

June 4, 1975

Environmental Advisory Committee:
Recommendations for committee composition and procedures

The responsibilities of this committee, advising "responsible officials" of the environmental consequences of their decisions, require that its members have some expertise in considering the environmental desirability of the projects reviewed. All applicants for membership should be informed fully of these responsibilities. These recommendations for membership recruitment attempt to keep the process as open as possible to insure a fair representation of the campus population, while keeping an eye to the specific responsibilities of the EAC.

The terms of the members should cover four quarters. The terms are to be staggered so that there are experienced members on the committee at any given point in time. This could be accomplished by appointing the first members to varying lengths of time; when each appointment runs out a new appointment would be made according to the standard term length of four quarters.

Distribution of committee membership:

Three faculty, relying upon volunteers to fill the available post -- at least one faculty should be actively involved in the natural sciences, preferably in environmental studies. Successive terms are to be discouraged.

Three students -- recruitment of the students should be done through the Environmental Resource Center. No successive terms.

~~Three~~ Two staff -- one staff position to be filled with someone from the office of facilities.

Other than the special quality of permanence of this committee, its meetings should be held in accord with the same guidelines set up in COG for DTFs. There are a few additional guidelines to deal with special problems which may come up. The chairperson should be elected by the committee for one quarter terms only, with an election for a new chairperson being held each quarter. Service for a second term as chairperson is possible. To be eligible for chairperson, the nominee should have been on the committee for at least two quarters. Members who cannot attend summer meetings are responsible for finding an alternate and insuring that the alternate's address and phone number are given to the office of facilities and the chairperson. Summer meetings are to be held with whoever is available. Any member whose attendance seriously drops off may be removed and replaced by consensus of the committee.

Recommendations Regarding Review and Revision of the Campus Master Plan and the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement thereon.

I. Assumptions and Principles

1. The process should be undertaken by a Master Planning Team separate from the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC). The EAC would serve a major advisory and review function as in the current guidelines. Some overlap in membership between the groups is possible and probably desirable.
2. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be prepared by the Master Planning Team concurrently with the Master Planning.
3. The Master Planning Team should consist of individuals from the Evergreen Community, with provision made for consultation with members of the 1970-72 Master Planning Team.
4. Staff and faculty involved as members of the team should be given 50-100% released time for this activity (i.e., Master Planning should be an integral part of their normal job description during this period). Students could either a) be paid, b) receive academic credit or c) receive both pay and credit for their participation. (There was some division of opinion in the EAC as to the advisability of giving both pay and credit.)

II. Outline of Procedure

1. The team reviews the existing planning documents and present use of facilities and grounds.
2. It collects existing data on the natural campus environment (geologic, botanical, zoological, hydrological, etc.). It then determines and undertakes (or provides for) additional research required to assure all necessary data is available for adequate discussion of existing conditions in the EIS.
3. The team reviews and suggests revisions in the basic conclusions and recommendations in the existing Master Planning documents.
4. It develops alternative use plans for the various areas of the campus considering a) basic policy conclusions and recommendations as noted in (3), b) existing uses, c) community needs (academic, recreational, facilities, etc.), d) optimum use of each area. As part of this, an environmental impact assessment of each of the various alternatives would be made.
5. A preliminary report is prepared and distributed to the campus community on the various alternatives with recommendations together with a Draft EIS.
6. The preliminary reports are reviewed, discussed and responded to by Evergreen faculty, staff and students, including public hearings held by the Master Planning Team.

7. The Team reviews community input and prepares final recommendations and a final EIS for submission to the Board of Trustees.

Provision should be made for a continuing team to review periodically the resulting master plan. (Note: This recommendation was also made by the 1972 Master Planning team.)

III. Personnel:

We recommend that the basic Master Planning team consist of 5-7 people -- faculty, students and staff -- with knowledge/expertise in the following areas:

1. Land use planning
2. Ecology/Natural Science
3. Architecture/Facilities Planning
4. Fine Arts/Humanities
5. Social Sciences (Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology)

Student members of the team should have field research experience.

Additional students could be involved through projects in various academic programs, individual contracts or work study.

IV. Timing:

Because of existing commitments, we do not see this process beginning earlier than January 1, 1976 (Winter Quarter 75-76). It should certainly commence no later than Fall Quarter 1976-77.

There are two possible modes of proceeding:

- 1) A five member team works full time for 1 to 2 quarters (e.g. Spring-Summer or Summer-Fall 1976) to prepare preliminary reports (through stage 5 of Section II above) with 25-50% commitment in the two succeeding quarters to complete the process.
- 2) A 5-7 member team has 50% released time for 12-18 months to complete entire process. (This option allows for broader student involvement, especially through academic programs and contracts, but results in a greater delay for planning guidance for decisions being made now on a regular basis.)

V. Budget:

Costs will depend on the alternative chosen and the specific individuals on the team. Two things are essential: 1) Funds must be available for limited use of external (and internal) consultants and for necessary supplies, clerical support and printing. 2) Funds for faculty and staff participants (at least that portion of salary devoted to the Master Planning effort) should not be taken from Academic or comparable operating unit budgets; there should be a special appropriation made for the Master Planning, representing specific college commitment to the process.