

Introduction

The fundamental task of campus planning is to maintain highly functional campus facilities which support the college's educational and operational programs while maintaining a healthy and attractive environment for the people who live and work at Evergreen. Although it is impossible to anticipate long-range changes in college curriculum and enrollment, the college must carefully manage and develop the campus to best serve operational and community needs with as much long-range vision as possible.

In 1972, the Master Planning Team reviewed the progress of campus development and evaluated that progress based on the planning principles of the Master Plan (page 13). An overall recommendation of their report 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). Currently, no such team exists, and the process for evaluating land use proposals is not clear. Many land use issues have not received the attention or action that they merit and this has somewhat hindered the development of campus facilities and procedures. In order to address this deficiency, the 1998 Master Plan proposes the formation of the Campus Land Use Committee to provide focus and structure to the process of encouraging and evaluating land use planning.

Chapter 4 outlines the principles of the planning process at Evergreen and the current process for land use planning. Discussion of the Campus Land Use Committee follows and this is the main focus for this chapter. Finally, update of the *Campus Master Plan* is outlined.

Principles of the Land Use Planning Process

Six underlying principles for effective and responsive planning underlie the policy and procedures for the planning process (page 54), as well as provide the impetus for creation of the Campus Land Use Committee. The importance of campus community participation is emphasized in the following sub-section.

The planning process needs to provide for **coordination** of all the components of a planning action including the various experts, decision-makers, consultants, the campus community at large, and the use of the Master Plan. The process must also allow adequate **time** for careful design, community input, review, planning, and completion, while providing for expedient action. Further, the process should include frequent consultation with the affected community, encouraging and providing for direct **community participation** where possible. Planning processes at Evergreen should be **compatible** with all governing policies and procedures of the college and the State. **On-campus experts** possess knowledge and skills that should be used to aid and enrich the planning process at Evergreen. Finally, the planning process should allow **flexibility** so that changing needs, values, and political or economic conditions can be incorporated into on-going decision making.

Campus Community Participation: A Prerequisite and Goal for Responsive Campus Planning

Campus community involvement is essential in the operation of flexible, responsive services and facilities. Students, staff, and faculty of the college are usually the most experienced and knowledgeable people concerning the workability of the campus environment during daily activities and many members of the campus community possess knowledge and expertise that could aid and enrich the planning process at Evergreen. Open discussion about planning issues is essential in making user participation meaningful, in which "...people are forced to deliberately and precisely discuss the issues relative to the purpose of the activities to be housed." (J. Rowe, page 15).

Campus community involvement in decision making is an important concept in governance at Evergreen. In campus planning activities, community participation is an important tool as well as a goal in itself. Community participation is not new in the planning process at Evergreen. A number of student projects have addressed planning issues over the years, including the 1976 study entitled *Campus Inventory and Land Use Planning* (H. Hall, H. Lockwood, C. Lomax), and the 1982 Environmental design seminar/library remodeling project. Involvement of a wider segment of the campus community has been possible through the inclusion of student, staff, and faculty representatives on DTF committees (examples include the 1975 Environment and Facilities Planning and Interim DTF, the 1976 Shorelines DTF, and the 1997 Space Efficiency Study).

Effective and useful community participation is an ideal, which can only be realized by continuous efforts to provide opportunities for involvement with a visible influence on the outcome of planning decisions.

Land Use Planning at Evergreen

For a history of the Master Plan, refer to Chapter 1, page 13 of this document. Other influences on land use planning at the college—both internal and external entities—are described on page 20.

The current land use planning process involves many separate groups. The Space Management Committee manages internal use of buildings. Proposals for land use outside of buildings are generated by the senior staff, Capitol Planning group, Office of Facilities, and many other organizational units and individuals throughout the campus community. Some of these proposals are developed further through the biennial budget submittal process. However, many elements of land use, such as most recreation and research in the Reserve areas, are not tied to budget submittals and thus are overlooked in the planning process. Institutional oversight over all elements of land use planning is lacking.

Primary administrative responsibility for campus planning lies with the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Final decisions on land use are made by the Board of Trustees (see page 20).

The Campus Land Use Committee Introduction

The 1998 Master Plan proposes formation of a standing committee to review designated proposals for uses of the college's land, excluding uses within buildings (see *Recommendations*, page 11). The Campus Land Use Committee is not intended to replace the entities currently involved in land use planning; instead it is meant to become a focal point for campus planners. The CLUC would provide oversight, support, and encouragement for the development of land use proposals from all segments of the campus population. Members of this committee would be locatable and accountable to the Board of Trustees and the members of the Evergreen community.

The Campus Land Use Committee (CLUC) would also provide oversight for the land use review process and ensure consistent and expedient review of proposals. The CLUC would employ specific procedures, outlined below, in order to ensure that the goals and policies of the Master Plan are considered during the review process and brought to bear on all activities that affect the physical character of the campus. Creation of the CLUC would allow the college to better carry out the procedures regarding the land use planning process itself (see page 54).

The CLUC would also be responsible for updating the Master Plan on a regular basis, thereby ensuring that the Master Plan will be a sustainable document relevant to contemporary planning needs.

Membership of the Campus Land Use Committee

The CLUC will consist of the following members appointed by the Vice President for Finance and Administration:

- Campus Architect/Planner (CA/P)
- Director of Facilities
- Environmental Health and Safety Officer
- Geographical Information Systems (GIS) staff person
- two members of the faculty (governance assignments)
- two staff members
- two students

The Campus Architect/Planner (CA/P) plays a key role for the CLUC. She or he is intended as the primary contact for members of the campus community for assistance with developing ideas into proposals. By working closely with project proposers, the CA/P could advise on the use of the Master Plan as a design tool and provide technical information and support during the early stages of design development. As the project concept is further developed, the CA/P could help proposers with preparations for formal presentations to the community.

The CA/P's current responsibilities on campus would augment his or her work for the CLUC. He or she works with the Office of Facilities, the Space Management Committee, and the Budget Officer in the preparation of the Ten Year Capital Plan and Capital Budget Request and also aids the Office of Facilities in their responsibilities for construction and operational management of the campus. These responsibilities and contacts give the CA/P an overview of land use

The Campus Land Use Committee

Introduction

Membership

Operations
& Authority

Developing
Proposals

Review of Proposals

Committee
Evaluation

The Campus Land Use Committee

Introduction

Membership

Operations & Authority

Developing Proposals

Review of Proposals

plans and thus he or she should be an excellent resource for people with new ideas for the campus.

The CA/P has been proposed as the chair for the CLUC as well. Given the responsibilities already assigned to the CA/P (described above), other options for the committee chair should be considered as well. Possible alternatives include the Director of Facilities and a member of the faculty as co-chairs and the Vice President for Finance and Administration as the chair or co-chair, again with a faculty member. Further discussion is needed on this topic.

Operations and Authority of the CLUC

The proposed functions of the CLUC include the following:

- review of land use proposals and applications
- assist with development of ideas for land use into formal proposals
- publicize land use proposals and decisions made following the review
- develop a Resource and Land Use Inventory (page 97) and Land Use Activities Map (page 110)
- coordinate the process of updating the Campus Master Plan (see page 111)

The primary responsibility of the CLUC would be as a mechanism to encourage and review proposals for land use from the Evergreen community. The scope and nature of projects to be considered by this planning process are widely varied. Generally projects include, but are not limited to, construction activities which alter public areas, changes in landscaping and maintenance practices which may noticeably impact the visual or natural environment, changes in campus services which will alter land or facilities use patterns, and academic or recreational activities which involve environmental impacts or designation of land areas for specific uses.

The CLUC would also serve as a clearinghouse of land use information, resources, and contacts. In addition, the CLUC must make every reasonable effort to involve and inform the college community of campus land use proposals and decisions.

The CLUC is not intended as a decision making body. The recommendations of the CLUC may be influential, but final decisions on land use proposals will be made by the President and the Board of Trustees. Recommendations of the CLUC will be given to the President for her or his determination. If the proposal concerns policy, changes to the current *10 Year Capital Plan*, or changes to the Master Plan, the Board of Trustees must make the final decision.

Specific proceedings for the CLUC will be determined early in its formation; the committee will write procedures for its operations to be included in the updated *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

Developing Proposals and Applications

All members of the campus community must be encouraged to express their ideas concerning the need or opportunity for improvement in campus facilities and land use practices. Many members of the Evergreen community may have ideas that could address campus needs. Specific proposals for the use of campus land may also come from off campus institutions, companies, agencies, or individuals.

Before an idea will be reviewed by the CLUC, it must be developed into a formal proposal. The CA/P or appropriate administrative official can aid in the development of the proposals gener-

Chapter Four: The Process for Land Use Planning

ated by students, DTFs, faculty, staff, administrators, and other groups by giving comments and advice to the idea generators. The CA/P should also aid idea generators in the application of the Master Plan to the particular proposal or issue raised and in attaining compatibility with approved land use designations. References to the Resource and Land Use Inventory (page 97) or the Land Use Activities Map (page 110) may help project development best fit into the context of past and present activities on campus.

In its deliberations the CLUC may see a need for additional land use plans and proposals that will be of benefit to the entire community. It can therefore also proactively recommend that studies and DTFs be charged in order to initiate land use proposals of value to the college.

All requests are subject to review through the procedures delineated in this chapter.

Types of Land Use Proposals

The level of disruption associated with academic uses varies greatly. Activities that will not last for more than three quarters, will not significantly disturb the soils or vegetation of an area, and the disruption will not be evident beyond the life of the project are considered **Short-term, Low Disruptive Projects**. Projects that will last for more than three quarters or will significantly disturb the soils or vegetation of an area and that disruption will be evident beyond the life of the project are considered **Permanent Educational Facilities and Structures and Disruptive Activities**. Academic uses of the college land are generally of three types: ecological studies, environmental education, and art projects; examples of each of these types of uses and the associated level of disruption are given here for additional clarity.

Ecological studies can be manipulative or observational. Observational applies to descriptive studies of plant communities, bird identification, field plant identification, or animal behavior studies. These academic activities do not seriously disrupt ecosystems and should be able to take place anywhere on campus although travel off of improved trails should be limited whenever possible. Manipulative ecological studies have some impact on the nature of the ecosystem. Some examples of this would be timber management, animal collecting and trapping, trampling of delicate vegetation communities, and agriculture activities.

Most environmental education involves observational activities. However, building a nature trail or a campsite are possible components of an educational programs that would involve manipulation or disruption of the natural environment.

The amount of manipulation involved with art projects varies with each piece of work. In most cases, an art piece is placed within the natural setting without impacting soils or vegetation significantly. However, manipulation of the environment does occasionally take place as a part of an installation or performance.

The Content of Proposal Applications

The application for Short Term, Low Disruptive projects shall be a simple single-page check sheet that includes, among other things, the applicant's or academic program's name, a brief project description and duration of the activities, who will be in charge at the site during the activities, and an agreement to clean up and restore the area when the activity is completed.

The application for Permanent Educational Facilities or Land Uses by Non-college Entities shall consist of full documentation about the proposal including but limited to the applicant's name and affiliation, a project description, justification, duration, cost and funding information,

The Campus Land Use Committee

Introduction

Membership

Operations & Authority

Developing Proposals

Review of Proposals

The Campus Land Use Committee

Introduction

Membership

Operations & Authority

Developing Proposals

Review of Proposals

on-site maintenance/management, and a site restoration/cleanup plan.

Review of Proposals

Allowing time for and placing emphasis on the process of public circulation and review of project proposals will be of prime importance in the CLUC's work. When people are given the opportunity and invitation to participate within the process, they become more responsible and involved with the end project and the campus environment in general. Although everyone may not participate, they should still have that opportunity. The return benefit is that the users of the campus environment can often give the best advice on how a proposal may work and what may be needed to make it better.

The committee itself will determine the most appropriate forums and opportunities for gaining community input on each proposal depending upon its nature and scope. These may include open community meetings, hearing, open houses, and surveys/questionnaires.

The CLUC shall review proposals for:

- consistency with the educational mission of the college
- consistency with the Policies and Procedures of the Master Plan,
- suitability with the use criteria for specific land areas of the campus
- environmental sensitivity and SEPA compliance if required
- conflicts with other approved and proposed uses within or near the desired site.

When review of a proposal is complete, the CLUC must then recommend approval, conditioned approval, or denial. This recommendation will be forwarded in accordance with the Board of Trustees delegation of authority for final decision (see page 20).

Short-term, Low Disruptive Projects

Short-term (one to three academic quarters), minimally disruptive activities are not a serious concern in terms of land use impacts by definition (see *Types of Land Use Proposals*, page 109). However, since unplanned and overlapping uses of an area are a concern, information regarding short-term, minimally disruptive projects must be submitted to the CA/P before the activity is begun. The location of the activity will be posted on an openly accessible Land Use Activities Map. This map must indicate where all campus land use activities are occurring, including educational and non-educational activities, maintenance and repair activities, and minor temporary structures. On proposals of this nature, the CA/P will do an expeditious "checklist type" review to ensure that the proposed activity is situated in an appropriately designated area and does not conflict with other activities or proposals occurring in or near the area.

Those contemplating using a part of the campus for educational or research purposes are encouraged to consult the Land Use Activities Map when planning their projects to avoid potential conflicts with other planned and ongoing activities. If a conflict between several appropriate planned or ongoing uses occurs, all involved proponents will be notified and asked to resolve the conflicts among themselves. If no resolution is reached, the issue may be then referred to mediation.

The CA/P reserves the right to undertake a more formal review of all short-term proposals from non-community members.

Permanent Educational Facilities and Structures, and Disruptive Activities

Land use proposals by members of the TESC community for long-term activities, extensions of short-term activities beyond three quarters, permanent structures, and disruptive activities must be submitted to the CA/P. The CA/P will call the CLUC into session for review of the proposal within 10 working days. At the CA/P's discretion, additional time for the CLUC to convene is allowed to accommodate summer sessions, inter-session breaks, and unforeseen situations.

Land Uses by Non-college Entities

Land use proposals by individuals who are not members of the TESC community for permanent structures and long-term activities must be submitted to the CA/P who within 10 working days will call the CLUC into session for review of the proposal.

Evaluation of the Committee

The chair of the committee shall annually review the functioning of the CLUC and make recommendations for its modification to the Vice President for Finance and Administration during the Master Plan updating process.

The Master Plan Updating Process

Copies of the Master Plan will be available for review to all segments of the Evergreen community; paper copies will be available to the public in many locations on campus and the document will be a component of Evergreen's home page on the Internet as well. Proposed suggestions and modifications to the Campus Master Plan can be submitted to the CLUC by any community member any time of the year and will be taken into consideration during annual review of the Plan .

The CLUC will be responsible for coordinating review and update of the Master Plan once a year. The Vice President for Finance and Administration shall consider the modifications to the Campus Master Plan and is responsible for revisions made to the Plan. The Vice President can assemble and convene a Master Plan Review Team, if deemed necessary, to hold hearings and recommend updates to the Plan.

The Campus Land Use Committee

Introduction

Membership

Operations & Authority

Developing Proposals

Review of Proposals

Appendix A

Building Descriptions

Also refer to *Building List* on page x for years of construction and the architects that designed the major facilities on campus.

Campus Core

Central Core: The buildings in central Core are of similar structure and concrete is the dominant surface material, with a few exceptions (see *Structure and Materials*, page x). Every building in the central Core is supported by systems that provide temperature control, access to the computer network, as well as other utilities described beginning on page x. From the 1998 reaccreditation study: "All...major buildings serve as multi-use facilities. With the exception of the lecture halls and college activities building, all of these major buildings have a mixture of faculty, staff and student offices and classrooms." (page 4).

Daniel J. Evans Library Building: The library is a large multipurpose structure containing the campus library, media services space, classrooms, faculty offices, administrative offices, conference rooms, and lounge and storage areas. Admissions, Registration, Controller's and Student Advising are also located in this building. Most floor areas of this structure are carpeted.

Lecture Halls: This building contains five lecture halls with capacities of 75, 75, 100, 150 and 300. Each lecture hall is designed to accommodate rear, front and overhead projection. Also included in this facility are a centrally located lounge area and a lecture preparation area. There is an underground corridor leading to the Laboratory Building.

College Activities Building: This project houses the main food service facility for both the Residence Hall students and the commuter students; included are a cafeteria and a full-service deli. Besides the dining hall, there is additional seating located in the staff/faculty lounge. A complete bookstore is provided on the main level for the sale of instructional materials and supplies. Other facilities included in this structure are two large classrooms, a cash machine, vending area, college FM radio station, student activity coordinating office area, bike repair shop, and Conference Services. There is a large receiving-storage area connected to an underground entrance. The building has its own loading dock. An addition was made to the CAB in 1990; this space is currently used by the Student Activities office area.

Arts and Sciences Laboratory, Phase I: Lab I includes general laboratory areas, faculty offices, conference rooms, classrooms, a terrarium, shop areas, a small animal room complex and general storage areas.

Art and Science Laboratory Annex: The Annex contains a large high-ceiling laboratory space for art and other large-scale instructional activities involving metal, wood, glass, clay and stone work. Also included in the building are art studios and a critique room. Additionally, this project has a large receiving-working dock area and an outdoor casting area with four kilns. This structure is connected to the Phase I laboratory structure.

College Recreation Center: The CRC has been built in two phases. The original space houses a large swimming pool with a separate diving bowl, five handballs courts, multipurpose rooms, exercise/weight rooms, two sauna bathrooms, locker-shower facilities and an office area. The new addition contains a large gymnasium area with bleacher seating, movement rooms for dance or martial arts, a classroom, wellness lab and a new office suite with work-rooms and conference space. The Health Center was recently moved to this facility.

Seminar Building, Phase I: This facility includes small classrooms, faculty offices, counseling services, and the campus Police Services. The EF Language School is also housed in this building.

Arts and Sciences Laboratory, Phase II: Lab II contains academic offices, interdisciplinary laboratory areas, a herbarium and collection room, classroom areas, shop areas, photo lab areas and permanent office space for the Office of Facilities. This facility is connected on all floor levels to the west end of Phase I Laboratory.

Communications Laboratory: The Communications Building houses classrooms, faculty and staff offices, and specialized production facilities that support the performing arts, audio, film and animation curriculum at Evergreen. The facility includes the Experimental Theater black box performance space, the Recital Hall performance space, the production scenic and costume shop, two dance/theater rehearsal rooms, 16 and 8 track audio recording facilities, electronic music studios, post production film and animation facilities, and several multi-use classroom/meeting/rehearsal rooms. Addition of a proscenium/thrust 750- 1,000 seat theater auditorium has been proposed as Phase II construction.

Longhouse Educational and Cultural Center: This building is designed after a Northwest Coast longhouse and is constructed from Olympic Peninsula cedar. It contains a large, open space which is used primarily by the Native American programs. Also included in the building are a full commercial kitchen and four large classrooms with flexible walls to allow configurations for large or small groups. The building also has a small conference room, an office, and two gas/wood fireplaces.

Seminar Building, Phase II: This building is in the pre-design phase, scheduled for completion in 2003. Planned layout will include classroom, seminar and other instructional spaces, A/V and computer equipped facilities, and faculty and staff offices.

Residences: All apartments include kitchen facilities with the exception of the studio units in "A" building. These units have access to community kitchens on the same floor. Laundry facilities are provided in the residence halls, the Mods and the Housing Community Center. Two recreation areas within the residence buildings are "The Edge" located in "A" Building and "The Far Side" located in the Mods. Both rooms have video and audio equipment as well as meeting and kitchen facilities. All rooms, except the Mods, were equipped in 1997-98 with technology upgrades consisting of data connections, cable TV, and phone service provided by the college. In 1997, "A" Building was retrofitted for fire system improvements which included the installation of a new fire alarm and sprinkler system. A new high security lock system was installed in 1996-97.

Phase I (A-D): Four residence halls stand in a cluster around a courtyard about five minutes walk northeast of the major campus plaza buildings. The residence halls are constructed of reinforced concrete. "A" Building is ten stories tall, and buildings "B", "C", and "D" are five stories tall and very similar in design. "A" Building is the only facility that contains any traditional residence hall rooms, having single studios and double studios. The residence halls also contain three-, four-, and five-person apartments of varying floor plans.

Modular Housing: A complex of nineteen modular duplexes lies east of campus, about a fifteen-minute walk from the campus The Mods, originally designed as temporary housing structures, are constructed of wood and have a more residential atmosphere than the residence halls. Each Mod contains two two-bedroom apartments housing four students each.

Phases II and III (E-K, N-U): Fourteen apartment buildings lie between Phase I and the Mods. Phase II and III buildings are wooden structures and are comprised of four- and six-bedroom apartments.

Student Community Center: The Community Center contains a student-run café, a small

branch of the bookstore, social and dining space, recreational equipment such as pool tables and foosball, a video/television viewing area, and a variety of vending operations. Laundry facilities and all residential mailboxes are also located in this building.

Other Buildings within the Core:

Central Utility Plant: This facility is located east of the Communications building. It contains two 35,000-pound per hour, and one 12,000 pound per hour fire tube boiler. Eight hundred and five hundred ton centrifugal chillers provide most of the cooling for campus buildings. These are R-134a and R-11 machines, respectively. The building is designed to accommodate one additional boilers and two additional chillers. If the heating and cooling equipment were fully installed, this structure would be capable of providing heat and air-conditioning to a campus of approximately 12,000 students. The unequipped area presently houses a temporary half-court basketball area and volleyball court. Present electrical utilities are sized for approximately 8,000 students

Recreation Pavilion: A large covered, but open, facility contains hard surfaced activity areas for basketball, tennis, volleyball and badminton. It can also serve as a large outdoor assembly facility.

Childcare Center: A wooden structure that the college purchased with the campus property in 1967. The building was originally a privately owned meat processing facility. It began its service to the college as the Facilities Office and has also housed art studios and other functions over the years. It was remodeled in 1883 for its current use.

Water pump station; Combustible storage; Utility Tunnels and Substation; and Well House: These facilities house elements of the support system for the college.

Cluster Areas

Maintenance Shops: The shops cluster is located off of Driftwood Road surrounded by the East Campus Reserve. The main structure within the corporation yard is the Shops building which houses several offices, a paint shop, a metal/fabrication shop, a wood shop, a sign shop, a meeting room/lunch room, a tool storage room, materials storage room, and a safety equipment storage room. Several other buildings provide additional office, storage and shop space: the shops equipment storage building; grounds equipment storage buildings (two metal structures); surplus shed, grounds office; and hazardous materials storage building. Two garage buildings, the garage/motor pool and the garage annex, provide full automotive services and house the motor pool and automotive mechanics' offices.

Organic Farm:

Farmhouse: A wooden structure with two floors and a third story loft. It contains classroom, kitchen and caretaker's apartment. The farmhouse has a residential atmosphere and is heated by wood stoves. The current structure replaces a farmhouse that existed on the property when the land was acquired by the State.

Greenhouses: Three plastic and pole greenhouses, one of them heated, are maintained for agricultural use.

Farm Operations Building: A permanent structure for office and storage space.

Other structures: A composting shed, vermicomposting shed, a thirty-three foot by hundred foot cold frame, and a few smaller outbuildings provide additional agricultural functions and storage space.

Geoduck House: (originally known as the Marine Lab West) A residential home that the college acquired when purchasing its current land holdings. The house is currently used as a rental

property by the Olympia Community School. The house is in need of major repair and its future status is in question.

Outlying Buildings

Driftwood House: A wooden structure purchased with the college property in 1967. It was originally a private residence. Up until 1983, this house served as the Childcare Center, and then was remodeled as a Leisure Education facility. It currently houses weaving looms.

Driftwood House Annex: A metal/aluminum building, originally designed as a mobile home. This facility housed staff offices when Driftwood House was used as the Childcare Center. It is currently used for Leisure Education storage.

Kifer Homestead: A small farmhouse located on Simmons Road west of Lewis Road that was acquired with the purchase of campus property in 1967. The house was occupied by its previous owner for many years, and then reverted back to the college when he passed away. Currently this facility is used for academic projects such as boat building.

President's Residence: A waterfront home, five-thousand square feet, purchased by the college in 1968. It is located off-campus at 4202 Leavelle NW.

Appendix B

Student Demographic Statistics

Age Cohorts as Percent of Total Enrollment

Excludes individuals "not indicated"

	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	1997
17-22	79%	50%	42%	42%	55%	54%	52%
23-29	15%	29%	31%	24%	21%	24%	25%
30+	6%	21%	27%	34%	24%	23%	24%

Gender as Percent of Total Enrollment

	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	1997
Females	42%	50%	53%	53%	58%	57%	58%
Males	58%	50%	47%	47%	42%	43%	42%

Students of Color as a Percent of Total Enrollment

	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	1997
Students of Color	7%	9%	7%	10%	12%	15%	16%
African American	2.7%	3.6%	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%	3.6%	3.9%
Native American	1.8	3.3	1.5	2.0	2.5	4.0	3.5
Hispanic	1.3	0.9	1.1	1.8	3.0	4.1	3.9
Asian	0.8	0.9	1.4	2.8	3.6	3.8	4.3

Distribution of Total Enrollment

	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	1997
Total Enrollment	1178	2636	2766	2965	3377	3715	4084
Undergraduate	100%	100%	98%*	95%	92%	94%	93%
Graduate	0%	0%	2%	5%	8%	6%	7%
Full-time	94%	81%	83%	85%	88%	84%	85%
Part-time	6%	19%	17%	15%	12%	16%	15%
FTE Enrollment**	1121	2496	2623	2838	3386	3610	3963

*Graduate studies were introduced in 1980

**Full Time Equivalents corresponds to 15 credit hours for undergraduates and 10 credit hours for graduate students

Appendix C

Growth Plan

April 1998

In 1994, Evergreen's Board of Trustees formally adopted a long-range growth plan for the college which projects enrollment to the year 2010. This plan was developed as part of the State's master planning process which focused extensively on the need to accommodate increasing numbers of students over the next fifteen years. The Evergreen plan and the state enrollment targets are modified each biennia, depending on state funding and actual enrollment demand.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Office of Financial Management are key players in projecting enrollment demand and making recommendations about enrollment levels at each institution.

For the past several months, a variety of groups at Evergreen—including the Senior Staff, the Enrollment Coordinating Committee, the Academic Deans and others—have been reexamining Evergreen's short-term enrollment goals over the next two biennia. This reexamination was part of the reaccreditation self-study process as well as a necessary part of planning for the next biennial budget. These groups have reached a consensus that some small modifications should be made in the growth plan over the next four years. These modifications would slow down overall growth over the four-year period by 120 Full Time Equivalents (FTE) students and target a substantial portion of the growth toward Tacoma. The overall fifteen-year goal of reaching 5000 students remains intact.

The rationale for this plan is as follows:

- This rate of growth seems more in line with our actual applicant pool, especially for next year.
- With the space shortage we now have, this plan allows some growth but puts most of the growth out into the period when Seminar Phase II becomes available. Since most of the growth is in Tacoma and the evening program, it has less impact on the daytime campus offerings.
- Growth in Tacoma is possible and desirable. We have large wait lists there already. Moving that campus to a more viable size of core faculty will make it function better. This plan moves it from 125 upper division students and a core faculty of 3 (with 2 rotating/adjunct lines) to 250 students and a core faculty of 8 (with 2 additional rotating/adjunct lines). This does require relocation to a larger facility and considerable infrastructure investments to improve quality. We have begun to make these investments this year and have a well developed plan to move ahead.
- This plan requires a more realistic rate of faculty hiring. Since we are in a period of large scale faculty hiring because of growth and retirements, we need to pace ourselves.

For more information on growth of the student population, see page x. Enrollment numbers are based on Full time Equivalents which corresponds to 15 credit hours for undergraduates and 10 credit hours for graduate students.

Growth Plan: 1998-99 through 2010-11

Category of Growth:	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Resuming annual MIT cohorts	80													
New full-time students	131	0	40	60	40	60	50	190	50	190	50	190	50	190
New E/W students	0	0	10	20	10	20								
New graduate program						30								
New Tacoma enrollment			20	20	20	20								
Total Funded Enrollment	3496	3576	3646	3746	3816	3946	3996	4186	4236	4426	4476	4666	4716	4906
Funded Growth from Prior Year	90	80	70	100	70	130	50	190	50	190	50	190	50	190
Cumulative Growth from 1996-97	90	170	150	170	170	200	180	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Actual Enrollment	3700	3700	3746	3846	3916	4046	4096	4286	4336	4526	4576	4766	4816	5006
Diff from funded level	204	124	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Appendix C

(continued)

Appendix D

Planning and Governance Groups

1997-98 Academic Year

Standing Committees (all major)

Agenda Committee
Council of Faculty Representatives
Enrollment Coordinating Committee
Faculty Hiring DTF
Hiring Priorities DTF
Planning Group Coordinators
Environmental Advisory Committee

DTF's and Other Work (all major)

Academic Advisors
Accreditation Self-Study
Campus Master Plan
Compensation, Benefits, and Post Retirement DTF
Computing DTF
Enrollment Services Dean Search DTF
International Studies Advisory
Prior Learning From Experience (Readers)
Radio Tower DTF
Sponsored Research Committee

Other Work/Committees (all minor)

ADA Advisory Committee
Athletics Advisory Committee
Arbitrators
Bookstore Advisory Committee
Commute Trip Reduction Advisory Committee
Copyright/Patents
Deadly Force Review Board
Ethics Review Board
Faculty Representative to Athletics
First Peoples' Mentors
Fund Raising Advisory Board
Health and Safety Committee
Human Subjects Review
Infraction Review Committee
Longhouse Advisory Committee
PLATO Royalties Committee
Police Services Hiring
Professional Educators Advisory
Public Art Advisory Committee
Student Conduct Code Hearing Board
Teacher Education Advisors

Possible DTF's

B.S. Degree
Community Service

1998-99 Academic Year (Proposed)

Standing Committees

Agenda Committee
Council of Faculty Representatives
Enrollment Coordinating Committee
Faculty Hiring DTF
Hiring Priorities DTF (spring only)
Planning Group Coordinators

DTF's and Other Work (all major)

Academic Advisors
Academic Dean Search DTF
Admissions
Core Advisory and Support Team (need two faculty from Core '97, '98 & '99)
Domestic Partner Benefits DTF
Hiring Subcommittee
Food Service Design DTF
International Studies Advisory Board
Prior Learning from Experience Document Readers Sponsored Research Strategic Planning DTF
(winter & spring only)

Other Work/Committees (all minor)

Accountability & Assessment Working Group
ADA Compliance Advisory Board
Athletics Advisory Board
Bookstore Advisory Committee
Commute Trip Reduction Advisory Committee
Day of Absence & Presence Planning Group
Environmental Advisory Committee
Ethics Review Board (2 years)
Faculty Representatives to Athletics
First Peoples' Mentors
Health & Safety Committee
Human Subjects Review
Parking Infraction Review Committee
KAOS Antenna Site Selection DTF
Longhouse Advisory Committee
Professional Education Advisory
Student Conduct Code Board
Teacher Education Advisors

Other Work/Committee (all minor; meeting once per year or as needed)

Cal Anderson Memorial Lecture Series Advisory Board
Copyrights/Patents
Deadly Force Review Board
Communications Board
PLATO Royalty Award Committee
Public Art Advisory Committee
Unsoeld Selection Committee

Appendix E

Selected Climatological Data

Olympia, Washington
(National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1996)

Month	Average Precipitation Inches	Average Maximum Temperature °F	Average Minimum Temperature °F	Average Mean Temperature °F
January	8.01	44.2	31.1	37.6
February	5.77	49.1	32.6	40.8
March	4.95	53.3	33.5	43.4
April	3.29	58.9	36.5	47.8
May	2.09	65.9	41.4	53.8
June	1.63	71.1	46.6	58.7
July	0.82	77.1	49.3	63.2
August	1.29	76.9	49.4	63.2
September	2.26	71.5	45.3	58.4
October	4.31	60.8	39.5	50.3
November	8.05	50.4	35.4	42.9
December	8.12	43.8	31.9	38.0
Annual	50.59	60.2	39.4	49.8

Appendix F

Responses to the *Campus Master Plan*

May 1998 Draft

Introduction: The Outreach Process

Copies of the revised *Campus Master Plan* were made available in several locations around campus, as well as on a web page. Memos asking for input on the draft were delivered to all mail boxes on campus and an e-mail memo to planning unit groups of faculty made the same request. In response to the memo, I have received responses from eight faculty and three staff members.

Public forums were held on two consecutive days—advertised in the *CPJ*, *Greener Scene*, and the memos. The first was well attended; about ten people, including faculty, staff, and a few students, participated in a discussion that mainly concentrated on the CLUC. The second forum was attended by only a single staff member.

A voice mail message was sent to all student organizations on campus. There was only one obvious response to this, but it likely helped to pique interest and recognition of the Master Plan in other settings. A “banner” was placed as header for opening all e-mail accounts in the “pine” system as well, and this seems to have resulted in a few letters. A chat room type forum was set up on the topic of the revised Master Plan, but it received minimal use (one entry so far).

The largest number of responses was gained by setting up a table in the CAB for a day and a half. This set up allowed people to casually inquire about the plan. Comments – from the very general to the specific – were encouraged and recorded. Responses were recorded from fifty-six students, ten staff, and four faculty members. However, it was estimated that overall more than two-hundred people stopped at the table; most of them inquired about the plan but did not give a response beyond accepting the information given to them. Many expressed their appreciation of this particular outreach effort. A few students that talked to me in this setting have contacted me with further questions and comments.

Three students and one alumna have sent e-mail messages, but none of them specified where they heard about the Master Plan.

All of the responses received on the draft *Campus Master Plan*, from all the various venues, are outlined below. While the intent of speaker or writer has been maintained as closely as possible, most of the responses have been edited for brevity. Those responses that do not directly apply to the Master Plan, e.g. those that are site specific, were passed on to appropriate members of the staff for further consideration. Those responses that do directly address an element of the Master Plan were discussed at length and many modifications were made to the plan as a result.

Responses: Facilities

Buildings

The Longhouse is in the wrong place. It would be ideal if Longhouse and Seminar II could switch locations. (Staff)

Likes the aesthetics of the Longhouse. The concrete buildings are ugly. Should use alternative building materials, design, systems (e.g. straw bale). Need to set an example. (Student)

A new building for administrative purposes or for classroom space would be welcomed. (Student)

Many check-ins on the location of Seminar II. Responses to are mixed – some people have no problem with it. Others are initially upset, but nearly all appear to accept the location choice when the reasons behind it are explained.

Students at Evergreen for Ecological Design (SEED) came to meetings about Seminar II and they feel that their suggestions regarding systems design for the new building were not taken seriously. (Student)

The administration doesn't care about student opinions. Doesn't want to hear the reasons for locating Seminar II next to the CAB. (Student)

Sad about the trees to be cut down for the location of Seminar II. Somewhat alleviated by hearing of the background in making the location choice. (Staff)

Supports proposal for new theater attached to the Communications Building. (Student)

Paint murals on the outsides of the buildings – it would improve the exterior appearance and give opportunities to art students. Paint would seal the pores of the concrete, so mosses, algae and lichens wouldn't take hold as quickly (reduced washing needs would offset additional maintenance of murals). (Student)

Include roof gardens in the design of new buildings. Terrace the different levels, with gardens on each terrace. Existing buildings are ugly and depressing. This strategy would green-up the exteriors.

Why not expand the campus vertically rather than horizontally? (Student)

Daycare Center building needs to be replaced. It isn't big enough (long waiting list) and it is in poor repair. Should be a high priority for the college. (Student)

Need a bigger daycare. (Student)

Don't build a stadium, or any sports events facilities unless it's for something outrageous. (Student)

Don't put the new building in front of my window. (Staff)

No mention of earthquake preparedness, disaster planning in the Master Plan. Include in modernization section? (Staff?)

The TESC woods are a unique, non-replaceable asset. Every effort should be made to minimize further encroachment into these areas. Limiting new construction to the core campus area, minimizing non-permeable surfaces, etc. are all part of the process. Grow up, not out. (Faculty)

We don't need another building. We don't need another clear-cut. What happened to progressive Evergreen? It's gone mainstream...ban the plan. (Alum)

Is there anything that pushes the school to keep with environmental goals when planning and executing construction? (or does it generally come down to economics?) Why has past construction on campus been so conservative? Evergreen should be a leader in innovative, environmentally sensitive development. The technology exists for alternative building materials and support systems – why do we balk at using it? (Fits with Objective 15) (Student)

Utilities

Need discussion of solid waste management on campus. Add a policy to address recycling and adding composting of all organic matter. If money is the concern, consider that the existing waste disposal system may already be losing money (how about the long term?)...would this really make it any worse? Possible site for composting facilities could be meadow on Driftwood. (Student)

Other Structures

Many check-ins about the status of the canopy walkway. Those who stated an opinion were in favor of the walkway.

Supports the location of KAOS tower in B Lot. (Student)

Interior Spaces

Move the bike shop to ground floor access... it would receive much more frequent use. In current location, have to use elevator to access, plus not very visible. (Student)

Need to display more artwork on campus. It is difficult for students to show their work on campus, and there is plenty of bare wall space that could be beautified with art. Needs to be a consideration for the new construction on campus. Also minor renovations of existing space to accommodate art work (better lighting). Student work should be given priority over faculty exhibitions. (Student)

Lounge areas are not well equipped. Furniture is missing or dirty. Many areas are dark. Adding art work to these areas would help to make them more inviting. (Student)

Use full-spectrum lighting in all classrooms. It would help prevent winter depression. We deserve better than the same old fluorescents we've suffered with since grade school. (Student)

Glad to see that display spaces for artwork is one of the design concepts for campus. However, not sure the campus adequately supports the actual installation and exhibition of artwork in these display spaces with financial, equipment and staff resources. (Faculty)

Could not find issues of indoor air quality and aesthetics adequately addressed anywhere in this plan. I believe both concepts are essential to the quality of our lives on campus. It seems these issues might more directly be addressed under "Section III - 2.2 Objectives and Policies: Facilities, Objective 3: To maintain a set of unified design concepts to guide campus growth". (Faculty)

One of the main disappointments I have had about this college is the lack of outdoor or environmental art on our grounds. On other campuses there are collections of art that elicit wonder, curiosity, commentary (even conflict) and illustrates a wonderful cultural diversity and history. These are also items of a mature campus and do not appear overnight. Now that Evergreen is maturing, I suggest we have a statement of a goal for soliciting or encouraging outdoor sculpture, structure, fountains and the like. (Staff)

I would like to suggest that when Police Services moves into the CAB, space and venting be made available in their lobby for a copy machine. Presently, the only student access copiers are in the library and this limits access when the library is closed. Having the machines in the lobby of Police Services would allow for supervision of the copiers and increase contact and exposure between the campus community and the Police Services staff. (Staff)

Parking

Parking is awful for people who have to make trips from campus during the day – waste time finding and re-finding parking spaces and walking to and from the outlying edges of the parking lots. (Staff)

Could faculty park under the library? They could use existing service roads for access. (Student)

Why not multi-level parking? Parking lots could maintain existing foot prints (avoid cutting down more trees or increasing walking distance) while providing more spaces. Could have trees growing up through the parking structure to maintain that feel. (Student)

Underground parking would allow for more parking spaces. Could use area over the underground parking for athletic fields or gardens. (Student)

Need more parking closer in to the Core. Should be a larger parking area by the Longhouse.

Housing

Use the meadow north of Driftwood Road as the location for the new dorms. Excellent solar exposure. (Student)

Use Driftwood House for a cooperative living residence. Humboldt Community College (not sure if I wrote the name down correctly) has such a set up – students get 2 credits per quarter to live as an intentional community, sharing responsibilities of the house (growing food for the house included). It would be best if the house was retrofitted for more appropriate technology, but even without that kind of renovation it would be a useful experiment/example of cooperative living. (Student)

The mods are in terrible shape – hard to clean, infested, falling apart, unhealthy. They were intended as temporary structures but instead have been used for 25 plus years. Should be torn down and re-built. Could provide site for future dorms (if they were multi-story structures, there still would be a net gain in dorm area). Use sustainable building materials for new structures. (Student)

Did campus ever own Cooper's Glen land? What was Evergreen's involvement with developing ASH? (Student)

Regarding dorms: likes the layout of Phase II and III dorms – more natural than Phase I or mods. For future dorms, have more variation in the appearances of interiors and exteriors. Leave as many trees between buildings as possible. (Student)

Campus housing is adequate. Housing has talked about "needing" to build, but many, many apartments (especially the mods) had extra beds and plenty extra space.

TESC computing and networking officials, get your act together!! It is a sad day when the connection to the internet (the heinously over-done firewall) that serves all of campus and resnet cannot be reset quickly when it goes down. Who's responsible for such irresponsibility? Housing costs were raised for net connections that housing members can't use. Not fair! (?)

Organic Farm

Wants the farm to expand. (Student)

Wants more space at the farm. Free Community Garden plots for students. (Student)

Growth (within and outside Evergreen)

College shouldn't grow any more. Be stubborn. (Student)

Need to address more directly in the Plan what the policy is on growth adjacent to the college boundaries. What kinds of things do we want developers to consider? (Student)

Make tables of student demographics and student population growth more clear (Appendices B and C). What about the extra students that were enrolled in 1997? When was the decision made to grow (what process decided this?). Discuss the ratio of in-state to out-of-state as well. (Student)

Any particular study area targeted for growth? (Student)

Can we affect how the land is developed at our borders? Can we buy adjacent property? (Faculty)

No growth would be best. Keep Evergreen small. That is what is attractive about the school. (Student)

Hope that Evergreen grows in a responsible way that is in accordance with the founding notion of simplicity and conservation of our natural surroundings. (Student)

Given the pressures of development, there will likely be no significant wooded areas on Cooper Point twenty years from now, unless development is controlled in the very near future. A very serious concern becomes maintaining connections to other habitat areas, if possible. Will the

pressures of development increase the value of the land to the point where the College has to sell it off or develop it? Is there any way to forever lock the wooded areas into a land trust that precludes any development? (Faculty)

Could outside entities ever buy up campus land? (Student)

Landscaping

Worried about ivy – it has already started killing trees on campus. Need to salvage the landscape. Involve academic programs and coordinate with outside entities (Sound Native Plants, Native Plant Salvage Project) to establish landscaping with native species. Expand the ethnobotanical garden at the Longhouse – have it spill over into other areas of the Core. Using natives will save money on maintenance. (Student)

Should use native plants on campus. Ivy is stupid; it is radiating out from the library building, invading other parts of campus. Grass is stupid; water requirements are high (and the sprinklers are sometimes turned on while it's raining). (Student)

Is there a policy to replant a tree for any that are cut down? (Student)

It is important to maintain plantings that are strictly native. Herbicide and pesticides be kept to an absolute minimum. Regarding new development, plan around the especially large trees which contribute to the richness of campus. (Student)

Fruit and nut trees, berry bushes, and culinary and medicinal herbs planted around the campus would be a great asset to future students. Add color and variety to the landscape, great for wildlife, and perennial herbs have low maintenance needs. Also wonderful to have food for campus population – supplying even a small portion of the food we need locally can help us to be more sustainable, healthier and happier. (Student)

Reserve Areas

Trails are in terrible shape. Need to improve existing trails and build new ones. Could employ a group of students to do the work (cheaper than hiring professionals). Have pay boxes at trail heads for non-TESS users. (Student)

Need to clean up forests. Garbage from students partying in the woods all over the place. (Student)

Supports idea of Ecological Reserves. (Student)

Small-scale (sustainable) forestry should be done by academic programs on campus. Have a program as an extension of the Organic Farm program. The forests as they are now don't look healthy and are a fire hazard. (Student)

Land base of Reserve areas not large enough to do much "real" science in terms of sustainable forestry experiments. Could Evergreen programs use off-campus (existing) forestry areas (e.g. H. J. Andrews and UW experimental forests)?

Reserve areas provide the perfect balance to the developed campus. These areas are part of the reason this student chose Evergreen. (Student)

When will habitation policy start to be enforced? Could we create a new position to cover this? (a forest ranger type)

Ecological Preserves need to include blocks of land, not just narrow strips. Should allow for some coherence of ecosystems on campus. (Faculty)

Impressed that so much of the campus is undeveloped. (Student)

Communication among the users of the Reserve areas is lacking. Now that we have a GIS gridwork in, and a staff person in charge of it, that we should be able to keep track of the use of these areas. Need an active committee to help with decision making, provide strong and fair

guidance in determining what sorts of activities are carried out on our lands. Sampling and marking plants must be done in a minimally destructive way. (Faculty)

Make a small campground in the campus woods, near a road so that it's easy for police to check-up on. For students only. With student ID they would have access to showers/toilets in the CRC. Camping should be free in exchange for residents being responsible for a certain section of the woods: trail maintenance, trash pick-up, making sure no transients living there. (Student)

The more woods we keep, the happier I'll be. (Staff)

Save as much woods as possible. (Staff)

Maybe log it a little bit. (Student)

Need trail maintenance. Also, why are we using non-native species on campus? Especially ivy – why use it and then spend time removing it? (Student)

Many trails emerging in the North Campus land area. How can these be prevented? Maintained? It is a complex problem warranting at least a year's worth of discussion. Perhaps an academic program should take it on. (Faculty)

Connect Ecological Preserve areas so that there are corridors for wildlife that use more than one area of campus. (Faculty)

The reward for commuting to Evergreen is the sweet air I get to breathe when I arrive...short walks between buildings rejuvenate me with truly fresh air. Walks to Organic Farm give respite from job stress. I can see all kinds of birds from office window. These are the selfish reasons why I enjoy the forests and want them to be preserved...evidence not only that our immediate environment is now in balance but also that there is a potential for more to be so. If we are constantly reminded of that potential, then perhaps we will better guided our steps in that direction. (Faculty)

Campus Land Use Committee (CLUC)

Likes idea of CLUC. (Student)

As a part of CLUC operations, they should regularly publish details of the process and results of review (in newspaper and/or other locations). If zoning is established, that should be publicized. (Student)

The CLUC should be set up so that committee members can't push their own agenda, push their own proposals through. How do we address potential conflicts of interest? Members shouldn't review their own proposals. (Student)

What is the timetable for formation of the CLUC? Need more specific details of operations of the CLUC. (Faculty)

Need formal inventory of vegetation and wildlife distribution on campus. Need to compile the studies that have been done (by students, faculty and others) so that we can build on earlier research and not waste time duplicating. Develop a protocol for how studies for the inventory are conducted? Copies of the reports and overall inventory should be centrally located (archives, data base) and accessible and indexed. (Faculty and Students)

The proposal to form the CLUC makes sense. (Student)

Supportive of the CLUC concept – need to hire some people to make it possible, though (existing staff already very busy). Should split the Campus Planner/Architect into two positions. (Faculty)

Replacing EAC with the CLUC is another step in the wrong direction. The aesthetic component has been removed from the original mission. Need to be concerned with the philosophy of preserving what is just a bit wild on our campus, not with developing a logging program. (Faculty)

Planning for the CLUC is very thorough; impressed with how much detail there is on what the committee will do and how it will work. It is essential to clearly communicate this to the campus

community and to clearly define and support the jurisdiction and decision-making powers of the CLUC. From the plan, understand that the CLUC will make decision-making recommendations only. Also wonder what the relationship between the CLUC and the Health and Safety Committee and the Environmental Committee will be? (Faculty)

Format

Doesn't understand section numbering. (Student)

Citations should be at ends of sentences, not between sentences. (Faculty)

Reading it the first time was a little overwhelming – so much information. But went back to investigate specific areas of confusion, able to easily answer own questions. So, format works well. (Faculty)

Change the name of the corporation yard – doesn't make sense. (Several Students)

In the electronic version of the Plan, it would be great to have word search capability. If you weren't familiar with the organization of the document, you could type in the topic that you're interested in and get all the references. (Staff)

Goals and Objectives

(Note: "Objectives" corresponds to "Policies" in the September 1998 Draft)

Re: Objective 9, need more consultation with intended service population. Faculty and students need to be included in planning and provision of campus activities and services to a greater extent. (Student)

Re: Objective 12, EF Language school needs to be integrated with rest of the college. Wants to mix with that part of the population. (Student)

Re: Objective 12, EF students are isolated – both housing and classrooms. (Student)

Re: Objective 4, police vehicles are the most prevalent automobiles within the campus core. While this makes some sense for night patrols, no reason for driving around the core during the day – why not use the bikes more?

Re: Objective 4, Need more parking/locking spaces for bicycles. Need bicycle lanes on all campus and access roads – especially on the Parkway at the main entrance. (Student)

Re: Objective 4, what about the services needed for cyclists (e.g. showers, lockers)? What encouragement are we providing for users of alternative transportation (Section III – 5.4.2)? (Student)

Re: Objective 15, Only one policy based on this objective. Needs to be more that address vision for campus utilities (waste management, energy sources etc.) and building design. (Student)

Which objective covers growth? (internal and external?) How about policies on these issues? (Student)

Overall

Include an appendix of input/responses in the Master Plan so that there is documentation of this part of the process. Will be able to see which responses resulted in changes to the document and show where opinions differed. (Student)

Agrees with concept of core and cluster areas. (Student)

Ugliest campus ever seen (referring to the campus core). (Student)

It looks great. (Student)

Generally positive response to the revised Plan. Likes that the Master Plan is setting the stage for

these discussions instead of leaping ahead to conclusions. (Student)

Many positive responses to setting up the table in the CAB. Students and faculty appreciated the administration reaching out in that way.

Great to look at the Master Plan on the web page. Final copy of the Master Plan should be a permanent part of the TESC home page. (Faculty)

Likes the campus how it is. Doesn't want anything to change – change is probably for the worse. (Student)

Liked subject heading on e-mail memo (Why not develop evergreen's forests?). (Staff)

Good job of assembling material. (Staff)

Add a section on the data communication network (under Section III – 2.4.9, *Communications*). (Staff)

Leaving the forests here as intact as possible ought to be our first goal. (Student)

Found much of the material in the plan to be extremely useful on a number of levels. For instance, the information on the climate of the area is an excellent resource for people new to the area. Will definitely reference many of the figures and appendices in the future. Would like to see the planning and governance groups list updated as part of the annual update and specifically updated to include the names of who is currently serving on those planning and governance groups. This would be a very useful resource to the campus. (Faculty) *Note: While a list of the planning and governance groups will continue to be included in the Master Plan, it probably isn't the appropriate place for listing the names of those that serve on the committees. However, it does seem like this could be a useful resource to have available somewhere on campus.*

The development plan is seriously flawed. If there are any ecological considerations, even concessions in the plan, they are well hidden under a mass of details concerning large-scale developments which may or may not be in the best interest of the college. Where and when will the AM/PM, Burger King, McDonald's and various stripsprawl be built...will transfer to another college where the character of the institution is a known, rather than unpredictable, evil. (Student)

Plans for the future should consider the many other things besides the academic program. In the dominating American culture, human beings are too often planning in their own behalf without thinking of all the other creatures around them. This place is an important place because of the way in which it preserves habitat for all our relations in the natural world. If we consider developing anything on campus, we should think, not just economically, not just environmentally, not just aesthetically, but wholistically and then we will talk carefully with the scientists and call in Native American elders from the area, and think about everything that this campus natures and makes possible so that we may act as an example for students needing to find harmony as they create human culture on an earth that supports more than just human life. (Faculty)

Heard that Evergreen is the only state college that breaks even. If this is so, why don't we have more flexibility to do what we want? How much pressure is there to not change this situation? (If other colleges are losing money, why can't we?) (Student)

Let's face it, the planet is at stake! The Master Plan is unquestionable, beyond challenge. Who ever wrote the Master Plan will not be held at fault. However, it is incomplete. It has obviously been shortened to this brief length so as to appeal to the quick/casual reader. I think someone who can more fully express the Plan should create an addendum. After all the voter may pass by and want to know exactly what the Master Plan says (other than – to be presumptuous – the President is charged with the duty to decide which bush or shrub is to be KILLED to make room for some new structure. (?))

Bibliographic Notes

(Incomplete for 9/98 Draft)

Franklin, Jerry F., & Dyrness, C. T. (1973). Natural vegetation of Oregon and Washington. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.

Local climatological data: annual summary with comparative data. (1996). Asheville: The National Climatic Data Center.

Campus Planning Documents

Long-range plan for The Evergreen State College. (1994). Olympia: The Evergreen State College.

Durham, Anderson & Freed, architects and Quinton & Budlong, engineers. (1969). The Evergreen State College: development plan – phase 2 studies. Seattle.

Durham, Anderson & Freed, architects and Quinton & Budlong, engineers. (1968). The Evergreen State College: master plan – phase 1 studies. Seattle.

The Evergreen State College campus master plan. (1983). Olympia: The Evergreen State College.

Final report of the Space Committee [space efficiency report]. (1997). Olympia: Space Efficiency Committee, The Evergreen State College.

Durham, R. L., Torkko, C. E., & Williams, E. D. (1972). Report of the master planning team. Olympia: The Evergreen State College.

Environmental and facilities planning DTF report. (1975). Olympia: Environmental and Facilities Planning Interim Team, The Evergreen State College.

Student/Faculty Reports

Greenberg, K., & Hartley, A. (1998). Trails mapping on the Evergreen State College. Olympia: student report, The Evergreen State College.

Greenberg, K., & Hartley, A. (1998). Forest canopy cover typing. Olympia.

Foltz, K. & Tucker, G. (1997). The Evergreen arboretum: a preliminary study. Olympia.

Zimmerman, C. (1998). Ecological assessment of stand structure and species composition on the Kifer and Organic Farm sites. Olympia.

Public Documents

Thurston County profile. (1997). Olympia: Thurston Regional Planning Council

Shoreline master program for the Thurston region. (1990). Olympia: Thurston Regional Planning Council.

bComprehensive plan for Olympia and Olympia growth area. (1994)

bThurston County comprehensive plan.