

The Evergreen State College

Campus Master Plan 1998

Goals and Policies for Land Use

Final Draft



The
Evergreen
State
College

The Evergreen State College

Campus Master Plan 1998

Goals and Policies for Land Use

Final Draft

Master Plan Steering Committee

Rino Balatbat, Richard Cellarius, Art Constantino,
John Cushing, Ruta Fanning, Lee Hoemann, Ken Jacob,
Nancy McKinney, Walter Niemiec, Tom Rainey,
Steve Trotter, Patti Zimmerman

Subcommittees

Land Use Subcommittee, Space Efficiency Study,
Physical Analysis Subcommittee (Modernization)

Editor

Joslyn Trivett

Design

Joslyn Trivett
Mary Geraci
Rip Heminway

Printing

The Evergreen State College Copy Center



The
Evergreen
State
College

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	7
Definition of Terms	9
Executive Summary	10
Recommendations	11
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	13
Statement of Purpose	13
History of the Campus Master Plan	13
1968: Master Plan Phase I	13
1969: Master Plan Phase II	15
Interim Documents	15
The 1983 Campus Master Plan	15
The 1998 Master Plan	16
Founding History of the College	17
The Educational Program at Evergreen	18
Chapter 2: Master Plan Context	20
Introduction	20
Authority of the Board of Trustees	20
Other Influences on Land Use Planning	20
Campus Population	21
Location and Environment	21
The Physical Environment	22
Macro-Climate	22
Micro-Climate	23
Geology	23
Soils	24
Topography	24
Drainage	24
Ecology	25
Introduction	25
Vegetation Zone: Western Hemlock	26
Campus Forest Habitat	27
East Campus Reserve	27
North Campus Reserve	28
West Campus Reserve	28
South Campus Reserve	28
Campus Meadow Habitat	29
Meadow North of Driftwood Road	29
Marshy Meadow along the Parkway	29
Campus Shoreline Habitat	29
Land Use in the Surrounding Area	30
Thurston County Population	30
History of Growth and Development Planning	30
Current Growth and Development	31
College Influence on Surrounding Land Use	31

Table of Contents

Chapter 3: The Master Plan	33
Introduction	33
Goals	35
Policies and Procedures	36
Major Land Areas of Campus	55
Introduction: The Clustering Concept	55
General Descriptions	56
The Core	56
The Clusters	56
The Organic Farm Cluster	57
The Geoduck House Cluster	57
The Maintenance Shops Cluster	58
The Reserve Areas	58
The Shoreline Reserve	58
The East Campus Reserve	58
The North Campus Reserve	58
The West Campus Reserve	58
The South Campus Reserve	59
Land Use: Developed Areas of Campus	60
Campus Buildings	60
Introduction: A Unity of Design	60
Spatial Arrangement	60
Relationship of Buildings	60
Plazas and Pedestrian Malls	61
Pathways	62
Architectural Design	62
Materials and Structure	62
Interior Space Arrangement	63
Ease of Modification and Flexibility of Spaces	64
Weather Protection	64
Operation and Maintenance Considerations	64
Open Spaces	65
Buffer Zones	65
Fields	65
Plazas and Outdoor Seating	65
Green Belts	65
Aesthetic Considerations	65
Design Outside of the Core	66
Clusters	66
Outlying Buildings	66
Building List	66
Utilities	70
Introduction	70
Natural Gas	70
Oil	70
Water	70
Sanitary Sewer	71
Refuse/Recycling Services	71
Storm Sewer	72
Electrical	72
Steam and Chilled Water	73

Table of Contents

Communications	73
Telephone System	73
Cable Television	73
Radio Communications Systems	73
Data, Video, and Audio Communications Systems	73
Circulation	74
Introduction	74
Internal Circulation	74
The Pedestrian Environment	74
Separation of Automobile and Pedestrian Traffic	75
Internal Bicycle Circulation	76
Hazards to Circulation	76
External Circulation to the Surrounding Community	77
Commute Trip Reduction	78
Automobile Parking	78
External Bicycle Circulation	79
Modernization	79
Introduction	79
The Concept of Modernization	80
Operational and Structural Standards	81
Examination of Facilities	82
Patterns of Use	82
Facilities Audit	82
Maintenance Practices	82
Modernization Strategies	82
Landscaping	83
Introduction	83
The Forest Fringe	83
Campus Core	84
Cluster Areas	85
Indoor Plantings	85
Artwork	85
Roadways and Parking Lots	86
Buffering	86
Chemical Use	86
Campus Services and Activities	86
Introduction	86
Community Services	87
On-campus Community Services	87
Commercial Services	87
On-campus Commercial Services	88
Off-campus Commercial Services	88
Campus Housing	88
Service Population	88
Provision of Services	89
Considerations for Future Housing	89
Safety	90
Fire Protection	90
Campus Police Services	90
Social Space and Entertainment	91
Recreation, Wellness, and Athletics	91

Table of Contents

Land Use: Undeveloped Areas of Campus	93
Introduction	93
A Note on Zoning	93
Types of Land Use	93
Academic use	93
Ecological Preserve	94
Recreation	94
College Community	94
Surrounding Community (Public Access)	95
Habitation	95
Management: Safety Considerations	96
Fire Protection	96
Snags	96
Management: Protection of Natural Resources	96
Impacts to the Undeveloped Lands	96
Resource and Land Use Inventory	97
Protective Maintenance	97
Trail System	97
Ecological Restoration	98
Regulations	98
Future Development	98
The Reserve Areas	99
Shoreline Reserve	99
Regulation of Shoreline Reserve	99
Future Uses of Shoreline Reserve	99
East Campus Reserve	100
Future Uses of East Campus Reserve	100
North Campus Reserve	101
Future Uses of North Campus Reserve	101
West Campus Reserve	101
Future Uses of West Campus Reserve	102
South Campus Reserve	102
Future Uses of South Campus Reserve	102
Chapter 4: The Process for Land Use Planning	105
Introduction	105
Principles of the Land Use Planning Process	105
Campus Community Participation	106
Land Use Planning at Evergreen	106
The Campus Land Use Committee	107
Introduction	107
Membership of the CLUC	107
Operations and Authority of the CLUC	108
Developing Proposals and Applications	108
Types of Land Use Proposals	109
The Content of Proposal Applications	109
Review of Proposals	110
Short-term, Low Disruptive Projects	110
Permanent Educational Facilities and Structures, and Disruptive Activities	111
Land Uses by Non-college Entities	111
The Master Plan Updating Process	111

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Buildings Descriptions	113
Appendix B: Student Demographic Statistics	117
Appendix C: Growth Plan	118
Appendix D: Planning and Governance Groups	120
Appendix E: Selected Climatological Data	122
Appendix F: Responses to the Campus Master Plan (May 1998 Draft)	123
Bibliographic Notes	131

Figure 1: Regional Location

Figure 2: Vicinity Map

Figure 3: Thurston County Zoning

Figure 4: Soils

Figure 5: Topography and Site Factors

Figure 6: Forest Typing

Figure 7: Major Campus Land Areas

Figure 8: Campus Core

Figure 9: Orientation Axes

Figure 10: Utilities

Figure 11: Ecological Preserves as proposed in 1983 Master Plan

Acknowledgments

The following individuals contributed to the writing of the 1998 Master Plan. Their time and expertise is much appreciated. Apologies to any contributors that are not mentioned here.

Chapter 1

Sherri Clarke: *Campus Population*
Steve Hunter: *Campus Population*
Linda Pickering: *Campus Population*

Chapter 2

Frederica Bowcutt: *Campus Forest Habitat*
Carolyn Cummins, Thurston County Planning: *Land Use in the Surrounding Area*
Lynn Dosheery, Thurston County Planning: *Land Use in the Surrounding Area*
Karuna Greenberg, student: *Campus Forest Habitat*
Arvid Hartley, student: *Campus Forest Habitat*
Fred Knostman, Thurston County Planning: *Land Use in the Surrounding Area*
Jill Lowe: *Campus Meadow Habitat*
Carrie Margolin: *Climate*
James Stroh: *Geology, Soils, Topography, Drainage, East Campus Reserve, Shoreline Habitat.*
Erik Thuesen: *Shoreline Habitat*
Gabe Tucker: *Campus Forest Habitat*

Chapter 3

Frederica Bowcutt: *Landscaping*
Barb Crossland: *Bicycle Parking*
Rich Davis: *Utilities, Use and Modernization*
Shannon Ellis: *Community Services*
Martha Henderson: *Campus Core*
Cliff Hepburn: *Landscaping, Operation and Maintenance Considerations, Maintenance Practices*
Bear Holmes: *Storm Sewer*
Michael Huntsberger: *Campus Radio Station*
Steve Huntsberry: *Habitation, Police Services*
Fred Knostman, Thurston County Planning: *Environmental Regulations*
Mark Lacina: *Use and Modernization*
George Leago: *Operation and Maintenance Considerations, Maintenance Practices*
Jill Lowe: *Circulation, Police Services*
Nancy McKinnery: *Ease of Modification, Commercial Services, Use and Modernization*
Tom Mercado: *Social Space and Entertainment*
Pat Moore: *Organic Farm*
Ralph Munro, McClane Forest Committee: *South Campus Reserve*
Linda Pickering: *Access Services*
Al Saari: *Communications*
Mike Segawa: *Housing, Services and Activities*
Kelly Smith: *Organic Farm, West Campus Reserve*
Clint Steele: *Operation and Maintenance Considerations, Maintenance Practices*
Pete Steilberg: *Recreation, Wellness and Athletics*
Sophie Stimson, City of Olympia: *Bicycle Circulation*
James Stroh: *Reserve Areas*
Erik Thuesen: *Shoreline, Environmental Regulations*
Joslyn Trivett, alumna: *Reserve Areas, Landscaping*
Steve Trotter: *Utilities, Use and Modernization*
Gabe Tucker: *Reserve Areas*

Laurel Uznanski: *Transportation Services*
Hal Van Gilder: *Storm Sewer*
Bob Worley: *Building List*
Patti Zimmermon: *Building List*
Chris Zimmerman, student: *East Campus Reserve*

Chapter 4

Russ Fox
Lee Lyttle
Nancy McKinney

Figures

Rip Heminway
Bob Worley

Appendices

Jeannie Chandler: *Planning and Governance Groups*
Lee Hoemann: *Planning and Governance Groups*
Steve Hunter: *Student Demographics*
Mike Segawa: *Building Descriptions*
Clint Steele: *Building Descriptions*
Patti Zimmerman: *Building Descriptions*

General Consulting

Academic Deans
Richard Cellarius
John Cushing
Kathy Dean
Carolyn Dobbs
Ruta Fanning
Russ Fox
Michel George
Mary Geraci
Tom Hill, City of Olympia
Lee Hoemann
Steve Huntsberry
Lee Lyttle
John McGee
Nancy McKinney
Craig McLaughlin
Mike Segawa
Mike Simmons
Rudy Sookbirsingh, student
Staff of the Office of Facilities
Pete Steilberg
James Stroh
Joslyn Trivett, alumna

Definition of Terms

Land Use	Consideration of the physical setting—the land itself, design and maintenance of buildings and other facilities, and the ways in which we use spaces—both developed and undeveloped, interior and exterior.
Goal	Desired outcome (page 35).
Policy	Specific directives founded on the goals (page 36).
Procedure	How to accomplish the policy (page 36).
Recommendation	Proposals for further investigation of unresolved issues (page 11).
Core	The central, “urban” area of campus where the main academic, administrative, residential, social, and recreational facilities are concentrated and where future expansion of the campus facilities would most likely occur. This area does include open space and forested sections (page 56).
Central Core	The area of campus most highly concentrated with buildings—Red Square and the major, multi-use buildings that surround it (page 56).
Cluster	A clusters of facilities in an area outlying the core that fulfills a specific function (page 56).
Reserve	Largely undeveloped area surrounding the Core and Clusters where natural ecosystems are the predominant feature. These areas were “reserved” for a wide range of possible future land uses, including continued nondevelopment (page 58).

Executive Summary

The Campus Master Plan contains the philosophical basis for land use planning at The Evergreen State College; it provides the foundation for the creation and maintenance of an ideal campus environment.

The current plan, last revised in 1983, has been a sound document. But the college is now 25 years old and is facing new issues about how we use our land and facilities. The issues of growth, both internal and external, the age of our facilities, and how we use our land have been major drivers in revising our Campus Master Plan.

The 1998 Master Plan is based on the vision developed during the earliest planning for the physical campus. The goals policies, and procedures of the Master Plan continue to provide guidelines for the best fit of maintenance and development into the existing campus environment. The document covers all elements of land use planning for both the developed and undeveloped campus and, in addition, addresses the planning process itself.

This draft is the result of a collaborative effort that has included staff, faculty, and students at the college, as well as outside entities. The acknowledgments (page 7) and the responses to the earlier draft of the Plan (Appendix F) demonstrate the wide range of input that went into developing this document.

Focus of the Revision Process

The 1998 Master Plan needs to provide a foundation for current and future planning efforts. Revitalizing Evergreen's Master Plan focused on the following tasks:

- Create a well-defined process for reviewing land use proposals—establish a mechanism to serve as the focal point for land use planners and as a major proponent of the Master Plan.
- Re-formatting the Master Plan in order to provide a more logical framework, to facilitate ease of reference, and to remove redundancy.
- Updating data within the plan to reflect the current conditions of Evergreen's campus.

Components of the Plan

The policies and procedures of the Master Plan, found at the beginning of Chapter 3 (page 36), are a primary point of interest. The overall layout of the document is as follows: Chapter 1 provides introduction; Chapter 2 addresses the context of the Master Plan, both the regulating elements and the physical setting; Chapter 3 is the heart of the Master Plan with the policies and procedures applied to all land use activities on campus; and Chapter 4 discusses the planning process itself and presents the workings of the Campus Land Use Committee.

The 1998 Master Plan, like the 1983 version, does not provide site-specific recommendations. It addresses the goals and policies for campus planning. It is intended to be a catalyst and guiding document for other more specific planning studies, such as the *10-Year Capital Plan* and the *Space Efficiency Study*.

Revision of the Master Plan has brought to light the need for further study on several issues. The following recommendations address these issues.

Recommendations

Planning Process

- The Campus Land Use Committee should be formed as a standing, major planning group as a mechanism to support land use planning and provide focus and structure to evaluating land use proposals. Committee recommendations on land use would ultimately be made to the college President and the Board of Trustees for final evaluation. The CLUC is intended replace the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC). The activities of the CLUC would encompass those of the former EAC and broaden its functions to include oversight of all land use issues.

Land Use Zoning

- A Disappearing Task Force should be charged with a full examination of creating land use zones on Evergreen's campus, particularly within the Reserve areas. Land use issues to consider as components of the examination include: academic (ecological) research, recreation, public access, Evergreen's trail network, Ecological Preserves, protection of natural resources, management for safety, and areas for future development.

Modernization

- The Office of Facilities is charged with forming an Advisory Committee to determine operational and structural standards for the college's facilities and infrastructure. Attributes to consider include: space requirements of students, faculty and staff; energy efficiency; cosmetic appearance; flexibility of interior arrangement; patterns of use; ease of maintenance, seismic standards; and safety and security needs. The Advisory Committee should include representatives of maintenance staff, faculty, students, and administrative staff.

Landscaping

- Develop and adopt a Landscaping Plan as a companion piece to the Master Plan. Issues to address include: removal of invasive, exotic species from landscaped areas and increased reliance on native species and species that are valuable academically.

Aesthetics

- The CLUC should develop a process for creating an aesthetic vision for the campus. This should include expanding the discussion of aesthetics within the Master Plan.

Innovative Facilities and Utilities Systems

- Members of the CLUC, the Office of Facilities, and other planners for the college should consider comments from the campus community suggesting that the college has been too conservative in its choice of building materials, design, and utilities systems. Planning efforts should give increased consideration to becoming a leader in this field.

Parking

- The senior staff should explore the need for another parking DTF (following the results of the traffic study). Comments from the campus community raised varied questions on whether or not parking spaces should be added and, if so, what form the expansion should take.

Statement of Purpose

The primary purpose of the Master Plan is to provide a comprehensive and clearly stated document of the direction for facilities and land use planning at The Evergreen State College. The document provides a foundation for the creation and maintenance of an ideal campus environment, which can only be achieved through the continued efforts of the people who make up the campus community. Thus, it addresses both the product and process of campus planning.

This plan does not offer a blueprint depicting exactly what will be needed and where development on campus will take place. Instead, Evergreen's Master Plan focuses on the philosophy intended to guide land use decision-making. The policies and procedures contained within this plan (page 36) reflect a careful review of past and present land use policies and practices as well as consideration of prospective land uses. The policies are flexible enough to allow for future revisions of the more specific procedures without necessitating a total reassessment of the basic ideas each time new issues arise.

The policy and procedures for the land use planning process aim toward integrating community participation with administrative practices in campus land use and facilities planning. It has always been a priority at Evergreen to encourage and include community input in the planning process. Yet coordination and oversight of this interchange has been lacking and the responsiveness of planning process has suffered as a result. Formation of the Campus Land Use Committee, as proposed in the 1998 Master Plan, is intended to provide focus to the planning process. It is conceived as a mechanism for collaboration of all segments of the campus population in shaping land use for the college.

History of the Campus Master Plan

1968: Master Plan Phase I

After land acquisition for the college began in 1968, Durham, Anderson, and Freed Architects and Quinton-Budlong Engineers were hired to prepare the *Master Plan Phase I*. The document included extensive background information on site factors and preliminary architectural, engineering, and site plan concepts. It also established twenty-two "principle planning conclusions" which have been maintained in every version of the Master Plan and continue to be viable in the present day. From the 1968 Plan:

The proposed Master Plan reflects the accumulated conclusions of the planning-architectural team, and their consultants in the fields of ecology, biology, oceanology, soils, geology, and traffic research. The site influences brought into focus by the work of these people are combined with and modified by the findings of the Arthur D. Little Company, the educational consultants. The evolved Master Plan is based upon the following principal planning conclusions:

1. The recognition of outstanding land forms and environmental qualities of the site;
2. The creation of an approach corridor/prime thoroughfare/limited access roadway from the U.S. 101 freeway;
3. The necessity for two major entrances, one from the west Olympia-Cooper Point area and the other from the U.S. 101 freeway;
4. The recognition of a need to preserve certain areas of prime growth or other

- superior or unique natural environmental qualities as ecological laboratory and classroom areas;
5. The need to recognize the added benefits and capabilities afforded the site by the water frontage;
 6. The recognition of certain areas of potential foundation instability on the site and the need for additional detailed investigation;
 7. The desire that structures should not dominate the site with relation to the human element and site qualities;
 8. The desire to create an academic campus in which the integral units are capable of both individual function and relatively convenient interaction;
 9. The desire to create a campus in which student participation is made a part of the fabric of the campus structure and program, rather than separating it and, perhaps, alienating such feeling;
 10. The desire to create a campus whereby a student/community interaction core area is created, thus heightening possible involvement of the student and off-campus community while intensifying possible community participation and interest in support of the college program;
 11. The necessity to recognize the essential service of the automobile on the Evergreen State College campus, and the necessity to recognize the potential hazard created for the campus by the automobile in the domination of land use and daily campus life;
 12. The necessity to separate automobile and pedestrian traffic areas while still recognizing the need for internal service, vehicular traffic security, and minimization of through traffic;
 13. The necessity to recognize the effects upon campus plan and structure of a sizable evening program for non-resident students who will commute, oftentimes after dark;
 14. The necessity to recognize certain legal or physical limitations and obligations created by the off-site utility service conditions and connections;
 15. The necessity to plan and construct community utility systems in coordination with Thurston County and the City of Olympia;
 16. The desire to limit site grading to that required for buildings, utilities, roads, parking, and playfield areas;
 17. The need to hold important the view potential to the Olympic Mountain Range, Mount Rainier, and Puget Sound;
 18. The necessity to establish and maintain zoning restrictions outside the campus to assure compatible community growth;
 19. The need to provide buffer protection in the planning program on the campus perimeter;
 20. The need to preserve the ecological and biological qualities of the campus;
 21. The need to develop architectural concepts compatible with site characteristics, utilizing low maintenance cost materials, uniquely “Northwest” in character;
 22. The desire to present an exciting, imaginative, functional, and flexible development plan (page 2).

These conclusions, along with standards for space and function developed by the educational consultants, shaped the early planning efforts.

1969: Master Plan Phase II

A revised Master Plan was prepared a year later by the same architectural and engineering firms in response to critique of the original document. They changed the planned layout for the campus based on input from the new college staff regarding the needs of Evergreen's developing educational philosophy. Recommendations from outside planning consultants were also incorporated. However, the original "principle planning conclusions" of the Phase I Master Plan continued to be valid and were maintained.

The most dramatic change in Phase II of the Master Plan is the location and arrangement of the campus core: it is shifted to the geographical center of the site and the buildings are more tightly clustered to allow for more interaction among the campus population in a pedestrian-oriented campus. Other recommendations within Phase II include the location of the campus parkway and architectural design concepts such as the choice of concrete as the dominant material for all academic buildings. The layout and design of the existing campus reflects the recommendations of the Phase II document.

Interim Documents

The progress of campus development was reviewed and evaluated in the *1972 Report of the Master Planning Team*; the Master Planning Team included consultants from three architectural and engineering firms (including the two mentioned above) and representatives of the Evergreen community. They concluded that the basic premises within the Master Plan had been achieved and focused on selected issues which had become increasingly important during Evergreen's formative years.

Detailed attention was given to development of the Art/Drama/Music area, housing areas, science addition, preservation of environmental features on campus, and maintaining the pedestrian nature of the campus Core. The report made no significant departures from any of the original "principle planning conclusions" and gave particular attention to points 6, 7, 8, 12, 16 and 20 listed above. An overall recommendation was that a team such as themselves "become a permanent tool for effective control of the long-range plan." (Durham et al., 1972, page 1).

In 1975, a Disappearing Task Force produced the *Environmental and Facilities Planning DTF Report* recommending the creation of a new Campus Master Plan by a team of students, staff, and faculty. This recommendation was based on conclusions that the existing Master Plan did not address the campus and educational program as it had developed since the college opened and that Evergreen student and the campus community at large could and should be directly involved in planning and maintaining the campus environment (EFPIT, 1975, page 1).

1983 Campus Master Plan

The 1983 Master Plan was the result of efforts by several groups within the college. An academic program prepared the first draft. This was refined by two of students from that program, hired as assistants to the Vice President for Business. The Campus Planner and the Environmental Advisory Committee completed the final review.

Again, the principle planning conclusions of the earlier versions of the Plan were maintained. Some of these points were relatively de-emphasized since the principles addressed plans already complete; for example, creating two major entrances to the college was already a reality. Other conclusions were emphasized and goals, objectives, and policies based on these points were presented. The overall focus of the document shifted from planning for specific site devel-

opment to planning for on-going management of existing facilities, campus services and campus lands. The Master Plan became mainly a philosophical document with policies as the foundation.

1998 Master Plan

Eleven years after the acceptance of the 1983 Master Plan, the 1994 *Long-Range Plan* identified the need to update and publicize the Plan (page 13). The process began in 1996 and the Master Plan Steering Committee—made up of Evergreen faculty and staff—met for the first time in early 1997 to complete the pre-planning phase. The next step was given to three sub-committees: the Land Use Sub-committee, the Physical Analysis Sub-committee, and the Space Efficiency Study. Within the sub-committees, various sections of the Plan were discussed and revisions of certain sections of the plan were assigned to individuals or small groups. Discussions of the Master Plan also occurred at Board of Trustee meetings and a faculty retreat.

In order to facilitate the revision process, an Evergreen alumna was hired to work exclusively on the Master Plan in March 1998. She consulted with many faculty, staff and students while developing the first draft of the revised Plan. This draft was completed in May 1998 and outreach to the Evergreen community on the draft prompted a substantial amount of feedback. Revision based on the feedback was incorporated over the summer of 1998.

Extensive updating and re-organizing was needed to reflect the changes over fifteen years. The Campus Master Plan Steering Committee reviewed the goals and principles of the 1983 document and agreed that “...goals and principles, which were formulated in the original Master Plan, remain viable today.” (Memo from Ruta Fanning, 1997). However, certain components of the plan required extensive updating and expansion. Five themes were identified as needing special attention in the 1998 Master Plan:

- growth and change (within and external to the college)
- external relations
- infrastructure issues
- fiscal constraints
- preservation of land

As the updating effort progressed, it became clear that adequate examination of these topics could not be expected within a reasonable timeline; extensive investigation and community input will be needed to obtain satisfactory conclusions. Therefore, writing of the 1998 Master Plan focused on providing a foundation from which future planning efforts could draw. It is intended as a catalyst for examination of planning issues such as those listed above. In order to achieve these effects, revitalizing Evergreen’s Master Plan focused on the following tasks:

- Create a well-defined process for reviewing land use proposals—establish a mechanism to serve as the focal point for land use planners and as a major proponent of the Master Plan (see Chapter 4).
- Re-format the Master Plan in order to provide a more logical framework to facilitate ease of reference and remove redundancy.
- Update descriptions of the campus environment and activities to reflect the current conditions.

The 1998 *Campus Master Plan*, like the 1983 version, does not provide site-specific recommendations. It addresses the guiding philosophies and the policies for campus planning.

Founding History of the College

In 1966, then-Governor Daniel J. Evans charged the Temporary Advisory Council on Public Higher Education (TACPHE) with determining the need for additional college facilities in the State of Washington. The Council concluded that 17,900 additional students would need placement within undergraduate and graduate level programs in Washington State by 1975.

The development of a new four-year state college in Thurston County was authorized by House Bill No. 596, Chapter 47, Laws of 1967, State of Washington. The Act passed the Legislature on March 8, 1967, and Governor Evans signed the Bill on March 21, 1967. Subsequently, a Board of Trustees was formed and a name, "The Evergreen State College", was selected.

Late in 1967, the State of Washington contracted with the Stanford Research Institute, Inc., to select and evaluate sites and report to the Board of Trustees and the State. Whitacre Engineers, Inc., supported SRI in the investigation of twenty-one sites. Their studies included establishment of general site selection guidelines; identification, collection, organization, and evaluation of data pertaining to sites offered; interviews with persons responsible for decisions concerning sites selected elsewhere, and with college and university administrations; defining specific evaluation criteria; and ranking sites in terms of criteria. Their studies considered site configuration, landforms, utility services, development influences, and acquisition costs. The Cooper Point site emerged from the selection process as clearly the outstanding choice. The Institute's report stated:

The Cooper Point Peninsula site includes approximately 1,000 acres of land with about 3,000 feet of water frontage on Eld Inlet of Puget Sound. While the site is divided into numerous parcels, relatively few homes will be disturbed because the site is largely undeveloped acreage. The site satisfied all limiting criteria. It is easily within the ten-mile radius of Olympia City limits. Assurances that the site can be purchased within the budget are based on prices paid in recent sales in the area. The topography and soil conditions, both subsoil and topsoil, are such that at least 600 acres would be available in one contiguous parcel for economical construction of the physical plant. There are no known extreme nuisance factors or hazards in the area. Because of its close proximity to the City of Olympia water and sewage services can be provided to the college by the City at a reasonable cost.

The area is served by a grid of country roads and is approximately two miles from the Grays Harbor-Shelton limited access highway, and within five miles of the State Capitol.

The site is endowed with natural beauty, having a sweeping view of Puget Sound, the Olympics, the Black Hills, Mount Rainier, and the Cascade Range. The topography is gently rolling and the terrain should not create unusual construction problems. The highest elevation in the area is 243 feet gradually sloping to Eld Inlet. The view of Puget Sound and the potential opportunity to develop water-front recreational activities add greatly to the attractiveness of the site (page?).

The Board of Trustees of the college received the Stanford Research Institute report on December 1, 1967, and the enclosed site was publicly identified. Land acquisition was begun in April, 1968. Facilities planning commenced based on a target enrollment of 12,000 students. In the development of Evergreen's educational philosophy, the founders strived to be innovative and flexible. They initiated an alternative form of education, which offered a pragmatic learning

experience with close student-to-faculty interaction, and an interdisciplinary curriculum. The institution was to be “...dedicated to meeting the present and future needs of the society it serves.” (McCann 1970).

The Educational Program at Evergreen

The Evergreen State College was purposely designed to be an institution focused on undergraduate education and on collaborative interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Now twenty-seven years old, the central institutional values and practices remain largely intact. Hallmarks of the college are interdisciplinary studies, personal engagement in learning, linking theoretical perspectives into practice, collaborative/cooperative work and teaching across significant differences. To support these, Evergreen’s goal is to have modern facilities, high quality equipment, and a large and diverse campus land area used for a variety of academic purposes.

The Evergreen Mission Statement: “Making Learning Happen”

The Evergreen State College is a public, liberal arts college serving Washington State. Its mission is to help students realize their potential through innovative, interdisciplinary educational programs in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. In addition to preparing students within their academic fields, Evergreen provides graduates with the fundamental skills to communicate, to solve problems, and to work collaboratively and independently in addressing real issues and problems. This mission is based on a set of principles that underlie the development of all college programs and services.

Principles that guide Evergreen’s educational programs:

- Teaching is the central work of the faculty at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Supporting student learning engages everyone at Evergreen—faculty and staff.
- Academic offerings are interdisciplinary and collaborative, a structure that accurately reflects how people learn and work in their occupations and personal lives.
- Students are taught to be aware of what they know, how they learn, and how to apply what they know; this allows them to be responsible for their own education, both at college and throughout their lives.
- College offerings require active participation in learning, rather than passive reception of information, and integrate theory with practical applications.
- Evergreen supports community-based learning, with research and applications focused on issues and problems found within student’ communities. This principle, as well as the desire to serve diverse placebound populations, guides Evergreen’s community-based programs at Tacoma and Tribal Reservations.
- Because learning is enhanced when topics are examined from the perspectives of diverse groups and because such differences reflect the world around us, the college strives to create a rich mix in the composition of its student body, staff and faculty, and to give serious consideration to issues of social class, age, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

- Faculty and staff continually review, assess and modify programs and services to fit changing needs of students and society.

As evidences by these principles, an important part of Evergreen's educational mission is engagement with the community, the state, and the nation. One focus of this engagement is through the work of public service centers that both disseminate the best work of the college and bring back to the college the best ideas of the wider community. (As last revised 4/9/97.)

Introduction

This chapter presents the parameters within which land use and facilities planning must operate. The authority of the Board of Trustees is the first consideration. Other entities, both internal and external, that regulate campus planning are also recognized, followed by a discussion of the campus population. Location and physical environment of the campus are described to set the physical context for the Master Plan. Finally, an overview of land use trends in the surrounding area is provided.

Authority of the Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees is given the legal authority to acquire and manage property for the college. The various boards of trustees of the regional universities and The Evergreen State College have the power and authority to acquire by exchange, gift, purchase, lease, or condemnation such lands as they deem necessary for the institution (RCW 28B.10.020). Trustees of The Evergreen State College have, in addition, the express statutory authority to exercise full control of the College and its property of various kinds (RCW 28B.40.120).

The Board of Trustees also has the authority to delegate its powers and duties under RCW 28B.10.528. Evergreen's Board of Trustees has reviewed the legally mandated functions of the board and assessed which areas of this policy-making function are of the long-term strategic nature. As part of this review, the board has reserved the authority to approve all elements of the college *Campus Master Plan* and *10-Year Capital Plan*, modifications to the *10-Year Capital Plan* that vary by more than 5% for each individual program project or preservation category, biennial capital budget requests, and capital spending plans regardless of fund source.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President the authority to exercise in the name of the Board all of the powers and duties which are required for the effective management of the institution and which do not set major policy or strategic direction or which are expressly reserved by the board. The President may designate other college employees to exercise specific powers and duties delegated to the President.

The President has delegated the primary administrative responsibility for campus planning to the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Other Influences on Land Use Planning

Internal and external regulations and policies influence land use planning. Internally, the *Campus Master Plan* guides the development of technical documents such as the *10-Year Capital Plan*, the *Space Efficiency Study*, and, in the future, a *Facilities Renewal and Adaptation Plan* and *Landscaping Plan*. These internal documents serve as companion pieces to the Master Plan and depict the complete picture of how the college develops and maintains the existing campus environment.

Policies of the Master Plan influence the development of college policies in other areas, such as *Space Management and Facilities*. The policies from the Master Plan will be included in the college's *Policy and Procedure Manual*.

Externally, the college is part of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan required by the Growth Management laws in Washington State. The college must comply with Thurston County Zoning Ordinances and Shoreline Master Plan (see pages 98 and 99). Additionally, the City of Olympia provides water and sewer services to the college. The planning, initiation and carrying out of projects on campus require college personnel to work closely with all county and city permitting and approval processes. The Campus Land Use Committee (CLUC) will provide guidance for compliance with the external regulators appropriate to a land use proposal.

Campus Population

The Evergreen State College opened its doors in the fall of 1971 as a four-year undergraduate institution, with an enrollment of 1,177 students. Original projections were for 12,000 students by the mid-80's. While student enrollment grew in the following years, it was far from this anticipated rate—changes in economic, social, and educational trends resulted in more gradual growth (Chance and Curry 1979, pages 39-42). By the academic year of 1974 student enrollment was 2,446, and it was obvious that the original projections were no longer accurate. Since that time, enrollment levels have generally increased, with minor recessions in the late 70's and early 80's. Since 1983, the student population has grown steadily with an all-time high of 4,084 full and part-time students in the fall of 1997; full-time student enrollment was 3,963 (see Appendix B).

The Board of Trustees is responsible for adopting the college's strategic plan, which includes levels of enrollment. In 1994 the Board of Trustees adopted the *Long-Range Plan* which estimated enrollment of 4,000 to 5,000 full-time students by the year 2010. In response to the state's demographic changes and the increased demand for access to higher education, Evergreen fine-tuned its enrollment plan in 1996. The Enrollment Coordinating Committee, the Academic Deans, and Vice Presidents worked together to create the *Revised Growth Plan* for the 1997-98 academic year. This plan, reviewed by the Board of Trustees, presented updated projections for enrollment of approximately 5,000 students by 2010 (see Appendix C).

Graduate studies were an important addition to the college curriculum in the fall of 1980. The college currently offers a master's degree in Public Administration, Environmental Studies and a Masters in Teaching enrolling approximately 300 students in total. Additional modes of study include upper-division programs at Evergreen's Tacoma campus, enrolling over one hundred students, and a small number of students enrolled in the college's tribal-based programs.

Currently, 52 percent of the students at Evergreen are between 17 and 22 years old, with 77 percent younger than 30 years old. Approximately 16 percent are non-white, and 58 percent are women (see Appendix B). Out of the 3,477 students attending the college in the fall quarter of 1993, 1,690 received financial aid.

In addition to serving 3460 full-time and 624 part-time students, the college is the workplace for 156 administrative and 283 classified staff. The faculty is comprised of 149 regular, 33 visiting, 90 adjunct and 13 re-employed faculty. For the 1997-98 academic year, there were 211 students with disabilities being served by the Access Services office. A total of 28 faculty and staff members self-identify as having various handicaps or disabilities.

Location and Environment

The Evergreen State College is a four-year post-secondary education institution in Thurston

County, Washington. The college is located on the Cooper Point Peninsula in the most southerly portion of the Puget Sound Basin, three miles northwest of Olympia, the state capitol of Washington. Other urban centers in close proximity are Seattle (66 miles to the north), Tacoma (29 miles to the northeast), and Portland (123 miles to the south). Vehicles may gain access to the college on U.S. Highway 101 via the Evergreen Parkway and a network of Thurston County roads (see Figures 1 and 2).

The rural setting of the campus on the Cooper Point Peninsula affords scenic views of the Black Hills, the Olympic Mountain Range, Mount Rainier, the Cascade Mountain Range, and Puget Sound. The campus consists of approximately 1008 acres of land, the largest land area of any post-secondary institution in Washington State. The campus is fortunate to possess 3300 feet of waterfront on Eld Inlet of the Puget Sound.

Most of the academic and social activities on campus occur in the campus Core area where academic buildings, administrative offices and student residences are concentrated. Only one Cluster of academic facilities, the Organic Farm, is removed from the campus Core. Over 700 acres of the campus property is undeveloped forest, meadow and shoreline and it is used for a variety of academic as well as recreational purposes. A key asset of the Evergreen campus environment is the presence of open space, in both the developed and undeveloped areas of campus, providing a pleasant atmosphere for study and work.

The Physical Environment

Various physical factors have and continue to affect planning in the campus environment. Among the many factors considered in the original planning phases of the college were climate, geology, topography, drainage, vegetation, shoreline, existing utilities and roads, prevailing winds, and view potential. Another important site factor is ecology which represents the interface between many of the previously listed site factors; an understanding of basic ecological parameters is of great importance in planning, development, and educational programs at Evergreen.

This section provides baseline information on elements of the physical environment including the climate, geology, topography, drainage, and ecology of the campus land area.

Macro-Climate

The climate at The Evergreen State College site is, in general, the same as that to be found throughout the immediate shoreline areas of Puget Sound. In all cases, the Pacific Ocean serves to modify and equalize temperatures. Additionally, the immediate presence of the water increases the incidence of fog and may increase the chances of heavy localized precipitation in areas close to the shoreline.

Precipitation in the area averages approximately 51 inches per year (Appendix E). Most of this falls as rain and is spread over a large number of days; nearly half the days of year report measurable precipitation (Thurston County Profile, 1997, page I-6). The highest number of rainy days occur during the fall, winter and early spring months, with extremely limited precipitation during July and August. Cloud cover in some form is present in 86% of the days of the year (Thurston County Profile, 1997, page I-6), again with the clear, fair-weather days in the summer months: about two-thirds of the days are sunny in July, August and September, and about half the days are sunny in May and June.

Snowfall averages approximately 20 inches, with January recording the heaviest accumulation. Maximum snowfall on record for a 24-hour period totaled 20.5 inches, and occurred in January

of 1972. The average frost-free growing season is 166 days (The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1996).

The maximum average temperatures throughout the year range from 44°F in January to 77°F in July. Minimum average temperatures range from 31°F in January to 49°F in July. Annual averages are 39°F minimum and 60°F maximum, indicating the tempering effects of the large body of water nearby. Since these readings are taken at the Municipal Airport, it is probable that campus site would be even more temperate because it is closer to the water. See Appendix E for monthly temperature statistics. For Olympia, there are an average of 88 days of heavy fog in a year, relative humidity at 10:00 am varies from 65-90%, and an average of 5.3 thunderstorms occur annually (NOAA, 1996).

Southerly winds prevail during most of the year. Olympia is shielded from the strong south and southwest winds of Pacific storms by the Coastal Range; winds can gust up to 55 mph, but the average is less than 8 mph, even for the winter months. Fall and winter storms generally result in some downed and broken utility lines, but buildings are rarely damaged. Summertime, fair weather winds are gentle and most often originate from the north or east.

Micro-Climate

Evergreen's site is undoubtedly affected by the presence of the Black Hills to the south. This landmass may quite effectively divert or channel portions of the airflow from the south. On occasion, the shape of the Black Hills may actually "funnel" southerly winds of unexpectedly high velocity into the campus area. This indicates a strong possibility that the northwesterly and northeasterly airflow off the water, coupled with these occasional high velocity gusts, may be the dominant factors in wind or storm activities at the site.

Undoubtedly, the most exposed area on the site is the bluff face above Eld Inlet (see Figure 5). Winds and storm conditions of occasional violence have occurred, arising on the waters of Puget Sound and causing some damage to the slopes exposed to the Sound. Airflow on campus generally gravitates toward the ravines, with cooler moist air following these channels. Such air is additionally cooled by the presence of moisture and heavy foliage in the ravines. Exposed westerly sloping hillsides, which have little foliage, will receive and radiate greater local heat conditions during hot weather. Thus, they may be drastically affected in their growth regeneration by periods of hot dry weather. Planning efforts should consider preserving vegetation on steeper slopes (see Figure 5).

Localized humidity within the site is likely to be increased by the degree and nature of forest cover (the more dense the cover, the greater the humidity). In general it is known that lower, more moist areas encourage the continued presence of fog and areas subject to the sweep of wind and exposure to bright sunlight clear more rapidly. Fog pockets have not been noted for any particular locations on campus.

Geology

The Puget Sound Basin and surrounding land areas were shaped during the Ice Age. Four major glacial advances occurred during this period, each one moving vast quantities of rock and sand. Each advance was followed by a retreat and non-glacial interval during which the landscape looked much like the present Puget Lowland, but without Puget Sound.

The Vashon Glaciation, the most recent of the four advances, moved south from Canada less than 28,000 years ago. This glaciation is most directly responsible for the formation of the

present landscape. Before retreating about 15,000 years ago, the glacier extended to about twenty miles (thirty-two kilometers) south of Olympia (McKee, 1972, page 294). Deposits from this glaciation form the surface and near-surface material for this area

The retreat of the Vashon Glaciation left complex drainage patterns on the land; meltwaters from the ice covering the Puget lowlands shifted pathways and left a large lake in the southern Puget Sound area. After the ice retreated, the northern Puget lowlands experienced a period of marine submergence. Water drowned adjacent valleys and formed high marine shorelines. Gradually the land, including the area near the college, uplifted to its present elevation while sea level also was rising to its current level.

Soils

The soils of the Cooper Point peninsula are derived from various glacial and post-glacial materials. Each soil type developed from a particular combination of underlying deposits and their interaction with biological processes and water. Four principal soil types are found on the Evergreen campus. Alderwood Gravelly Loam, at 3-15 percent slope, is the most prominent, comprising about 55 percent of the campus land. Other soil types include Kapowsin Gravelly Loam, at 0-15 percent slope; Chehalis Silty Clay loam, at 0-2 percent; and Giles Fine Sandy Loam, at 0-15 percent slope (Soil Conservation Service 1947, 1972, 1990; Cooper Point Association 1972). Soil distributions are shown in Figure 4, and detailed soil engineering reports are available from the Office of Facilities at the college.

Topography

The topography of the campus is characterized by gradual slopes with some small rolling hills and lower elevation, very low relief “terrace” areas. Most of the campus is fairly level with slopes of 10 percent or less (Durham et al. 1968, page 18). The steep-sided drainage ravines and waterfront bluffs on the northern part of the campus are notable exceptions to the otherwise gentle terrain. Table 1 shows campus areas classified by slope. Figure 5 shows the general topography of the campus.

The highest point on campus (“Mt. Evergreen”) is a knoll rising 243 feet (74 meters) above sea level located a few hundred feet west of the campus plaza.

Table 1: Slope Analysis of the Evergreen State College campus (Durham et al. 1968, page 18)

Slope Range (%)	Acres	Percent of Total
0-8	725	76.8 %
8-15	101	10.6
16- 24	40	4.3
25 and over	77	8.3
Total	943	100.0

Drainage

Most of the campus’ forested land area is well drained through a combination of downward percolation and surface run-off. Major drainage channels carry excess run-off with intermittent or perennial streams. Other drainage ways simply act as seepage areas.

The developed and disturbed portions of the campus account for over 20% of the total land area and constitute an important part of campus hydrology. Unlike the forested portions of campus, the developed and disturbed surfaces allow little to no water infiltration and therefore surface runoff is high. The college's drainage system quickly moves this runoff out of the campus Core as described in *Storm Sewer*, page 72.

Poorly drained areas of the undeveloped campus have surface water present through all or most of the wet months (November through April). A small swampy area between the dormitories and Hidden Springs Drive (the service road leading to the College Activities Building) is all that remains of a much larger swampy area that was drained in the initial campus Core construction. A peat area just east of the original alignment of Overhulse road was removed during construction of the recreation fields.

Larger areas of poor drainage outside the campus Core include an red alder woodland with some forested wetland characteristics south of the Core and a flat area in the eastern area of the campus along the Evergreen Parkway which forms a marshy meadow. In this last area, a drainage ditch and culvert installed by the college allows drainage to the northward-flowing watercourse just east of the easternmost campus boundary. New wetlands have formed, apparently resulting from beaver activity, abutting campus property near the pump station on Overhulse Road and in the land between Overhulse and Kaiser Roads. During very heavy rainfall, flooding of the Parkway occurs, but the event is rare enough that it probably is not a major concern.

Before construction of the college, almost the entire Evergreen campus was underlain by two saturated zones (referred to as aquifers in the engineering reports, Shannon and Wilson 196x). The evidence came from over a hundred boreholes places as part of the general campus foundation study (Shannon and Wilson 196x). A near-surface to surface (probably seasonal over part of the campus) saturated zone perched over very low permeability glacial drift or lake sediment. Below this lay an unsaturated zone, then a lower saturated zone. Under the buildings of the campus Core the upper perched "aquifer" was drained into the lower to avoid having to pump water from the foundation areas. Under the unbuilt part of the campus the upper perched saturated zones still exists. The lower saturated zone probably helps supply water to the local aquifers used for residential water.

For planning purposes the college should try to limit runoff on campus by minimizing hardened surfaces and maximizing undisturbed forest. Promoting infiltration can be achieved in the same manner: by maximizing undisturbed forest. As the development of hardened surfaces increases around the college, Evergreen's role in providing infiltration areas will become more critical.

No current studies have determined the impact of the college on surface or ground-water quality. The college is the major source of automobile and fertilizer use in the local area; it is reasonable to assume that these activities result in some impact to water quality.

Ecology

Introduction

The Evergreen State College possesses a large amount of acreage in a relatively natural condition, meaning that biological and ecological processes are the predominant forces that shape the character of these areas. Assessment of the ecological features of this land is of great importance in planning. Only through knowledge of the natural processes occurring can the land and resources be utilized in a responsible manner. This section deals with ecology as a natural science. Human relationships to the campus environment are addressed throughout Chapter 3: *The Mas-*

ter Plan.

The trustees and administration of The Evergreen State College have shown an enduring dedication to the preservation of the ecological and biological qualities of the campus. This commitment gives Evergreen its unique and appealing atmosphere providing great opportunities for scientific study of a variety of different ecosystems and recreational activities unavailable at other colleges.

The following discussion of ecological features of the campus is included for three purposes:

1. To provide a basis of understanding and necessary background for making planning policy decisions.
2. To make available valuable information to a widespread audience.
3. To use in a systematic zoning of the campus for various uses, and for selection of areas to be preserved as sanctuaries, scientific study sites, and outdoor laboratories (Ecological Preserves).

Three types of vegetation habitats characterize the land area of the campus: forest (includes riparian woodland), meadow, and shoreline. The remainder of this section will first discuss the general vegetation zone prevalent in western Washington, based on information found in Franklin and Dyrness, 1973, pages 70-92. Descriptions of the forest, meadow and shoreline habitats on campus, and the animals that live there, complete the section on ecology of the campus environment. **Additional contributions from faculty and students are needed to provide more comprehensive and up-to-date descriptions of flora and fauna on campus. Compilation of the Resource and Land Use Inventory, as proposed on page 97, should facilitate this effort.**

Vegetation Zone: Western Hemlock

Most of the campus lands are composed of forests and meadows typical of the Western Hemlock Zone—the most extensive vegetation zone in western Washington and Oregon. Most of the college land has been logged during the past century and thus is in varying stages of secondary plant succession. Currently the overstory of the college's forested lands is characterized by a mix of Douglas-fir, red alder, big-leaf maple, and Pacific madrone. Western hemlock and western red cedar are also present and would theoretically become the dominant species in the absence of any major disturbances over several hundred years.

When existing vegetation within this zone is disturbed by activities such as clear cutting or construction, the successional stages of re-establishment begin quickly. Herbaceous and shrub species are the first to volunteer in a barren site. These pioneer species are responding to increased light on the ground due to a lack of forest canopy. Various kinds of pioneers may characterize these early stages of succession, dependent on soil, moisture, disturbance, and burn conditions, but generally some nonnative weeds can be expected to invade.

By the fifth growing season after a slash burn, shrub species begin to gain dominance over the herbaceous species. The shrub-dominant phase is followed by development of an intermediate forest canopy. Red alder, a very common deciduous tree species of moist sites in the Western Hemlock Zone, grows very quickly and is often the dominant species of early-successional forests; the meadow north of Driftwood Road is currently in this stage of succession. On drier sites, Douglas-fir is the most important species in this intermediate or seral stage. Cleared areas on the Evergreen campus are generally being invaded by one or both of these tree species.

As the forest canopy develops, the amount of light available to plants in the forest floor is

drastically reduced. In darker understory, the more shade-tolerant species of western red cedar and western hemlock begin to develop. In areas with more light, Douglas-fir becomes the most important understory species. In some places on campus, big-leaf maple grows in the understory. Theoretically, western hemlock and western red cedar would become dominant all over the campus if no major disturbance altered the progression for several hundred years, although there is disagreement over whether western red cedar is truly a climax (the last successful stage) species, or just an intermediate.

Campus Forest Habitat

The forest acts as a buffer against such physical factors as temperature, wind, and noise. The trees and understory vegetation anchor the soils with their roots and intercept rainfall. At the same time, forest vegetation serves to maintain fairly consistent levels of light and moisture on the forest floor.

The forest provides habitat for wildlife, and many species of animals feed on the ground herbs and shrubs of the forest floor, the trees themselves, and dead vegetation debris. Most of these species perform vital functions in the maintenance of the forest ecosystem. Mammalian species found in the campus woodlands include mice, shrews, squirrels, moles, Mountain Beavers, weasels, Black-tailed Deer, and Black Bear. The Northern Flying Squirrel, and the Short-tailed Weasel, two “species of concern” (as designated by the Washington Natural Heritage Program), have been sighted on campus (Natural Heritage Data System 1981). A wide variety of birds inhabit the campus forests, including sparrows, wrens, warblers, jays, crows, and owls. Most bird populations are rather sensitive to changes in their environment. For example, the Pileated Woodpecker is vulnerable to disruption of its habitat because it has specific needs for nesting sites in snags (standing dead trees) (McAllister, interview, 1981).

More specific forest types vary according to site factors such as soil conditions, moisture, and elevation. According to a preliminary study of forest typing based on canopy cover, four major categories of forest exist on campus: conifer dominant (Douglas-fir); deciduous dominant (red alder or big-leaf maple); deciduous/conifer shared dominance (the aforementioned species plus western red cedar); and mixed conifer and deciduous (less than 30 percent cover by any one species) (Greenberg and Hartley, 1998).

Figure 6 shows the distribution of forest typing by sub-categories as found by the Greenberg and Hartley study. Douglas-fir dominated forest covers the largest area of campus, encompassing approximately 207 acres. Mixed forest is the second most common (137 acres) and red alder dominated is the third (91 acres). More detailed descriptions of the campus forests, based largely on the same study, are given below for the four forested Reserve areas of the campus (see *Major Campus Land Areas*, Figure 7). These descriptions may require corrections and additions from other members of the campus community. Discussions of land uses in these areas is given beginning on page 100.

East Campus Reserve

A mix of forest types is present in the East Campus Reserve, with no one type especially prominent. The eastern area is characterized by dominance or shared dominance of red alder and big-leaf maple; stands of big-leaf maple with conifers is present on both sides of Driftwood Road north of the Evergreen Parkway and red alder is most prevalent in the adjacent area to the west. An area of western hemlock cover in the eastern part of the Reserve, noted in earlier studies, were not found to provide significant cover.

Western red cedar is most common in the southern part of the East Campus Reserve. The central

and western part of this area is covered by a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees (no one species with greater than thirty percent cover). An area of Douglas-fir dominated forest, mostly within the campus Core, extends across Overhulse Place. A few Sitka spruce grow near the marshy meadow on the campus Parkway. Oregon ash, black cottonwood, and bitter cherry are also present. The understory is dominated by sword fern, salmonberry, and salal, with many other species present. Vine maple is abundant in the western part of the Reserve. Species found at drier sites on campus are absent.

The East Campus Reserve has very low relief with the lowest point at the southeast corner. Ten soil types are present within the area. The area is dominated by fine textured soils, often associated with a near-surface water table, (54 percent), but the coarse gravel-rich Alderwood and Everett series also have importance (34 percent). One small patch of waterlogged “muck” soil still exists south of the Evergreen Parkway—the only muck soil on campus according to soil survey maps. Campus construction changed the hydrology of the East Campus Reserve from one of almost complete local infiltration, with some winter ponding, to one with substantial runoff from the recreational fields, roads and Housing. The majority of the runoff is routed to the artificial drainage ditch along the Parkway and then into Green Cove Creek.

The forest north of the East Campus Reserve was recently cleared for development of subdivisions (see *Growth and Development*, page 31) and the campus forest has lost its connection to wild lands to the north. The main forest area of the Reserve was already relatively isolated by the arterials that surround it; this change has made it even more of an ecological island. The thin forest strip remaining north of Driftwood Road, only about 150 feet wide, will suffer edge effects, such as increased light penetration and windthrow. Species composition of this strip will likely change as a result.

Traffic will increase on the Parkway, and may increase on Driftwood Road as well, with the new subdivisions. The noise level within the East Campus Reserve will increase as a result.

North Campus Reserve

The majority of the North Campus forest is dominated by deciduous tree species. Red alder is prevalent in a large area north of the meadow on Driftwood Road and big-leaf maple dominates areas surrounding Snyder Creek and the West End Drainage. Coniferous forest dominated by Douglas-fir is found along the length of the shoreline and in an area north and west of Parking Lot F. Big-leaf maple and western red cedar have shared dominance on the mid-section of Snyder Creek. Large areas of mixed forest also exist within the North Campus Reserve in which no one species has over thirty percent cover.

West Campus Reserve

A large area of west of the campus Core and extending north to Driftwood Road is mixed deciduous and coniferous forest with shared dominance of big-leaf maple and Douglas-fir. The large block dominated by Douglas-fir, shared with the South Campus Reserve, covers the central area up to the edge of the Organic Farm; salal is the dominant understory species.

The Kifer tract, the area west of Lewis Road, was logged immediately prior to its purchase by the college. Currently, forest cover is mainly big-leaf maple with other deciduous and some coniferous trees providing secondary cover. Douglas-fir forest is more common at the edges of the Kifer tract on higher ground.

South Campus Reserve

This is the only Reserve with the majority of cover provided by coniferous tree species. The

largest contiguous block of Douglas-fir dominated forest on campus, shared with the West Campus Reserve, covers the higher ground; a long ridge oriented north-south in the center of the Reserve is covered in a dense stand of nearly pure Douglas-fir with luxuriant undergrowth dominated by salal.

Red alder is most prevalent in the drainage to the west of the ridge with scattered western hemlock, big-leaf maple, and western red cedar. The understory in this area is primarily salal closer to the ridge and sword fern in low-lying areas with poorer drainage. The drainage to the east of the ridge consists of swampy lowlands supporting vigorous stands of red alder and big-leaf maple. The dominant understory species are sword fern and salmonberry. Pockets of root rot, a malignant fungal disease carried in the roots of trees, are found in the northwestern part of this area.

Campus Meadow Habitat

Two major meadow areas exist on the Evergreen campus, as shown on Figure 6 (**need to indicate meadows on forest typing figure**). Each is an open area that provides a unique habitat for flora and fauna.

Meadow North of Driftwood Road

This meadow forms a narrow strip of open area that extends north from Driftwood Road. During initial construction of the college, the area adjacent to the road was used for equipment storage and dirt dumping. Within the meadow three distinct habitats exist: the open field, the field edge, and the forest fringe (McCartan et al. 1977). Red alder thickets have invaded much of the slopes to the north. At the northern end is a lower flat section characterized by meadow grasses and shrubs.

Diverse forms of wildlife inhabit this area. Garter snakes, frogs, small mammals, and numerous insect species have been sighted (McCartan et al., 1977). The meadow also provides a food source for deer, predatory mammals, and birds.

In 1992, soils contaminated with unleaded gasoline were found in the area of the Central Utility Plant. This soil was moved to a section of the meadow north of Driftwood Road for bioremediation with oversight provided by the Department of Ecology. Prior to its removal from the meadow, the soil was tested and met DOE clean soil standards.

Marshy Meadow along the Parkway

A marshy meadow lies along the Evergreen Parkway east of Overhulse Road. It is part of a larger wetland that extends south from the eastern part of the college campus. The area is poorly drained and vegetated primarily by sedges, spiraea, and other species tolerant of the moist environment.

Although no inventory of fauna is currently available, deer are frequently seen browsing in the area. Due to the uniqueness of the habitat, it is likely that species of birds, rodents, and amphibians not found elsewhere on campus inhabit the marsh.

Campus Shoreline Habitat

The 3,300 feet of Evergreen's shoreline on Eld Inlet, a part of Puget Sound, include a variety of ecosystems and natural environmental features. The coastal habitat is characterized by steep bluffs, gravelly beaches with many washed-up logs, and the marine intertidal zone, which extends 125 to 150 feet out into Eld Inlet during low tides. There are approximately 27 acres of

tidelands belonging to Evergreen (this area is included in the calculation of total campus acreage). Land uses of the Shoreline are described in *Shoreline Reserve*, page 99.

The bluffs range from 15 to 60 feet (5 to 20 meters) in height. Analysis shows that higher banks are generally less stable, but overall bank erosion is slow at Evergreen's beach. The bluffs are forested with a mix of Douglas-fir, western red cedar, and big-leaf maple trees of considerable size and age (relative to other campus woodlands) in several places. The forested bluffs were logged eighty to one-hundred years ago (Professional Forestry Service Inc. 1975, page 10); old logging traces descend to the waterfront from the West End Drainage and from the woods west of the marine slough.

Erosion has felled many trees making the beach impassable during higher tides. Low bulkheads are in place at the northern end of the beach. Due to storm damage from the winter of 1996-97, the bridge road and adjoining bulkhead at Snyder Creek were repaired and upgraded during the late summer 1997.

The beach near the bluffs is composed of large rocks and coarse gravels mixed with fine gravels and sand. These materials originate from the glacially deposited layers in the bluffs. Three freshwater drainages empty into Eld Inlet along the beach. The middle drainage terminates in a small marine slough. These areas provide a transition zone between fresh and saline water, creating a unique estuarine habitat for fish, waterfowl, and other species. The entire coastal area offers a rich diversity of habitat for life forms. The marine intertidal zone supports shellfish, crustaceans, and other marine species. Studies done in 1972 showed a variety of marine plant-life (Liebman and Zito 1972). The composition of the sediments in this area is particularly important because it is the gravel, rocks, and similar hard substrates that provide attachment points for tidal species of flora and fauna (Globerman and Olson 1975). Other important faunas in the coastal zone include waterfowl and numerous species of fish. Several "species of concern", including the Olympia Oyster, Coho Salmon, Steelhead and the Harbor Seal, have been sighted at the waterfront (Natural Heritage Data System 1981).

Land Use in the Surrounding Area

Thurston County Population

The 1997 population estimate for Thurston County is 197,600 according to the census of that year. Approximately 65% of the county population live in Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, and the surrounding unincorporated metropolitan area. The population growth rate from 1987 to 1997 was approximately 36 percent, which for that period made Thurston County the sixth fastest growing county in the state. While the average annual rate of growth has decreased from a high of 4.9 percent in the 1970's, growth was at a relatively high rate of nearly 3 percent from 1990 to 1997. In-migration continues to account for the majority of growth in the county; from 1990 to 1997 nearly 80 percent of the growth was due to in-migration.

Projections of the county's future population are based on growth rates continuing to gradually decline. Forecasts are for 28.7 percent population increase from 1995-2005 and 21.3 percent increase from 2005-2015. Based on these projections, the Thurston County's population will be nearly 300,000 by 2015 (Thurston Regional Planning Council 1997).

History of Growth and Development Planning

With the adoption of the Cooper Point Sub-area Plan in 1972, Cooper Point became one of the first areas in the south Sound to adopt zoning to preserve its rural character. Zoning was first established County-wide in 1980, and then updated with the Urban Growth Management Agreement in 1983. The Urban Growth Management Boundary associated with this agreement maintained northern Cooper Point as a rural area, but Evergreen's campus, as well as the rural areas to the south, were within the urban boundary.

In 1990 and 1991, the Washington State Legislature passed a series of laws known as the Growth Management Act which required fast growing counties and the cities within them to upgrade their comprehensive plans to meet new standards (*Comprehensive Plan for Olympia and Olympia Growth Area*, 1994, page 2). The new planning efforts included reevaluating the Urban Growth Boundary. The revised boundary, established 1995, is intended to accommodate urban growth for the following 20 years. It no longer includes Evergreen's campus or the rural area to the south; however, a "finger" of the Urban Growth Area remained bordering the college to the northeast (see following section).

Current Growth and Development

The majority of the Cooper Point peninsula, mainly excluding the southeast area (the "west side" of Olympia), is zoned rural-residential. The rural area designation, according to the *Thurston County Comprehensive Plan*, is meant to preserve areas "...characterized by a balance between the natural environment and human uses with low density residential dwellings farms, forests, mining areas, outdoor recreation and other open space activities." (page 2-17). While growth does continue in the rural areas of Cooper Point, development is limited to zones of one unit per five, two and one acre. Urban sewer and water services are not provided.

An area immediately north and east of the campus has been zoned at urban densities since 1972—currently it is designated as Single Family Residential (R-4-8). A development called "Cedrona" is currently under construction and will build 104 single family units (at two per acre) bordering the campus boundary. Four proposals for additional developments are at various stages in the review process. If approved and built, these developments will add an additional 222 single family units at five per acre and a 112 unit apartment complex. These would be located, along with Cedrona, between the existing Cooper's Glen Apartments and the Evergreen Parkway.

The college can expect several types of impacts on the campus resulting from this development. Traffic will increase along Driftwood Road and the Parkway and requests for easements for roads on college property are likely. Increased recreational and "incidental" use of the campus Reserve areas, especially the East Campus Reserve, are also foreseeable (see *Public Access*, page 95). The forest habitat of the East Campus Reserve has already been altered by clearing for the development; most importantly, the forest habitat of East Campus has lost its connection to other wild lands to the north, making it more of an ecological island (see *East Campus Reserve*, page 100).

College Influence on Surrounding Land Use

Members of the college community have been working proactively to minimize negative effects to the campus from development in the surrounding areas. College officials are working closely with City and County agencies to examine and measure the impact of the proposed development to transportation and utility systems. The college recently commissioned a traffic study to determine the effects of the growth to our roads and intersections and determine mitigation fees that we should request from developers.

The college has become aware of the need to actively strive to be good neighbors to the surrounding community. The college has worked to develop more contact with the local neighborhood associations through participation in revising the Master Plan and consultation on proposed development plans. Members of the college have participated in discussions with community members regarding a proposal to connect the campus to the surrounding neighborhoods through a trail system (see *South Campus Reserve*, page 102). The college has become more active in providing input to documents being developed by the City and County and sought out their consultation during the revision of the Master Plan.

In order to ensure that the quality of the campus environment is maintained, the college should continue to monitor development plans for the surrounding area and make every effort to promote patterns of use that complement those of the college. A focus for the near future should be to ensure that the campus Reserve areas are not overtaxed by public use. Ideally, provisions for other green spaces near the campus would take pressure off the college to provide all wildlife habitat and recreation base in the surrounding area.