISCUSSION:
This was the final meeting with the focus groups during the Master Plan process. The Master Plan drawing was presented along with aerial perspective sketches of each subcampus, sketches of the West Michigan Entry and an eye-level sketch of East Hall from Davis Street. Focus group members were invited to share thoughts and ideas regarding the most recent refinements to the plan. This was the last opportunity for such input as the final refinements are made to the illustrative drawings of the Master Plan. Participants were asked to complete a project evaluation sheet.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

The next and final phase of the Master Plan Project is the Documentation Phase, Part 5. Once the final changes to the plan are made, the Technical and Summary Reports are prepared and a final presentation is made to the Board of Trustees and the President.

B. COMMENTS

With respect to the Illustrative Master Plan:

1. It was noted that current studies are underway that are building a database to show how the current parking availability is being utilized by students. This additional information will be useful as the university continues to study the feasibility of a transit system.

2. The location of transit stops should be close to parking ramps and major lots.

3. The placement of a pedestrian bridge over Stadium Drive at Oliver, while conceptually supported, would not practically work. The bridge would have to rise from ground level to an elevation of about 28 feet to clear the train and roadway.
4. Concern was expressed for development on Oakland Drive Campus and the increased traffic entering from Oakland Drive. The latter is an important visual entrance to the city of Kalamazoo. It should be noted that traffic consultants have studied this level of development and have made recommendations to accommodate any increased traffic and to improve the already congested intersections.

5. It was noted that residential units to be replaced are currently in poor condition and are non-competitive with the housing offered at other universities.

6. Concern was expressed for the Vine neighborhood. Students who live in this area would be accessing campus from Oakland Drive. Currently this neighborhood has an access problem to West Campus.

7. The Honors College was briefly discussed. It was noted that the current location does not support the need to strengthen the central mallway, but recommendations include a variety of solutions.

8. Pedestrian access on West Campus should show a secondary flow.

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

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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cc: Participants
    R. Rigterink / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES
Revised April 25, 2000

Meeting Subject: East Campus Focus Group

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, March 22, 2000 / 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.

Issue Date: March 27, 2000

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

WMU Staff:
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

Consultants:
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR
Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Project Designer / SG JJR

Others
Pam O'Connor, Kalamazoo Resident
Melissa S. Milton, President, Public History Forum
George G. Dales, WMU Emeritus (HPER/Athletics)
Amy Remmert, Vine Neighborhood Association
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
East Campus Focus Group
March 22, 2000
Page 2

Mona K. Harris, WMU Public History Student, Historic Preservation Employee

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

This was the final meeting with the focus groups during the Master Plan process. The Master Plan drawing was presented along with aerial perspective sketches of each subcampus, sketches of the West Michigan Entry and an eye-level sketch of East Hall from Davis Street. Focus group members were invited to share thoughts and ideas regarding the most recent refinements to the plan. This was the last opportunity for such input as the final refinements are made to the illustrative drawings of the Master Plan. Participants were also asked to complete a project evaluation sheet.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

The next and final phase of the Master Plan Project is the Documentation Phase, Part 5. Once the final changes to the plan are made, the Technical and Summary Reports are prepared, and a final presentation is made to the Board of Trustees and the President.

B. COMMENTS

1. Concern was expressed for the proposed Davis Street housing. Vine Street neighborhood members who attended this meeting expressed concern about the overall student density currently in the neighborhood. Concern was also expressed that the proposed housing would block views to East Hall.

2. Response: The proposed Davis Street housing is intended for non-traditional/graduate/married students. This would not significantly increase the population of the neighborhood. It would also open park-like green space to the community for passive recreation. This housing would be under university jurisdiction, which would restrict the activities permitted here as well as increase surveillance by the university police. These nontraditional students would help to elevate the safety and quality of life in the neighborhood. The focus group members support housing on Davis Street.
3. The East Campus bridge (vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle) was supported as a means to truly connect the historic buildings on the east side of Oakland Drive with the rest of the campus west of Oakland Drive.

4. The question was raised regarding the proposed placement of the Physical Plant at the Lawson Ice Arena in the future and where the new location of the ice arena may be relocated. This location has not been determined.

5. It was suggested that the university work with the community in an effort to determine appropriate uses for the existing East Campus buildings.

6. The focus group members strongly supported the current plan with respect to the entire campus, and in particular, East Campus. It was also noted that the Master Plan is a framework and guide to future development. It does not reflect immediate directions, but will be a reference work that is updated as the university grows over the next 20-25 years.

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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cc: Participants
R. Rigterink / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES
Revised April 25, 2000

Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group
Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060
Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, March 22, 2000 / 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Issue Date: March 27, 2000
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 Association
  Chris Bakotic, Undergraduate, Integrated Supply Management, WSA

WMU Staff:
  George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
  Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
  Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
  Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

Consultants:
  Eric Hallquist, Site Planner, Project Designer / SG JJR
  Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager / SG JJR

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:
This was the final meeting with the focus groups during the Master Plan process. The Master Plan drawing was presented along with aerial perspective sketches of each subcampus, sketches of the West Michigan Entry and an eye-level sketch of
East Hall from Davis Street. Focus group members were invited to share thoughts and ideas regarding the most recent refinements to the plan. This was the last opportunity for such input as the final refinements are made to the illustrative drawings of the Master Plan. Participants were asked to complete a project evaluation sheet.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

The next and final phase of the Master Plan Project is the Documentation Phase, Part 5. Once the final changes to the plan are made, the Technical and Summary Reports are prepared and a final presentation is made to the Board of Trustees and the President.

B. COMMENTS

1. It was clarified that all the water shown along Stadium Drive generally represented retention basins for storm water runoff. It was agreed that permanent water features of some kind are very desirable in this area.

2. It was clarified that the transit system shown is pretty basic, and represents the need for study, not a solution.

3. The sketch of the entrance at West Michigan is an option, but hasn’t been designed or tested for feasibility. Traffic and aesthetics of this entrance are important issues.

4. Changing traffic and pedestrian flow near the “wedge” and from Vine neighborhood to campus – will students be able to safely and reasonably access campus?

5. The bridge to East Campus over Oakland Drive will allow traffic to come from West Campus without traveling on Oakland Drive. Feasibility has to be studied.

6. Oakland Drive Campus building possibilities reflect maintaining view to West Campus and observing historical building placement and setback along Oakland Drive.

7. The proposed bike path along the railroad right-of-way, proposed by the Non-Motorized Plan, would absolutely require safety fencing. The likelihood of this happening was generally doubted. Having the plan join the Loop Road was considered a good alternative.
8. It was strongly recommended that the Master Plan require that all main roads on campus should have designated lanes for bikes and other slow vehicles, such as landscape equipment.

9. A pedestrian path along the Loop Road is needed.

10. It was questioned where to locate the bus connections to the Engineering campus and to downtown, and where the best visitor drop-off would be.

11. It was discussed that a successful transit would depend on parking policies, ease of use and motivation to use. It was suggested that University transit should be free, and that buses should pick up every five minutes during peak times.

12. The approach to the center of campus along West Michigan (near SRC and Bernhard Center) is very important. Development potential in this area is an important issue.

13. It was agreed that the Master Plan needs to be revisited every 5 to 10 years.

14. The question was raised with regard to the change in traffic flow where West Michigan Avenue meets Stadium and how the Vine Street neighborhood students access West Campus?

15. It was noted that the bike path as proposed in the Non-Motorized Plan along Stadium Drive would probably not occur as shown. It was agreed that a better route would be to show the bike path joining the Loop Road as a bike lane in this segment.

16. It was noted that bike lanes should be shown along the entire Loop Road with extra curb width for bikes and slow vehicles.

17. A Pedestrian path should also be shown (Level 3) along the Loop Road.

18. The transit connection of the campus system to the city bus system was discussed. The exact locations of these connecting nodes were raised as well as transit connections to Parkview Campus (city bus or campus bus?).

19. It was noted that the University Transit System should be free.

20. Buses should run more frequently than every 15 minutes. Every 5 minutes was suggested.

This focus group strongly supported the Master Plan as presented with the above comments and suggestions.
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
West Campus Focus Group
March 22, 2000
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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cc: Richard Riggerink / SmithGroup JJR Participants
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Advisory/Policy Committee

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 1060

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, March 22, 2000
3:00 – 5:00 p.m./6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Issue Date: March 27, 2000

Participants: Committee: (*not present)
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Askew, 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
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody
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DISCUSSION:

The Master Plan drawing was presented along with aerial perspective sketches of each subcampus, sketches of the West Michigan Entry, and an eye-level sketch of East Hall from Davis Street. Focus Group members were invited to share thoughts and ideas regarding the most recent refinements to the plan. This was the last opportunity for such input as the final refinements are made to the illustrative drawings of the Master Plan. Discussion in this committee meeting included reports from each Focus Group and was directed toward achieving consensus on the issues and the integrity of the plan. Participants were also asked to complete a project evaluation sheet.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

The next and final phase of the Master Plan project is the Documentation Phase, Part 5. Once the final changes to the plan are made, the Technical and Summary Reports are prepared, and a final presentation is made to the Board of Trustees and the President.

B. COMMENTS

1. Oakland Drive Campus Summary
   a. Three guests from the community attended this meeting.
   b. Concern was expressed regarding traffic on Oakland Drive.
   c. Questions were raised regarding the realignment of Oliver Street and its current use as a connector to West Campus.
   d. It was suggested that localized parking permits might be feasible.
   e. It was noted that David Lemberg, Asst. Professor of Geography, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group, has some research on commuter travel patterns, which would be of interest in transit studies.
   f. It was agreed that a good Transit System is necessary.
   g. It was recommended that Oliver Street become the dominant flow of traffic and connect directly with the Loop Road.
   h. The Oakland Drive Campus Plan reflects the Historic Plan.
i. There should be a single point parking destination, and travel from there should be by transit or on foot.

j. Study of the pedestrian crossing at Stadium and Oliver does not justify a bridge.

k. The Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group supports the current plan with the above refinements.

2. East Campus Summary
   a. The committee as a whole enthusiastically supported the following:
      - The proposed East Campus Bridge over Oakland Drive
      - The proposed Promenade along the ridge east of East Hall
      - Proposed Davis Street Housing
      - Transit access to East Campus

   b. The committee did not express concern with the proposed removal of the wings of East Hall in order to save the original portion of the building.

   c. The community members who attended this meeting expressed the following:
      - Concern for proposed Davis Street Housing with regard to density, safety and condition of neighborhood properties occupied by students
      - Recommended funding to support the restoration of East Campus buildings

   d. Overall, the East Campus Focus Group committee supported the plan.

3. West Campus Summary
   a. The storm water accommodation along Stadium Drive should be permanent water features to complement the campus.

   b. With respect to Bike Routes on campus: The campus Loop Road should replace the portion of bike route proposed by the Non-Motorized Plan along Stadium Drive. All future campus roads should be built to properly accommodate bikes (wide curb lanes).

   c. The parking ratio of 650 gross square feet/space is supported.

   d. Transit System: There should be a 5-minute headway for buses on campus; 15 minutes is too long.
e. Off-campus commercial development needs to be enhanced.

4. **General**
   
   a. The University will be responsible for phasing with regard to implementation of the Master Plan.

   b. The City of Kalamazoo is interested in the phasing aspects of the plan, particularly with regard to those issues that impact the city. The city needs to incorporate items in a multiple year budget if the University would like funding support from the city.

   c. In response to the question: Why is the University pursuing a Master Plan at this time? Many factors contribute to the need for an updated Master Plan. They include: a new president, the development of a new campus (Parkview Campus), new construction on the existing campus, parking issues, dated housing and development reaching its limit on West Campus.

   d. Concern was expressed that the community may not support moving the intramural fields to the east end of Goldsworth Valley. It was noted that if and when this occurs, the fields would not be lighted.

   e. Concern was again expressed for the location of a parking lot at Stadium and Howard.

   f. It was noted that the Master Plan includes multiple elements: the Fundamental Concepts, the Illustrative Plan Drawing, System Plan Drawings, perspective and eye-level sketches, sections, the Technical Report and the Summary Report.

   g. It was agreed that the Fundamental Concepts would be reworked to read more simply with sub-points as bullets. There is a need for a bullet regarding parking and transportation, the character of Oakland Drive Campus, and housing (separate from land use patterns). The first statement is a "preamble" (Create a physical framework...) rather than a Fundamental Concept.
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Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:
SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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cc: Participants
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #9 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Campus Visit #9, Major Review Visit
Open Community Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Auditorium, WMU

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 23, 2000

Issue Date: April 10, 2000

Participants:
WMU Staff:
Robert Beam, VP for Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Kammam, Campus Planning
David Dakin, Assoc. Director, Campus Planning
and Architecture
Bob Miller, Associate VP for Community Outreach

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

Community:
See Attached List

Prepared By: Linda Cody, Project Manager

DISCUSSION:

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

Observations, questions and comments were recorded and are as follows:
Q: The plan looks good, but has there been any study of crossing under Stadium Drive? Is there a way to reduce the flow of traffic and reduce land widths on Oakland Drive?
A: Discussions to cross under Stadium Drive were done previous to this Master Plan study. This was shown to be too costly and to conflict with high ground water tables. The traffic consultants, HNTB, have looked at Oakland and have proposed upgrades to the intersection of Oakland and Howard that would improve the flow of traffic in this area. The current layout will not be changed. The lane widths will remain the same.

Q: Have we looked at a cloverleaf configuration for the Stadium and Howard intersection?
A: HNTB studied this intersection and recommended additional and dedicated turn lanes at this intersection.

Q: What is WMU's policy (plan) for East Campus? Why has it been neglected?
A: East Campus has been studied previous to this master planning effort, and as a result, a dedicated focus group was part of the master planning process. SmithGroup JJR (JJR) was contracted to do a physical master plan for the entire campus. In order to do this for East Campus, a use had to be determined. Administration would be a good fit for these historic buildings. Continuing to develop the Athletic Campus west of Oakland Drive was also considered. Placing housing on Davis Street had a twofold purpose: to help to revive this campus and to contribute to the community opening green space for shared use, and to provide housing that complements the historic Vine Street neighborhood.

Q: Have we looked closely at the entries to campus and how traffic congestion can be eased, especially at Michigan and Howard?
A: The entries to campus have been carefully studied and improvements have been recommended by HNTB. It has been recommended that this particular intersection be upgraded by adding turn lanes both into and out of campus to keep traffic flowing more smoothly. Upgrades to other entries along Howard are intended to relieve the current volume at the West Michigan/Howard intersection.

Q: There appears to be water shown along Stadium Drive; do these ponds serve a function, or are they just for aesthetics? Will they always be full?
A: These ponds represent areas where detention basins could be placed as required for future development on West Campus. Rough calculations have been made with regard to the volume of water that would need to be detained, and areas identified show recommended locations for detention of water. These could also be designed as aesthetic features.
Q: Is there an alternative for mass transit to diesel powered buses, trams/monorails?
A: These concepts have been discussed. The University is currently studying the possibilities for a transit system, and future recommendations will be forthcoming. The Master Plan indicates the need for an alternate to the automobile as a mode of campus transportation.

Q: Major concerns were expressed regarding East Hall. Have there been studies made as to the costs of removing the wings and then restoring those facades that would be exposed?
A: There are more than just five historic buildings on campus, as referenced in the presentation; concern was also expressed for the term "worn out" when describing buildings as a subjective term. Restoration for East Hall was estimated at $17,000,000.00 in a previous study, not $20,000,000.00 as referenced in the presentation.

Q: What is going to happen with the plan? What is the University going to do with this information?
A: This plan will be a framework to guide development on campus over the next 20 to 25 years. The actual implementation of the plan is still being developed, but will be in place by the completion of the project.

Q: Is there a technical report available with East Hall that includes restoration cost estimates?
A: Reports related to East Campus buildings can be found in the Campus Planning Office.

COMMENTS

1. High compliments to the plan, the process and the team!

2. Please save as much as possible.

3. Concern was expressed over Davis Street: The street is too crowded and there is not enough green space. Dr. Haenicke promised to restore the Olmsted plan. Why hasn't the neighborhood been included in the process? The housing for Davis Street appears to be a last minute decision... Why now?

Response: The entire Master Plan process has been announced in the press, on local radio and the Web. Open meetings have occurred on four occasions (including Visit #9) during the process, and invitations have been made to neighborhood associations and the community at large. The housing on Davis Street was the result of discussion held on several visits to campus and has been shown on previous plans.
4. Please include the neighborhoods in the planning process.

5. Please include students in the planning process.

6. Compliments to the plan. Happy to see it's not "patchwork." Disappointed with the lack of neighborhood involvement.

   Response: The University and consultant team have been open about the process and the intermediate steps that have led to this visit. This is the ninth campus visit and the fourth Open Community visit. We have shared a Web site and an e-mail address, as well as welcomed comments to the traffic consultants, JJR and the Office of Campus Planning at WMU.

7. The plan must address the parking problems on campus – concern about walking distance and nighttime safety.

   Response: The plan addresses these issues in the Vehicular System plan, which shows an 8-minute walk radii from parking decks to the center of campus. Decks have been distributed specifically with attention to limiting the maximum walk distance from parking to destination.

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: Susan Kamman / WMU
    Evie Asken / WMU
    David Dakin / WMU
    Richard Rigterink / SGJJR
    Chris Luz / HNTB
    Jason Kelly / HNTB
23 MARCH 2000
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
OPEN COMMUNITY SESSION

SIGN-IN SHEET

Pat Brown, WMU
Dale Pattison, WMU, Retired
David & Joan Schicman, Landlords
William Teichert, Arcadia Neighborhood / WMU
Steve Terranella, Resident
Lynn Houghton, Resident
Mike Tenenbaum, Resident
Melissa Milton, Public History Forum
William Snyder, Resident
Robert Chamberlin, Resident
Leo Goddeyne, Resident
David Jarl, Eckert Wordell / Oakland Drive Neighborhood
Valeria Grier, Oshtemo
Greg Moorehead, WMU
Dennis Hollan, Arcadia Neighborhood
Bob & Marty Boughuer, WMU
Gail Bron, WMU Alumni Association
Jim Robinson, Alumnus
Patrick Hudson, Alumnus
Holly Jensen, Oakland/Winchell Neighborhood Association
William Cox, Alumnus
Edward Stoltz, Alumnus
Mona Harris, Public History
Richard Voormann, Resident
Betty Canvin, Resident
Nathan Stonerock, WMU
During the final campus visit, March 22–23, 2000, focus group and committee members were asked to complete an evaluation form in order to assess opinions regarding the Western Michigan University Master Plan and the master planning process. The evaluation form, "Project Evaluation WMU Master Plan Project," follows.
PROJECT EVALUATION
WMU Master Plan Project

Please answer the following questions so that the University will have a better understanding of how you view the
Master Plan and the techniques used to prepare it. Your thoughts will be very helpful and your time appreciated.

General Background

1. **What is your background?**
   - Faculty
   - Student
   - University Staff
   - City Staff
   - Neighbor
   - Other

2. **Were you involved in the master planning process?**
   - Actively
   - Some
   - No

3. **How were you involved?**
   - University Focus Committees
   - Open Community Sessions
   - Policy Committee
   - Open Campus Sessions
   - Advisory Committee
   - Special Sessions
   - Interviews

Observations and Reactions

4. **How satisfied are you with the overall planning process?**
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Not Satisfied
   - A. Were appropriate opportunities for input provided?
      - For University Participants? Yes No Don't Know
      - For Community Participants? Yes No Don't Know
   - B. What could have made the planning process more effective?

5. **Was there appropriate University, Community, and Neighborhood input?**
   - Yes No
   - If you answered no, was there too much? or too little?
   - Does your answer relate to University involvement? Neighborhood involvement? or Community involvement?

6. **Was the web page helpful to you?**
   - Yes No
   - How could it have been more useful?

7. **As a result of this effort, do you have a better appreciation of other groups' priorities?**
   - Yes No
   - A. Have lines of communication been improved? Yes No
   - B. Has cooperation been improved? Yes No
8. What were the bright spots about developing the plan? 

What were the least interesting or meaningful? 

9. How satisfied are you with the Master Plan?

Very Satisfied_____ Somewhat Satisfied_____ Not Satisfied_____ 

A. What are the three ideas you like best?

1. 

2. 

3. 

B. What are the three ideas you like least?

1. 

2. 

3. 

C. Does this plan reflect what WMU wants to become? Yes ____ Somewhat ____ No ____

D. If implemented, will the campus be user-friendly? Yes ____ Somewhat ____ No ____

10. Is it a good plan from the following groups’ perspectives?

University____ City____ Neighborhoods____

11. What was your biggest surprise about the project? 

12. Would you like to be involved in the next Master Plan effort? Yes ____ No ____

13. Consultant Team

A. Was this the right Consultant Team for this project? Yes ____ No ____

B. Were the Planners responsive to your ideas/suggestions? Yes ____ No ____

C. Did the planners understand Western’s needs and expectations?

Yes ____ Somewhat ____ No ____

D. Was the Consultant Team Great? ____ Good? ____ Fair? ____ Poor? ____

Why?
Please answer the following questions so that the University will have a better understanding of how you view the Master Plan and the techniques used to prepare it. Your thoughts will be very helpful and your time appreciated.

General Background

1. What is your background? Faculty 31%  Student 19%  University Staff 31%
   City Staff 0  Neighbor 13%  Other 6% - community

2. Were you involved in the master planning process? Actively 94%  Some 6%  No 0

3. How were you involved?
   - University Focus Committees 52%  Open Community Sessions 3%
   - Policy Committee 11%  Open Campus Sessions 17%
   - Advisory Committee 14%  Special Sessions 3%
   - Interviews 0

Observations and Reactions

4. How satisfied are you with the overall planning process?
   Very Satisfied 88%  Somewhat Satisfied 12%  Not Satisfied 0
   A. Were appropriate opportunities for input provided?
      For University Participants? Yes 100%  No 0  Don't Know 0
      For Community Participants? Yes 100%  No 0  Don't Know 0
   B. What could have made the planning process more effective?
      See attachment

5. Was there appropriate University, Community, and Neighborhood input? Yes 94%  No 0
   6% were not sure about Neighborhood input.
   If you answered no, was there too much? _____ or too little? _____
   Does your answer relate to University involvement? 80%  Neighborhood involvement? 20%
   or Community involvement? 0  Univ. Involvement had 1 mostly

6. Was the web page helpful to you? Yes 88%  No 12%
   How could it have been more useful? __________________________________________________________________________

7. As a result of this effort, do you have a better appreciation of other groups' priorities?
   Yes 94%  No 6%
   A. Have lines of communication been improved? Yes 100%  No 0
   B. Has cooperation been improved? Yes 100%  No 0
8. What were the bright spots about developing the plan? See attachment

What were the least interesting or meaningful?

9. How satisfied are you with the Master Plan?
   Very Satisfied 88%  Somewhat Satisfied 12%  Not Satisfied 0

A. What are the three ideas you like best?
   1. See attachment
   2. 
   3. 

B. What are the three ideas you like least?
   1. See attachment
   2. 
   3. 

C. Does this plan reflect what WMU wants to become? Yes 94%  Somewhat 6%  No __

D. If implemented, will the campus be user-friendly? Yes 75%  Somewhat 25%  No __

10. Is it a good plan from the following groups' perspectives?
   University 41%  City 29%  Neighborhoods 30%

11. What was your biggest surprise about the project? See attachment

12. Would you like to be involved in the next Master Plan effort? Yes 92%  No 8%

13. Consultant Team
   A. Was this the right Consultant Team for this project? Yes 93%  No 7%
   B. Were the Planners responsive to your ideas/suggestions? Yes 93%  No __
      7% halfway between no and yes
   C. Did the planners understand Western's needs and expectations?
      Yes 93%  Somewhat 7%  No __
   D. Was the Consultant Team Great? 57%  Good? 36%  Fair?     Poor? __
      Why? See Attachment 7% in between Great and Good

Your Name:___________________________________________
Your Address:_________________________________________
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4. B. What could have made the planning process more effective?
   - The community has claimed that they’ve been left out; is that inevitable?
   - More participation by University constituents
   - Nothing on the part of SmithGroup JJR and campus staff – committee or focus group members could have been more dedicated to attending meetings
   - Additional information available to campus community via campus newspapers and faculty news to generate awareness – could happen more via community access as well
   - Assembly of subgroups for major concerns sharing

6. How could the Web page have been more useful?
   - If it had been more up-to-date (said the page was useful)
   - Earlier posting (said the page was useful)
   - Well done
   - Wonderful communication tool

8. What were the bright spots about developing the plan?
   - To see the Master Plan come together
   - Campus integration and greater communication
   - Seeing suggestions implemented on next project visit
   - Identifying strong unique potential of geography at WMU
   - Meetings of focus groups in which real interchange of ideas occurred and the gradual “unfolding” of a coordinated plan
   - Visualizing alternate futures
   - Watching vague ideas take shape and become physical characteristics
   - Input and the incorporation of those ideas into the next planning phase
   - I was skeptical at the beginning, but it turned out great! Verbal spars were exciting!
   - Better internal transit, more unifying concept
   - Concept development
   - Open forum and opportunity for discussion and comments
   - The interaction between students/community/University
   - Getting the East Campus into the “loop” via transportation and the Oakland bridge
• Very good documentation; great methods
• All

8. **What were the least interesting or meaningful?**
• Nothing
• Listening to members'/participants' endless stories or – worse – harangues
• The "green" sketches, which looked unrealistic
• The morning talks – too general when on a focus group
• No real focal/arrival point
• Discussion pertaining to other campus uses and committees.

9. A. **What are the three ideas you like best?**
• Open spaces
• Open space in Center Campus
• Green space, especially the Michigan Mall
• Michigan Mall as public gathering space
• Loop road, green spaces and ponds
• **Central** green space
• Major green space preserved
• Improving loop road
• Campus entries – alterations of Ring Road and connect total campus
• Stadium Blvd. as entry and landscape development on both sides
• Established entryways
• Taking account of bike/pedestrian needs
• Linking all three campuses with bridges and roads
• Vehicular/pedestrian plans and connectivity of campuses
• Integrated development along Oakland
• Preservation of the Historic Core of East Hall
• Clustering of buildings
• Spreading housing to both campuses
• Bridge over stadium
• Bridges
• Adding parking structures, while subtracting surface lots
• Parking garages/ramps
• Vehicular System
• Architecture System
• Transportation focus
• Working with complementing terrain
• Functional consolidation
• Internal transportation components
• Trees
• General concepts
• People from SmithGroup JJR have been great, professional, friendly, attentive. . .

9. B. What are the three ideas you like least?
• Isolating parking on Oakland Drive Campus for West Campus activity
• MME recommendation/discussion about University architectural integration
• Given what I've learned about all the constraints with which we must deal (topography, politics, etc.), I'm rather satisfied with the plan. If I could, I'd like to get rid of the railroad, of course!
• Not connecting to streets across Oakland as four-way intersects
• No good connection to Engineering Campus
• Parking lot at Stadium and Howard
• Davis Street housing
• Addition to Ellsworth Parking Structure (tighter turn for loop road)
• Lack of attention to "real costs"
• Parking
• Costs
• Lack of other people at the general meetings
• Campus entrances are still in need of work.
• Not having use of all areas defined by WMU

11. What was your biggest surprise about the project?
• The final plan (Visit #9)
• Bridges, particularly Oakland at East Campus, increased vistas, open space utilization
• That we actually did it!
• How many major changes which came along the way
• The two bridges, how adventurous – and the administration actually likes them
• How our input was heard and incorporated into the planning
• Project is actually being completed and stressed as a “plan” (not “written in stone”)
• How it changed over the course of the project
• That the community was not aware of the meetings
• Last-minute community interest

13. D. Why was the Consultant Team great or good?
• Because everybody was understanding and willing to get along
• Congenial, listeners, responsive, patient and, of course, creative
• SmithGroup JJR’s initial “key concepts” helped to steer this plan in the right direction
- Linda’s presentations were very sensitive to community/faculty comments
- They were prepared, thorough, and well-equipped to deal with negative or strongly opposing comments; concerned about creating a win-win situation
- Traffic? No strong involvement with others
- Amount of time spent on project
- Listening well – adapting to lots of groups and concerns with patience and understanding