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VI. A. **WEB SITE ORGANIZATION AND OVERVIEW**

VI. A. 1 Web Site Organization
Phase I

Campus Analysis 3/99

Regional Campus Analysis

Neighborhood Analysis Community Interface

Campus Core Analysis

2/99 Project Initiation

Issue Identification
Phase III

8/99 Sub-Campus Alternative
- Alternative A
- Alternative B

Interim Sub-Campus Plan 10/99
- Interim Sub-Campus Plan
- Revised Sub-Campus Plan

12/99 Campus System Plans
- Preliminary Composite Plan
- Tentative Open Space, Bicycle and Pedestrian
- Tentative Architectural System Plan
- Tentative Vehicular System Plan
VI.A.2 Overview

The Campus Master Plan is a valuable document. Through a highly collaborative process, the master plan establishes a framework to accommodate the physical growth and development of the University campus over 20 or more years. The quality of the physical environment has a tremendous influence on the University as an academic institution. The framework, thoughtfully crafted and sensitively integrated within the existing campus plan, serves as a blueprint to guide future growth. A well-crafted master plan supports the University mission, enhances the existing campus image, fosters a sense of physical unity, and provides a campus-wide level of organization. Establishing a clear and orderly direction for the future allows the University to utilize its resources to their maximum potential and, at the same time, to continue to foster a vibrant learning environment.
These general principles, when applied to college and university campuses, guide their development in a logical, safe, and people-centered fashion.

**A PLACE FOR PEOPLE**
While this seems the most obvious principle to be applied to the physical design of the campus, it is often the most easily compromised. Campus decisions that enhance the smooth day-to-day functioning of the physical aspects of the institution may not always be people-friendly. In solving specific and often urgent problems, from sidewalks to parking to utilities, one needs an understanding of who is to be served. The question of how these daily decisions serve human activity and the human spirit is an essential element in the planning process.

**RESPECT CAMPUS INTEGRITY**
The existing campus framework is analyzed at the start of the master plan process. Those elements that are an integral part of the physical design and function well are recognized and respected. Those elements that speak to the past must also serve the future needs of the University. The challenge is to provide a balance that embraces both the heritage and the future needs of the University. A clear and sound direction toward the future is an invaluable resource when trying to provide for future needs with limited resources.

**ECOLOGY OF CAMPUS: AN EVOLVING PROCESS**
As generations of students pass through the University, formulations of academic and institutional ideals evolve. Technological advances may transform the way learning and research is conducted. Economic growth and social trends influence the way institutions of higher learning function. While the planning process must respond to these issues, ideals, and trends, it must always have in mind that planning and design concepts are based upon people. The essential question becomes, how we, as human beings, at any given point in time respond to our physical environment – how we experience the campus when we are in it, move through it, and interface with others while in it.

**A FRAMEWORK FOR GROWTH**
A successful master plan provides the fundamental organizing principles around which new growth may occur and the essential elements of the campus are incorporated. The plan must communicate the goals of the master planning process. It allows for creative solutions to future needs and builds upon that which preceded it.
THE PROCESS
An interactive planning process provides a forum for administration, faculty, students, staff, alumni, and the community to provide meaningful input. High levels of interaction occur throughout the planning initiative. The result is a fundamental understanding of the opportunities and constraints of the campus, a logical assessment of alternative concepts, and appropriate refinements and recommendations. The final outcome is a master plan that is well understood and supported throughout the University community. The following elements are integral to this approach:

- The kind of information needed to respond to critical campus issues is identified early in the process, and the focus of data gathering is in these areas. The plan must consider all significant elements of the campus physical environment (open space, pedestrian circulation, vehicular circulation and parking, utilities, land use, and development patterns).

- If it is to be useful, the master plan must provide a coherent, yet flexible framework for long-term decision-making. It must chart a clear course within the constant flux of a vibrant, growing academic community. This flexibility is achieved by understanding predetermined directions and future uncertainties. The long-range plan is based on relatively stable elements (existing assets and development patterns) rather than less certain variables (budgets, enrollments, and programs).

- The planning approach is participatory. It brings consultants together with members of the University community to discuss a broad range of issues and options. The active dialogue that is encouraged throughout the planning process creates a forum for sharing ideas and for educating the campus community to those University assets that merit protection, to those factors that limit development, and to the implications of alternative approaches.

- A highly interactive planning process yields a clear and responsive plan that is well understood and supported by the University community. This process also serves to communicate and coordinate initiatives with the surrounding neighborhoods, related institutions, and the city. The establishment of a consensus-based master plan is essential to creating a strong foundation for its implementation.
WMU Master Planning Process: Primary Goals

I. Create a "sense of place"
   Identify, emphasize, renew, and build on the special features that constitute the spaces of the Western Michigan University campus.

II. Develop academic "communities"
   Develop a unified campus with viable parts. Create West, East Campus, and Oakland Drive Campus "communities."

III. Organize the campus zones
   Assure a people-friendly campus. Simplify the campus into zones that are easily identifiable, accessible, and manageable for pedestrians and vehicles.

IV. Plan a four-season campus
   Aim for a friendly, year-round campus that imparts a different vital spirit with each season change.

V. Develop the campus edges
   Design the campus edges to be physically identifiable, yet friendly and sensitive to the urban fabric. Make the campus "front door" a positive experience.

VI. Think ahead
   Plan for and protect future development opportunities, responding to the demands and changes faced by educational institutions in the 21st century.
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #1 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Scope of Services Review
Location: Western Michigan University
Meeting Date: November 09, 1998
Issue Date: November 10, 1998
Participants: WMU Staff:
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
David Dakin, Associate Director of Campus Planning and Architecture

Consultants / SmithGroup JJR
Richard Rigerink, Vice President, Team Leader
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

- Consultants and university officials discussed the Scope of Services, finalized committees, and established a meeting schedule and procedure for the planning process.
- Issues related to campus planning were discussed in light of the new campus development for the College of Engineering. Planning for this campus would not be included in the Scope of Services for the WMU Master Plan.

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\initiation.doc

cc: Participants
E. Hallquist, P. Berg / SG JJR
# Visit 2 Schedule

**Visit 2 Kick-Off/Setting the Ground Rules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, February 1</th>
<th>Tuesday, February 2</th>
<th>Wednesday, February 3</th>
<th>Thursday, February 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:30 - 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:30 - 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:30 - 9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Preview</td>
<td>Outlying Parcels Focus Group</td>
<td>Outlying Parcels Focus Group</td>
<td>Interview: John Houdek; History Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Consultants</td>
<td>&quot;Mini Kick-off&quot; Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td>&quot;Mini Kick-off&quot; Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td>Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>10:30 – 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>10:30 – 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>9:30 – 10:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“KICK-OFF” Session</strong> Remarks by President Elson Floyd</td>
<td>East Campus Focus Group</td>
<td>Policy Committee Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td>Interview: Ariel Anderson, President AAUP Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks by Dick Rigterink, JIR Oakland Recital Hall</td>
<td>&quot;Mini Kick-off&quot; Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td>Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:00 – 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>1:00 – 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:30 – 2:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour of Main Campus Staff and Consultants Meet at Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td>Interview: Terry Williams, Chair Theatre</td>
<td>Interview: Terry Williams, Chair Theatre</td>
<td>Outbound Committee Staff and Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul MacNeill</td>
<td>1:30 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wilson Ray Kezenius</td>
<td>2:00 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 – 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kamman Doug Lloyd</td>
<td>Interview: Don Thompson, VP Research</td>
<td>Interview: Robert Luscombe, Dean Fine Arts; Janet Stillwell, Asst. Dean Fine Arts</td>
<td>VP Office – Walwood Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:30 – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 – 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview: Andrew Brogowicz, Chair Marketing; Deb Berkey Chair HPER</td>
<td>Interview: Robert Luscombe, Dean Fine Arts; Janet Stillwell, Asst. Dean Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td>Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 – 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Departure of Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview: Corey-Watts, WSA President; Ray Aile, Prof. Mgmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Rooms Campus Services Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 – 9:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory (Action) Committee Commons Room Walwood Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Kick-Off Session

Location: Oakland Recital Hall

Meeting Date/Time: February 01, 1999 / 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Issue Date: February 26, 1999

Participants:

University:
President Elson Floyd
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
David Dakin, Associate Director, Campus Planning and Architecture
George Wilson, Campus Engineering
Ray Kezenius, Campus Engineering
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:

The Opening Meeting of the WMU Master Planning effort included a welcome and history from President Elson Floyd. Vice President Bob Beam introduced Evie Asken and the Office of Campus Planning as well as the SmithGroup JJR consultant team. Dick Rigterink presented the team members, discussed the history of SmithGroup JJR with campus master plans, and presented a slide show of similar projects from SmithGroup JJR archives. He discussed the process and the importance of the involvement of both campus and community.

The Master Plan that evolves over the next 12 months will become a framework for the Western Michigan University community that will guide its path over the next twenty years. The master plan is a document meant to withstand the constant flux that characterizes any community. It provides support for the University as it
pursues its mission to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population into the next century. The master plan will allow the University to accommodate growth, concomitant with its goal to "discover, disseminate, extend, and preserve knowledge and culture," as well as the critical role the University plays in the cultural, social, and economic development of the region.

During the four-day visit to Western Michigan University to kick off the master planning process, the SmithGroup JJR team met with the five University committees that are involved with the process on various levels. Interviews of campus faculty members were also conducted at this time. The process for the next 12-18 months was described and dates for committee meetings were established for upcoming campus visits. It is desirable to keep a consistent time for each committee to meet in order for members to plan for future meetings and thus to have a most effective and productive master planning process.

At each of these meetings, committee members were asked to consider a 200-scale plan of the central campus (west, north, south, and east) and to identify those areas/features that were positive aspects of the physical design of the campus and those areas/features that were negative aspects of the physical plan (or contributed negatively to the campus image).

These were recorded graphically (with colored dots) and in text format. All of these comments were collated and integrated into a list to identify those issues which members of the campus community consider to be the most critical. It is a way to identify those issues which most concern the campus community and to prioritize those issues in terms of planning for the future of the Western Michigan University campus.

An issues list has been generated that identifies critical issues to be considered by the master planning team and committees. This list is by no means complete and reflects the attitudes and opinions of those in attendance integrated with the consultant analysis as a result of the second visit and a slide inventory compiled during that time. For this reason, this list is flexible and adjustable as new information comes to light during the process. This list is meant to be amended – the priority of items changed within the next few months in order to appropriately focus the efforts of the SmithGroup JJR team. To that end, a matrix has been created that prioritizes the issues in order of importance as reported by each committee. Those which have the strongest support across the board have been placed at the top of the list and those with the least support at the bottom. Several issues that relate specifically to the neighborhood or community around the University have been listed separately at the bottom. Committees have been color coded in an effort to see where the greatest concern of each committee resides. This matrix is a starting point to help focus our direction as we proceed.
ISSUES LIST

A. Vehicular
   • Traffic congestion at vehicular entries to campus
   • Confusing internal road layout results in safety concerns
   • Campus signage difficult to read and not readily visible

B. Pedestrian
   • Lack of clearly defined vehicular and pedestrian corridors leads to difficult campus wayfinding
   • Stadium Blvd. & RR Corridor barrier to pedestrian flow between campuses
   • Improve campus accessibility
   • Poorly defined neighborhood links (bike paths)

C. Parking
   • No hierarchy of parking space distribution (student/faculty/visitor)
   • Insufficient building “drop-off” points to allow parking at distance from faculty offices
   • Too much surface parking, particularly in the western & northwest quadrants of campus
   • Parking lot at end of W. Michigan Avenue viewed as both necessary and unappealing

D. Architecture
   • Core campus buildings are not placed to define space and have little relationship to one another
   • Many buildings poorly maintained
   • Inconsistent building exterior design, materials, and fenestration
   • Need for new student services building that functions for recruitment, retention, financial aid, housing, registrar, etc.

E. Land Use
   • Poorly defined and treated campus entries
   • Inadequate integration of campus with community and commercial elements
   • Poorly defined campus edges
   • Poor image at campus edge: student housing, surface parking lots
   • Numerous one- and two-story buildings do not achieve an appropriate density
   • Need to determine policy on how to accommodate high tech research facilities within the campus
   • Need to integrate and determine best use for East and Oakland Drive Campus facilities
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Kick-Off Session
February 01, 1999
Page 4

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

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager

p:\23450\wmufinalrpt\appendix\9-0201v2smry.doc

cc: Participants
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Strategy Session

Location: Campus Planning Office, Bernhard

Meeting Date/Time: February 01, 1999 / 4:15 p.m.

Issue Date: February 19, 1999

Participants: Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
              Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
              David Dakin, Associate Director of Campus Planning
              and Architecture

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

Schedule for Kick-Off Review

Agenda is being updated with undergraduate and graduate student names and committee members.

Copies of Agenda for SmithGroup JJR team needed.

Committee members request information concerning upcoming meeting dates, times and what preparation they need for the discussion.

We will tie down future meeting times and dates during this visit as quickly as possible.

Topo information requested by SmithGroup JJR:
- Will use current info even though 10 years old
- Waiting for city info 2± weeks
Mylar sheets of aerial photos available in Evie’s office as well as 200’ scale aerial of entire Main Campus:
  • SmithGroup JJR requests black line prints of aerial negatives and to borrow 200’ B&W aerial photo

Inventory data still needed: department information, relevant planning studies, status of campus buildings (need only yes, no, maybe), historic buildings on campus and in city.

Check City of Kalamazoo Web site.

Central Campus = 400 acres.

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\9-0201strategy.doc

cc: Participants
    E. Hallquist / SG JJR
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES
Revised March 22, 1999

Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group
Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall
Meeting Date/Time: February 02, 1999
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Issue Date: April 06, 1999
Participants:
Committee:
Paul Pancella, Assoc. Professor, Physics; Chair,
West Campus Focus Group
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
Kristen Collesel, GSA, Department of Communication – not
present
David Jarl, Architect, Eckert-Wordell Architects; Winchell
Area Neighborhood Representative

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

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

Opening comments by Dick Rigterink. Linda Cody introduced committees, and this focus group discussed the best time to meet during the consultants’ three day visits throughout the coming year:

Visit #3
Tuesday, March 9, 1999
7:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Commons Room, Walwood Hall

The committees seemed rather large and repetitive. That is, this committee “included only very limited diversity – i.e., few women or representatives with culturally or racially diverse backgrounds.” It was noted that other groups and committees had more diversity.

It was recommended that more diversity be expressed in the committee members, as WMU has many women and other minority groups as well as international students.

Student Survey: The suggestion was made that more student viewpoints could be represented by administration of a survey. Survey should be available by next week for general information.

Interim committee assignments: Paul suggested that faculty often see between 100-500 students during the semester and would be willing to share the process with them and complete other team assignments as necessary in between campus visits by consultants.

During this meeting, members were asked to identify those parts of the campus physical design that they thought were the most positive and those that presented the most negative impact to the users of and visitors to the Western Michigan University campus. Their choices were recorded on the graphic of campus used for presentation, and listed as well. They are as follows:

Positive Physical Characteristics

A. Open Space
   a.1 Defined by Waldo Library, Knauss Hall and Dalton Center
      Large, pastoral, green, good views from all sides, rotating outdoor art exhibits
   a.2 Goldsworth Pond: green, pastoral, pretty
   a.3 Miller Plaza: beautiful, always changing, grass, water (fountain and pool)
      by night, many different views
   a.4 Tent space
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
West Campus Focus Group
February 02, 1999
Page 3

a.5 Stadium field: lots of people in open green space
a.6 East Campus spot: View from the hill, nothing there, great space
a.7 East campus vistas
a.8 Wooded space behind the Business College
a.9 Courtyard, Knauss Hall
a.10 Courtyard at the Business College
a.11 Window wall at Library (facing McCracken)

B. Buildings
b.1 Student Recreation Center and surrounding grounds:
   Serves between 3,000-4,000 students daily, M-F, always busy. **place
   where many people of the campus community come together, peak times
   are between 3:00 p.m. and 9:30 p.m.

b.2 Waldo Stadium: place brings people together
b.3 East Hall: beautiful interior space, best views of city, quietness of spot,
great space artists have to work
b.4 East Campus buildings: architecturally very pleasing, tradition connects
   with a past
b.5 Water Tower: identify and preserve
b.6 Walwood Building: beauty of architecture and quality of restoration
   preserved history and tradition of building
b.7 The Oaklands: former president’s house
b.8 Gilmore Theatre Complex
b.9 North Campus Residence Halls: views across campus, quality of the
   residential area, part of West Main commercial core
b.10 Wood Hall - large glass addition: beautiful interior space, a common
   resting place within the complex
b.11 College of Business: architecture

C. Land Use
   c.1 East entrance to West Campus, Michigan Avenue: retail merging with
      students, only integration of city and campus.

Negative Physical Characteristics

A. Open Space
   a.1 Campus Entry: at west entrance, particularly where Michigan Avenue
      terminates in campus
   a.2 Tent in plaza: tacky, too much concrete
   a.3 Almost any entrance to campus is appalling, get the worst impression from
      the road that brings you to campus
   a.4 Presence of the RR tracks along campus edge
B. Circulation
   b.1 Traffic congestion at west entrance to campus on Michigan Avenue
   b.2 Intersection at Gilkison, Dormitory is very confusing, poor design
   b.3 Traffic congestion at new entrance from Oliver Street
   b.4 Bottleneck at northeast entrance, West Michigan Avenue and the RR crossing

C. Pedestrian Circulation
   c.1 People cut across lawns/grass everywhere
   c.2 Dalton Center Promenade where you walk up stairs to walk down stairs, doesn’t make sense

D. Building Use
   d.1 Bernhard Center is underutilized
   d.2 Sangren Hall is an unfriendly building, hallways dark, wayfinding inside is very confusing

E. Building Architecture
   e.1 Housing along edge of campus – Elmwood
   e.2 Married housing buildings belonging to Kalamazoo College
   e.3 Ellsworth Hall
   e.4 East Campus buildings in poor shape physically, need restoration
   e.5 Administration Building: ugly, parking
   e.6 Looking at front of Wood Hall
   e.7 North end of East Hall houses archives and regional history: poor physical condition was seen as our link to the Ivy League (buildings and campus most similar to eastern universities)
   e.8 West Hall: needs restoration
   e.9 Oakland Drive Campus housing – Stadium Drive Apartments: old and tired buildings, ugly
   e.10 Physical Plant: location at entrance to campus

F. Parking
   f.1 Remove concrete parking lot with concrete pylons and red lava rock by Dalton Center
   f.2 Sangren Hall parking lot
   f.3 Poor circulation in parking lots, timing of usage poor, availability/presence of meters
   f.4 Parking is an issue in many places on campus; the expectation is that you (faculty) will be able to park close to your building/office/classroom and then you are not able to
   f.5 West Michigan by Bernhard Center – “The road that ends in a parking lot.”
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
West Campus Focus Group
February 02, 1999
Page 5

**Question:**
How far are you willing to walk to get to your office/building from your parking space?

**Answers:**
- 10-15 minutes
- 50 yards
- Need a drop-off with lots to carry

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

Respectfully submitted by:

**SmithGroup JJR**

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: East Campus Focus Group

Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall

Meeting Date/Time: February 02, 1999 / 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 06, 1999

Participants:
Committee:
Linda Powell, Asst. Professor, HPER;
Chair, East Campus Focus Group
David McKee, University Libraries, AAUP Rep. – not present
Dave Corstange, Assoc. Director Intercollegiate Athletics,
sitting in for Kathy Beauregard, Director of Athletics
Sharon Seabrook Russell, Asst. Director, Alumni Relations
Paul Solomon, Asst. Professor, Department of Art, Campus Planning Council
Tom Carey, Professor, Department of Management
Elton Weintz, Graduate Student, GSAC – not present
Mary Godfrey – not present

WMU Staff:
Susan Kamman, Campus Planning
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering
Deb Berkey, Chair, Department of HPER

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

Opening comments and introduction of committees. This focus group discussed the best time to meet during consultant’s two and three day visits throughout the coming year:

Visit #3
Wednesday, March 10, 1999
7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.
Commons Room, Walwood Hall
DISCUSSION:

During this meeting, members were asked to identify those parts of the campus physical design that they thought were the most positive and those that presented the most negative impact to the users of and visitors to the Western Michigan University campus. Their choices were recorded on the graphic of campus used for presentation, and listed as well. They are as follows:

Positive Physical Characteristics

A. Open Space
   a.1 Space around the Honors College, Rood Hall, the large trees and sunlight
   a.2 Space created by the Gilmore Theater complex, fountain, function/aesthetics
   a.3 East Hall Hill, the tradition
   a.4 East Campus, views = pastoral, big trees, traditional campus setting
   a.5 The valley, the pond, green space, a Zone of Tranquility
   a.6 Space between Knauss, Dunbar, Friedman, stepped amphitheater and terrace
      strongly attracts students, sunny at lunch time.
   a.7 Walk along Oakland Drive, sidewalk, large trees, fall here
   a.8 Hospital grounds

B. Buildings
   b.1 Oakland Gym, traditional view to gym from Oakland Drive, view to stadium
      also
   b.2 View from North Hall
   b.3 New Student Rec Center: blend of services, high activity area
   b.4 Walwood building favored by Alumni
   b.5 New Business School, view from building
   b.6 The Oaklands: the original farmhouse and the large oak trees there
   b.7 The new stadium
   b.8 Fetzer Center: Interior architecture and entry

C. Land Use

D. Other

Negative Physical Characteristics

A. Open Space

B. Vehicular Circulation
   b.1 Michigan Ave. Substation area = a crossroads, but confusing, disorganized
   b.2 Bad corner at Knollwood and Western, safety concern, widened for buses, scary
   b.3 Intersections: Stadium and W. Michigan, Stadium and new entrance,
      Oakland Drive, RR tracks
b.4 Intersection of Stadium and Howard: looks like the university is a secret, a maze
b.5 Oliver and Oakland

C. Pedestrian Circulation
c.1 How to cross the RR tracks
c.2 Crossing Stadium Drive
c.3 Stadium Drive as barrier, RR tracks

D. Building Use
d.1 Speech and Hearing building: not big enough for its use
d.2 ROTC rappelling tower (at end of track field)
d.3 Sangren Hall needs structural update, very confusing, get lost
d.4 East Hall Archives: quality of interior space poor
d.5 Motor Pool, Physical Plant, whole area: access poor, hard to get in and out, ugly
d.6 Faunce Student Services Building
d.7 General statement with respect to the quality of the facilities

E. Building Architecture
e.1 Football field not attractive at the road edge: location, interface with neighborhood
e.2 Clock Tower
e.3 Exterior siding of the Welborn Hall and the Lee Honors College
e.4 Student housing = cell blocks with numbers

F. Parking

G. Land Use
g.1 No ceremonial front door, blocked major campus entry with new science building, brick material used for building
g.2 Entrance at Dairy Queen, RR tracks, bar

H. University Image
g.1 Howard and West Michigan: not attractive, combination of university and commercial
g.2 Entry to campus from Oliver Street gives impression that athletics is the most important thing.

**Question:**
What is the prettiest entrance to Campus?

**Answers:**
- Oliver Road visual corridor to new recreation building and Bronco
- There isn’t any, would have to blindfold to get onto campus
- Oakland is the best approach, then down to campus to Oliver
- Howard Street entrance to the valley
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
East Campus Focus Group
February 02, 1999
Page 4

Question:
How far are you willing to walk from parking space to major destination on West Campus?

Answers:
- 1.5 minutes
- Faculty – 2 minutes
- Depends on if you have items to carry
- 10 minutes with nothing to carry
- 10 minutes
- **Time is a factor
- **Load is a factor

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

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group

Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall

Meeting Date/Time: February 02, 1999
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 06, 1999

Participants:
Committee:
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
David Lemberg, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Geography
Ronald Coleman, Graduate Student, GSA – not present
Tom King, Attorney, Kreis Enderle Callendar & Hudgins, PC

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

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

Opening comments by Dick Rigterink. Linda Cody introduced committees, and this focus group discussed the best time to meet during the consultants’ three day visits throughout the coming year:

Visit #3
Tuesday, March 9, 1999
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Commons Room, Walwood Hall
During this meeting, members were asked to identify those parts of the campus physical design that they thought were the most positive and those that presented the most negative impact to the users of and visitors to the Western Michigan University campus. Their choices were recorded on the graphic of campus used for presentation, and listed as well. They are as follows:

**Positive Physical Characteristics**

A. Open Space
   a.1 Pond
   a.2 Gilmore Theater Complex, fountain: good space
   a.3 Space between Dunbar Hall and the Library
   a.4 Bronco entry and new recreation center: good welcome, statement
   a.5 Space between Library and University Computing Center
   a.6 Outside amphitheater (#16) between Dunbar and Knauss

B. Buildings
   b.1 Fetzer Center: easy wayfinging in building, parking convenient, good space to meet
   b.2 Library/Tower: good recognizable feature
   b.3 Business School: architectural style, welcoming building, sculpture/courtyard garden, forms nice cluster with Fetzer Center
   b.4 East Campus: buildings give a presence in Kalamazoo, must restore buildings
   b.5 Honors College: internal space, pleasant place to be in
   b.6 Bernhard Center, student center: very active, bowling, pizza, computer center all here
   b.7 Walwood Hall
   b.8 Haenicke Science Center and Wood Hall
   b.9 The Oaklands
   b.10 Dalton Center

C. Other:
   c.1 View from top of Sprau Tower

**Negative Physical Characteristics**

A. Open Space
   a.1 Campus entry, transportation and maintenance garage: poor entry
   a.2 Western Gateway

B. Vehicular Circulation
   b.1 Intersection at Gilkison and North Dormitory: dangerous, lot of traffic, too fast, major bus route
   b.2 Entire traffic pattern, difficult to get around
Meeting Notes  
Western Michigan University Master Plan  
Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group  
February 02, 1999  
Page 3

b.3 Intersection at Western Avenue and West Michigan  
b.4 Stadium Drive/RR/Arcadia Creek: high speed train, what is effect on campus?  
b.5 Intersection of Oliver and Stadium: no left turn signal  
b.6 Intersection of Oliver, Oakland (goes from 2 lanes to 1 lane) and Austin, Oakland  
b.7 Knollwood and West Michigan Avenue

C. Pedestrian Circulation  
c.1 See b.1 above – major vehicular/pedestrian conflict  
c.2 Dangerous pedestrian crossing at intersection of Oliver and Stadium, lots of pedestrian traffic to bus stop  
c.3 Wayfinding confusing for pedestrians

D. Building Use  
d.1 Moore Hall poor interior physical condition, not enough space  
d.2 Sangren Hall: confusing, poor interior  
d.3 Residence Halls: external appearance, Valley too far away, inconvenient placement, feels like a housing project, lacks aesthetics

E. Building Architecture  
e.1 Oakland Gym, tired, alone, isolated  
e.2 East Hall, Archive Location: wretched building condition  
e.3 Kalamazoo College Student Housing

F. Parking

G. Campus Image  
g.1 Campus not unified, interrupted by Stadium Drive and RR tracks

Question:
How far are you willing to walk to get to your office/building from your parking space?

Answers:
• 50 feet when carrying load  
• 100 yds, 1.5 minutes  
• 5 minutes  
• Distribution and accessibility are important  
• Parking keeps the community out of the campus  
• Include metro transit  
• Signs to show overflow parking  
• Biggest parking problem: faculty and students want to park at the building
Question:
Should Freshmen have cars stored on campus?

Answer:
Yes, they need them.

Question:
Where do most students in off-campus housing come from?

Answer:
- South and north of Howard
- Off East Campus

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

Respectfully submitted by:
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Project Manager
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Advisory Committee

Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall

Meeting Date/Time: February 02, 1999 / 7:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Issue Date: April 06, 1999

Participants:

Committee:
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Paul Pancella, Assoc. Professor, Physics;
Chair, West Campus Focus Group
Linda Powell, Asst. Professor, HPER;
Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS;
Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Trudy Verser, Assoc. Professor, Management;
Chair, Campus Planning Council
Jeff Chamberlain, City Planner, City of Kalamazoo
Hannah McKinney, Vice Mayor of City of Kalamazoo;
Professor, Kalamazoo College

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

• Introductory remarks by Dick Rigerink
• Need for a new source of student input discussed
• Request to make a videotape of the presentation during each campus visit for those committee members who would miss it
• Request to schedule a meeting for five of the neighborhood associations – Jeff Chamberlain has a roster of the presidents of these associations

Visit #3
Wednesday, March 10, 1999
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Commons Room, Walwood Hall
DISCUSSION:

During this meeting, members were asked to identify those parts of the campus physical design that they thought were the most positive and those that presented the most negative impact to the users of and visitors to the Western Michigan University campus. Their choices were recorded on the graphic of campus used for presentation, and listed as well. They are as follows:

Positive Physical Characteristics
A. Open Space
   a.1 Pond
   a.2 Wooded hillside behind Business School
   a.3 Library Wall
   a.4 Plaza behind Wood Hall

B. Vehicular Circulation

C. Pedestrian Circulation

D. Buildings – Use

E. Buildings – Architecture
   e.1 Waldo Library
   e.2 Kanley Chapel
   e.3 Business School
   e.4 Theater Complex
   e.5 The Oaklands

F. Land Use

G. Other
   g.1 Outdoor artwork

Negative Physical Characteristics
A. Open Space
   a.1 need more landscape on perimeter, not parking

B. Vehicular Circulation
   b.1 Traffic problem at interface with Knollwood neighborhood
   b.2 W. Michigan traffic at Howard
   b.3 Changing speed limits on Howard/Oakland

C. Pedestrian Circulation
   c.1 Wayfinding poor
   c.2 Wayfinding poor
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Advisory Committee
February 02, 1999
Page 3

D. Parking
  d.1 Too many parking lots on the perimeter
  d.2 “Moonscape” – looking across parking lots toward the Business School
  d.3 “Center” parking on Michigan Ave. at terminus on campus (east side)
  d.4 Visitor Parking on Central campus
  d.5 Students park in neighborhoods around campus

E. Buildings – Use
  e.1 Knollwood tavern

F. Buildings – Architecture
  f.1 Freshman Residence Halls
  f.2 Trimpe/Knollwood Buildings
  f.3 Apartments on Oakland Drive Campus
  f.4 Stores Building on East Campus
  f.5 EWB Building

G. Land Use
  g.1 Campus Entrances – all
  g.2 Stadium/RR barrier
  g.3 No main entrance
  g.4 Corner of Stadium/Western Michigan ugly
  g.5 RR Tracks look terrible
  g.6 No sense of order
  g.7 Campus edge with Davis on east side
  g.8 No student commercial center

H. Other
  h.1 Public Art doesn’t fit the campus

MAJOR ISSUES (OBJECTIVES)

1. Vehicular Circulation
   • Master Plan should make it easy and pleasant to get around campus
   • The whole system might have a rationale
   • Vehicular and pedestrian patterns must be well signed
   • Safe campus
   • Link students who live off campus

2. Organized and well defined campus entries

3. Gateway

4. Define boundaries of campus
5. Pedestrian System
   • Well defined
   • Link to neighborhood
   • Well signed
   • Create linkage across Stadium, RR, creek

6. Gathering points (Activity Nodes)
   • Create more major activity nodes
   • Zone campus
   • Define open space
   • External gathering spaces should be complemented with internal gathering space
   • Clustering of buildings; more and more nature
   • Place faculty offices in close proximity to their classrooms

7. Pedestrian Core in West Campus
   • Partially implemented
   • Create one at East/Oakland Drive Campus

8. Accessibility problems
   • Difficult grades on campus

9. Improve bicycle access and links to neighborhoods
   • City is working on a “Non-motorized Plan”
   • West Michigan Ave. provides an opportunity for bike lane

10. Integrate campus with the city
    • Improve neighborhood links

11. Improve beauty of campus in all seasons
    • Four months of empty fountains
    • Maintain feel of Oakland Drive Campus: protect and promote rolling land

12. Create a campus that is special, unique, welcoming

13. Parking
    • Improve visual impact of lots
    • Move the lots
    • Commuter lots / bus line/ hierarchy of spaces
    • Surplus of off-campus apartments
    • Removing cars for freshmen would drive them off campus
    • Kalamazoo is not a mass transit community; students have few options for public transit
    • Many students on aid have jobs
    • Commuter students create problem with vehicles, looking for best spots, wait for classes to get out
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
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- Need drop-off sites
- Large lot by Business School too big / size makes it worthwhile to “hunt” for space

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.
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #2 MEETING NOTES

Meeting Subject: Policy Committee
Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall
Meeting Date/Time: February 03, 1999
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Issue Date: April 06, 1999
Participants: Committee:
Dick St. John, Trustee
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director of Campus Planning
Paul Pancellia, Assoc. Professor, Physics;
  Chair, West Campus Focus Group
Linda Powell, Asst. Professor, HPER;
  Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS;
  Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Trudy Verser, Assoc. Professor, Management;
  Chair, Campus Planning Council
Fred Sitkins, Chair, Engineering College Site Committee;
  Prof., Dept. of Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering

Consultants / SmithGroup JJR:
Richard Rigterink, Vice President, Team Leader
Douglas Koza, Landscape Architect, Campus Planner
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

• Introductory remarks by Dick Rigterink; continuation of discussion from Advisory Meeting

Visit #3
Wednesday, March 10, 1999
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
Commons Room, Walwood Hall
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Policy Committee
February 03, 1999
Page 2

- Introduction of committee members
- Fred interested in the team looking at the link between the outlying parcel (Parkview Campus) and the central campus.
- Oakland neighborhood: Traffic, Correction Center gives poor image
- Planning for development of Parkview Campus under discussion with the City of Kalamazoo
- Importance of Policy Committee:
  - Important responsibility
  - Build as we go; reason for 6 weeks between visits
  - Important to be sure of decisions
  - Policy is confidential and will not be shared if requested,
  - Open Community meetings: will share decisions with them unless otherwise indicated.
- Suggestion to use the Web site as means to communicate pre-visit package

Question:
What are directions the university wishes to move in? Presidents come and go, the Master Plan remains.

Answers:
- WMU will reach a Research 2 status primarily through Engineering and Health & Human Services (federal focus).
- WMU will become a “regional university.”
- WMU will work with the region with respect to economic development.
- Major corridors and WMU must have a presence; President must be involved in these areas.
- WMU state funding must be enhanced: The way monies are allocated in the state legislature cuts WMU short; Research 2 status will help here. WMU has always been (with respect to the other state institutions) underfunded by the state: funding based on a “base” = operating budget. When extra monies are garnered, they don’t get added to the base and it never increases.
- WMU wants to establish and maintain an excellent undergraduate program.
- WMU wants to expand the graduate programs in order to achieve Research 2 status – want to spur collaborative research efforts (reason for Parkview Campus site); New Science complex is an example.
- Increase their positive relationships with “host” communities: Kalamazoo, Battle Creek, etc.; Master Plan will help to accomplish this.

Question:
What facilities will be required for R2 status, and where will they go?
Answer:
Benefit to clustering buildings together on edge of campus, do not want to scatter within Campus Core.

Question:
Can we anticipate significant research growth on this campus?

Answers:
- Next area of growth will primarily be the Health Campus on Oakland Drive Campus.
- This is not high tech growth.
- When the Science Building sited sees possibility of a related building.
- Health & Human Services College looking at “interdisciplinary research” – joint use of facilities on campus (related: Beckman Center at University of Illinois, constant turnover of facilities use).
- Engineering: Multiple departments have use of high tech equipment, almost requires a separate institute to accommodate effort. EXAMPLE: Parkview Campus = science and research part, Battle Creek facility = application part.
- Interest is not to create another campus in Kalamazoo, but to provide opportunity for collaborative research with small businesses.
- WMU will incorporate high tech facilities in the next 20 years, can be an “informal” approach (VP Beam).
- 1972 Plan zoned the campus: academic zone, student services zone, athletic zone.
- VP Beam predicts future will be more collaborative research, Upjohn/Pharmacia will collaborate in such a way as to require an independent facility, not necessarily an academic component.
- Accessibility of public business to campus.
- Keep undergrad world separate from research world.
- Moving Engineering off campus is positive – less vehicles.
- Will WMU export students to corporations, or will WMU bring corporations to campus?
- Importance of student centered Research 2 status.
- WMU has five professional colleges: Business, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health & Human Services.
- Students require cars to drive off campus to internships, clinical experiences, jobs, etc.

Question:
What will enrollment do over next 20 years?

Answer:
Project that new Engineering School will double population over the next five years.
WMU wants to be on cutting edge and unique in what it offers, not necessarily offer what everyone else offers.

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:
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Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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### Visit 3 Schedule

**Website Documentation and Visit Materials**

#### Analysis Review and Scope Confirmation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR MASTER PLAN VISIT #3</th>
<th>TUESDAY MARCH 9</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY MARCH 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Campus Focus Group Commons Room Walwood Hall</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><strong>Interviews</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Campus Services Bldg.</strong>&lt;br&gt;a. Public Safety – Chief Robert Brown and Captain Wesley Carpenter (scheduled together – only one is definite)&lt;br&gt;b. Beth den Hartigh, Director, Disabled Student Resources and Services&lt;br&gt;c. Doris “Dori” Kunkle, CPA&lt;br&gt;<strong>Bianca Hala, Student, Industrial &amp; Manufacturing Engineering (may be late)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Caterina Hutchinson, WMU Graduate, Interior Design 1998; Kingscott Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td><strong>Preview Meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Fetzer Center</em></td>
<td><strong>Advisory Committee</strong>&lt;br&gt;2020 <em>Fetzer Center</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Buffet Supper</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Outbound Committee</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Policy Committee</strong>&lt;br&gt;2030 <em>Fetzer Center</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td><strong>Group Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Oakland Recital Hall</em></td>
<td><strong>Aija Lobaws, WMU Alumnus, Psychologist, WMU Foundation Board</strong></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td><strong>Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Commons Rm./Walwood Hall</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></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><strong>West Campus Focus Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Commons Room Walwood Hall</em></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>
Figure 6-B.1 Regional Campus Analysis (Web site graphic)
REGIONAL ANALYSIS OBSERVATIONS

1. Natural Features
   A. Overall Character of the region
      - Views of the city from high points on campus should be protected. Views from the original Normal School campus (East Campus) have special historical and aesthetic significance.
   B. Valley/Upland Topography
      - Extension of the campus across valley (Goldsworth Valley, Arcadia Creek Valley) and upland is an asset that should be protected and emphasized.
      - Vehicular circulation should take advantage of this topographic variation.
      - Promote and use the valley system to contribute to the area’s distinctness.
      - Keep buildings out of the valley.
   C. Important natural features
      - Views across the valley from upland plateaus should be preserved and enhanced.

2. Man-Built Patterns
   A. City of Kalamazoo development
      - The edges of the campus are relatively fixed. There is little land contiguous to campus that could accommodate growth.
      - The northwest quadrant of the city exhibits mature development.
   B. University impact on contiguous neighborhoods
      - The campus is not contiguous to the central business district. Links to downtown should be explored and strengthened.
      - The concentration of industry on the east side of the city is an asset to the University on the west side where development is predominantly by residential.
   C. Approach routes to campus – three major visitor routes were analyzed
      - East approach from I-94 Business Route through the city of Kalamazoo
      - West Approach from US-131, Stadium Drive appears to be the shortest most direct route; no more aesthetically pleasing than the others, it passes both the future site of the College of Engineering and the existing WMU campus
      - From US-131 at West Main Street and down Howard Street to the West Michigan Ave. entrance
      - Another commonly used approach route is Oakland Drive from I-94
Figure 6-B.2 Neighborhood Analysis / Community Interface (Web site graphic)
NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS/COMMUNITY INTERFACE

More detailed information regarding the campus/community interface is still being collected.

1. Vehicular Approach Routes and Arrival
   A. Different campus entrances present varied entry experiences.
      - Howard Street and Valley Drive, and leading to the Goltzworth Pond provides a pastoral drive through rolling terrain.
      - Oliver Street and Western Ave. at the Student Recreation Center is a more urban/collegiate experience that celebrates the athletic campus tradition.
      - West Michigan Ave. from Stadium Drive presents a cluttered mix of elements: commercial, institutional, and athletic, which result in a poorly defined progression as a campus entry.
   B. Campus Arrival Zones
      - West approach at Howard Street and Stadium presents a first view of significant campus images along both sides of Stadium Drive.
      - Stadium Drive and West Michigan Ave., while currently a problem area with a "wedge interchange," is a long-range possibility as an approach to campus.
   C. Important natural features
      - Views across the valley from upland plateaus should be preserved and enhanced.

2. Circulation
   A. Vehicular: Alleviating traffic congestion at the Howard Street/West Michigan Ave. entrance will significantly improve approach to campus during peak hours.
      - A concentration of parking on the west end of the Central Campus draws vehicles to this entry.
      - Traffic utilizes the Howard Street entry during AM Peak Hour travel. It is three times higher than at any other campus entrance measured during that time (1991 Traffic Study).
      - Outbound traffic volume at this same intersection is also highest of all entrances, though not by the same factor.
      - Stadium Drive and the railroad are barriers to linking West Campus with East and Oakland Drive Campus.
   B. Pedestrian access to and from campus traverses surrounding residential neighborhoods.
      - Establishing and maintaining strong pedestrian links to surrounding commercial and student housing through sidewalks, footpaths, and bike paths can improve the integration of the University with the community.

3. Land Use Patterns/Limits to Campus
   A. The campus is efficiently configured – this is a positive feature.
      - The point that results from the convergence of West Michigan Ave. and Stadium Drive is an exception.
   B. South Campus provides an opportunity for significant future growth and the preservation of open space.
   C. Kalamazoo College and WMU, because of their unique physical relationship and proximity to downtown Kalamazoo, make this area unique.
      - An institutional zone consisting of both universities could make this area even more visually distinctive.
   D. Campus edges are fixed.
Figure 6-B.3 Campus Core Analysis (Web site graphic)
CAMPUS CORE ANALYSIS

1. Open Space Patterns
   A. Clearly defined open spaces are significant components of a university campus. Quadrangles are often used as organizing components. Few well-defined open spaces currently exist on campus.
      ▪ The football stadium is the one existing "quadrangle" on campus.
      ▪ Miller Plaza is an example of an evolving "quadrangle."
      ▪ There are numerous potential spaces for this type of open space pattern.
      ▪ East Campus has a Quadrangle defined by East, North, and West Halls.
   B. Open spaces relate to the public edge. There exists a Valley System and an Upland Edge.
      ▪ Arcadia Valley Corridor (along Stadium Drive) relates to the public edge. It could be made more visually significant. It is currently viewed as a negative element. The Athletic and Intramural campus works successfully as a public edge.
      ▪ The pastoral Goldsworth Valley is a positive example. Athletic fields and the practice fields on East Campus are part of the Valley System where open space features meander along the valley floor.
      ▪ Oakland Boulevard is bordered by the clearly defined paths, open lawns, and stately trees of East and Oakland Drive Campuses.

2. Pedestrian Patterns and Movement
   A. Pedestrian patterns have evolved rather than been created as a comprehensive system – the result of careful planning and design.
   B. Linkage between campuses represents a challenge to the planning effort.
   C. Wayfinding problems must be resolved to alleviate vehicular/pedestrian conflicts and to improve campus circulation.

3. Bicycle Opportunities: Safe and efficient bikeways can provide valuable links between campus and community, as well as allow efficient movement across campus. The City of Kalamazoo Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is being coordinated with the University.

4. Transportation and Parking
   A. Campus entries present varied entry experiences (see Neighborhood Analysis, #1).
   B. Parking availability is a problem in the campus core.
      ▪ Most parking is concentrated on the west side of campus.
      ▪ Perimeter parking at campus edge is unscreened.
   C. Roads within the campus core either loop or dead end.
   D. Currently the loop road is incomplete. Loop road alignment and intersections pose circulation and safety issues.

5. Land Use and Building Issues
   A. Campus Use Zones (Academic, Student Services, Residential) are not clearly defined and are thus difficult to distinguish.
   B. Buildings frequently bear little relationship to one another.
C. Use Distribution: public destinations are well serviced with respect to parking. Direct vehicle access is provided.
   ▪ Miller Auditorium and parking ramp are well sited and easily accessible to public.
   ▪ The Fetzer Center drop-off and parking are conveniently located.

D. There exists great diversity of materials and style. Many buildings are only one or two stories and, therefore, do not take full advantage of the site area they consume.

6. User Friendliness
A. Activity nodes are needed to accommodate and stimulate social interaction across campus.
   ▪ Increase the number of outdoor and indoor sitting areas, plazas, coffee stops, and quiet study areas.

B. A framework is needed to support the unification of West, East, and Oakland Drive Campuses.

C. Campus signage should be viewed more easily from roadways and more easily read.

D. Wayfinding is a significant problem on campus.
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY VISIT #3 SUMMARY

Subject: Analysis Review

Date: March 09 & 10, 1999

Issue Date: March 26, 1999

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of Visit #3 was to review the Campus Analysis conducted during previous visits based on campus tours, photographic documentation, interviews and meetings with university faculty, students and staff. During a general presentation in Oakland Recital Hall Auditorium, issues and analyses were presented. More detailed discussion followed in meetings with focus groups, Advisory and Policy Committees throughout the two-day visit.

Difficulty distributing pre-visit information was discussed. Committee members were advised to be aware of its arrival five working days prior to the next campus visit and to notify the Office of Campus Planning if there is difficulty retrieving this information.

A draft of the Student Survey Form was presented to all committee members. Discussion followed to clarify and refine the questions used in this form. Any further clarifications were requested by March 12th.

ISSUES

Issues that were identified during the previous committee meetings were collated and listed as a preliminary study of those issues that the campus master planning committees and campus interviews identified as most critical. These issues were also placed into a matrix, which showed where support was strongest (i.e., identified across the board by all groups) and where support was most localized (i.e., identified by one or two groups). Committee meetings during this visit provided the opportunity to discuss these issues, refine or reword them, and add to or delete them as necessary. It is intended that this process of refinement continue throughout the study.
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ANALYSIS

Analysis of the WMU campus was presented at three levels: Regional, Neighborhood, and Campus.

At the Regional level, discussion centered on the landscape forms in which the campus is situated. Approach routes to the Western Michigan University campus and the first impression or image that is conveyed to the visitor was also a focus of discussion. Key points of discussion included:

- The natural valley/upland landscape is one of the university’s greatest assets and should be used to its greatest advantage in the planning process.
- Approach to the campus from Highway 131 at the Stadium Drive exit provides the shortest approach route and addresses the university-owned parcel, which fronts the highway. However, other routes may be more frequently traveled and may provide more aesthetically pleasing approaches to campus (131/West Main, Oaklnd Drive).
- The campus approach must also be linked through downtown Kalamazoo.
- The Comprehensive Plan for the city of Kalamazoo will show updated land use patterns.

The Neighborhood Analysis discussion addressed vehicular approach routes and traffic congestion at campus entrances. The variety of experiences was noted ranging from pastoral (Howard and Valley Drive) to urban/collegiate (Oliver and Western at the fieldhouse) to a mix of urban/commercial/institutional (Western Michigan and Howard).

- Topics of discussion were of the many campus entrances, which should be identified as a “major” entrance or approach route and what criteria define a major entrance.
- Entrances that have the highest use are not necessarily those that convey the best image of campus.
- The location of the major parking areas and specific campus zones helps to define which entrances are used most heavily during peak hours.
- Students and staff will find the most efficient routes to campus regardless of image. Yet, a positive campus image is important for all campus users, not solely the visitor.
- Alleviating traffic congestion on major campus approach routes and entrances will improve circulation during peak hours.
- Pedestrian access to and from campus must traverse contiguous neighborhoods and link to downtown Kalamazoo.
- Campus planning efforts must address contiguous land uses - residential, commercial, and institutional - in an effort to integrate campus and community.
Campus Core Analysis focused on linkages within the campus and to surrounding neighborhoods. The most significant elements discussed, Stadium Drive and the railroad, divide the main Academic Core (West Campus) and East and Oakland Drive Campuses. Open space patterns were studied both within the Campus Core and as they relate to the public edge. Pedestrian corridors and non-motorized transportation were discussed as well as issues related to vehicular transportation and parking. All of these systems (open space, pedestrian, non-motorized and motorized vehicular) provide opportunities to link the campus and to provide an organized means of circulation. Relationships between buildings (or lack thereof) also contribute to campus organization and linkages within the core.

- The valley system and upland edge provide dramatic natural features to the open space system on campus
- Stadium Drive is currently viewed as a barrier that separates the subcampuses.
- Oakland Drive Campus development can contribute significantly to linking the whole campus. Circulation patterns and land use issues are important elements in this discussion.
- The dominant method of campus circulation is by automobile. Student lifestyles, significant grade changes and limited time between classes makes walking, biking and during winter storms, and the bus system impractical.
- Parking is limited and is predominantly located in surface lots on the west end of West Campus.
- Internal road design contributes to traffic congestion at campus entrances/exits, unsafe conditions for pedestrians, and difficulty of campus wayfinding.

**SUMMATION**

During the next five weeks, Alternative Linkage Opportunities will be proposed to address the needs further defined and identified during Visit #3. While the focus will be at the campus level, regional and neighborhood analyses must also contribute to these proposals. Open space, pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle, and land use systems will all be considered.

Respectfully submitted by:

**SmithGroup JJR**

Linda Lucchesi Cody  
Project Manager
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Revised March 22, 1999

Meeting Subject: Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group

Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall

Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, March 09, 1999
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Issue Date: March 14, 1999

Participants:

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

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

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR (JJR) and the Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group to review and discuss the Campus Analysis at three levels of detail: Regional, Neighborhood and Campus. These analyses were presented at a group slide presentation at the Oakland Recital Hall, WMU, Tuesday, March 09, from 1:00-3:00 p.m. This session was the second meeting with this group and was an opportunity for this focus group to review the issues list and matrix that was generated during the previous visit. Committee members were invited to add to this list and to make changes that they felt better reflected the ideas and opinions of the group. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

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

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for the next three visits to campus:

   Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group will meet on Tuesday, from 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. in the Commons Room, Walwood Hall, WMU.
   Dates are April 20 (Visit #4), May 25 (Visit #5), and July 27(Visit #6).

   Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by JJR to receive comments. That address is:

   wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

3. The student survey form was presented for review and comment, and the following recommendations were made:
   - Be sure to get a broad sampling of students.
   - If surveys are just distributed to large lecture classes, they will miss a great deal of people.
   - Correct the typographical error in #9 and #19 (Crossroads Mall).

4. A pre-visit package will arrive to the Office of Campus Planning via e-mail no later than five working days before the next visit. Items within this package will be distributed to committee members through the Office of Campus Planning. Committee members should be aware of this information and familiarize themselves with its contents prior to the next campus visit.

B. ISSUES MATRIX

A discussion of this matrix and the accompanying list generated the following discussion:
1. Parking should be added as an item on the issues matrix. This prompted a discussion to more clearly define the issue.
   - The need for a car on campus was discussed. Students do need cars in order to travel home on weekends, to get to jobs off campus and to drive from West Campus to Oakland Drive or East Campus.
   - There are not enough parking spaces for students that have cars. More parking stickers are issued than spaces available. The issue should state that there are not enough spaces available to accommodate University staff, students and visitors.
   - Freshmen do need cars on campus. Perhaps there should be a storage lot at a remote location so that they may store cars for weekend use and not use them daily as a means of transportation to get to class. If they park remotely, they should have a reduced rate for their parking pass.
   - If spaces are added or lots reconfigured, then it is hoped that the University will look to more parking garages and not more surface lots, regardless of the cost. Twenty-five percent of the parking spaces in surface lots are lost during and after snowfall due to piled snow in spaces.
   - Using the bus system is a problem during the winter. Due to traffic congestion and road conditions, buses get off schedule and thus are not an efficient means of getting a student to class on time.
   - Items #3 and #5 suggest that non-motorized travel be studied. While a pedestrian bridge does exist over Howard, it is not clear how to get to it.

C. REGIONAL ANALYSIS

1. The three most likely exits from major highways (94, 131) to approach the University were identified by the consultants as:
   - Oakland Drive
   - Stadium Drive
   - Kings Highway
   - West Main to Nichols to Howard is also a well-ased route and should be included.

2. It was suggested that Stadium Drive would be a reasonable entrance to bring a visitor to campus for the following reasons: the school can’t be missed from Stadium, and it is a straight shot to campus.

3. Some of the purple, industrial areas on the east side of Kalamazoo have been abandoned and replaced by a 35-year-old forest.

4. The Comprehensive Plan for the city will show accurately the city’s land use patterns.
D. NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS

1. Be aware that there are other entrances to the campus along Howard in both north and south directions, and these should be highlighted. For example, southbound on Howard, it is possible to enter at the ice arena and then cross the vehicular bridge to West Campus.

2. What entrances should function as major entrances to campus? Should Stadium and Howard be viewed as a major entrance? Oliver and Stadium doesn’t work as a major entrance.

3. How is main part of campus accessed?
   - Roads force you to choose left half or right half of campus.
   - Main entrance is a T-intersection at the Recreation Center.

4. Loop Road
   - History of road layout: The Ring Road concept was promoted during development, but Kalamazoo College did not allow road through their campus.
   - Parts of the Loop Road have major issues.
   - As a rule of thumb, the Loop Road should remain inside Stadium and Howard. Where the road parallel’s Stadium it works well, not congested

E. CAMPUS ANALYSIS

1. Campus Linkage: Discussion centered on the topic of connecting the campus across Stadium Drive. Students are currently crossing on foot at critical points, which greatly endangers their safety.

2. A walkway that crosses over Stadium Drive was discussed as a way to connect students from Oakland Drive Campus to West Campus.
   - This walkway should try to cross at grade. An at-grade crossing could be accommodated at Oliver and Stadium.
   - Will the students really use it or will they continue to drive?
   - The campus bus system is one answer to the problem.
   - Ten minutes between classes is not enough time to walk some of the distances required between West Campus and East and Oakland Drive Campus. One solution would be to use an express bus service from some central collection point.
   - Because of the distance, people will more likely bike than walk.
   - Could there be more than one pedestrian crossing and/or a pedestrian bridge?
3. Oakland Drive Campus Development:
   • Could some of this development be residential?
   • The development issue should be raised with the community.
   • Consider relieving the dangers to pedestrians posed by traffic on Oakland Drive as plans to develop Oakland Drive Campus proceed.
   • Students avoid the traffic problems by jetting through campus and out to Oliver.
   • A traffic signal at Oakland Drive and Oliver would help.

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

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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Meeting Subject: West Campus Focus Group
Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall
Meeting Date/Time: Tuesday, March 09, 1999
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Issue Date: March 14, 1999
Participants:
Committee:
Paul Pancel1a, Assoc. Professor, Physics; Chair,
West Campus Focus Group
Larry Oppliger, Chairperson Arts and Sciences
Paul Wilson, AAUP Liaison; Assoc. Professor, Department
of Education and Professional Development
Vernon Payne, Division of Student Affairs
Stefan Sarenius, Maps Coordinator, Waldo Library,
PSSO Representative
Bruce Naftel, Assoc. Professor, Department of Art, Campus
Planning Council – not present
Lew Graff, Undergraduate; WSA Campus Design Chair
Kristen Collesel, GSA, Department of Communication – not
present
David Jarl, Architect, Eckert-Wordell Architects; Winchell
Area Neighborhood Representative
Chris Bakotic, Undergraduate, Integrated Supply
Management, WSA

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

Consultants / SmithGroup JIR
Richard Riggerink, Vice President, Team Leader
Peter Berg, Associate, Sr. Designer, Project Manager
Linda Cody, Site Planner, Project Manager
Eric Hallquist, Site Planner

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR (JJR) and the West Campus Focus Group to review and discuss the Campus Analysis at three levels of detail: Regional, Neighborhood and Campus. These analyses were presented at a group slide presentation at the Oakland Recital Hall, WMU, Tuesday, March 9, from 1:00-3:00 p.m. This session was the second meeting with this group and was an opportunity for this focus group to review the issues list and matrix that was generated during the previous visit. Committee members were invited to add to this list and to make changes that they felt better reflected the ideas and opinions of the group. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

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

2. Meeting dates were confirmed for the next three visits to campus:
   
   West Campus Focus Group will meet on Wednesdays from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. in the Commons Room, Walwood Hall, WMU.
   
   Dates are April 21 (Visit #4), May 26 (Visit #5), and July 28 (Visit #6).

   Note that Visit #4 and Visit #6 are Major Review Visits, and the consultants will be on campus for three days. The third day is added to provide an opportunity to meet with the media, the president, neighborhood associations, campus and community in open sessions.

   Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by JJR to receive comments.

   That address is: wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

3. The student survey form was presented for review and comment. The following observations were made:
   
   • The survey will be distributed through the faculty to their classes.
   • Include a space on the form to identify which department the class is in.
   • #5 is an empirical question and must be clarified. Because of the wording, it may be answered similarly to #6.
   • Add “why” or “why not” to those questions that ask for an opinion.
   • Have an even number of choices. Odd numbers of choices tend to be answered by choosing the middle item regardless of opinion.
   • The last question will always have parking as part of the response.
   • Change #15 to “when walking on” campus.
4. A pre-visit package will arrive to the Office of Campus Planning via e-mail no later than five working days before the next visit. Items within this package will be distributed to committee members through the Office of Campus Planning. Committee members should be aware of this information and familiarize themselves with its contents prior to the next campus visit.

B. ISSUES

1. With respect to building use, administrative uses should be kept on the edge of West Campus. With the removal of Engineering from this campus, some administration could occupy this space and thus provide student services in two different places.

2. The Administration Building does not have the “image” of such a building. There does not exist a consistent “fabric” of building materials and, thus, there is no framework for an image building such as Administration to stand out or apart from the rest. It was observed that there is an abundance of “look at me” buildings on West Campus. This type of building should be about 10% of all campus buildings. The rest (residence halls, classrooms, etc.) should be background buildings (defined by their facades). Well-defined open spaces and paths that align would make the diversity of buildings less obvious.

3. Concern was expressed for having Student Services and associated facilities in a convenient location. Many major institutions have a Multicultural Center. It was suggested that Welborn Hall could serve this function. This led to discussion of item #15 on the issue matrix, which follows in #4.

4. Student Activity Nodes:
   - There exists a need for a true Student Center. The Recreation Center meets many of these needs, but not all of them. This is viewed as a weakness at WMU. A Student Activity Center, which has multiple uses, is needed rather than many small areas in different locations.

5. The observation was made that other universities have well used (i.e., high activity) open spaces, but at WMU, the open spaces are not inviting. These spaces are not clearly defined.
   - More participatory art was suggested.
   - Observations that if the parking lot south of Sangren Hall were removed, it could contribute to a larger green space

6. Parking distribution in “zones” across West Campus would allow one to park closer to their campus destination.
7. Clarification was presented with respect to the difficulty presented by one- to two-story buildings that are found on campus. They do not define spaces very well because they constitute smaller open spaces in order to scale to the building.

C. ANALYSIS

1. Oakland Drive must be considered a major approach to campus.

Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.
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SmithGroup JJR
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Project Manager
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Meeting Subject: East Campus Focus Group

Location: Commons Room, Walwood Hall

Meeting Date/Time: March 10, 1999 / 7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Issue Date: March 14, 1999

Participants:

Committee
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, not present
Dave Corstange, Assoc. Director Intercollegiate Athletics, Alternate
Sharon Seabrook Russell, Asst. Director, Alumni Relations
Paul Solomon, Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art, Campus Planning Council, not present
Tom Carey, Prof., Dept. of Management
Mary Godfrey, Community Volunteer, not present
Elton Weintz, GSA, Department of Sociology, not present
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
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody
DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR and the East Campus Focus Group to review and discuss the Campus Analysis at three levels of detail: regional, neighborhood and campus. These analyses were presented at a group slide presentation at the Oakland Recital Hall, WMU, Tuesday, March 9, from 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. This session was the second meeting with this group and was an opportunity for this focus group to review the issues list and matrix that was generated during the previous visit. Committee members were invited to add to this list and to make changes that they felt better reflected the ideas and opinions of the group. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion:

Organizational Items:

- Project status was reported and the purpose of the visit presented.
- Meeting dates were confirmed for the next three visits to campus:
  
  Wednesdays, 8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
  Commons Room, Walwood Hall

  Dates are April 21 (visit 4) and July 28 (visit 6)
  *Meeting on Wednesday, May 26 will be from 12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Note that Visit 4 and Visit 6 are Major Review visits and the consultants will be on campus for three days. The third day is added to provide an opportunity to meet with the media, the president, neighborhood associations, campus and community in open sessions.

Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by SmithGroup JJR to receive comments. That address is:

  wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

- The student survey form was presented for review and comment. Any recommended changes to the form must be to SmithGroup JJR by the end of March. The following observations were made:
  
  • A distinction should be made between “Student Facilities” and “Recreation Facilities” and between “Recreation Facilities” and “Recreation Programs.”
  • Question #4 should offer two choices: Better or Worse.
  • With respect to question #6, perhaps list specific buildings: Library, SRC, Bernhard Center, Indoor Rec.- Outdoor Rec.
  • Add a question related to long-term parking for students.
• A Pre-visit Package will arrive to the Office of Campus Planning via e-mail no later than five working days before the next visit. Items within this package will be distributed to committee members through the Office of Campus Planning. Committee members should be aware of this information and familiarize themselves with its contents prior to the next campus visit.

Issues:

• An overview of issues was presented. West Campus Focus Group needs a dot on #15 of matrix.

• There is a need for a Common Student Use Center.

• It was noted that due to the nature of the students and the timing of schedules, fall and winter are the times of year when most students are on campus.

Regional Analysis:

• Highlight the 131-bypass and Oakland Drive as major approach corridors to campus. The campus approach must also be linked through downtown Kalamazoo.

• Show existing bicycle trails on the board.

• The Comprehensive Plan for the city of Kalamazoo should have additional, useful analysis information.

Neighborhood Analysis:

• Connections must be maintained with downtown Kalamazoo and campus neighborhoods. The community of WMU at one time overflowed into contiguous neighborhoods for classes, etc.

• The bulk of university students are housed in neighborhoods west of campus.

Campus Analysis:

• It was observed that Western students are non-traditional. That is, they are older than the 18-23 age group and often are married. This suggests that they use the campus in non-traditional ways, unlike the typical college co-ed.
• East Campus students feel very detached from the Central Campus Core. They feel “disconnected.” It was observed that it is often difficult for these students to get to campus and back to class on West Campus in time.

• Oliver Street would be the link to West Campus from the east. Developing Oakland Drive Campus will help create a connection.

• With respect to transportation across campuses, it was noted that there are two critical factors:
  • There must be a reason to go and a way to get there. If the links exist but there is no way to get there, then the links are useless; and if there is a way to get there but no reason to go, the same is true. Thus the campus transportation system is critical.

• Sense of Place: Discussion centered around the concept that the Business College developed its own culture when it was on East Campus, which has been lost since the move to West Campus and the new Business School building.
  • It was suggested that a critical mass is necessary to establish a sense of “home.” like the difference between owning and renting a home. There is a need for social interaction as well as infrastructure – a combination of the college and support services. The nature of the arts includes the need to be together in the same part of campus.
  • It was observed that East Campus is the only piece of campus located on the right side of Oakland Drive. Perhaps East Campus will always be separate, but equal.
  • Athletics is already divided by Stadium Drive.

• Must consider methods to promote student/faculty interaction. While space is important (given well-designed space), some faculty do not interact.

• Campus Linkage: It was observed that it is most common to drive from West to East Campus, but the question was raised regarding the creation of a pedestrian bridge to span Stadium Drive. There was support to consider a pedestrian bridge, but not for a vehicular bridge. There may be a psychological effect to the bridge that makes one feel more connected.
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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Revised March 22, 1999

Meeting Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2020

Meeting Date/Time: March 10, 1999 / 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Issue Date: March 14, 1999

Participants:

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

WMU Staff:
George Wilson, P.E., Campus Engineering

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this meeting was for SmithGroup JJR and the Advisory Committee to review the issues list, matrix, and campus analysis for those members who were not present at the Group Presentation, Tuesday, March 9, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in the
Meeting Notes
Western Michigan University Master Plan
Advisory Committee Meeting
March 10, 1999
Page 2

Oakland Music Hall. This session marked the second meeting of the Advisory Committee and provided an opportunity for the committee chairs to represent the views of their committees to other committee members. The Advisory Committee was invited to make changes and/or additions to the material presented. Their observations and comments are reported here.

Organizational Items:

- Project status was reported.

- Meeting dates were confirmed for the next three visits to campus:

  Wednesday, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
  Fetzer Center, Room 2020

  Dates are April 21 (Visit #4), May 26 (Visit #5), and July 28 (Visit #6)

Note that Visit #4 and Visit #6 are Major Review visits, and the consultants will be on campus for three days. The third day is added to provide an opportunity to meet with the media, the president, neighborhood associations, and campus and community in open sessions.

Attention was called to the e-mail address set up by SmithGroup JJR to receive comments. That address is:

  wmu_masterplan@aa.smithgroup.com

- Consultants discussed with the focus group chairs their responsibilities between meetings. It was suggested that they keep in touch with their committee members with regard to: notification of upcoming meetings, e-mails they should have received, and their opinions regarding materials presented at previous meetings. The importance of keeping committee members feeling connected between visits was noted.

- A Pre-visit package will arrive to the Office of Campus Planning via e-mail no later than five working days before the next visit. Items within this package will be distributed to committee members through the Office of Campus Planning. Committee members should be aware of this information and familiarize themselves with its contents prior to the next campus visit.
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**Issues:**
- No new items were raised with regard to the issue matrix.

**Regional Analysis:**
- It was suggested that when considering a major approach route to campus, Oakland Drive better represented the character of Kalamazoo than I-94 to Stadium Drive. Consideration should be given to this road as a major approach route. The discussions raised the following points:
  - I-94 is a good route for the first time visitor — it is short and direct to campus, and signage will be placed on I-94 that identifies the college.
  - Who are the users that would use this route? Students and staff will find their own way to campus, so this is for first/second time users.
  - If this is an image issue, then the first image visitors receive is important.
  - By putting more emphasis on Oakland Drive, the traffic load may increase, thus endangering or destroying what is loved about this route.
  - The intersection of Parkview and Oakland is very congested.
  - Most overnight visitors to campus must go to Stadium Drive/131 to find hotels, so this route cannot be avoided.
  - The Stadium Drive edge must be cleaned up to improve the image.

**Neighborhood Analysis:**
- Concern was expressed about the West Michigan/Howard Street entrance to campus. This is an opportunity for WMU to join with the City of Kalamazoo to improve the streetscape on West Michigan extending out past the campus along this major approach route. The City would welcome some design ideas that extend out into the neighborhood along West Michigan Avenue.
  - West Michigan Avenue forms a “wedge” with Stadium Drive. Discussion centered around changing the configuration of this piece by changing the road design or by acquiring the triangle of neighborhood on the north side of this street. If the university could acquire this portion, it could work to improve this part of campus. It was suggested that West Michigan Avenue on the east side of campus would not work as an entrance. The Gateways Proposal should be reviewed regarding entrances to campus and city.
  - A history of discussions between Kalamazoo College and WMU involved the purchase of Angel Field, and an old plan to connect Oliver to Burrows and connect into the Loop Road at Goldsworth Apartments.
Campus Analysis:

- Oakland Drive Campus was discussed with respect to its future development and the need to connect to West Campus. The following points were made:
  - The future of Oakland Drive Campus is uncertain, but the nature of the students in Health and Human Services will be more graduate level. In that sense, campus can remain separate from the core. However, the sophomores will still need to commute.
  - Oakland Drive Campus needs to address other student needs such as food service, an entrance to this campus from Oliver Street and the need for a new facility.
  - There is some concern over how much will be developed and how much will be preserved.
  - Right now the college is in 13 different locations on 3 campuses; thus, there is the desire for a facility (or facilities) to unite the college.
  - The need to share equipment within the college services and for patient parking and wayfinding makes Oakland Drive Campus the desired location.
  - Probably more than one building will be needed for classrooms, office, research, etc.

- Linkage across Stadium Drive was discussed with regard to pedestrian overpass:
  - Reasons not to build an overpass include: 1) they are not used enough given this climate and weather, 2) they are very expensive, 3) students will still need to drive to the new Engineering Campus and will still drive to Oakland Drive Campus, and 4) WMU is a driving culture.
  - It was observed that there is a need to provide options for the location of an overpass even if an overpass is not an option.
  - It might be better to use Oliver Street as a main spine and to use buses between campuses.

- The university is currently in pursuit of private funding for student housing. This will significantly change the density of campus and change plans for buildings.
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Our summarization of this meeting is transcribed as above. Please notify the writer within five (5) business days of this transcription of any disagreement as the foregoing becomes part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Respectfully submitted by:

SmithGroup JJR

[Signature]
Linda Lucchesi Cody
Project Manager
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Meeting Subject: Policy Committee Meeting

Location: Fetzer Center, Room 2030

Meeting Date/Time: Wednesday, March 10, 1999
7:30-9:30 p.m.

Issue Date: March 14, 1999

Participants:
Committee
Dick St. John, Trustee
Robert Beam, VP Business and Finance
Evie Asken, Director, Campus Planning
Paul Pancella, Assoc. Prof., Physics; Chair, West Campus Focus Group
Linda Powell, Asst. Prof., HPER; Chair, East Campus Focus Group
Janet Pisaneschi, Dean, College of H&HS; Chair, Oakland Drive Campus Focus Group
Trudy Verser, Assoc. Prof., Management; Chair, Campus Planning Council
Fred Sitkins, Chair, Engineering College Site Committee;
    Prof. Department of Industrial and Mechanical Engineering

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

Prepared By: Linda Cody

DISCUSSION

After a break for dinner, the Policy Committee convened. The purpose of this meeting was for the Policy Committee to begin to narrow and identify issues that should be the focus of the planning effort. To initiate this effort, the consultants identified nine issues to be considered for further discussion. Unanimous agreement on a specific issue placed it on the board for future discussion; it is identified here with a "Y" immediately following the number of the statement.
Any dissenting votes or requests for further discussion tabled the issue until they could be reconciled, or the issue thrown out or reworded (identified with a “D”). The issues chosen to begin this process were identified from the issues list and subsequent discussions with the focus groups during this visit. The following comments and observations were offered during this discussion.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Y – Acknowledge the Valley System as a mechanism to enhance the campus. Avoid terms such as “preserve” and “protect.”
2. Y – Stadium Drive is the primary visitor approach route.
3. Y – Respect the Oakland Drive Edge.
4. D – Three major visitor entrances to campus: Valley Drive and Howard, Oliver and Stadium, and Howard and Stadium
   • Entrances are important not just for visitors, but for those who come to campus every day.
   • How do we define “main” entrance and how many are there?
   • Entrances have different and specific functions. West Michigan Avenue at Howard has the highest volume of cars during a.m. peak hours and p.m. peak as well. It was suggested that this entrance is heavy because of the heavy parking distribution on this end of campus.
5. Y – The portion of West Campus defined by West Michigan Avenue and Stadium Drive (previously referred to as the “wedge” because it forms a triangular shape) must be reconfigured.
   • West Michigan Avenue/Stadium Drive entrance does not function well, yet this part of campus is viewed as a link to downtown Kalamazoo.
6. Y – Join WMU with Kalamazoo College to form an institutional zone.
7. Y – A campus town should be located contiguous to WMU.
   Keep the commercial on the east side and link it to downtown
   Commercial already exists on the west side and is growing.
   Campus commercial dies in the summer with the decreased student population.
   If these businesses couldn’t survive, they would be gone.
   The presence of commercial at campus alleviates the need to drive off campus for student needs.
8. Y – Plan for better parking distribution.
9. Clarify the Vehicular Circulation System:
   Y – Roads should not dead-end.
   Y – Loop Road system should be given the highest priority.
   Y – Michigan Avenue must change its character as it enters campus.
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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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