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1.0 Introduction

Vegetation has always played a pivotal role in the formation of the spirit and genius of Wellesley’s remarkable campus. Mr. and Mrs. Durant certainly recognized the importance of the native New England vegetation as a part of the land they set aside for Wellesley. Between 1870 and 1881, the Durants set about improving the indigenous landscape at Wellesley to create a particular type of cultivated nature, adding, for example, many rhododendron and magnolia trees to the existing groves. In a 1902 letter to Wellesley president Caroline Hazard, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. cited the importance of vegetation as an inseparable overlay of the fine glaciated topography of the Wellesley landscape. But the vital role of planting as part of the campus history extends well beyond Olmsted to include ideas and principles that uniquely belong to Wellesley and were developed as much by the faculty at the time as by professional design consultants. The campus has evolved in a variety of ways, but all of these share the tradition of building on the strengths of the native flora, with plantings assuming a variety of distinctive roles in the changing character of the romantic campus landscape in the twentieth century.

2.0 Campus Planting as Artifact

The Wellesley campus landscape, particularly the campus planting, is an artifact influenced by a broad range of philosophical, pedagogical, and practical concerns. All of the plants on the Wellesley campus, native and introduced, are living organisms that respond to the same set of environmental factors: they reach branches toward the sun, become larger over time, grow more openly in shade, and so on. Over the course of time, native and exotic plantings become interwoven as one landscape. As a result, it is difficult to recognize that Wellesley’s campus is a built landscape, a living record of the history of careful and particular thinking about the campus design over time.

Each planting at Wellesley is, or should be, the result of purposeful decisions about planting design based on a variety of motivations. For example, a decision was made to maintain and supplement the found native plants on the campus hillsides, just as it was a methodical decision to establish and nurture the important and introduced exotic plantings on campus. Behind the campus planting design decisions were numerous objectives: whether these objectives were spatial, visual, decorative, pictorial, or related to wayfinding, they related back to making places and giving Wellesley its specific character. There also have been ecological concerns that guided planting design decisions at Wellesley; these are addressed in Working Paper 3. Thinking about the campus planting has also been guided by fragility, safety, and maintenance requirements and these will be addressed in Working Paper 7.

2.1 Place and Pedagogy: Understanding Wellesley’s Plant Palette

Planting design at Wellesley, at its best moments, has been an inseparable resolution of poetic and pragmatic variables: for this master plan we need to resolve how future planting can reinforce the overall structural and spatial qualities of the campus employing a relevant, contemporary interpretation of poetic and practical concerns.

The Wellesley campus plantings are a careful melding of the native New England vegetation, much of which was found on the original site mixed with a variety of exotic species that have been introduced to form a cultivated natural landscape. The resulting matrix of native and introduced species structures the three-dimensional landscape spaces and experiences on campus: the enveloping plantings of tree-covered hillsides, the embracing grove of the Academic Quadrangle, the intimacy of the spaces within the Hunnewell Arboretum, and many others. The introduction of exotic plantings has stretched across Wellesley’s entire history, and continues today; it reflects the pedagogic need of the former botany department to have a variety of native and exotic species as parts of the living collection on campus. Beyond creating this living collection, the addition of ornamental plants (such as magnolias and crabapples), with their exceptional spring and fall flowers or foliage, has formed, especially in previous times, a campus landscape with profound sensorial richness. The campus today is a mosaic of more purely native plantings, such as the stately, muted, gray trunks of New England oaks and maples in the Academic Quadrangle in winter, and the brilliant red foliage of Nyssa at Tupelo Point in early October, juxtaposed near places on campus that include the hybrid rhododendron in Rhododendron Dell and the dotting of crabapples and kousa dogwoods at the edges of campus spaces. Part of the planning of this master plan will include expanding the palette of appropriate species to diversify rather than homogenize the existing landscape.
2.2 Renewing the Existing Campus Vegetation

This master plan comes at an important moment in the evolution of the maturing of the vegetation on the Wellesley campus. Many of the existing campus plantings were installed as part of the building program between 1900 and 1940. Approaching eighty to one hundred years of age, numerous plantings are reaching maturity. A tree, once in decline, cannot be renovated; one starts again with a sapling of some sort. Although there is a kind of beauty in watching a tree grow, there would be little beauty at Wellesley if the majesty of its great connective canopy of trees and plantings were lost.

Planning for the renewal of Wellesley's mature plantings is a pivotal responsibility that this master plan will guide. The landscape renovation of Harvard Yard has shown that with an overly mature tree canopy, it is best to make a significant corrective step by implementing a partial replanting, then by incrementally reinvigorating the tree canopy by adding a few new trees in perpetuity every year. The long-term goal of such a strategy is a campus landscape of trees and plants of widely varying ages, thus breaking the cycle of the uniform maturing of a canopy that intermittently needs an expensive and nearly complete replanting.

Furthermore, catastrophic loss of trees from extreme weather or disease can affect significant portions of the campus plantings. Such unexpected losses will continue to create the occasional need to replant portions of the campus. Major plant losses on the Wellesley campus resulted from the American chestnut blight early in this century, followed by the loss of the American elms to Dutch elm disease in the second half of the century. Other significant losses of trees have resulted from ice storms and the 1938 and 1954 hurricanes. Wellesley now faces a new dilemma: whether to carry out an expensive annual spraying regime or risk significant losses to the extensive plantings of Canadian hemlock to the invasion of the woolly adelgid aphid. The magnitude of any such future losses from diseases or insects can be reduced by avoiding monocultures and increasing the diversity of species of the campus plantings to create a polyculture.

3.0 Campus Landscape Structure

As discussed in earlier Working Papers, the fundamental structure of the Wellesley campus is based on Olmsted's vision that stipulates the siting of buildings on hilltops: in practical terms, Olmsted's concept also preserves the valleys. The resulting relationship of buildings on hilltops and open valleys below creates one of the basic patterns informing campus life: one embarks from the hills, passes down the sides of the hills, and then moves through the valley landscape below. Plants play a crucial role in the realization of these spatial organizational principles of the campus. Within the general structure, a variety of specific patterns of plantings provides much of the diversity and subtlety in the overall landscape.

The major vegetative masses of the campus occur on the hillsides, thereby exaggerating the verticality of each hill. The result is to make the hillsides seem taller and densely enclosed, in contrast to the low, interconnected and open valleys. The nature of the other main planted configurations that form the structural patterns of the campus are described as types below.

4.0 Landscape Types

Designers use the word "type" to identify the recognizable and often repeated compositional elements of a landscape that result from a similar design response to a specific functional or programmatic goal. In looking at the structure of the Wellesley campus, it is possible to identify a series of types related to its plantings, that is, plantings that share a basic similarity of formal purpose and compositional structure in response to program. These types are reviewed below to catalog their purpose and provide a description of their formal properties and their individual plant species makeup. These compliment the second half of this paper which is a plan and a phonographic and descriptive catalog of all the spaces of the main campus landscape.

4.1 Hilltop Quadrangles and Courtyards

One of the most recognizable landscape types on the Wellesley campus is the development of relatively simple gardens within courtyard spaces. The majority of building clusters on hilltops are formed to have some type of "U"-shaped courtyard, such as with Tower Court, Green Hall, Hazard Quadrangle, and Stone-Davis. Several benefits arise from this configuration. For example, these open courtyards typically are sized to allow the sun to sweep through them across the span of each day. The resulting sunny courtyard garden, with its more protected and mild microclimate in fall and spring, also creates a fine prospect for looking into the distant campus landscape. These courtyards and their plantings are typically structured to frame these views and to provide peaceful spaces for study and relaxation. An extension of the center line of these courtyards creates an implied axis into the adjacent (and often quite distant) campus landscape. The sight lines associated with these areas reveal other identifying reference points in the view that is seen. The campus landscape seen from the courtyard also works in part as a scenic background for the courtyard space.

The courtyards at Wellesley are among the most deteriorated landscapes on the campus. For example, the Tower Court landscape, attributed to the landscape architect Fletcher Steele, is a shadow of what it once was. And the small courtyard within Green Hall that looks to the east is now a parking lot.
whereas it once was a garden space and an important part of the constructed architecture and landscape of Green Hall. Rather than having prospective students arrive at a parking lot within Green Hall, would it be better to reserve at most a few visitor parking spaces and restore the rest of this courtyard into a welcoming green landscape?

4.2 The Planted Hillsides: Veils and Separators

A basic structuring element of the Wellesley campus is the location of trees and shrubs planted on hillsides to veil the hilltops and to separate the open valleys below. In many cases, such as at Tower Court, these hillside plantings partially complete the fourth side of the courtyard, creating a kind of permeable edge whose transparency changes dramatically from summer to winter. These planted hillsides complement the structure of the campus in a variety of other ways: by creating the overall illusion of separation and distance on a campus where buildings are closer together than they feel; by defining the edges of the valley spaces that otherwise would be amorphous and less interesting if not bounded at their edges; by reducing the need for intensive maintenance on the steep, erosion-prone hillsides; by providing wildlife habitat; and, perhaps most important, by establishing pieces of cultivated nature—beautiful thickets of tree and shrub—that are pleasurable to walk through and to occupy as transitional zones as one travels to and from the buildings on the hilltops.

These hillside plantings are partly a kind of self-renewing forest and partly a carefully maintained element of the built landscape. The management of the campus hillside needs a combination of traditional horticulture, forest management, and wildlife habitat preservation. The contradictions inherent in these varied management goals have historically been a maintenance challenge and a source of disagreement among parties with diverse interests on campus. These disagreements extend back to the early twentieth century; at least, when a maintenance crew removed the understory of the wooded hillsides in an attempt to interrupt the life cycle of the gypsy moth, a move that was met with outcry from members of the botany department, who returned to campus after summer break to find many desired species and habitats destroyed. Among the most crucial aspects of the management of the campus hillsides is clearing the sight line axes from the courtyards and deciding to use young (volunteer) sapling trees as part of the regrowth of these types.

4.3 Valleys: Expansive Open Spaces for Inspiration and Activity

At nearly any cost, Wellesley must preserve and reassert the importance of the valleys and ensure against encroachment by inappropriate uses. Together the valleys form one continuous space made up of a series of smaller open spaces of mowed turf or meadow grasses, which collectively contribute to an overall sense of generosity on the campus. Olmsted’s idea of densely populating the hilltops with buildings owes a large part of its success to the way he also specified the preservation of a valley open space system on the campus, with its sense of tranquility and democracy. The fluid, connective space of the valleys also permits one to see the numerous structuring views and landmarks through campus and by visually connecting distant points in space, to understand the complex organization of the campus. Socially, the valleys provide places for, intramural sports, chance meetings, and other college-wide activities that are part of campus life. Finally, the valleys serve an important ecological function related to hydrology, as described in Working Paper 3.

Archival research indicates that some of the campus valleys were once far more beautiful wet meadows and flower fields than they are today. Instead, these areas now are mowed and are even often covered with parked cars. Most notably changed is the valley in front of the Science Center, once a naturally occurring wet meadow that was mowed once a year with a mowed turf edge along the roads and paths. Was the change to turf in this entire area made to facilitate parking cars?

Sawyer Green functions well as mowed turf even though it is not naturally well drained. Because of its central location and the honorific significance it has acquired over time, mowed grass is a useful surface for this area. This surface can absorb the broad range of important campus activities that take place there. The irregular and rolling quality of its central ground plane is an important and defining quality of the campus and should not be further modified.

4.4 Groves

A grove is a carefully constructed planted form type composed only of trees. It can be distinguished from woodlands by the absence of understory plantings. The campus grove, whether at Harvard Yard, or in the quadrangles of Smith, Cornell, and Bowdoin and countless others, is an enduring symbol of American collegiate life. At Wellesley the campus groves are among the most unchanged planted forms of this century. As a result, they are imbued with meaning shared across the many generations who have experienced campus life within the relatively unchanging character of these groves, beneath their enveloping form and dappled shade. The Academic Grove on Norumbega Hill and the Chapel Grove are prominent examples.

The trees in Wellesley’s groves are randomly spaced, unlike the imbedded geometric regularity of tree spacing in Harvard Yard and on parts of the Smith campus. Generally the lower branches of trees in a grove have either been self-pruned or removed by maintenance cutting to create a tall open space below
the canopy. The ground plane of Wellesley’s grove is activated by a criss-cross pattern of bituminous sidewalks positioned to align with ever-changing destinations on campus and desire lines that result.

When replanting the mature groves, care will be required to skillfully and subtly reinvigorate them and to establish a more enduring diversity of younger and older trees. Openings in the canopy that allow direct sunlight are obviously the best locations as the new trees will grow tall and have straight trunks. Wellesley’s groves are generally composed of native oaks and maples: red oak, scarlet oak, white oak, pin oak, red maple, and sugar maple. The desire to create a polyculture of diverse tree species (as opposed to the near monoculture of oaks and maples) needs to be weighed against the equally important goal of forming a compositional unity for the grove. Assessment of tree species to be added to the groves at Wellesley should include a consideration of: overall tree form; shade and drought tolerance (crucial factors when planting new trees below existing trees); the time that the species leaves out and defoliates in relationship to the dominant species of the grove; and maintenance issues, especially the strength or brittleness of wood and known disease and insect pests.

4.5 The Alexandra Gardens and the Hunnewell Arboretum

The Alexandra Gardens and the Hunnewell Arboretum are extraordinary resources of Wellesley and can be understood as an entire landscape within the larger overall campus. Their presence is sufficiently important that they be considered as separate parts of the campus structure. The primary purpose of the Alexandra Gardens and the Hunnewell Arboretum is to display plants for study. The care with which the plants are grouped and the character of the resulting intimate landscape spaces add immeasurably to the complexity of the campus. The Alexandra Gardens and the Hunnewell Arboretum are generally in excellent condition and will over time require only minor changes, realized possibly through ongoing upkeep permitted by their separate maintenance endowment. The otherwise beautiful plantings around Paramaecium Pond need to be evaluated in terms of their impact on the fluidity and connectivity of the adjacent meadows as part of the valley system.

4.6 Lake Edge

The edge of Lake Waban, with its sometimes narrow band of riparian plant species and the irregular walkway that winds through the lake edge, is an important element of the campus landscape. This band of plants serves the dual purpose of helping protect the water quality in the lake and contributing to the lake’s health in areas where wetlands increase oxygen exchange as part of the natural ecological structure. The deteriorated condition of the lake-edge plantings and of the paths and benches in several locations needs attention, particularly at entry points to the lake path from the campus circulation system. At these junctures serious erosion has occurred at the delicate edge, and a specific strategy for the reversal of this erosion needs to be developed.

The edge of Lake Waban requires serious restoration and renewal. The lake-edge plantings need to be replenished with native species, and issues of soil compaction and surface wear and tear near the beach and the boathouse need to be corrected. The remnant stream that enters Lake Waban near the boathouse (on axis with Alumnae Hall) offers a great opportunity to reclaim a deteriorated yet important piece of the natural riparian landscape of the campus that has been lost.

4.7 Lines of Trees and Allées

Lines of trees have historically been associated with certain key circulation paths and roadways on the Wellesley campus. The rhythm of lines of trees are a secondary but nonetheless important element in the structure of the campus; their trunks, as seen when walking on the former brick path along Lake Waban, create a measured series of vignette views of the landscape. Experientially these work as a strong counterpoint to the appealing but somewhat amorphous irregularity of the surrounding valley landscapes and to the long views across Lake Waban. The only remaining line of trees on the campus today is the sweeping line of sugar maples that parallels one side of the now-lost brick walk that starts near the Wellesley Club and stretches to the Student Center. The brick path once extended past the site of the library to at least the base of the hill below Tower Court. Archival research indicates that lines and/or allées of trees were more prevalent in the past, with an allée of American elms along the campus road near Stone-Davis and a line of trees along the abandoned campus roadway entrance from the now-destroyed north lodge area.

4.8 Dells

On campus there are just a few dells, or small and contained wooded valleys. At Wellesley the most prominent dells are the one in the Hunnewell Arboretum and the Rhododendron Dell (or Hollow), below Founders Hall, which was planted with rhododendron (probably from the Hunnewell estate) in the nineteenth century.

4.9 Lost Types

As documented in the history of the campus, a number of other specific plant types that once were part of a much more diverse campus landscape have been lost. These include flower meadows, shrub borders, orchards, and perennial gardens. Although it
is not possible or even desirable to reclaim all of these features, the master plan needs to address the issue of the shortage or absence of these kinds of plant forms today and how a renewal plan can responsibly and reasonably rebuild some of these into a campus with more diversity.

4.10 Specimen, Class, and Memorial Trees

Wellesley is fortunate to have a number of unusual and mature specimen trees, many of which are identified in the second half of this report. These trees deserve special protection. The campus as a whole could benefit from a reassessment of the time-honored practice of planting trees in honor of graduating classes. These trees could be a part of a more unified plan for the addition of specific kinds of trees to the campus landscape. The same could be said of memorial trees, which could perhaps be permitted only if they were used to reinforce identified structural qualities and specific planting goals. Better integration of the class tree program and of the planting of memorial trees as part of an overall plan could, over time, be another significant way to enhance the campus landscape and to create a stratified regime of trees with a broad range of stages of maturity.
Chapel Lawn, Rhododendron Dell, and Severance Green

- Although distinct in their individual expressions, these three spaces function as one continuous landscape to create an honorific center of the Wellesley campus. The general reading of these areas and of the Academic Quadrangle is similar in the way that a substantial portion of the space is structured by the presence of a tall grove of deciduous trees.

- One important quality of these spaces is the way they seamlessly transition to adjacent landscapes: the Chapel Lawn unfolds into the linear landscape associated with the sugar maple line along the former brick walk; Severance Green unfolds at the end of the library to Lake Waban where the Robert Irwin sculpture is cited. Therefore, the addition of shrubs in this area should be done very carefully so to not disturb or break up this spatial connectivity.

- The Rhododendron Dell is a wonderful and quirky planting occurring in the center of this important space. The inwardly focused dell with its intricate texture and strangely inaccessible center is a living example of what once were many more romantic, complex, and small scale landscape pieces that distinguished the Wellesley campus from others. Because the rhododendron occur within the depression of the bowl landform, the dell can be seen in its entirety and understood as a place within a larger overall landscape.

- Replanting the grove in this area will need to address many of the same limitations as outlined for the Academic Quad: in this space there can be more latitude regarding diversity of tree species. For example, the grove already has sweet gum and tulip poplar mixed into the plantings; the overall form and character of these trees is almost imperceptible within the oaks and maples.

- Although sylvan in its generous size, Severance Green presents several different problems: the purity of the lawn dissuades the insertion of needed paths that would mar its simplicity.

Figure 4.1: View from Chapel Lawn to Rhododendron Dell

Figure 4.2: Aerial view of Severance Hall and Severance Green

Figure 4.3: Desire line from Clapp Library across Severance Green
strong, heavily traveled diagonal desire line that connects the intersection of Jewett Hill Road and Tower Court Road and the library does exist.

- Historical photos show that a great richness of plantings previously existed along the eastern facade of Severance Hall. Perhaps these plantings should be restored.
- The large Norway spruce at the north side of the space blocks views and the spatial connection to and from the Davis courtyard. The paths that lead into the Rhododendron Dell are too steep for wheelchairs and are quite treacherous in the ice.
- The entire area immediately in front of the library is tired: the lawns and paths are not adequate for the amount of traffic and for service vehicles. The wheelchair access to the computer lab is only a temporary solution that needs to be designed to be permanent.
- The removal of cars from the Chapel Lawn is one of the most important priorities for the campus landscape. The oak grove surrounding the Chapel is mature. Starting a new generation of replacement trees is of the utmost importance. Service access to the Chapel is a concern that any future renovation of this building should address.
Academic Quadrangle

- The Academic Quadrangle, irregular in plan, is defined on three sides by Jewett, Pendleton, and Green Halls. The fourth side is open to Severance Green. The interior space of the quad is structured by a deciduous grove of red oak, white oak, scarlet oak, pin oak, sugar maple, and red maple. The carefully manipulated height of the tree canopy creates a tall and majestic space, one that allows clear sight lines to the surrounding buildings and into Severance Green.
- The nearly uniform maturity of the trees that comprise the grove requires correction, as described earlier.
- The ubiquitous and suburban feeling of the nearly continuous band of rhododendron and shrubs at the base of all the academic buildings in the quad—except along the base of the Jewett—should be reevaluated.
- Circulation in this area needs to be studied. The pathway system of the quad presently does not accommodate several diagonal desire lines that connect a variety of doorways and entry points.
- The archeological fragments of the remains of Farnsworth Hall and the associated sitting terrace are well positioned to provide an overlook above Severance Green. At the same time the trees on this terrace feel broken away from the structure of the main grove. This should be evaluated in terms of its detail design.
- Paving surfaces and site furniture need evaluation and some require replacement. As mentioned in Working Paper 2, a handicapped-accessible connection needs to be integrated to connect Jewett Hill Road with the Academic Quadrangle. This is an important link in connecting the buildings of the quad to the rest of the campus.
- The appropriateness of the Academic Quad for the siting of sculpture should be considered, given the recent addition of the Davis Museum to the campus. A consideration of the general policy concerning sculpture and the campus as a whole is needed.
The recently created courtyard by the Davis Museum and the Jewett Art Center is surprising but altogether appropriate as an urban presence in the otherwise more romantic campus. This courtyard is a bold addition to the range of landscape space types on campus. The circular planting area, cut from the pavement, includes three Katsura trees and creates a memorable outdoor dining terrace to the Collins Cafe.

- The recent addition of a band of deciduous shrubs at the base of the columns of Jewett inappropriately covers the way these columns should occupy this space formed by the coming together of these two buildings.
- Paving, furniture, and signage in this area are generally new and in excellent condition.
- New bollards are planned for this area.
- The Service Area needs design attention.
- The removal one of the large Norway spruces of the courtyard would allow views to and from Severance Green and Lake Waban.
Green Hall Courtyard

- The Green Hall Courtyard should be restored to its original and incredible simplicity, a landscape oasis perched above the connecting view of the campus to the east.
- Although pure historical restoration of much of the Wellesley campus is partially impossible and might be deemed too economically prohibitive, and in some areas not advisable, the Green Hall Courtyard is perhaps one of the few pieces of the campus where the value of time should be turned back and a manageably sized piece of the past could be rescued and returned to the future.
The success of the Founders Terrace lies in the juxtaposition of its simple form against the complex and dynamic grove of deciduous trees in the Rhododendron Dell. What is more beautiful than a terrace constructed of beautiful stone with a simple panel of lawn on it?

Today the condition of Founders Terrace goes beyond one of simplicity to a condition that feels a bit neglected. A partial restoration of the paving, including resetting the existing bluestone is needed. The recently added square bluestone stepping stones should be removed. Finally, the turf panels should be reinvigorated. The possible addition of a flowering tree should also be evaluated.
The Tower Court quad and its deep but narrow in
width view to Lake Waban could be more beautiful.
The newly restored stairs and terrace would be
complemented by selectively cleared view channels
out to the lake. Earlier photographs of the view to
Lake Waban show that a far wider panorama to the
lake previously existed. The space of the Tower
Court Quad is divided into two areas, a predomi-

nantly paved upper area to the north and a largely
glass-surfaced lower space. Portions of the design
are attributed to the landscape architect Fletcher
Steele, although we have not yet verified to what
extent Steele’s design was realized.

The small courtyard between Severance Hall and
Tower Court is in need of study as is the large
service court between Chaflin and the Lake House.
Improperly parked vehicles in the service area and
worn and eroded hillsides indicate a need for a
new plan and management strategy. The steep
pedestrian connection from the Lake House to the
boat house needs restoration. Historic photo-
graphs of the north side of Tower Court indicate a
finer-grained and detailed level of plants existed in
this area including shrubs in the main turn-around
and vines on the building facades. New plants in
this area need to take into consideration the
dimensional regiments of modern snow removal
equipment. Possible handicap-accessible connec-
tions between the Davis area and Tower Court
need to be studied.

The dominance of Canadian hemlock in the hillside
towards Alumnae Hall needs evaluation in terms of
the woolly adelgid aphid.
Hazard and Munger Quad

- Similar in purpose and form to the Tower Court Quadrangle, the Hazard Quad—known today as The Quad—and the Munger Quadrangle are south facing microclimates that orient towards Norumbega Hill and the Academic Quad. Both areas warrant significant restoration and better maintenance. The Hazard Quadrangle is in particular need of a complete restoration of plantings, lawns, paving, roads, and curbs. The areas to the north of the buildings are in disrepair and are indicative of an overstretched maintenance staff.
- Both quadrangles have lost part of their important sight lines to the larger campus landscape. These sight lines are crucial devices in creating the ability to read and understand the organization of the campus. As seen in historical photographs of Munger, the entry walk once aligned with a virtual axis focused on the Stone Tower of Green Hall. It appears that the wall of trees at the end of the Hazard Quad is also thicker and more opaque than in times past. The correction of these conditions can be realized by careful pruning of the lower branches of the existing trees, perhaps accompanied with selective removals.
- The fastigate oaks inside the Hazard Quadrangle, with their isolated and staccato rhythm, seem out of character with the feeling of the other courtyards at Wellesley.
Munger Meadow

- Munger Meadow is unique among the valley spaces on campus because vehicular circulation defines two edges of the space and because the meadow is quite low in relation to the surrounding occupied edges. Munger Meadow is a former wet meadow, as described in Working Paper 3, and is presently used as an intramural field. Because the ground plane of the meadow is not the appropriate size and grade for a playing field, relocating the intramural sports function to a better and new location should be studied in the master plan. The north edge of Munger Meadow is dominated by the hillside of Hazard Quad and Munger Hall and is quite intact. However, better handicap-accessible connections could possibly be threaded through the slope up to the Quad and to Munger.

- The south edge of the space of Munger Meadow is presently quite eroded. It seems trees removed from the hillside that continues east below Pendleton were never replaced when College Road was relocated to its present alignment in this area. It is very important for the continuity of this area to reestablish the wooded hillside across the back of the Davis Museum and to transplant the small flowering trees that are of the wrong scale.
Middle and Lower Meadow

- Middle (now known as Science) and Lower Meadows are critical open spaces in the structure of the college campus. These meadows serve as key, unprogrammed spaces in the sequence of movement through the campus. The ecological role of the meadow landscapes within the hydrologic structure of the campus is discussed in Working Paper 3.
- Middle and Lower Meadow are as present the only remaining former wet meadows that remain on the campus, of the original six, that have not been programmed with more active uses. Improper management of these areas, including mowing that is done at the wrong period of the year, parking on their surfaces, and drainage, has rendered them shadows of their former beauty.
- A vigorous re-establishment of a wet meadow grass and wildflower community in these spaces would reverse a tendency on the College campus to simplify the diversity of the native and cultivated landscape.
• The small knoll once known as Pine Hill, presently occupied by Stone-Davis and Oakwoods, is fraught by delights and problems. The two buildings have five driveways rendering the landscape of the entire north and east sides of the buildings with an overwhelming constructional presence drastically out of character with the rest of the campus. On the other hand there are almost no direct pedestrian connectors to the buildings so people walk on the roads.
• The abrupt height of the hill also presents problems for handicap accessibility.
• As was pointed out in Working Paper 2, the white pine planting to the east of the Stone-Davis service area has grown up to block views of the building, the dining pavilions, and also to the Stone Tower at Green Hall.
• The courtyard garden of Stone-Davis is splendid in the way it receives the gesture of the dished out hillside between it, the brick wall, and Lake Waban.
• Plantings on the hillside have been cleared of underbrush and it would be important to allow some new sapling trees to form a next generation of small canopy trees under the existing trees.
• The future use of Oakwoods needs to be studied in the context of the master plan to weigh the benefits of dedicating this building to the use of a single faculty member.
Tupelo Lane

- This area is characterized by a certain small scale and bygone charm. There are also many unresolved uses that need attention. Most seriously, the status of Schneider as a student center needs to be resolved. Although the central location of Schneider is good, access for events is poor and the space is not well utilized. One idea worthy of investigation in the master plan is removing the connection to Bates, moving some library functions over to Bates, removing the interior platforms and exterior portico from Schneider, and re dedicating the quite beautiful arched space as a multi-denominational religious space which is currently housed in the Chapel basement.
- Service access to Schneider needs to be improved.
- The library service area may be inadequate for current needs—this needs to be investigated but in any case this area would benefit from curbs to control vehicles, new plantings, etc.
- The small houses (Day care, Harambee, Slater, Continuing Education, ZA and TZE) are buildings that require more maintenance relative to the number of functions or people they house than do larger buildings. At the same time, the charm and low impact of the small-scale architecture of these houses, sensitively positioned close to the lake, is an important consideration.
- The wetland area and Tupelo Point is a remarkable resource within easy reach of the daily users of the campus; it feels remote but is actually quite centrally located. The only concern of the area is the severe erosion of the path to Tupelo Point itself which is quite severe. A very careful intervention needs to be made here that in no way appears like an engineered solution but in fact rebuilds and stabilizes the point for future enjoyment.
Beach and Lake Edge

- The edge of Lake Waban and its associated riparian plant zones is a very delicate linear system. The plants along the edge of the lake hold together the native soil, a sandy gravel that is prone to erosion when exposed to foot traffic or run-off, resulting in gullies and washouts. This condition is exacerbated by the need for people to get to the lake edge in many locations.

- The beach is an important water access location and is reasonably successful because the shallow cross-sectional angle of the shore dissipates the erosive forces of waves. This area must be maintained with periodic regrading and replenishment of the sand.

- The boat house and the boat ramp are other places where access to the lake are necessary. The design of both of these areas needs to be reviewed in the spirit of celebrating these uses and allowing these activities to occur in beautiful settings and without environmental degradation.
Service Parking Lot

- As has been identified several times in the other Working Papers, the Service Lot is the place within the core campus with the most potential to become an extraordinary new place for the college. As described in Working Paper 1, the valley that the lot occupies is one of the three major valley spaces structuring the core campus. The other valleys are the Severance/Rhododendron Dell area and the Upper, Middle, and Lower Meadows. As the college looks for room to grow, the presence of the Service Lot has in a strange way preserved this space for future expansion.

- The Service Lot Valley is defined strongly on the south side by Tower Court Hill and to the west by the long, sloped, curving ridge, above which are the athletic fields and abandoned tennis courts. To the north, Alumnae Hall and the Outdoor Theater eagerly anticipate the redesign of this area to restore their connection to the landscape.

- The power plant is a difficult but crucial presence to the east. If Severance Green and Rhododendron Dell are the honorific valley landscapes of the campus, and the outer meadows provide the passive, richly-sensorial landscape spaces that students move through on their way from dorm to class, the character of this Service Parking Lot Valley could be an expression of today's evolving and changing relationship of the college with the landscape. The design of this area might include active-use areas such as athletic fields that could be creatively woven together with a re-assertion of the natural systems of the valley, such as the reconstruction of the stream landscape that once connected to Lake Welby.
• The separation of the Distribution Center and the athletic fields from campus by the bulk of the gymnasium and pool building is a challenging condition. As a result, there is a poor connection from this area for pedestrians and cars to the rest of campus. The Distribution Center is poorly connected to the campus. The present requirement to drive on Route 135 has been repeatedly pointed out as dangerous for turning into the Distribution Center. The possibility of an internal road that connects to the campus should be studied.

• Extraordinary topographic features are an asset to this area. The site of the abandoned tennis courts is the third major ridge and building site identified by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. in his 1902 letter.

• The closing of the West Lodge Gate severed this entire area from the regular circulation pattern of the campus.

• The layout of the Distribution Center is distinctly piecemeal and unplanned in a way that assumes it is just a remote outpost.

• The siting of Distribution Center Lot #3 (DC3) located south of the hockey field, destroys the natural landform of the small valley in which it was built. This is anachronistic to the sensitive approach to native landform that characterizes most of the campus development.

• There is poor truck circulation and truck dock access. Great opportunities exist and could be part of a comprehensive plan for the area.

• The use of the abandoned tennis court site for a new building could be part of a larger plan for the Service Lot area.

• An extraordinary ridge-top walk connects the boathouse area to the plateau. This walk overlooks the Service Lot Valley and Lake Waban.
Alumnae Lot

- The site of a former gravel pit, Alumnae Lot is cut into the landscape in a way that both helps to hide the cars parked there and contributes to the isolated feeling of this lot. Alumnae Lot feels remote, even though it is not much farther from the Davis area than the west end of Service Lot. Alumnae Lot is actually better positioned in terms of topography.
- Contributing to a feeling of remoteness is the raw, ravaged quality of the landscape just west of Alumnae Hall.
- The main circulation to this area of the campus is just east of the Alumnae Lot, but it veers east as it penetrates deeper into the campus. This leaves Alumnae Lot unable to be seen from Route 135 and College Road.
- Alumnae Lot feels like a peripheral area. A solution to changing this condition and a resolution of the need to create vehicular connections to the western portion of the property may be found in creating a new road that weaves east and south from the Distribution Center, to the abandoned tennis court site, then along the ridge above Service Lot, and connects to the Alumnae Hall circle.
The Entrance from Route 135 is reinforced by a good planting of trees. The small scale and curved alignment of College Road at this entry and the associated road-edge plantings that overhang part of the road make a pleasant sequence. Just below the Hazard Quadrangle the road edge opens to a view of Munger Meadow to the left.

After this point a difficult view opens to the service side of the Davis Museum. Although underground utilities have limited the possibility of tree plantings in the area that would screen this view, it is possible to build retaining walls allowing an increase in the soil level over the utilities and to create sufficient soil depth to grow trees.

The character of this new planting should be an extension of the Oak-Pine hillside plantings below Pendleton Hall that should extend all the way from the Davis Museum to the Pendleton Hillside. The crabapples scattered in this area should be transplanted.
Alexandra Gardens and the Hunnewell Arboretum

- As described earlier, the Alexandra Gardens and Hunnewell Arboretum add immeasurably to the diversity of the Wellesley landscape. Together these landscapes create one environment that is nearly a self-contained element of the campus. Structurally the landscape is divided into two pieces: the lowland landscapes with the linear watermill and Paramecium Pond, and the topographically contained Dell area, defined to the west by Observatory Hill and on the east by Fiske Walk. These landscapes reflect the benefit of separate endowment funds. Upcoming maintenance will offer design opportunities for new plantings that should be evaluated. In particular, future studies should include the way in which plantings are used to define the character of the main walk that leads to Wellesley Village.

- Another concern is how the Paramecium Pond precinct is integrated into the adjacent meadow landscapes. One issue of concern in this area is the increased opacity of this landscape as more plants have been added. An important design question is how the self-contained quality of this area can integrate with the structure of the College Road sequence and the continuity of the Meadow Valley landscape.
Figure 4.39: Paramecium Pond, Botanic Gardens, date unknown.
Fiske Walk

- The Fiske Walk is one of several pastoral and tranquil walkways on the campus. In addition to structuring the connection to Wellesley Village, marked by Fiske Gate, the canopied space represents one of numerous opportunities for regular campus users to be immersed in the landscape at Wellesley.
- The plantings in these areas of the campus are relatively mature and the renewal plan should address this condition.
- The dominance of Canadian hemlock and the potential impact of the woolly adelgid aphid on these trees needs consideration.
- The Fiske Walk awkwardly segues into Christmas Tree Alley and the Gray Lot and the redesign of this connection offers the potential to create a more continuous sequence of space.
This area has numerous problems that have not been resolved since the construction of the New Dorms in the 1950s. The dorm complex, although apparently based on a formal idea of weaving into the native vegetation and hillside, has nascent connections to the surrounding landscape and is poorly situated relative to views from Christmas Tree Alley.

For instance, unlike the motor entrance court to Green Hall that has beautiful views of the meadow landscape, the court at the New Dorms gives but fleeting glimpses of the larger landscape beyond. The roofs of the common spaces are low enough to look onto but cannot be occupied. The spaces between the wings of the building cannot be physically occupied but are only visual amenities to be viewed from the dorm dining rooms and common spaces. Perhaps most unfortunate of all is how the Service Yard and entrance dominate the expression of this building as seen from Christmas Tree Alley.

The cars parked along Christmas Tree Alley as discussed in Working Paper 2 convert this once beautiful area into a parking lot. Also problematic is the overly straight alignment of the road as it goes down the hill toward Stone-Davis, thereby encouraging high speed driving in an area where many students cross the road.

As we discussed in Working Paper 2, this area is entirely under-equipped to handle the traffic and need for parking that the Science Center has created in this area. The closing of Fiske Gate and the truncating of Middle Road to a dead end at the Science Center area has seriously affected the function of this circulation system.

The Observatory is beautifully sited on its hill and is a charming structure. Whitin House seems somewhat forlorn and perhaps occupies a site that could be better used by another type of building. The Sage parking area is not attractive.

As described in Working Paper 3, Gray Lot is a former wet meadow site that might benefit from restoration if the cars could be relocated.
Brick Walk

- As described earlier, the Brick Walk includes the only remaining linear configuration of trees of the Wellesley campus. Incremental change, hurricanes, and disease have removed numerous other lines and allees from the campus.
- In all probability, the Brick Walk became a blacktop walk as part of a desire to reduce maintenance. Since that time, so many other similar places and surfaces have been homogenized on the campus, that it is worth considering a complete restoration of this element of the past. Of course it would be meaningless to do this without also raising funds for its maintenance.
- If the walk is resurrected, it might be worthwhile to extend the walk all the way to the bottom of the stairs below Tower Court, as seen in the archival photograph at the right.

Figure 4.45: Brick walk looking east

Figure 4.46: Brick walk
Figure 4.47. Archive photo of brick walk running along Longfellow Pond
These three zones are connected by a common hourglass-shaped volume of space, the top triangle of which is defined by the points of East Lodge, the New Dorms, and Homestead; the bottom triangle edged by brick walk, Homestead, and the College Club. The central axis of this space focuses on Tupelo Point across the Lagoon.

The reactivation of East Lodge Gate, as described in Working Paper 2, could benefit this area. The forgotten corner of the campus that East Lodge occupies could be brought more directly into the daily experience of campus users. Alignment of the new portion of the drive with the central axis of the spaces would make the view to Tupelo Point a regular part of the experience of the campus. The reinvestment of the East Lodge entrance should be studied in the context of a new planting of beech trees that references the original plantings, only three of which are left in the area.

By deactivating the Route 16 Entrance as a main entrance and moving the traffic signal to East Lodge, the area around the College Club could be rethought with the intention of increased parking in the area. The Club has the potential to be a revenue source with parking facilities that are appropriate.
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A Campus Form and Structure

Principles:

1.0 Historically, Wellesley's landscape and buildings have been organized topographically in an irregular pattern of buildings sited on hilltops and the crest of roll lands. Key vistas and sightlines function as guides to the campus form.

2.0 Education at Wellesley is inextricably linked to the landscape particularly in the way that landscape is engaged with the daily life on campus through movement.

3.0 Movement from buildings out into the landscape is a fundamental organizational element of the Wellesley campus.

4.0 The Master Plan will approach the landscape design as an explicit extension of the historic patterns of land conservation and development that are unique to Wellesley and which are based on the principles of the 1921 Master Plan.

Goals:

1.0 Campus Form - Indigenous Landscape

A Master Plan goal will be to identify existing and previously existing elements of the indigenous landscape that should be protected and revitalized to renew the historical importance of the natural landscape as a fundamental component of the campus form.

2.0 Restoration of Orienteering Devices

The Master Plan recognizes that the key vistas and sightlines outlined in the 1921 master plan, that act as guides for orientation on campus, cannot be precisely restored, however reopening viewsheds and sightlines must be encouraged wherever possible.

3.0 Relationship to Architecture to Understanding Campus Structure

A goal of the master plan is to explore strategies whereby the campus can be better understood in terms of way finding and perceived as an integrated and manageable whole.

4.0 Siting of Buildings

Future expansion of the campus must adhere strictly to the historical pattern of siting of new buildings on hilltops and the top brow of hilltops.

The master planning team will make an assessment of the optimum locations for new facilities in the medium to long term future. The team will investigate a specific list of possible future building types as well as possible locations for as yet imagined facilities.

The Master Plan will identify sites for potential development and sites where construction should not be permitted.

5.0 Massing and Scale of New Buildings, Parking Areas and Play Fields

The massing and location of future buildings and playing fields must be carefully considered to preserve the remnants of the original, fragile topography.

The Master Plan will guide the massing and optimum location of new facilities.

B Historical Context

Principles:

1.0 Landscape takes precedent over architecture at Wellesley. The continuous, absorbing, and timeless qualities of the cultivated natural landscape of the campus envelop and unify a rich but diverse collection of architectural styles.

2.0 Wellesley must reinvigorate the idea of cultivated nature as a central part of its campus landscape.

Concerns: Historical documentation has shown that since the 1930s, and increasingly in recent years, the vegetative diversity of the campus landscape has declined. This results in a landscape that although pleasant, has become homogeneous and lacking in the rich collage of landscape elements that existed in the past.

Goals:

1.0 Landscape Management and Maintenance

A Master Plan goal is to reintroduce a cultivated natural landscape to the Wellesley campus within the context of a feasible landscape management and maintenance plan.

2.0 Integrity of the Historic Landscape

An encompassing goal of the Master Plan is to reverse and correct the gradual process of homogenization and standardization of the campus landscape.

3.0 The Suburbanization of the Landscape's Character

The Master Plan promotes an understanding of the need to revive the historic patterns of the Wellesley campus landscape as a collage of distinct landscape elements that together form a whole.
C Parking

Principles:

1.0 Cars have nearly always been a part of the Wellesley campus and therefore should not be banned from the campus or limited to its perimeter.

2.0 Contemporary challenges such as increased dependence on the automobile must be balanced with safety, the primacy of the pedestrian experience, and the ecological and aesthetic impact of parked cars and roads to the surrounding landscape.

3.0 The historical importance of walking should be re-encouraged as the primary form of movement within the campus. All future parking policy, availability, and placement such as the storage of vehicles at the periphery of the campus, should reinforce this principle.

4.0 All parking should be safely and directly linked to major areas of the campus.

5.0 Parking should be discouraged in locations that create unsafe environments for pedestrians.

6.0 Where the public is regularly attracted to places on campus, parking and wayfinding needs must be addressed.

Goals:

1.0 Moving or stationary vehicles that endanger the lives of students, faculty, staff, and members of the Wellesley community, should be removed from the campus. Parking in the Green Hall courtyard and on portions of the Pendleton and Jewett ramps should be quickly phased out.

2.0 The presence of parked cars in the campus landscape, particularly the historic core, must be diminished.

3.0 Parking policy for staff who require the use of their vehicles during the day, (and access to the historic core of the campus,) should be established.

4.0 New overall campus parking policies should accompany all parking changes to ensure fairness in implementation.

Recommended Parking Changes:

1.0 Center of Campus

Cars parked at the edges of historic open spaces such as Chapel Lawn should be removed. Parked vehicles in these spaces disrupt the overall sense of the landscape, breaking the continuity of views across the spaces to the campus, and altering the historic scale and feel of these areas.

2.0 Science Center Area

There is a severe shortage of parking in the science Center/Observatory/Sage area. Nine academic departments reside in the Science Center alone, but the demand for daily parking in this area has never been seriously addressed.

3.0 Special Event Parking

The Master Plan will study alternatives for parking shortage on campus during special events, with the intention of permanently keeping parking off the meadows.

4.0 Service Staff Parking

College service vehicles should not be parked in valuable central parking areas such as the Service Lot. Identifying alternative locations for service vehicles will be considered.

Staff parking in service areas impedes delivery access and endangers pedestrians. Finding alternative locations for service staff parking should be a priority.

5.0 Student Parking

Student parking should be limited in central parking areas. Alternative strategies for student parking will be explored.

6.0 Surface Lot Parking

The surface parking lot should be eliminated from the Alumnae Hall Valley and should not be allowed in the future in any of the campus valleys. A strategy for relocating this parking and returning Alumnae Valley to a 'green' valley is proposed.

7.0 Increasing Campus Parking

There are no centrally located sites for new large surface parking areas on campus. The Master Plan examines two alternative approaches to increasing parking on campus: parking structures, and remote surface parking areas, such as the North 40.

7.0.1 Places where existing parking lots may have been identified.

8.0 Parking Structures

Parking structures are proposed to be unobtrusively woven into the campus landscape. Parking structures must be studied in terms of their landscape qualities as much as their architectural qualities: and conveniently sited, and designed to be safe and near areas of campus with activity.

9.0 Remote Lots/Connectivity of the Campus

One aspect of Wellesley's parking problem is the perception that the existing remote parking lots are too far away, inaccessible, and unsafe. This perception can be altered by a new campus road that links this area to the campus core.
The successful use of remote lots for special event parking will be facilitated with better management strategies that can use this new campus road to make a clearer connection to the campus center.

D. Campus Entrances and Circulation

Principles:

1.0 Circulation is an integral component of the Wellesley campus landscape in terms of its beauty, function, safety, clarity, and way finding.

2.0 The Wellesley College campus is understood and revealed through movement. The historical primacy of the pedestrian experience of the landscape must be renewed. All forms of movement—vehicular and pedestrian—should reinforce the experience of the campus on a daily basis.

3.0 Arrival is an essential aspect of the experience of Wellesley Campus. The first glimpse of Wellesley upon leaving adjacent public roads should convey a sense of hospitality and provide a reminder of the changing and unending beauty of the campus. The points of arrival should be reinforced to clarify the basic structure of the campus.

4.0 The Master Plan diminishes the ease of vehicles cutting through campus, without precluding easy access to the campus.

Concerns:

1.0 A particular concern is the associated safety threats and visual degradation resulting from the mixing of pedestrian movement with vehicular traffic in some areas of the campus.

Recommended Changes:

1.0 Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation

Reducing the mixing of pedestrians and automobiles in areas of unnecessary proximity, is a primary goal of the Master Plan. A study of pedestrian and vehicular circulation existing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

The importance of the pedestrian experience of the landscape is reinforced by the Master Plan, especially emphasizing along with the goals of improving safety and calming traffic.

2.0 College Road

The realignment of College Road as part of the Master Plan provides a more appropriate and diverse experiential journey through the campus landscape, at the same time as improving safety.

The daily use of College Road should sequentially reveal and describe the organization of Wellesley. Whether for the first time or after years of regular use, the experience of the road is of equal value in structuring one's understanding of the campus organization.

The current alignment College Road does not serve as an adequate introduction to the structure and diversity of the Wellesley Campus. College Road, as realigned in the 1960s, now acts as a perimeter spine of the campus and as such contradicts the planning intentions of the 1921 Plan in which vehicular circulation introduces the historic core of the campus.

One of the functions of College Road is to enable people to understand where the center of the campus is, how to get there, and where to park. The Master Plan realignment of College Road recaptures these important qualities of the campus road alignment.

3.0 Campus Entrances

The existing main campus entrances are under expressed as gateways to the campus, thus departing from the historic tradition at Wellesley in which entrances were clearly defined.

The Master Plan proposes the relocation of entrances as part of the overall vehicle sequence of arriving and leaving campus.

3.0.1 Intra-Campus Circulation

The Master Plan proposes relocating some internal campus services (such as the print shop) to the Distribution Center. All of this is supported by the ease of connection from a new and enlarged College Road.

The current isolation of the Distribution Center from the core of the impede the day to day need for internal circulation, from the center of campus to the Distribution Center, since the present route that includes exiting onto Route 135 is cumbersome, time consuming, and at times unsafe.

E. Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Principle:

1.0 Wellesley College is committed to improving the accessibility of its campus to people with disabilities and will comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Policy Recommendations:

1.0 Access to New or Renovated Buildings

All new building projects and renovation projects planned for Wellesley College will comply with the requirements of the ADA.

The location of future building projects should consider the potential of extending ADA-compliance to include surrounding parking areas and buildings, and the campus landscape as a whole.

2.0 Access to Buildings Eligible for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places

Wellesley will continue to evaluate the potential of each historic building on campus to comply with ADA, while retaining each building's historic character. Each building evaluation should include a summary of the financial, architectural, and aesthetic implications of compliance.
3.0 Access to Buildings Which Should Comply with ADA

Several buildings on campus should be made to comply with ADA, even though these are required to comply only in the event of renovation. These buildings include the Science Center and others with a public lecture hall, classroom buildings and to a lesser degree, the dormitories. Each building evaluation should include a summary of the financial, architectural, and aesthetic implications of compliance. A more detailed summary is included in the Master Plan.

4.0 Access to the Landscape

Movement from buildings out into the landscape is a fundamental organizational element of the Wellesley campus. Wherever possible this experience should be extended to students with disabilities, particularly between significant places on the campus such as the Academic Quadrangle which, at present, can only be reached by people in wheel chairs by passing through a building. The Master Plan shows a way to create an exterior connection between the Jewett Ramp and the Academic Quadrangle.

F. Places Identified to be Preserved

Principle:

1.0 The diversity of landscape types and intimate spaces that historically have been in abundance on the campus contribute significantly to its visual richness, intimacy, and these, in turn, create a plethora of memorable places on campus. Places which are a part of Wellesley’s unique character and special beauty are identified to be preserved.

Goals:

1.0 List of special places for preservation.

List:

G. Campus Use

Principle:

1.0 Campus use and its effects on the landscape must be continually evaluated.

Goals:

1.0 To maintain Wellesley’s unique beauty, limits to programs and building additions must be evaluated yearly.

2.0 Any building or building addition must be cited and its servicing addressed by a landscape architect in coordination with the architect who designs the structure.

H. Wellesley’s Campus Planting

Principle:

1.0 Future planting should reinforce the overall historical structural and spatial qualities of the campus by employing interpretation of historical, philosophical and practical concerns. The Master Plan will produce a summary of the existing campus planting associations.

Goals:

1.0 Renewing the Existing Campus Vegetation

Many of Wellesley’s plantings are reaching maturity and a plan to guide their renewal will be part of the Campus Master Plan.

1. Landscape Types

Principles:

1.0 Future landscape change, (and planting) should respect the historically evolved and very particular structure of the Wellesley College landscape.

2.0 Wellesley must preserve and reassert the importance of the valleys and ensure against existing and future encroachment.

Goals:

1.0 Identify the primary landscape types that are part of the campus form with the purpose of assuring

2.0 Hilltop Quadrangles

Whenever possible new buildings will respond to the shape of the land replicate the established south facing courtyard pattern, and establish sight lines to the landscape or to Lake Waban.

3.0 Courtyards

The restoration of the existing courtyard gardens, including the Green Hall courtyard, will be part of this Master Plan.

4.0 The Planted Hillsides: Yells and Separators

The Master Plan will set the limits of the planted hillsides that must be preserved and will also establish restoration guidelines and maintenance procedures for the hillsides.

5.0 Groves

The Master Plan will guide the replanting of the groves on the Wellesley campus.
6.0 Lake Edge
The Master Plan will provide specific guidelines for the renewal of the edge of Lake Waban.

7.0 Lines of Trees and Allées
The Master Plan will guide the renewal of lines of trees and allées as part of the Campus Landscape.

8.0 Lost Types
Although it is not possible, (or even desirable,) to reclaim all of these lost planted features, the master plan will address the issue of the shortage of these kinds of plant forms today, and suggest how a renewal plan might build some of these back into the campus fabric, to add more gusto to the campus landscape.

9.0 Specimen, Clas, and Memorial Trees
Memorial trees should be part of a more unified plan for the addition of specified kinds of trees to the campus landscape.

J Landscape Maintenance

Principle:
1.0 A detailed, fiscally responsible and feasible maintenance plan is essential to the long term health of Wellesley’s cultivated landscape.

Goals:
1.0 Existing maintenance procedures and current budget allocations will be reviewed in terms of their appropriateness to existing landscape conditions.
2.0 New capital projects should include an endowment for landscape maintenance.

K Infrastructure

Principle:
1.0 Policy for future alteration and/or expansion of campus infrastructure should emphasize an ecological, cost effective, and low maintenance approach.

Recommendations:
1.0 Irrigation
Criteria for implementation and management of a limited campus irrigation system will be established. Whenever possible criteria should be ecologically based.
2.0 Storm water Run-off
The absorption of run-off is a crucial element in the viability of any natural landscape. The Master Plan proposes curbing the use of new "piped" storm water systems. Instead, whenever possible, storm water run-off, should become part of the visible landscape of the campus, (such as open streams) as opposed to the invisible infrastructure of pipes below ground. Potential regulatory constraints will be evaluated in terms of the long term gains of eliminating high cost infrastructure prior to further development of conceptual ideas.

3.0 Maintenance Endowment
The feasibility of new capital projects should include an evaluation of their impact on adjacent infrastructure systems such as utilities, parking, and circulation routes. Where infrastructure upgrade is required, project budgets should include the capital costs of new infrastructure and a landscape maintenance endowment.

L Wellesley’s Adjoining Lands

Principles:
1.0 The historic and contemporary role of each parcel in extending the idyllic campus landscape must be understood when considering future uses.
2.0 The ecological relationship between the main campus and its adjacent parcels must be understood when considering future uses for the parcels.

Policy Recommendations:
1.0 Protecting Lake Waban
The Master Plan will define strategies for protecting Lake Waban as a natural resource while allowing it to continue to serve recreation needs.
2.0 Deed restrictions and public constraints
There are numerous private deed restrictions and public regulatory constraints that will limit Wellesley’s flexibility with its land
3.0 Potential future use
Each adjoining land parcel must be considered in its relationship to the main campus in terms of its potential for future use, prior to implementation of any proposal.

M Wellesley’s Neighbors

Principle:
1.0 Wellesley College has a responsibility to its neighbors.
Goals:
1.0 The effects of new buildings, lighting, and/or roads should be studied before implementation to determine day and night impact upon its neighbors.

Ecological Considerations

Principle:
1.0 Comply with all environmental regulations governing Wellesley’s lands.
2.0 Respect the ecological cornucopia of the campus where regulated and feasible.

Goal:
1.0 Identify and preserve unique ecological areas on campus.

Policy Recommendations:
1.0 The Master Plan will evaluate the visual, legal and management impacts of creating wetlands and wet meadows.
2.0 The Master Plan proceeds with the acknowledgment that the wet meadow is— ecologically and historically— in terms of campus form, a dominant plant type that should be more visible on the campus as a result of the Master Plan.

Planning for the Future Recommendations:
1.0 Campus Center
The Master Plan will examine potential sites and programming for a new Campus Center to meet the contemporary needs of the campus as a whole.

Before any further renovation work is envisioned and completed in the existing student center, (new offices, maintenance, code compliance, etc.) the future of this collection of buildings should be resolved.

2.0 Dormitory
The feasibility of siting a new dormitory will be studied. Presently there is a housing shortage and a demand for an air-conditioned residential facility that would give Wellesley the ability to host summer conferences and provide on campus accommodations for conference attendees.

3.0 Gathering Space

The master plan will recommend the development of a general (interior) gathering space for conferences and non-denominational religious groups.

Varsity and Intramural Playing Fields
Recreational activity has always been integral to the life at Wellesley. Wellesley needs to increase the number of regular sized intramural fields on campus. The Master Plan will explore sites for adding varsity and intramural fields in a manner that will enhance the overall landscape structure and character.

Decentralized Dining
Decentralized dining is a significant element of the campus social structure which should be retained.

Green Hall
Issues of the programmatic use of Green Hall along with a general need for restoration of its interior leads us to recommend a total review of Green Hall versus the currently planned program of incremental actions. It is clearly a building worthy of such consideration.

Pendleton Hall
The master plan suggests the need for a methodology for a further study of Pendleton Hall. The study would explore whether an expansion of Pendleton Hall could make it a center for the Social Sciences, analogous in some ways to the role of the Science Center on campus. Issues of accessibility and fire safety, as observed in the status report dated 29 July 1997, should be carefully evaluated as part of this separate study.

Houghton Chapel
It seems inappropriate to radically change the Chapel. Clearly, worship activities placed in the basement are secondary to the space of the Chapel above. While this type of space may be acceptable for social and educational functions, it is problematic for a truly integrated and egalitarian community of religions and beliefs.

Clapp Library
The master plan will address locating a site for a book storage structure as part of the overall land holdings of Wellesley campus, (not as part of the historic core campus,) but possibly as a part of the west campus area.
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I. PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR LIGHTING

A. The lighting should assist in fostering the perception of personal safety

Lighting is just one element in creating a sense of safety. Key is lighting in a manner that:

- allows individuals to see and recognize the face of an approaching pedestrian.
- penetrates into recesses and between shrubs and parked cars
- provides illumination on well-traveled paths

Increasing visibility will also assist in the effective patrolling of Wellesley by the campus police, which in turn, will help increase the sense of safety.

The perception of safety is created by balancing many factors. What is lit and the manner in which the light is provided are just as important as the amount of light that is furnished for a particular task. Paradoxically, it is possible to provide adequate illumination and not create a sense of safety.

B. The lighting should provide for the safe traversal of the terrain of the campus (path or road), whether by foot, car or other conveyance.

The lighting should provide the proper illumination for pedestrians to walk along paths, go up and down stairs and ramps, and cross roadways, and for drivers to navigate curves and identify people and objects along the way.

C. The lighting should help the orientation of individuals on the Wellesley Campus.

Lighting should assist in the movement from place to place on the campus and identify those paths that are safest to traverse. This includes identifying and lighting major paths as well as recognizing and lighting shortcuts that are frequently used by those who live and work at Wellesley. The proper lighting of signs will also assist in facilitating orientation on the campus.

D. The lighting should create a sense of place.

Typically, lighting at night only identifies paths and roadways. The landscape is flattened into two dimensions and becomes a series of ribbons snaking through the campus. The buildings and landscape are lost in this scheme. The elements recede into the background and become foreboding in their invisibility. Lighting selected architectural and/or landscape elements will reveal the third dimension of the campus and, most important, create a lighted perimeter that will increase the ability to orient oneself and one's sense of security.

E. The traditional lighting iconography of the campus should be retained and explored.

The Wellesley Lantern is universally favored and should be retained and worked into the lighting composition. Beyond that, lighting select architectural and landscape features will reveal new meanings to how the campus is read.

F. The lighting should assist in the aesthetic appreciation of the campus.

Lighting is not just about providing a prescribed amount of illumination to a task. Good lighting transcends the mere utilitarian and should evoke an emotional response. Lighting has the power to attract and to reveal size, color and texture. How you compose with it can make you feel safe. What it reveals as it interacts with that which it lights can make you feel proud. In can allow you to see the beauty around you.
II. DESIGN CRITIQUE

While the lighting on the Wellesley Campus, for the most part, provides for a sense of safety and is in line with generally accepted lighting levels, it can be improved considerably so that it goes beyond the merely functional by creating a sense of space and bringing it up to the design quality commensurate with the rest of the campus.

A. The Wellesley Lantern - The Wellesley Lanterns, as they exist now, are mounted ten feet above the ground and typically 100 feet from one another. The fixture uses a 100 watt high pressure sodium lamp and provides the horizontal illumination required by our standards.

It bears repeating, as mentioned in the first goal, that good lighting is not just a function of providing a prescribed amount of illumination. The factors below have a negative impact on the successful use of the Lanterns as they now exist:

1. Disparity glare - the plastic diffuser of the lantern produces two spikes of light that prevent individuals from seeing oncoming pedestrians and are a source of discomfort for drivers.
2. Distracting patterning - the spikes produce two bright stripes of light on the ground about 90° from one another. This interferes with a smooth light pattern on the path or road. It is distracting and can be a cause of a missed step along the paths.
3. Distorted colors - the high pressure sodium light source used is efficient (see III. B. Light Source) however, its limited spectral distribution (rich in reds and oranges, deficient in blues and greens) is not well suited to illuminating heavily landscaped areas.
4. Scale problem - the original Wellesley Lantern was an incandescent source. The fixture head was smaller than the one we know today and correctly sized to the thin, shepherds crook pole. The Lantern's lamp (light bulb) was then replaced with an energy efficient source necessitating the use of a ballast that was housed in a box at the base of the pole. This box destroyed the elegant line of the fixture as a whole. The current head incorporates the ballast within it leaving us with an oversized head in relation to the pole and the vestigial ballast box at the base.

B. Building Lights - A hodgepodge of fixture types and sources are currently used. There is no consistency to the fixtures. Some are historic in nature and have been retrofitted with energy efficient sources of varying quality. Many are in a severe state of disrepair. Other fixtures are utilitarian in look and operation and are not suitable to be attached to buildings of an historic nature. While they may be efficient, they are glaring, and use the poor color high pressure sodium source.

C. Parking Area Lights - These cobra-head type fixtures are appropriately used in parking areas that are shielded from other areas of the campus either by trees or buildings. They are an efficient source for providing high levels of illumination. They also use the poor color high pressure sodium source.

D. Signage - There is simply no consistent relationship between signs and how they are lit.
III. PATHS

A. Lighting Criteria - Pole fixtures should be placed along all pathways. Despite the functional and design issues cited above regarding the existing fixtures, the use of a "Wellesley Lantern" is an appropriate design solution in that it is an efficient and attractive means of producing illumination. The ambling park-like quality of the terrain argues for a consistent treatment of the paths. The reinforcement of the pattern of fixtures and light will allow for the easy and comfortable movement through the campus. It is the consistent, and therefore, familiar treatment of these paths that will encourage the sense of safety. The creation of a hierarchy of paths by increasing illumination or changing equipment is not appropriate and will undermine this comfort level. Any redesign of the campus should acknowledge existing lines and the resultant shortcuts that are created. These paths as well as all paths where pedestrian access is desired should be lit using the defined criteria. If pedestrian access is not desired, the path should not be lit.

Recommended levels of illumination –

- Minimum average horizontal levels: .5 fc
- Average vertical level for special pedestrian security: .5 fc at face height

A footcandle is a measure of illuminance. It is not uncommon for a city street to be lit to 1 fc

B. Light Source - Typically there are two sources available to the designer - high pressure sodium (characterized by its orange color) and metal halide -- a blue-white source.

Induction lighting is a third source now available. It is a highly efficient, long-life source equivalent in quality to fluorescent light. Its light can be warm or cool.

Researchers have developed a number of measures to evaluate and compare the visual effectiveness of light sources. They are:

- Acuity - resolution of small visual details
- Detection of objects in the line of sight
- Detection of objects in the peripheral field of view
- Color naming accuracy
- Visual clarity
- Brightness perception

The relative comfort of the first two items is dependent upon the amount of illumination provided. All things being equal there is no preference between high pressure sodium (orange light) and metal halide (blue white light). However, for the last four criteria there is a preference for a blue white source. Additionally, the sense of safety is more closely associated with the last four criteria. It is for these reasons that we should light the campus with a source that is blue-white.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color of Light</th>
<th>High Pressure Sodium (HPS)</th>
<th>Deluxe HPS</th>
<th>Metal Halide</th>
<th>Master Color MH(^2)</th>
<th>Induction Lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color Vision</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Blue White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Vision</td>
<td>21 CRI(^1)</td>
<td>60 CRI(^1)</td>
<td>65 CRI(^1)</td>
<td>85 CRI(^1)</td>
<td>85 CRI(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Time</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>95 lms/watt</td>
<td>73 lms/watt</td>
<td>85 lms/watt</td>
<td>93 lms/watt</td>
<td>78 lms/watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Shift(^3)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>200K</td>
<td>± 600K</td>
<td>± 200K</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>24,000 hrs</td>
<td>15,000 hrs</td>
<td>10,000 hrs</td>
<td>10,000 hrs</td>
<td>60,000 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) CRI - Color Rendering Index - 100 is perfect  
\(^2\) Color Shift, measured in degrees Kelvin, refers to the fact that a light source may become warmer or cooler in apparent color over time. No shift is preferable, 200K is acceptable, and beyond that range is unacceptable.  
\(^3\) Master Color is a trade name of Philips Lighting

Given existing technology, the Master Color metal halide is a good choice: it has virtually the same light output for the same wattage expenditure as the current HPS fixture. But, as described above it will actually appear clearer and will render color better. The lamp life, however, is less than the current solution, necessitating more frequent replacement of lamps.

The induction lamp holds promise as well. It has a high lamp cost and our scheme requires a 150 watt unit to produce the necessary light. As can be inferred from the chart above the relamping replacement cost is three to six times better than any currently available system.

Since it is a new lamp source in the U.S., just a few fixture manufacturers have incorporated this source into their existing lines. Most manufacturers are looking into the source and several have expressed their willingness to help us design a new fixture employing its technology. As the technology advances, and as the source becomes more excepted into the American market the price of the unit will fall.

C. **Light distribution** - The fixture head chosen controls the distribution of light. Some fixtures direct most of the light down onto a horizontal surface and exhibit little brightness when seen from normal viewing angles. These are called cutoff fixtures. Non-cutoff fixtures, project the light out further on a horizontal plane and do exhibit brightness.

The Wellesley Lantern is a non-cutoff type fixture. It is efficient in that it spreads the light far and also produces a high level of vertical illumination necessary for pedestrian recognition. The existing refractor (which serves as a light controlling device) is not of a quality, however, to minimize glare. In addition, it produces two spikes of light that produce an uneven and distracting pattern of horizontal illumination.

A new fixture can be designed which shields the light better by using a better refractor (lens). Ironically, it is not desirable to completely eliminate refractor brightness. In a well balanced system, where the established brightness relationships are
followed, the refractor brightness

is equated with a well lit environment,

and Master Color metal halide all will provide the desired amount of illumination as defined
above. The induction lamp wattage would have to be increased to 150 watts.

IV. ROADWAYS - Here too, the Wellesley Lantern, in concept, is a fine design solution. The same 
design considerations and solutions are applicable here as for the pathways described above. As 
with the paths, a consistent treatment is appropriate. Poles should be placed to mark intersections 
and critical cutoffs and to provide illumination for signs. (See signage below).

Recommended levels of illumination:
- Average maintained illuminance: .5 footcandles
- Illuminance uniformity ratio average to minimum: 6 to 1

Illuminance refers to the amount of light that hits a surface. A footcandle is the unit of illuminance. 
A city street is typically lit to about 1 footcandle.
The uniformity ratio refers to how even the light is distributed over the lit surface. An even wash 
of light is desirable while distinct pools of light is distracting and disorienting.

College Road by day

College Road at night lit with a white light source.
The illuminated cupolas and flag subtly reveal the campus beyond the road.

D. Pole height - the distribution of the light (item C) influences how high fixtures can be 
mounted. The higher the pole, the further apart fixtures can be spaced. Above a certain
height, a higher wattage lamp is required.

The original incandescent Wellesley lantern is evident in just a few places on campus. The 
size of the fixture is properly scaled to the pole and the mounting height. The existing 
fixture by necessity is larger because the lamp it uses is larger than the original incandescent 
lamp used. By consequence, it is too large for the pole and looms too large given the 
mounting height. A twelve foot mounting height would be appropriate for the existing 
fixture and any new fixture that might be designed that has the same scale. In addition, it's 
higher placement would reduce glare for pedestrians and motorists alike.

E. Pole spacing - Given a desired illuminance level and uniformity ratio, pole spacing is a 
function of light distribution (item C), lumen output (the amount of light produced by the 
lamp) and the pole height (item D). A cutoff fixture compared to the Wellesley Lantern 
mounted at the same height would require about twice as many fixtures to comply with the 
lighting requirements. It would not give the desired vertical illumination.

The existing pole spacing of 80 to 100 feet is visually comfortable and should be maintained.
It is also an appropriate spacing given the desired luminance criteria defined above.

F. Lamp wattage - The distribution of light from the fixture and the pole height will serve as 
a guide in determining the lamp wattage.

Despite variance in light output, the 100 watt version of the HPS, deluxe HPS, metal halide,
V. BUILDING ENTRANCES - It is critical to mark the entrances of buildings and in most cases this is not done adequately. Only decorative fixtures that are appropriate to the design of the building should be used: sconces, surface mounted ceiling fixtures, pendants and post lamps are all appropriate. They should use a compact fluorescent source (3500K) or where feasible the induction source, which will match the quality and color of the fluorescent light but will last at least six times as long or about 13 years. (A year’s usage is approximately 4400 hours). Light control and shielding is another important issue: fixtures should produce a general glow and be shielded to reduce glare and/or excessive brightness. Under no circumstances should a bare lamp (bulb) be evident.

Certain quadrangle areas are now lit with utilitarian light packs attached to the building surface. They should be replaced with fixtures tucked above the roofline that light down onto central areas and/or paths in front of buildings. The fixture chosen should have a good cut-off and shielding ability to prevent stray light. Given the variety of buildings, the lighting solutions should be tailored to the specific buildings and their surrounds.

VI. PARKING LIGHTING - Fixtures on high poles (25 feet) are practical in these situations because they can provide a high level of illumination, cover a very wide area and, because the light is coming from a high angle provide light between cars. Remote and or concealed lots can effectively use a cobra head type fixture. Where trees, building or other shielding devices do not border lots, cut-off type fixtures should be used which better prevent the light from trespassing into unwanted areas.

The indoor parking that is being proposed should be lit using the same light source that is decided upon for lighting the roads and paths.

- **Recommended levels of illumination**
  - **Open Parking** - 2 footcandles with a uniformity ratio average to minimum of 4 to 1
  - **Closed Parking** - general areas 5 footcandles with a uniformity ratio of 4 to 1

An outdoor mall parking lot is typically lit to a minimum of 1fc while indoor facility is lit to an average of 5fc.
VII. ARCHITECTURAL AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES - Lighting these items is critical to defining the campus, assisting in orientation, and giving a sense of place to visitors and residence alike.

The intention here is not to light in an aggressive manner, rather to provide a glow that will reveal shape, form and function. The effect can be achieved by a gentle wash of light over a facade or landscape feature or by highlighting just a few important sculptural features.

The library by day

A gentle wash of light over the façade brings the building forward onto the landscape. The sculptures flanking the door are no longer mysterious figures lurking in the shadows.
The treatment should start at the campus entrances and extend throughout the campus. A lit gateway structure would clearly mark the entrance and the point of arrival. Paths, for example those through Serverance Green and Rhododendron Dell, will appear brighter and more comfortable if elements of surrounding buildings are lit.

Looking at the Library across Rhododendron Dell

Lighting the library helps define the perimeter areas and creates a sense of place. The additional lighting increases the visibility of people for the campus police.
By lighting key architectural elements, the experience of driving will change from going along an anonymous road to one where the driver can pick out campus landmarks. Though not actually contributing light to circulation paths, lighting certain landmarks and structures will have a powerful psychological effect allowing the campus to be more understandable at night.

Galen Stone Tower by day

At night, the paths are lit by the white light of the Wellesley Lanterns. The gently lit tower becomes a landmark, visible at night, that assists in one's orientation of the campus.
Landscape features can be illuminated to great effect also. It is important to note that plantings must be cut and thinned when necessary. Overgrowth blocks light that would normally fall along the outside perimeter of paths. The resultant dark recesses create a threatening condition.

Columns overlooking Lake Waban

Because the lake goes dark at night, highlighting the columns redefines the edge, bringing visual interest into the foreground.
Lighting for architectural and landscape features should be limited to using the Master Color metal halide source. This source will produce a good color rendering light appropriate for architectural materials and plants. In addition its color will work well if induction source lights are used. If the decision is made to stay with HPS in the lantern along paths and roadways, the white color of Master Color will serve as an acceptable contrast to the orange light of the paths and roads.

A. Recommended levels of illumination -
   1. For light colored structures no more than 15fc
   2. For dark colored structures or plants no more than 20 fc
      (A mock-up of lighting effects will serve as the best guide)

B. Light Trespass refers to stray light that is bothersome to a neighbor. Typically light trespass can be classified into one of three categories:
   1. Light shining in a window
   2. Unwanted light on adjacent property
   3. Excessive brightness in the normal field of vision (nuisance glare)

C. Light trespass is a somewhat subjective topic but there are techniques that can be used to mitigate light trespass and to be a good neighbor.
   1. Keep accent lights away from windows on residential buildings and highlight features of those buildings at the roodline.
   2. Use fixtures that are well shielded and/or control the light precisely.
   3. Contain the light within a small design area through careful placement of fixtures.
   4. Modulate the amount of light on special features so as not to overpower a scene and be a source of distraction.
   5. Use timer controlled switches - just like turning down your stereo when the road every effort should be made to place signage at a point that will maximize the engagement of the sign with the car headlights.

VIII SIGNAGE - Signs along roads and paths should be lit from the ambient light of the nearby fixtures. This is more in keeping with the park-like nature of campus. Placement of the signs and fixtures should be coordinated to accomplish this and also to mark key intersections. Signage design should maximize contrast and readability given driving and walking conditions. Additional illumination along the road will be provided by the car's headlights. Given the curvy path of the road every effort should be made to place signage at a point that will maximize the engagement of the sign with the car headlights.
IX SUMMARY

A. By using the Wellesley Lantern as our basic lighting element and refining it, we can improve the sense of safety, and create a night time environment that increases visibility, is clear, bright and lit by a source with good color rendition.

B. The careful selection of fixtures around campus will remove visual clutter and anachronistic design solutions. Fixtures must provide the appropriate light but also be historically correct or sympathetic to the design of the area in which they are placed.

C. By lighting select architectural and landscape elements we will assist in one's ability to orient oneself on campus, reveal the nature and beauty of the campus.
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WORKING PAPER SEVEN: CAMPUS SIGNING

Introduction
When people arrive at an unfamiliar place, they ask a series of basic questions: Where am I? What direction should I choose? Who can help me? How can I find my way? Seeking to answer these questions, they gather information from signs and printed material, from other people, from the physical character of the spaces they move through. Along the way, new concerns arise: Have I seen this before? Have I done something wrong? How can I get back? Does this seem right?

When wayfinding signals are absent — or when they are in conflict — people lose an important resource: confidence in their ability to find their way. Visitors perceive themselves to be in a difficult, unsupportive environment, and they are denied the confidence that arises from knowing where you are, where you are going, and how to get back.

Improving wayfinding signals at Wellesley will require an integrated set of resources, including landscape strategies, lighting, signs, visitor services, information programs, and publications. Our goal must be to create a more comprehensible campus. In so doing, we can communicate Wellesley’s management commitment to serving the interests of its visitors.

Scope of Work
Over the past few months, we have reviewed campus conditions, circulation patterns, visitor information services, and orientation materials. We have also interviewed Wellesley staff involved in administration, admissions, security, visitor services, and operations. We submit this report to recap our work, report on the key results of the interviews, and to present strategies to improve wayfinding at Wellesley.

Our mission is to develop exterior wayfinding strategies designed primarily to serve the needs of unfamiliar visitors to the campus. This audience includes prospective students and their families, visitors using Wellesley libraries and facilities, and visitors attending meetings or campus events (exhibitions, lectures, symposia, sporting events, etc.). Although new wayfinding tools will benefit Wellesley students and staff, the system is not to be designed around their needs.

This work is a pre-design effort, wherein we seek to identify the assets and problems of wayfinding at Wellesley, assess the opportunities created by the new landscape master plan, and devise strategies to solve wayfinding problems. Those strategies should become the mandate for future design and implementation phases of work.

Wayfinding at Wellesley
Over the past six months, I have sought comments about wayfinding at Wellesley from a wide variety of people: staff members, people I encountered at random, alumni, etc. This is anecdotal evidence — not a structured research effort — but the commentary has been strikingly consistent.

At root, these concerns revolve around the physical character of the campus itself. For familiar members of the Wellesley community, the rolling topography of the land, the winding roads, and the interplay of woodlands and open spaces are features that distinguish a place of special significance and beauty. For the new visitor, these same features create a sort of labyrinth, a place that is hard to understand and navigate.

That leaves us in an apparent double bind — where the most valued physical resources of this campus seem to be the primary cause of its wayfinding problems. Indeed, the relative absence of wayfinding aids on the Wellesley campus over many years is a symptom of this conflict. The obvious solution — a program of many new signs — has threatened to diminish the character of the campus... and thus has never happened.

Included in this conflict is the degree to which Wellesley wants to be open and accessible to those outside the campus community. That conflict manifests itself in many ways: concern about maintaining a women’s campus, of and for the Wellesley community; concern about maintaining security; the relative unavailability of campus information; the debates over attracting audiences to exhibitions or social events.

For many reasons, ignoring visitor information needs is not now working to Wellesley’s advantage. The flow of unfamiliar visitors to the campus continues to grow in ways that appear central to Wellesley’s mission and future success: admissions visitors, people attending symposia and lectures, visitors to the Davis Museum, guests at revenue-producing rental events, people attending student events and activities. On a practical level, the energy and expense expended in trying to manage the flow of unfamiliar visitors is already substantial. On a philosophical level, it seems clear that a large percentage of Wellesley’s guests leave the campus without having truly seen it — and without an appreciation, however preliminary, of the distinctive landscape virtues that make Wellesley a remarkable place.
The Opportunities of a Landscape Master Plan

Our mission at Wellesley is to find ways to make this landscape more "readable." That mission weaves together the immediate needs for visitor information (Which way do I turn?) and the goal of clarifying the organization of campus life in this unique landscape (What is this place like?).

We have a remarkable opportunity to address these questions — and to form strategies — within the larger context of Wellesley's landscape master plan. At the center of those opportunities is the chance to work with the landscape itself to improve wayfinding problems. Thoughtful revisions of roadway alignments, pathways, landscape elements, and landscape maintenance strategies can become powerful tools to enhance the "readability" of Wellesley's landscape. In so doing, we can both reduce our reliance on additional signs for information — and powerfully influence our visitors' experience, attitude, and openness to discovery.
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

Campus Entrances

The Wellesley campus is served by three entrances:

1) A vehicular and pedestrian entrance on Washington Street/Route 16, near Homestead and the College Club;

2) A vehicular and pedestrian entrance on Route 135, near Hazard Quadrangle;

3) A pedestrian-only entrance at Fiske Gate, at the corner of Route 135 and Weston Road.

As discussed in other working papers, both of the two vehicular entrances have a modest, almost utilitarian feel. Neither offers a particularly strong visual gateway to the Wellesley landscape.

Pedestrian arrivals appear to be restricted almost entirely to campus community members, with very few unfamiliar visitors arriving on foot at any entrance. Despite its visual prominence, proximity to downtown Wellesley and former status as a major vehicular entrance, the Fiske Gate pedestrian entrance is essentially restricted to use by familiar visitors. Unfamiliar visitors are not likely to be aware of its existence, and no signs are provided to direct people across the Fiske path toward the central campus.

Nearly all unfamiliar visitors arrive by car, either at the Route 16 or 135 entrances. Of the two, the Route 16 entrance offers a more attractive introduction to the campus, offering a longer entry roadway, a view of a variety of landscape and building types, and a fleeting (but often missed) opportunity to glimpse Lake Waban. The Route 135 entrance is shorter and initially less attractive, but it is closer to many major public destinations (Alumnae Hall, Admissions/Green, the Museum, Jewett, and Pendleton). The Route 135 entrance is also much closer to the only reliably-available visitor parking (in Alumnae Service Lots) and to the campus police office, which is also identified as an information center.

Our interviews indicate that campus community members view the Route 16 and 135 entrances as essentially interchangeable, with neither achieving any recognition as Wellesley’s “front door.” When directing visitors to campus, administrators tend, understandably, to suggest the entrance that is closer to a visitor’s destination. For example, the Admissions Office and Davis Museum provide directions to the Route 135 entrance; the College Club and Science Center provide directions from Route 16.

In general, those responsible for programs and events that attract outside visitors tend to feel that the campus is confusing and poorly signed. They consider it very important that people be encouraged to arrive at the campus entrance closest to their destinations. Though perfectly logical from a management standpoint, this practice tends to reduce the likelihood that a visitor will experience the campus in a broad way.

Roadways

Although the hills and curves of the campus may initially suggest otherwise, the campus roadway system is quite simple. College Road is the single, main campus artery, traversing the center of the campus from one vehicular entrance to the other. The only two branch roads that are normally used by unfamiliar visitors are the road to “Christmas Tree Alley” (serving the Science Center, the Greenhouses, and the “new” dorms), and the roadways that branch off College Road at the Museum service area to serve the Museum and Academic Quad.

Outside delivery people and contract service personnel represent the only group of potentially unfamiliar visitors travelling on other campus roads — many of which are normally restricted to authorized users.

Road widths are relatively consistent throughout the campus, although drive lanes are reduced in many areas by the practice of allowing parallel parking on one or both sides of the street. With few exceptions, there are no shoulder lanes or pull-off areas on major campus roads. With rare exceptions, campus roads are not identified by any street signs or names.

As is evidenced throughout the other master plan papers, roadway driving speeds and roadway parking are major issues. Many people commented that people often substantially exceed the 20 m.p.h. speed limit along College Road, which creates safety problems for all users and increases the pressure on unfamiliar drivers who might otherwise want to slow down to look for signs or roadways cues.

Despite its pleasant appearance, College Road has something of the character of a road to nowhere; drivers catch glimpses of Wellesley’s buildings, but are led around and behind them, never seeing exactly how to get there.

Parking

The supply and location of parking spaces on the Wellesley campus has been a major issue for decades. (See the master plan working paper on this subject.) Over time, the competition among faculty, staff, and students for parking spaces that are perceived as desirable has tended to reduce the availability of visitor parking. The effect has been to concentrate an inadequate supply of visitor spaces
noted that the name "Alumnae" lot seems exclusive, suggesting to some that this space is not intended for public use.

**SERVICE LOT** (also called Waban Lot): This lot is primarily used for service and student vehicles, which usually occupy the more desirable spaces. Parking spaces available to visitors tend to be at the back of the lot, near the tennis courts. The route back across Service Lot to Davis and the Academic Quad is one of Wellesley's least distinguished pedestrian experiences. Although this lot appears initially to be the logical place for Museum and Admissions visitors, both offices usually recommend Alumnae Lot instead. The steep hill at the Quad end of the lot is problematic for older visitors (and for everyone in bad weather), and spaces at the far western end of the lot are actually more distant than close-in spots in Alumnae.

**FOUNDERS LOT:** Three visitor spaces are provided at the edge of Founders Lot, below Founders Hall. Although it is logical to provide visitor parking in this area, which is the most prominent and central parking area on the campus, there are no roadway signs to announce the existence of these spots adjacent to a lot that is otherwise blocked by a card-controlled gate. Further, these few visitor spaces seem to be virtually always occupied, making it highly unrealistic for a campus visitor to expect to park there.

**ACADEMIC QUAD AREA:** Several spaces adjacent to Green Hall are restricted for Admissions visitors. Admissions reports that these spots are
inadequate to meet their demand for parking on many days, which (although demand fluctuates depending on the time of day and the time of year). They estimate the need for up to 40 spaces on their busiest days, with peak activity occurring in August, October, and April. Several visitor spaces (also almost always occupied) are also designated along the one-way exit road that leads down the hillside.

The College Club Lot is designated for use by Club visitors only. Depending on the activity schedule of the Club, their lot (and the overflow lot across Washington Avenue), are sometimes inadequate to meet their needs. In practice, Wellesley police cannot usually identify cars that do not belong to Club visitors, and people who use the Club lot for general visitor parking are unlikely to receive a ticket or be towed. Although the Club lot is relatively distant from most other visitor destinations, parking by Lake visitors is a major problem in the warmer months.

Outside of weekday business hours, the parking situation improves. When faculty and staff have left Founders Lot, the card-access gate is opened to permit general parking, and spaces become available in most other parking areas. Based on the availability of off-hour parking, the special events managers make a major effort to convince people to schedule events outside the normal business day. They consider this particularly important for events in the central campus (chapel, library) and the Science Center — since there is no hope of providing acceptable visitor parking near these locations during the business day.
The campus police report that they issue about 2,500 parking tickets annually. Towing a car for a parking violation is quite rare — and is usually restricted to circumstances to situations that compromise safety. Some members of the campus community complain that enforcement of parking rules is not sufficiently aggressive. Understandably, the police report that they do not have sufficient staff to pay constant attention to minor parking violations — preferring instead to focus on repeat violators, students who fail to register their cars, etc. Further, in the absence of satisfactory visitor parking, an aggressive enforcement program is likely to alienate a significant number of guests to Wellesley.

The critical points are these:

- Wellesley’s visitors are likely to be confused about where to park, since most of the prominent parking areas are restricted to permit holders, and visitor parking is not identified on the campus map. In a real sense, a visitor’s primary wayfinding challenge is to find parking — not to find a destination.
- Many visitor parking sites (both sanctioned and ad hoc) are placed in Wellesley’s least distinguished settings, and are often distant from visitor destinations, with little sign support provided.
- The routes from parking to major public destinations tend to lead visitors through unwelcoming landscapes and along busy roads, rarely inviting interaction with the splendor of the campus. One cannot escape the sense that welcoming visitors is a low priority.
- Signs cannot overcome these basic parking problems. The supply of visitor parking must be increased, and locations must be improved.

Pedestrian Paths
Wellesley is served by a network of pedestrian paths throughout the built campus areas, around Lake Waban, through the Botanic Garden and Arboretum, and towards the town along Route 135 and to Fiske Gate. Many of these routes are designed to lead pedestrians through a sequence of vistas — of the Lake, of changing landscapes, and of the complex relationships between Wellesley’s buildings and their landscape settings. Indeed, Wellesley has always placed a high priority on cultivating a walking campus, and many — if not most — of the remarkable aspects of this place are revealed only when a visitor leaves their car and begins to walk.

That historic notion — the priority of walking paths over roadways — remains firmly embedded in the College today, and many we spoke to affirmed this as a shared value of the community.

Unfortunately, the pedestrian experience plays only a small part on the experience of many Wellesley visitors. Nearly all visitors arrive by car; visitor parking sites are typically on the edges of Wellesley’s best settings; and routes from parking to many visitor destinations follow the edges of roadways, having more the character of roads, not paths. Indeed, pedestrian paths are not even shown on Wellesley’s campus map.

Many people mentioned the need for pedestrian path signs to direct visitors from the Chapel to the College Club (which is a common route after weddings and memorial services); between both Alumnae and Service Lots and the Museum and Academic Quad; and between all visitor parking areas and Clapp Library.
EXISTING SIGN CONDITIONS

Trailblazer Signs on Public Roads
We found no state or municipal signs directing people to Wellesley on public roadways, either within or beyond the town of Wellesley. Several people noted that such signs do exist for Babson and for Mass Bay Community College. Despite the importance of the College for the town of Wellesley — both as an institutional neighbor and as an historic landscape — one can pass through the town without being aware of the College at all.

Entrance/Gateways Signs
The two vehicular entrances to the Wellesley campus are marked with ground-mount post-and-panel signs on each side of the entrance road. Entrance sign graphics are rendered in gold against a brown, aluminum field. (Gold graphics are used on signs within the campus, but the brown sign field appears only at the entry.)

These signs are in modest disrepair, and at least one is bent over at an angle (possibly caused by snow plowing). All entrance signs are adequately illuminated by ground-mount lighting.

The pedestrian entrance at Fisk Gate is marked with a similar post-and-panel sign that includes a message directing car traffic to the motor gate on Route 135.

The configuration of the landscapes at both vehicle entrances, and the mount location of the signs, contribute to relatively low visibility for these gateway signs. Drivers approaching the campus entrances on either road cannot see Wellesley’s signs until they arrive at the intersection. The presence of a traffic signal at both entrances is the primary indication that a significant intersection is approaching.

Directional Signs
A relatively small installation of vehicular directional signs has been provided along College Road. Most of these are steel panels on a single steel post, with graphics rendered in gold or yellow paint against a black painted field. A few of the newest signs use vinyl sign graphics, replacing the painted text. With the single exception of the police office/information sign, none of Wellesley’s roadway signs are illuminated.

For the examples shown here, the directional signs at major intersections include a very long list of destinations (e.g. the intersection of College Road and the Science Center Road/Christmas Tree Alley), which are rendered with relatively small letter heights and tight line spacing. The sign colors (gold on black), long messages, and sign typography are all contributors to the relatively poor legibility of Wellesley’s directional signs. Nighttime visibility is particularly problematic. After dark, the black sign fields tend to disappear into the landscape, providing very little target value, and the flat, painted graphics provide low contrast and little reflectivity.

Several of the directional signs along College Road include far too many individual messages, producing a confusing (and potentially hazardous) reading task for a driver on a busy roadway. The sign directing people to the Science Center and new dorm area,
Roadway directional signs.
There are very few pedestrian directional signs anywhere on campus. In some cases, heavily-used visitor pathways are on sidewalks adjacent to roadways, where case pedestrians are also guided by roadway directional signs.

**Building Identifications**

There is no consistent means of identifying buildings at Wellesley. Some locations are marked with small post signs (similar in design to the gold and black directional signs). Other buildings are marked with integrated architectural graphics (carved lettering, etc.), and some buildings are not identified at all. With few exceptions, the tenants that occupy a building are not identified at all.

Several people expressed the view that dormitories should not be identified by name, as a measure to protect student privacy and security. At present, some dorms are identified by name, including Munger, which is identified by a sign visible from Route 135.

**Parking Signs**

As with building name signs, there is no consistent means of identifying parking areas at Wellesley. Despite the fact that nearly all parking lots have names, very few have any identification signs, very few are mentioned on any directional signs, and no parking lot names are provided on the campus map.

In the few circumstances where parking names and purposes are identified, they may be increasing, not decreasing, confusion. For example, a directional identification sign is provided at the entrance to the Service Lot, opposite the ramp into the Davis courtyard. That sign identifies this area as "Waban Lot," providing parking for the "Davis Museum" and the "Jewett Arts Center" (but not Admissions).

As mentioned previously, the Museum itself suggests that its patrons park on Alumni Lot, and the visitor responding to the "Waban Lot" sign is very likely to find themselves parking at the far end, beyond a storage area for many student and staff cars.

Similarly, the Wellesley admissions literature recommends that visitors "follow signs for admission parking." For most visitors, that message will lead to the small parking area adjacent to Green Hall, where (in our experience) visitors have a fairly low chance of finding an open space. Having failed in that location, drivers must wind their way down the hillside — still without any realistic hope of finding a parking place. At the foot of the hill, they must
reorient themselves to determine how to get back to the Academic Quad...this time probably choosing to park in Service/Waban Lot.

At present, there are no sign cues to direct an admissions or Museum visitor to Alumnae Lot.

As mentioned in the discussion of regulatory signs, the rules surrounding parking have generated more signs on the Wellesley campus than any other single factor. Curbsides and parking areas throughout the campus are heavily populated by parking regulation signs, which include sticker requirements, reserved space designations, and tow-away notices. The parking situation creates an almost urban feeling in parts of campus — lines of cars along the roads, rows of parking signs and notices, and the constant, low-level sense of risk that one hasn't parked legally and will be ticketed or towed.

Regulatory Signs
The installation of roadway regulation signs combines two different formats: standard, Department of Transportation approved signs (usually mounted on punched metal channel posts), and Wellesley's own format, using gold graphics on a black field. The campus police report that, in some cases, D.O.T. standard signs must be posted in order for a campus officer to issue a legally valid citation.

It is important to note that there may be some liability issues raised when an institution posts a custom-designed traffic sign, in lieu of the state standard. There have been a number of cases in which a driver who committed a violation — or caused an accident — has asserted that they failed to recognize a nonstandard traffic regulation sign.

There remains some conflict between various campus constituencies about the number and appearance of regulatory signs along the roadways, the enforcement of speed limits, and the degree to which Wellesley should (or could) reduce the use of College Road by non-Wellesley "cut through" traffic.

As mentioned above, the number of parking regulatory signs dwarfs the installation of all other categories of signs on the campus. Interestingly, those we interviewed seemed highly attentive to the aesthetic issues surrounding roadway signs, but relatively inattentive to the forest of parking signs on the campus.

Signs marking accessible routes to buildings and handicapped parking spaces have appeared throughout the campus, as Wellesley has sought to accommodate the requirements of ADA on a campus that represents major access challenges. In addition to the legal and philosophical imperatives of accommodating those with permanent disabilities at Wellesley, a number of people mentioned that the presence of many with temporary disabilities (caused, for example, by skiing accidents and the like) these two groups combine to create a nearly constant demand for accessible paths, parking, and entrances.
As discussed in the working paper on circulation parking, the campus is relatively badly equipped with accessible paths, entrances, and parking spaces — and many of the existing accessible areas are located at service docks, not at the normal public entrance to buildings. As a result of these factors, the installation of accessibility signs is thoroughly inconsistent, incorporating many different formats, sizes, and mounting techniques.

Temporary Signs

A variety of kinds of temporary signs are used to direct people at Wellesley, some posted with administrative approval, and some posted independently by students or event operators. Although the event office has developed some standard formats for temporary signs, there are no guidelines for format, color or typography.

The special events office maintains a set of plywood, A-frame sign units that are arrayed along College Road to direct people at large events. For major events (e.g., Commencement and Reunion), the signs are supplemented by parking and directional signs brought to campus by Wellesley’s contract parking managers. This firm provides temporary parking signs and personnel to direct traffic and parking.

For smaller events, paper signs are often taped to light posts, trees, and College signs — directing people to special events, seminars, and meetings. Families holding weddings in the chapel (often followed by a reception at the College Club) frequently tie balloons to the light posts along the roads — directing their guests to follow the trail of balloons to the wedding site.

Although temporary signs will likely always play a useful role at Wellesley, there are too many people posting signs without any central authority. Some of the perceived need for temporary signs will surely be eliminated if Wellesley installs a more complete, more consistent sign program.

Several people noted that the campus has an adequate supply of places to post notices or posters. There is a campus poster policy that controls the kind of indiscriminate postings that are common at many other schools. However, the relative absence of prominent outdoor posting locations was mentioned by some as a factor that makes it harder to promote events — and hides some of the intellectual and social ferment that exists, but is sometimes not recognized, at Wellesley.

Terminology/Sign Messages

Nearly every building, road, and landscape at Wellesley has a traditional name — some of which are in current use by the entire College community, and some of which are relatively little known. These names function on several levels — both to identify features of the campus and to reflect the history and values of the institution. Like many college campuses, Wellesley’s building names honor major figures, and major donors, to the College. Unlike many campuses, Wellesley has attached names to many of its landscapes, including places of special significance in the history, ecology, and social life of the campus.

For the most part, Wellesley’s roadways have not been included in this naming tradition. Roadway names tend to be more prosaic: College Road, Green Hill Road, Chapel Road, etc. The absence of significant road names is reflected in the absence of street signs. Other than College Road, it seems that street names are not commonly used by the Wellesley community — and are unknown to campus visitors.

Nearly all of Wellesley’s parking lots are named — but few of these names appear on any signs, and no parking lot names appear on the campus map.

From the standpoint of a visitor, Wellesley functions as a small town with no addresses: there are no "neighborhood" names, no street names, no parking lot names, and relatively few building names are visible from a car. In effect, a visitor has no way to organize their decision-making into the normal hierarchy of decisions...from the "macro" level of finding a neighborhood or major road, down to the "micro" level of finding a specific building. Instead, the Wellesley visitor has only the "micro" level information available (a specific building) and must depend on "shopping list" sign messages to show that building at each intersection.
Information Services

POLICE OFFICE/INFORMATION CENTER: The only publicly-identified center for campus information is the police office, located at the end of the service/physical plant building. This office is well-located for visitors arriving via Route 135, since it is among the first sites encountered on the campus. It is less useful for those arriving via Route 16, since visitors need to traverse nearly the entire length of College Road to find it, and—until one arrives at the driveway—there are no signs announcing the existence of an information office.

The police are available 24 hours a day and are well-equipped to answer visitor questions, provide directions, and offer advice about parking. However, the layout of the driveway and parking area seems strikingly unwelcoming. Although several parking spaces are marked for visitors, most are prominently marked as “Reserved,” and there are usually several police cars and maintenance vehicles parked nearby. The entrance to the office (marked “Campus Police”) is at the end of the building, slightly below the grade of the lot, and not highly visible. Not surprisingly, everything at this site seems very much oriented around the security role of the police, and the public information service seems decidedly secondary.

Wellesley telephone operators are the first-line information resource for anyone who makes a phone inquiry. Operators field many questions that are not easily answered—drawing on their own information resources or making an educated guess about where to transfer a call. Several other campus
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offices field’s significant number of general inquiries from visitors, among them the Admissions office, the Davis Museum lobby desk, and the reception desk at the College Club. Telephone Operators

Although a campus of Wellesley’s size cannot maintain some of the visitor services found at large institutions, it is worth noting that many campus have established attractive information centers in prominent, central locations.

CAMPUS MAP: The Wellesley campus map is a modest, one-color sheet showing the campus and its immediate environs. The map provides a perspective view of the campus that illustrates the general appearance of buildings, but not the topography of the land. The map is distributed by the police, admissions and special events offices.

The following points are important to note:

• Virtually all buildings are shown and identified by name, but their functions or tenants are not provided.

• All roadways are shown, but only College Road is identified by name, and no distinction is drawn between public roads and limited access, staff-only roads.

• All parking lots are shown, but none are identified by name, and no distinction is made between restricted parking and visitor parking.

• The campus police office is identified, but the driveway entrance off College Road is not shown, and there is no mention of the its role as an information center.

• Pedestrian paths are suppressed entirely.

The are several variants of the map, including a version used by the Admissions Office the provides directions to Green Hall and highlights the road route with a contrasting green line. This map is provided with confirmation of Admission’s appointments. Event managers report that they try whenever possible to send maps to visitors before they arrive, included in advance materials for meetings or in invitations for events. They report that visitor confusion is substantially reduced by annotating a map with suggested directions and parking.

VISITOR’S GUIDE: The Admissions Office has produced a “Visitor’s Guide to Wellesley,” which is oriented toward the needs and interests of prospective students and their families. In addition to admissions and general information about the College, this publication includes a small campus map, campus points of interest (including the locations of academic departments), directions to campus from major highways, and suggestions for local hotels and restaurants.

WEB SITE: Wellesley’s Web site includes substantial information about the campus, including a campus map (similar to the printed map) that can be downloaded or printed. Although the Web site offers the potential to provide useful, pre-visit information to Wellesley’s guests, its use for orientation/wayfinding purposes is limited at present.

Maintenance and Operations

Wellesley’s exterior signs are ordered and maintained by the Physical Plant Department. A small number of exterior signs are made within Wellesley’s own shops, but any significant sign projects are referred to an outside contractor for fabrication. In recent years, there has been relatively little call for new signs — with most new sign requests centering around parking regulations.

Existing signs are in varying states of repair. Many exhibit some rusting, where the paint coating has been breached, and a few are significantly, visibly damaged by rust and paint loss. A noticeable number of signs have been bent by collisions, lawn maintenance equipment, or snow removal work, and are no longer vertical. These problems make clear the importance of designing new sign installations that present minimum obstacles to mowing equipment and snow plows.

The Physical Plant staff reports that vandalism of signs has not been a problem at Wellesley, and they do not normally find the need to use high-performance materials or graffiti-resistant coatings.

Given the relatively low level of sign activity in recent years, there is no budget dedicated to the purpose. Sign requirements are funded from general maintenance budgets.
**MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Goals**

Make it a priority to serve the orientation and information needs of visitors to the campus—to improve the experience of visitors, enhance the first impression made by the College, and to resolve the long-standing problems and inefficiencies that harm the daily operations of the campus.

Wellesley should conceive of wayfinding in the broadest possible way, seeking wherever possible to employ non-sign elements (landscape, lighting, publications, and visitor services) to reduce the need for signs on campus.

Establish consistent standards for sign messages, colors, sizes, typography, mount structures, and siting; give visitors the confidence that they know what a Wellesley sign looks like and where then can expect to find them.

**Trailblazer Signs**

Wellesley should be identified on directional “trailblazer” signs along major highways and local roads that approach the campus. These signs are usually provided by the state and local transportation departments, which may or may not be receptive to new requests of this kind.

Identify desirable locations for the Wellesley-specific roadway trailblazer signs, and inventory the existing signs for other colleges and institutions.

Negotiate with state and local authorities to include Wellesley on roadway trailblazer signs (which may require an offer to underwrite some of the costs of such signs).

Establish a pattern of periodic review of trailblazer signs—to document their installation, report maintenance problems, and identify new development or construction that might warrant requesting additional signs.

**Entrance/Gateway Signs**

We recommend that Wellesley replace its entrance signs to provide better visibility/legibility and a stronger presence along Routes 135 and 16. Ideally, that project should be developed as part of a landscape and lighting redevelopment plan that improves the design of vehicular entrances.

We very strongly ratify the proposals to relocate the Route 16 entrance to the East Lodge and the Route 135 entrance to the West Lodge. Both proposals present an opportunity to address serious flaws of the existing entrances—improving their relationships to the street, their symbolic function as “gates” to a landscape, and the entrance sequence and orientation views along the initial roadway segment. Of the two, the relocation of the Route 16 entrance is substantially easier to accomplish.

Design new gateway signs for the Route 16, Route 135, and Fiske Gate entrances to the campus; enhance the appearance and visibility of campus entrances, and provide signs that establish the colors and formats that will be used throughout the campus interior.

Ratify the plan to relocate vehicular entrances, per the landscape master plan, and develop a preliminary timetable for this work.

Replace the existing signs at the existing entrances, with consultation on site improvements from a landscape architect and lighting designer (with the scope and expense of this work devised to reflect the schedule on which major roadway realignments might occur).

**Orientation Signs**

We do not believe that Wellesley needs orientation maps or site directories at its entrances (with the possible exception of the entry at Fiske Gate). Since nearly all visitors arrive by car, any such plan would require a parking area or roadway pull-off at campus entrances. Supported by a consistent wayfinding plan, we think it far preferable for a visitor to enter the gates, begin to travel through the landscape, and find information/assistance within the campus, not at its perimeter.

That notion builds on the core values of Wellesley’s campus; this striking landscape has been carefully designed by a setting for this College, and we should encourage visitors to see and experience it. The complex, sometimes disorienting aspects of the campus can be understood as invitations to discovery of this place—but only if we provide wayfinding cues that reinforce a visitor’s confidence that they’ll find their way.

Part of the orientation process depends on the “readability” of the campus. It is centrally important that we eliminate the current sense that College Road leads around the campus without ever allowing a view into it. These issues are clearly delineated elsewhere in the working papers. We note that the proposed relocation of entrances on Routes 135 and 16 would restore the historic relationship between the campus entrances and the East and West Lodge buildings. In that scenario, the Lodges would likely be restored to some administrative use, creating the possibility that these two gatehouses could play some role in providing information, printed maps, or directions during times of peak activity.
Despite the desire to define Wellesley as a walking campus, we cannot escape the fact that virtually all visitors engage the campus for the first time from a car. We can — and should — enhance the pedestrian experience of visitors, but we cannot ignore the central importance of devising a successful entrance and orientation experience for drivers.

Central to that venture is the need to create — or, in many cases, restore — views and vistas within the campus. Views to Lake Waban, to the towers, and from hillocks down to low-lying land play multiple roles: they help people assess their location in the landscape, they clarify the topography of the land, they create memorable "landmarks" that organize spaces, and they invite a closer experience with the natural beauty of the campus. As mentioned elsewhere, multiple "viewsheds" were established in the original design for the campus, but some have been lost within an overgrown landscape. The effect has been to isolate areas of the campus, creating, at times, the sense that you cannot see out... and cannot see in. Restoring these visual links is critical.

We strongly recommend the following:

*Restore and protect viewsheds, per the recommendations elsewhere in the master plan.* Views (to the Lake, to the towers and other landmarks, and across meadows and hills) reveal the campus structure and organization, invite an understanding of the significance of this place and setting, and provide powerful orienting tools that help people to understand their passage through a place.
Rearrange College Road to the Chapel side of Founders Lot, per the recommendations elsewhere in the master plan. Although the relocation is modest, it provides multiple benefits, bringing drivers close to the center of campus and providing views into some of Wellesley's best buildings and landscapes. We also believe that the addition of an intersection and stop sign (where the road would turn east around Founders Hall) will modulate traffic speeds and punctuate the otherwise "mono-speed" experience of College Road. Simply put, it is right that people stop and see the central campus.

Devise and implement a careful lighting design, per the master plan, that will define spaces, create views to softly-lit landmarks, and enhance the nighttime readability of the campus.

Review the possibility of posting a campus map and directory at the Fiske Gate pedestrian entrance, as part of an effort to restore a stronger connection with the town and to encourage more activity in this location. (This review should also address the concern of some on campus that a map in such a public location might harm campus security.)

Enhance the availability of a printed campus map and guide (per discussion later in this report), and provide map signs for interior use in many more locations throughout campus (particularly the lobbies of buildings with visitor traffic). Make sure that people see the campus map, and make it easier for them to get one.

Sign Messages
Wellesley needs to expand its library of campus names and addresses, both to identify things that are currently unmarked, and to provide a hierarchy of terms that breaks the campus into more manageable sections. The notion here is to provide addresses that are analogous to those found in a typical town: primary names (campus "neighborhoods"), secondary names (streets), and tertiary names (specific buildings or locations). This system would allow us to reduce our reliance on long lists of "tertiary" destinations—instead directing people first to a major region.

Although some new terms will be needed, there are also many traditional names that have fallen out of use. The specific names will be a subject for broad discussion. In draft, we recommend the following:

**Divide the campus into four named regions:**
- **East Campus:** All areas served by the Science Center/Christmas Tree Alley roadways.
- **Central Campus:** The area roughly bounded by Stone-Davis and Clapp Library, including the Chapel, Science, and Tupelo Point.
- **Norumbega Hill:** Davis Museum and the Academic Quad.
- **West Campus:** Alumnae Hall and the sports facilities.

These areas include nearly all visitor destinations at Wellesley, and they correspond generally both to roadway decision points and to parking facilities.

**Build recognition and use of these region names on signs, maps, campus addresses, College publications, and in directions given to visitors.**

Reduce verbiage on directional signs by using a standard, abbreviated set of names (e.g. Chapel, not Houghton Memorial Chapel, etc.). Historic and honorary names can be rendered in full in building identifications.

**Roadway Directional Signs**
The network of directional signs at Wellesley needs to be entirely replaced. Note, however, that many of the complaints made about directional signage are really symptoms of the parking problem. A good directional signing program cannot eliminate the frustration, confusion, and traffic problems caused when people arrive near their destination but cannot find anywhere to park. In the near term that suggests that some faculty and staff should be moved from close-in parking spots to create space for visitors. A variety of long-term solutions are presented elsewhere in the master plan.

The absence of acceptable visitor parking harms the image of the College, creates cost and confusion, and hobbles groups like the Davis Museum in their efforts to attract outside audiences. We believe that some improvement in the supply and location of visitor parking should be implemented as soon as possible.

**Pedestrian Directional Signs**
With limited exceptions, we see relatively little need for pedestrian directional signs. At present, few unfamiliar visitors use the path system. Once on foot, their wayfinding tasks are easier, and people are available to offer directions. Given this level of need, it is hard to justify the aesthetic effects, initial costs, and maintenance problems associated with a major installation of ground-mount pedestrian signs.

As mentioned previously, we strongly believe that enhancing the pedestrian experience on campus—for visitors, faculty, staff, and students—is an important goal. We have recommended that near-term and long-term parking modifications be designed and sited to invite pedestrian interaction with the landscape on the walk from car to office, dormitory, or visitor destination.
Pending clarification of where visitors will be asked to park, there will probably be a need for some pedestrian directional signing between parking areas and major visitor destinations. At the moment, for example, there is a need for some signing between Alumnae Lot and the Davis Museum and across the Academic Quad between Jewett and Green/Admissions. Signs leading to the bookstore are also a concern to many people; although that issue might more appropriately be addressed by identifying the store on a building identification sign and highlighting its location in a campus map/guide.

Per the mention above, the pedestrian entrance at Fiske Gate, and the path from Fiske into the campus, are also logical sites for some modest pedestrian signing — pending clarification of concerns about public access and security. If those issues can be resolved acceptably, it seems highly desirable to enhance a strong pedestrian link to downtown Wellesley.

Wherever possible, we recommend that path and landscape designs be devised with wayfinding in mind — providing an obvious “major” path in circumstances that warrant, and installing distinctive features that make it easier for people to distinguish between paths. A prime example is the prospect of restoring the distinctive paving of the former “Brick Walk” from the Chapel to the College Club. This path improvement would recover a lost lakeside amenity, while creating a distinctive, easy-to-follow route between two important campus sites. In the absence of such a landscape cue, many visitors make the same trip along the curbside of College Road.
Examine design options for a modest implementation of pedestrian directional signs, which might include some form of directional message that could be mounted on existing light poles.

Assess the need for pedestrian directional signs after near-term (and long-term) plans are in place to accommodate visitor parking.

Restore a distinctive surface to the former “Brick Walk” path, and seek other “low impact” opportunities to enhance the “readability” of the path system.

Identification Signs
We propose that all buildings at Wellesley be visibly identified by name, either through existing or new architectural graphics (e.g., carved lettering), by a site sign, or a combination of the two. A consistent set of building identifications provides multiple benefits: it builds familiarity with Wellesley’s historic names and buildings, it reinforces a visitor’s confidence upon arrival at a building, and it provides a network of “checkpoints” that allow users to orient themselves with a paper map.

When an individual building tenant generates many unfamiliar visitors (e.g., Admissions), we recommend that it be identified on the exterior sign. Issues for discussion include the possibility of listing all major tenants/functions of each building, and/or identifying the architect and year of construction. Both ideas offer the potential to expand awareness of Wellesley’s history and its diverse activities...both at cost of somewhat larger signs. (Although outside the current scope of work, note also that many of Wellesley’s interior building directories are inadequate; a coordinated directory program for major buildings should be considered in the future.)

Design a format for post-mounted building identification signs (including options for limited listings of tenants/building functions), consistent with the formats for the balance of the sign system. This should include formats for identifying buildings that are outside the main campus, including options for more prominent driveway/entrance signs for off-campus buildings that generate many visitors.

Assess identification needs at each Wellesley building, documenting the format of existing architectural graphics and potential for new architectural graphics.

Examine the advantages and disadvantages of identifying building tenants/functions (and possibly architects and year of construction), and arrive at a College-wide policy.

Building on the above, implement (at minimum) a campus-wide set of building identification signs.

Design a format for loading dock identification signs (including information about hours of operation and policies at each building), and provide consistent signage at every Wellesley dock.

Parking identification signs warrant a specific, carefully-designed sign type. These should include some sort of campus-wide symbol for parking, the
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lot name, prominent identification of visitor parking, and formats to render the various kinds of permits accepted in each lot.

**Design a format for parking lot identification signs**, consistent with the formats for the balance of the sign system.

**Regulatory Signs**

The three main categories of campus regulatory sign — roadway/traffic signs, parking regulation signs, and ADA accessibility signs — should be designed as part of the campus-wide sign program.

As mentioned earlier, liability and enforcement issues suggest that it is wise to use state-standard formats for traffic signs, in which case we propose that custom posts and mount fields be devised to reflect the detailing of all other campus signs.

**Review existing roadway signs and recommend change, in cooperation with campus police and a traffic engineer.**

**Design custom posts and mounting fields to accommodate state-standard traffic signs in a manner consistent with the balance of the Wellesley sign program.**

**Replace all existing traffic signs.**

Improvements in the supply and allocation of parking, as envisioned by the landscape master plan recommendations, should substantially reduce the number of parking regulation signs at Wellesley. In particular, we strongly endorse the proposal to eliminate parking along campus roadways; this proposal will enhance safety, access, and orientation views — and would eliminate the need for a large number of existing signs that are a significant visual blight.

**Design new formats for parking regulatory signs** (consistent with parking identification signs, discussed earlier).

**Develop near-term and long-term plans to improve parking arrangements, and identify areas that warrant near-term investment in new signs.**

There is no near-term solution to the problem of providing ADA-compliant accessible parking and access at many Wellesley buildings. Improvements will likely occur on an incremental basis over a long period, requiring regular revision of the ADA signs at each campus building.

Given the complexity of access issues at Wellesley, we recommend development of a modest map and guide designed specifically to address access issues. Ideally, this information should be incorporated into the College’s standard-issue map. In Wellesley’s case, the complexity of accessible routes, parking, and entrances seems to warrant a separate presentation, which — for the first time — would provide reliable advice and direction to those with temporary or permanent disabilities. This publication would also reflect a commitment to ease of access, particularly in an environment in which ADA-compliant access is very hard to create. The existence of such a map should be mentioned in the standard map and guide, and it should be freely distributed at major visitor sites.

**Review conditions at each building and parking site, to document existing ADA sign conditions and routes of access.**

**Design a format for ADA access signs, including both post-mount formats and wall-mount formats.**

**Install new ADA signs on a phased basis, replacing existing signs as needed.**

**Design and print an access map for the campus, showing (and providing information on) accessible routes, parking, and building entrances — as well as sources of assistance available from College staff and police.**

**Temporary Signs**

We expect that a well-implemented wayfinding program will substantially reduce — but not eliminate — the need for temporary signs on campus. In particular, we expect that some campus events (including both College and outside rental events) will still warrant specific mention on directional signs. Events such as commencement and reunion will also always require temporary signing — although the nature of the requirements will change dramatically when the past practice of parking on the meadows is eliminated.

As a new campus sign program is designed, we suggest that temporary sign needs be addressed in an integrated way. That might include the possibility of adding an additional, temporary component to permanent signs — or a separate, consistently-designed unit to accommodate them. That effort should include development of electronic layout templates for temporary signs, providing managers with easy access to pre-designed layouts and typography.

None of this should be expected to entirely eliminate hand-made paper signs on campus. The mission is to address the biggest part of the problem in an integrated, controlled way... not to eliminate completely the capacity for individuals to solve their own problems.

**Visitor Services**

It is essential that Wellesley provide some sort of information center for non-admissions visitors. (To a large extent, admissions provides this service directly for prospective students and their families.) This service should provide in an attractive setting, located close to the campus center and visitor parking and equipped with chairs, telephones, restrooms, and information about campus activities, lodging and dining options. The ideal arrangement would allow people to park in a visitor’s lot, visit the information center to acquire directions and a campus map, and proceed to many campus locations on foot.
This is clearly impossible in the present police office — where the location, appearance of the building, and conditions in the parking lot create a difficult, unwelcoming experience for visitors. Although there is obvious logic to using the existing 24-hour police staff for information services, the combination of security and public information services is also less than ideal.

**Map & Guide**

Wellesley needs a printed map and guide that is very widely distributed to the campus community, to prospective students, and to visitors. Visitors should receive this map as part of pre-visit materials, and it should be made widely available at all public destinations (including, but not limited to, the police office, Davis, admissions, the College Club, the Greenhouses, and major event locations).

This will require a substantial expansion of the existing format — including upgraded production values to include multi-color printing.

Note that maps cannot be the centerpiece of a wayfinding plan — particularly since many people have a hard time relating a two-dimensional map to a three-dimensional environment. That said, a quality map/guide reflects a management commitment to visitor services that affects a visitor's perception of the "navigability" of the environment, it can provide important (and currently unavailable) information (on map graphics and in text), and it invites a broader awareness of the scope, organization, and features of the campus landscape and buildings.

**Management Implications**

Enhancing the wayfinding environment at Wellesley will involve management commitments that range well beyond sign management. It will require a policy-level commitment to make significant changes in the physical form of the campus, its operations, and its attitudes toward visitors. It will also require more management attention and more staff resources than have been provided in the past.

Important management issues include the following:

- Creating an effective wayfinding system is an evolutionary process. It will require a "mission" level commitment on the part of the administration, and would benefit from on-going oversight by a senior staff person with specific authority and responsibility for wayfinding at Wellesley.
- Future landscape and architectural projects must incorporate orientation and wayfinding planning. No capital project should proceed without a serious, documented effort to maximize its positive effect on wayfinding at Wellesley.
- General wayfinding reviews should be conducted at least annually, to assess progress, identify problems, and identify changes in facilities or use patterns that will affect wayfinding. There is no substitute for ongoing, creative problem-solving, and management resolve to reject inappropriate requests.
- A dedicated budget for campus wayfinding and orientation services will help to ensure the success of the program. Items like a new map and guide need to be devised, and budgeted, within an administrative context. The distributed nature of academic administration often leaves no one as an advocate — and funder — of programs for visitors.
- A new sign installation will require a budget and staff for modest — but regular — maintenance. The current maintenance practices are reactive, not proactive. If Wellesley invests in new signs, it needs a mechanism to maintain their appearance.

The full realization of a wayfinding plan at Wellesley will depend on many of the landscape proposals presented elsewhere in the master plan. Those ideas establish the context for any effort to improve the campus experience for Wellesley's community and its visitors.
Even as these proposals are considered, we firmly believe that Wellesley can—and should—begin the work we describe in this report. The current sign installation has begun to be more of a problem than an asset, and relative absence of campus information is creating daily confusion and frustration—and masking the virtues of a remarkable campus landscape. A careful work plan, devised to reflect the master plan decision-making process, offers a chance to address many of these issues in the near-term. In so doing, Wellesley can lay the foundation for an effective, durable wayfinding plan.
Wellesley College 1998 Landscape Master Plan

Working Paper Eight:
The Interdependence of Design and Maintenance

Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Inc., Landscape Architects
15 May 1998
Maintenance and design must be inextricably linked for Wellesley College to achieve its full potential as a landscape. The challenges of landscape maintenance at Wellesley are complicated by the diversity of landscape types, the different maintenance operations needed to support the diversity of these types, the complexity of the various pieces of the campus landscape, and the relative difficulty of interpreting what is meant when we define Wellesley’s campus as a “cultivated nature.” Adding to this complexity of the relationship between design and maintenance is the fact that the norms and conventions of all types of landscape maintenance have changed dramatically over the course of this century. In addition to changes in the skills of people available in the landscape maintenance work force, the use of mechanical equipment, and the overall increase of the bottom line of maintenance costs have significantly altered landscape maintenance at Wellesley since the 1923 Master Plan. A significant emphasis of our findings regarding maintenance highlights the interdependence between the design goals for the campus and the role of maintenance in the incremental realization of these goals.

Maintenance and Cultivated Nature

The contradictions and ambiguities that are inherent in a campus whose landscape is described as a “cultivated nature” explain some of the difficulties in describing the role of maintenance as part of the Wellesley campus. Nature is an energy-driven system, and left uninterrupted, the natural landscape has clearly legible patterns and particular forms that result from dynamic interactions of the surrounding biotic and abiotic conditions. The “cultivated nature” of the Wellesley campus consciously builds upon the inherent patterns and capabilities of the natural qualities of the site. It is the reading of this landscape, and understanding how to manipulate its growth and change, that requires maintenance at Wellesley to be a collaboration between maintenance personnel and a landscape architect.

The landscape design of the Wellesley campus evolves from a fundamental respect for how the existing landscape types would evolve naturally, and building with these types by augmenting or highlighting the different aspects of the landscape. Since the campus design strategy essentially preserves existing topographic conditions, the built landscape of the campus is enhanced primarily with plantings and a series of site design elements — road alignments, decisions about site furnishings, and the removal of plantings to create open space — that are supportive of and deferential to the surrounding presence of nature. As a result, the role of maintenance is constantly one of a subtle interpretation of how to amend, enhance, and guide the processes of nature while cultivating it in certain ways to create a particular sense of place that also solves the programmatic needs of human inhabitation. As one can quickly imagine, this constant maintenance need to interpret how to amend nature requires many small and subtle decisions rather than a few bold moves. The long-term success of how well maintenance of the landscape at Wellesley supports the larger aesthetic intentions of a cultivated nature is dependent upon the overall quality of these ongoing decisions.

Cultivated Nature versus Suburbanization

As early as the 1930s, alumni of Wellesley noted that aspects of the campus landscape were becoming suburbanized. Although suburbanization can mean many things, these early cries of suburbanization had mostly to do with attempts to standardize and conventionalize aspects of maintenance on the campus. Taken individually, each small decision might seem reasonably grounded. But today, the campus landscape has been oversimplified. As a result the brick walk along Lake Waban was replaced with concrete and then black top (easier to plow), fields of bulbs and flowers were replaced with swaths of cut grass (easier to mow), and meadows were cut or drained (to receive parked cars in times when overflow parking was needed). As this point in time, a plan for campus landscape maintenance must be combined with a series of corrective design steps to reinvigorate or renew the cultivated nature of the campus landscape.

Plant Species Types and Suburbanization

The suburbanization of the Wellesley campus is also partly the result of the incorrect use of plants on the campus, partly the introduction of plant species that are inappropriate, and partly the removal or decline of native plants for one reason or another. A subtle variety and complexity is replaced in some areas by ubiquitous and normalized conditions commonly found in suburban America. Suburban plantings have been added incrementally — a high maintenance turf panel might have been installed where native groundcovers would have required limited but specialized care, yew shrubs might have been planted
to "soften" conditions that really did not need softening, and so on. More recent transgressions have included the wide use of "horticultural shrubs" that have been popularized since 1950, such as evergreen Japanese yews and exotic shrub species that, unlike most shrubs in the New England landscape, have been hybridized and selected for "showy" large flowers and symmetry of plant form rather than having smaller flowers and irregularity of form that typify plants in the native New England landscape. The suburban attributes of certain plants are exaggerated when these are planted in full sun as opposed to when planted in the dappled shade of woodland edges.

Another problem is the overuse of ornamental trees including crabapples and flowering cherries. Although the crabapples near Parmelee Pond are quite beautiful, when crabapples are used elsewhere on campus they optimize the tendency to use plants for their flowering attributes, as opposed to selecting plants for their overall visual compatibility with the characteristics of the New England landscape. The forms of crabapples are generally either rounded or particular in some way, and not, for example, irregular and more transparent like New England flowering trees such as shadbush (Amelanchier) and dogwood (Cornus florida and alternifolia). Moreover, because crabapple trees are grown for their flowers there has been less thought given to their other important qualities such as overall shape, canopy height, and transparency. There are certain flowering trees, while not native, that blend well with the New England landscape. For example, silverbell (Halesia) is underutilized at Wellesley, perhaps because multistemmed forms of this plant (grown more recently in the trade) tend to break in snow and ice, whereas the single- or double-trunked tree form, such as the large one planted near the entrance to Tower Court, is a magnificent flowering specimen that also feels like it belongs in a cultivated New England landscape. Other non-native flowering trees that have a place on the campus include Stewartia and Koelreuteria. Both trees have admirable seasonal characteristics and can blend well into the dappled sunlight at the edges of woodland areas.

Most obvious is the need to renew an emphasis on campus plantings in the various micro-climates of the campus that are native to New England: hornbeam (Carpinus caroliniana), hop hornbeam (Ostrya virginiana), maples (Acer rubrum and Acer saccharum), oaks (Quercus rubra, bicolor, and palustris), and so on.

The diminished condition of the herbaceous flowering layer of the campus today, as compared to how robustly similar areas existed in the past, is another significant example of how the campus has been oversimplified. Large drifts of naturalized spring bulbs such as daffodils, although not native, would compliment the re-establishment of beds of native woodland herbaceous plants and groundcovers, as well as carefully selected, but dryer edges of meadows. The historical research has shown that the cultivation of nature also was previously supplemented with areas that are planted in a style that descended from the nineteenth-century tradition of using expanses of wild flowers (not always native) and flowering bulbs such as crocus, in carefully selected and often out-of-the-way places on campus. The result of this of course is to add a relatively ephemeral color and variety in spring when the campus is intensively used.

Canadian hemlock is one of the most pervasive and beautiful trees on the Wellesley campus. Tragically, it faces destruction by the woolly adelgid aphid. Either Wellesley can face quite expensive annual spraying with dormant oil (over $500 per tree per year in perpetuity), or areas of the campus such as Christmas Tree Alley and the hillside behind Shakespeare House will be significantly denuded. Efforts are underway to import natural control pests from Japan, so short term dormant oil spraying may temporarily preserve these trees with the hope that a biological control will be found soon. For the long term, a more difficult choice of losing these trees may be necessary. If these trees are lost, it will be a disaster similar to the earlier loss on campus of native chestnuts and American elm. Wellesley will need to be prepared to take action as the losses will denude some areas of the campus. Obviously, no other Hemlock should be planted until the woolly adelgid is under control.

Viewsheds

The Wellesley campus is fundamentally organized around the formation and preservation of sightlines and viewsheds. As described earlier, the gradual infill of these sightlines with the vertical growth of trees, the lateral growth of tree branches, and the emergence of volunteer trees has significantly diminished the transparency of many of the important sightlines and viewsheds. In some cases, such as the sightline from Munger Quad to the Stone Tower, the visual connection to the campus center has been completely lost by the rapid growth of white pines on the hillside.

The restoration of these important elements of campus organization will do much to clarify the organization of the campus and help campus users with wayfinding, since the ability to see destinations -- or referencing landmarks such as the Stone Tower and Lake Waban -- is fundamental. It is important to remember that while the overall intention is to reclaim a particular view, this view passes through a landscape condition today that is different from the one that existed at any other moment in time. As such, the re-establishment of each viewshed must be considered individually. Interpretation that takes the form of field decisions as part of each clearing operation will be crucial in realizing this important and politically sensitive aspect of maintenance. Obviously, certain large trees cannot be cut and instead the canopy can be significantly thinned to
increase transparency. It is important to remember that the maintenance of views and sightlines will always play against the fact that all landscapes continue to grow and change. The latter section of this Working Paper annotates photographs and explains in a general way how these sightlines and views should be reclaimed. (This section will be added to the final draft of the Working Paper and is presented today in slide form for discussion.)

Current Maintenance Staff Levels

The condition of the Wellesley College landscape today is partly the result of an inadequately sized maintenance staff. The maintenance shortcuts of the past are showing up now, as the landscape is reaching a phase of its maturity. In particular, aspects of the campus landscape that require while and on-going maintenance operations have been deferred, and as a result Wellesley now faces a relatively expensive series of corrective measures, some of which will necessarily be realized through capital projects performed by independent landscape contractors.

A particularly challenging staffing issue is created by the assignment of kitchen staff during the summer, to the landscape maintenance crews. Even seemingly simple operations, such as grass mowing, can be disastrous with unskilled staff if they are unaware of the need to not damage the bark of young trees, or if their training is inadequate to recognize insect and disease problems in areas of the campus. The other problem results from this extra staff coming into the landscape crew late in the spring. The highest level of maintenance in a landscape normally occurs in late winter and early spring when plants are dormant. Wellesley should identify other work for the dining staff in the summer and, instead, should ensure that extra hands are available for maintenance at the time of the year when this help is needed.

An additional complicating factor is that this Master Plan will, hopefully, generate quite a lot of need for additional maintenance once these new projects are realized. Although certain aspects of this maintenance, such as watering and pruning new trees, can be outsourced to other contractors, Wellesley must acknowledge that the demands for maintenance will increase during the establishment phase of these projects that are on the horizon.

Wellesley must work directly with Patrick Willoughby and make a detailed assessment of how to improve and increase its landscape maintenance personnel. The question of what staff, and how many, must be evaluated by Mr. Willoughby, partly because it is the capabilities of existing staff that must be central to this analysis.

Zone Maintenance

The concept of zone maintenance, in which staff are assigned primarily to selected areas of a landscape, is in principle a good idea. It motivates staff to care about the area as if it were their own. But Wellesley College is a relatively small landscape and it seems impractical to have a small staff divided into smaller staffing increments. Perhaps a way to achieve the sense of ownership of areas of the landscape by staff -- while preserving the overall singularity of the maintenance staff working as one cohesive group -- would be to assign staff the responsibility of monitoring specific areas of the campus. Monthly meetings (perhaps more frequent in the busy spring months) could be held and staff could make brief oral reports on the areas of the campus that are their responsibility. This would encourage pride in a staff member’s "own" area of the campus, but it also could elevate the overall staff’s level of interest and understanding of the kinds of maintenance that are going on elsewhere on the campus.

Understanding the Interrelationship between Maintenance and Design

At this point in time, the Wellesley College landscape requires different types of maintenance involving the maintenance staff and the use of an outside landscape architect in different ways. This maintenance has been divided into the following four categories at Wellesley College:

1. Maintain/Repair Projects
2. Restore/Repair Projects
3. Redesign/Repair Projects
4. Redesign/Rebuild Projects

The following is a brief description of what is meant by the above categories; each of the areas of the campus described later in this Working Paper are coded to reflect one of the above project category designations.

Category One: Maintain/Repair Projects

These areas are to be maintained more or less as they are presently configured, or changed in minor ways as described in the Master Plan. Category One projects can be accomplished through routine maintenance and repair operations performed by the in-house Wellesley College maintenance crews. The level of professional design advice and guidance for areas in this category would be covered by the inclusion of each area in a semi-annual campus walk-through attended by an outside landscape architect and key Wellesley maintenance staff. The types of decisions that would be made on this walking tour would include marking plants to be removed or pruned, staking locations, and specifying species of new plantings. Additional notations on masonry
repair, identifying plantings in need of extra maintenance, and minor new plantings could be recorded as part of a simple photographic record with hand written notes to summarize the recommendations of each such campus walk.

**Category Two: Restoration/Repair Projects**

Many of these areas are small enough that they can be part of the annual projects undertaken by the regular Wellesley maintenance staff. Certain aspects of Category Two projects may require the use of outside contractors to accomplish some of the work. The level of involvement of a design professional in these projects will be higher than Category One, and will vary from project to project. The least level of involvement would include archival research to determine earlier lost landscape configurations, interpretations of this historical information to adapt the landscape to contemporary conditions and programs, and the assembling of simple plans to guide the work of the landscape crews.

The uses of spaces and the maintenance capabilities of crews have changed sufficiently over time to preclude almost any project from being a strict historical restoration in the conservative sense of that idea. Rather, the involvement of a landscape architect would be needed to guide the historical interpretation. This procedure is key to the success and continued sustainability of the Wellesley landscape. Projects in Category Two that include only minor changes or small areas may not require commissioning a survey, although a survey may be necessary for larger areas and areas with complex topography. Simple and clear design documents prepared by a landscape architect would be worth the effort and initial expense because these plans can be used to guide future crews on the ongoing and incremental maintenance and upkeep of areas. As a normal course of operations, maintenance guidelines, especially guiding the pruning of plants and the intended future form of these plants, would be made part of future landscape maintenance guidelines.

**Category Three: Redesign/Repair Projects**

Many areas of the campus will require more extensive redesign to function properly, to adapt the areas to present uses, and to be affordably maintainable. These projects usually will combine differing levels of restoration or may require wholly new creative interpretations. The majority of landscape maintenance projects on campus fall into this category.

The degree of outside contractor involvement will vary from job to job but typically contractors will be needed for several kinds of work, such as new pavement, curbs, major tree plantings, storm drainage repair, and new utility system adjustments. All work in this category should be documented in contract documents and realized under the direction of a landscape architect. The landscape architect should be involved in all levels of the project from schematic design through production of construction documents and construction observation. Work that will be bid by outside contractors will require a proper set of bid drawings and specifications.

These documents and specifications need not be extensive; they can refer to performance specifications that at a later time can be assembled as part of a series of projects for various details on the Wellesley campus that could be standardized, i.e., lighting, paving, curbing, and planting techniques, etc. These performance specifications can then also function as reference manuals to the staff for small routine repairs. Most of the work in this category will require a site survey. Surveying projects as they are undertaken and completing as-built drawings at the end of projects will be a good way to compile a more accurate record of the entire campus in an incremental fashion. Each survey completed can be tied back to the aerial base map of the campus, which could be a continually updated electronic file.

**Category Four: Redesign/Rebuild Projects**

Several areas of the campus are identified in the Master Plan to be substantially changed, added to, or redesigned. The scope of these projects will be beyond the capabilities and workload of the campus maintenance staff. Most of the Category Four projects involve major architectural projects. Landscape and infrastructural improvements in these areas should be included as part of the architecture project scope. These projects should be bid as complete packages with a general contractor or construction manager in charge of coordination of the construction of both the building project and the landscape and infrastructure. The scope of these projects would require a level of attention that current in-house Wellesley staff could not provide because of other demands on their time. An architect and landscape architect -- contracted separately with Wellesley -- should be involved in all aspects of these projects. Areas that fall within this category are not addressed specifically in this Working Paper, but are identified on the summary plan.

**Maintenance-Related Projects**

The following is a listing of five projects that should be considered as separate projects to be developed by a landscape architect and bid for construction by independent contractors. It would be crucial to have someone like Patrick Willoughby to provide oversight through each of these projects, in part for overall continuity but also to have his evaluation of whether the resulting maintenance demands would be beyond the capabilities of his current staff. In such cases, for example, a decision could be made to
outsource maintenance temporarily and evaluate whether any more long-term increase of maintenance by Wellesley staff is required.

- **Grove Replanting Project- Category 3**

  The trees of the major groves of the campus, the Academic Quad, the Chapel Lawn, Severance Green, as well as the Tower Court area and the Sage area are quite mature with almost a complete absence of next generation trees. The best course of action would be a one time planting project of approximately 150-300 trees.

  Detail considerations to be resolved in the project would be:

  - To generate a list of appropriate species to be used for overstory (shade) trees on the campus. This list could be used to guide future tree planting beyond the immediate project. These trees would be selected according to an agreed upon set of criteria that would consider appropriate scale, suitability of the species for a high branch structure, disease resistance etc.

  - To generate a plan showing the location of proposed trees as well as potential locations for future class trees, within the above mentioned areas.

- **Meadow Restoration Project- Category 3**

  The meadows are degraded to a state that a mere change in maintenance will not restore them suitably. A separate meadow restoration project would address several aspects that are critical in allowing the meadows to become an important component of the campus landscape. Critical aspects that would need study are species selection for the different wet and dry microclimates of the meadows, precise grading modifications to the meadow areas, if necessary for them to thrive, the drainage of the meadows, and the evaluation of materials and grades for pathways through the meadows. Finally, and perhaps most important for the success of the meadow planting, would be the development of a new maintenance regime that determined proper times and methods for upkeep.

- **Lake Edge Restoration Project- Category 3**

  Areas around the lake and the lake edge path are severely eroded. Erosion is particularly bad at points around the lake where people enter the water. A separate project to address these problems would develop sustainable sensitive solutions to these problems. New concepts, from a specialized field of civil engineering called bio-engineering, can be applied with careful design to reverse and prevent future degradation of this very important resource.

- **Hillside Restoration Project- Category 2**

  Perhaps the most dynamic landscape type on the Wellesley Campus, the forested hillsides are in need of attention. The selective editing and removal of undesirable species as well as the planting in some areas of appropriate plants, needs to be studied to find ways to work with the natural process of forestation that largely determines the species composition of these areas. A one time project to correct the preponderance of undesirable invasive species would establish standards that would be followed up by a much simpler annual maintenance regime.

- **Central Campus Pathway Circulation Study and Redesign- Category 3**

  The master plan will make several recommendations about how pathways in the Severance Green, Rhododendron Dell, and Academic Quad area can be modified to allow more efficient circulation and reduce extra desire lines. Although addressed in a general way in the Master Plan, this area will need to be studied in more detail to determine exact location, grade width, and material of pathways before they are changed or rebuilt.
Lower and Middle Meadows
Category 3 Project

- Eliminate mown grass verges along paths and roadways. These edges tame and suburbanize the meadow, and greatly reduce their overall area.

- A Meadow Restoration Project should address the following issues:
  - Plant a proper regime of upper meadow and wet meadow species to create healthy and beautiful meadow.
  - Adjust storm water inlets to allow more water to remain and thereby allow wet meadow to function properly.
  - Eliminate inappropriate mowing and all car parking.
  - Create new maintenance regime as part of redesign.
  - Extend line of street trees along north edge of College Road from the Dover Lot to the Founders Lot.

- All of these changes would first require further design and engineering study prior to implementation.
Middle (Science) Meadow

Category 3 Project

- Initiate a Meadow Restoration Project to restore the meadow, eliminating the large areas of mown grass.

- Develop as part of the Meadow Restoration Project an ongoing maintenance regime for the meadows.

- Select species for dry upland and wet meadow sites.

- Limb up trees in meadow area to open views at eye level.

- Add street trees to the edge of College Road north of Norumbega Hill.
Science Center South Facade
Category 2 Project

Meadow Restoration Project
Category 3 Project

- Extend the hillside planting of overstory trees and native flowering understory trees to the south side of the path in front of the Science Center in the areas between the stair towers.

- The new plants will allow oblique views of the Center to be softened, but views out from the Stair Tower will be preserved.
Science Center Entrance

- Fussy plantings:
  - are inappropriate species for the sunny location
  - disrupt continuity of the meadow planting
  - prevent the use of the sitting wall
  - contribute to a suburban feel.

- Extend meadow up to edge of seated wall.

- Extend tree planting discussed elsewhere to integrate this area into large scale plantings and make it more like a hillside.
Street Trees at College Road East
Category 2 Project

- Consider replacement of street trees along the north side of College Road from the Dower area to Founders Lot (see plan).

- Trees in this location help to de-emphasize the view toward the Science Center. The street trees also extend the planting of Stone Davis Hill across the road.
Brick Walk  
Category I Project

- Raise canopy of more recently planted trees to encourage branch structure that is similar to original planting as shown by comparison here.

- Consider restoring Brick Walk to its historical condition.

- Add new connection between the Wellesley College Club and the central campus by connecting brick walk directly to the club.
East End of Stone Davis
Category 2 Project

- Raise the canopy of pine, as directed, in selected areas to allow views of Stone Davis from College Road and brick walk.

- Plant lower growing understory shrubs to screen service area on the lower level.
Intersection at Tupelo Lane and Chapel Road
Category 1 Project

- Remove rhododendron that block view into Severance Green.

- Avoid using rhododendron for utilitarian purposes such as pedestrian movement control or screening, as such inappropriate uses diminish the historical significance of the plant on campus.

- Keep rhododendron planting in Dell area within the hollow.
Walks at North Library Entrance
Category 3 Project

- Paths in this area are used by service vehicles to access the beach area and Severance Green. Narrowness of existing paths does not permit vehicles to pass without damaging grass.

- All paving in the library area should be studied — expansion of paving should be kept to a minimum, but some adjustment and widening is necessary to accommodate service vehicles.

- No amount of path redesign or widening will preclude all circumstances where compaction or the lawn verges will occur. Therefore the annual maintenance budget should have an allowance for lawn repair in all such areas on campus.

- The planning for a next generation of overstory trees needs to be carefully studied. A campus-wide and significant replanting needs to be initiated to provide grove replacement for all major campus groves, including Academic Quad, Chapel Lawn, Rhododendron Dell, and Severance Green.
Paths from Library to Davis Area
Category 3 Project

- Initiate a careful study of all the paths in the Rhododendron Dell area. Paths should:
  - Eliminate or provide suitable alternatives to desire lines
  - Avoid excessively steep areas
  - Provide service access to area.

- Relocate some paths to more easily negotiated slopes.

- Use of simple unobtrusive rails to control cutting across Severance.

- Extend Rhododendron Dell planting as shown.
Hillside at Severance Hall
Category 2 or 3 Project

- Add new overstory and understory trees to slope north of the sledding hill.

- Include new shade trees east of Severance as part of grove replanting project.
Hillside at Severance Hall
Category 1 Project

- Replace shade trees and understory trees in the area at the north side of the sledding hill.

Existing Conditions
South Edge of Academic Quad
Category 3 Project

- All pathways in Rhododendron Dell, Severance Green, and Academic Quad should be studied in more detail as part of a specific study of this area.

- Consider removing paving between trees as shown.

- New tree planting should be part of a grove replacement project for Academic Quad and Severance Green.

- Seating in the Academic Quad could be included as part of the circulation and pathway study.
Area South of Jewett Hill Road  
Category 3 Project

- Remove paving from portions of the upper terrace between existing trees to keep pedestrians away from unguarded retaining wall and to reduce necessary paving.

- New overstory trees are needed to connect the grove of the Academic Quad to that of Severance Green. These trees should be included as part of the suggested Grove Replanting Project.
**Academic Quad Grove**

**Category 3 Project**

- A major effort needs to be made campus-wide to restore the mature tree groves with a new generation of plantings. A Grove Replanting Project would include these areas, Academic Quad, Rhododendron Dell, Chapel Lawn, Tower Court Hill, and Sage-Observatory Area.

- Trees must be selected for proper size, form, canopy height, horticultural requirements, etc.

- Include replanting of canopy trees for this area as part of a one-time replanting project of approximately 300 trees, followed up with annual replacements of trees.
Pendleton Hill Road
Category 3 or 4 Project

- Eliminate parking and add pedestrian walkway (part of parking reorganization projects, see Working Paper 2).

- Extend overstory grove across road to north side.

- Establish native understory shrub and trees. Typical species would include witch hazel, flowering dogwood, hop hornbeam, and native viburnums.
Davis Courtyard View Shed
Category 1 Project

- Remove one spruce from along the Jewett Hill ramp to allow views from the Davis Courtyard to Severance Green and Lake Waban.

- Remove inappropriate shrubbery from the base of the Jewett Colonnade.

- Address desire line circulation conflicts as part of a pedestrian circulation study of Norumbega Hill and Severance Green.
Davis Museum Service Area
Category 3 Project

- Extend the grove of overstory oaks and understory trees across the back of the Davis Museum.
- Eliminate inappropriately scaled crab apples.
- Consider extending the land form across the entrance to the Davis Service Area from College Road.
Davis Service Area
Category 3 Project

- Consider eliminating the direct access drive to the service area to create a raised area over the buried utilities which prevent at-grade planting; thereby allowing the extension of the Pendleton hillside planting. Study turning radii and access to Davis service area to determine the extent to which this area can be modified as shown. Initially establish a ground plane planting of native meadow grasses and wildflowers with the intention that they will eventually give way to shade tolerant ferns and woodland flowers as the tree canopy knits together and shades the hillside.

- Restore hillside with plantings that continue and extend the oak tree overstory and add a native understory shrub and herbaceous planting.

- Remove inappropriately scaled planting of crab apples, cotoneaster yews, etc.
Hazard Quad Viewshed
Category 2 Project

- Historic photographs indicate viewshed openings existed at both sides of the south facing edge of Hazard Quad. Selective pruning of lower branches in these areas of the hillside would allow the Quad viewshed to be restored.

- Invasive species, including bittersweet vine and forsythia, need to be removed from the hillside.

- New overstory trees should be encouraged or added in the canopy openings on the hill.
Hillside Planting at Hazard Quad and Munger Meadow
Category 2 or 3 Project

- Eliminate invasive vines and shrubs including bittersweet vine, forsythia, and crabapple.
- Maintain views under canopy as explained elsewhere in this document.
- Establish native flowering understory trees and shrubs.
- Encourage or plant new overstory trees in open areas of the hillside.
- Encourage and plant native and exotic woodland flowers.
South Facing Hillside at Munger and Hazard Quads
Category 2 Project

- Although many planted hillsides on the campus are largely in satisfactory condition this area is seriously infested with invasive species that are preventing the establishment of the next generation of overstory shade trees.

- Three types of difficult weed species are creating a thick mat that is not letting beneficial species reach through from below. These weed species include:
  - Bittersweet vine, a rampant climbing vine.
  - Buckthorn, an exotic understory shrub/tree.
  - Crab Apple, a species that requires adequate light to grow properly.

All three species have been spread as seeds into this area by birds. Also present are yew, forsythia, and barberry.

- Problems caused by the presence of these plants include:
  - Opacity of the forested hillside at eye level, which is both a safety and a wayfinding problem.
  - Suppression of native trees and shrubs especially the next generation of overstory trees.

- Maintenance solutions:

Since most species that are problematic in this area are spread by birds, these species cannot be entirely eliminated. An initial large-scale hand removal project followed up by annual maintenance will keep the problem in check.

- Planting and encouraging native overstory and understory trees will create more shade, a condition that is less conducive to these invasive plants.
Typical Woodland Wildflower Plantings

- Native and exotic woodland wildflowers are the type of planting that are representative of the "cultivated nature" that defined the historical campus experience as described in Working Paper 2a.

- These types of plantings should be encouraged and planted. With proper management, these types of plantings could be made a strong presence again on the campus.
Pendleton Hillside
Category 2 Project

- Interplant native understory shrubs and wildflowers to diversify and restore intricacy to the hillside plantings.

- Emphasize native shrubs and understory trees that feature spring flowers and fall color for enjoyment during the school year.

- Consider such plants as witch hazel, amelanchier, flowering dogwood, hop hornbeam, maple leaf viburnum.

- Add native overstory trees as needed in open areas.
Hillside South of New Dorms

Category 2 Project

- Continue the hillside planting lost in this area.
- A concentrated effort to reforest this area should include approximately 30-40 deciduous trees.
- Species should include white pine, oak, dogwood, red maple.
Road to Tower Court
Category 2 Project

- These shrubs are similar to many other such shrub plantings on campus that have outlived their usefulness.

- Removal of these shrubs could be made part of the suggested grove replanting project.

- Replacement of these shrubs with large trees and open lawn would visually connect Shakespeare House with Severance Green, eliminate the crowding of this congested sidewalk, and allow views of the outdoor terrace on Severance Hall.
Tower Court Courtyard
Category 3 Project

- Eliminate the joyless and heavily overpruned shrubs.

- Make a strong figural presence of the center lawn panel by studying the elimination of the edge strips of grass. Replace strips with groundcover and spring bulb plantings.

- Consider adding high branched trees along south edge to shade court in summer.

- Consider adding deciduous shade trees to south facade of building to protect from sun, but allow views in winter.

- Study ways to incorporate sitting, eating, and study areas more effectively into the design.

- Study more effective solutions to handicap access.

- Conduct archival research of previous plans for the Court.
**Tower Court Viewshed**

**Category 2 Project**

- Historical photographs indicate a central view opening existed at this site.

- The orientation of the courtyard is intended to direct views toward the lake.

- Open the central view slot to the entire width of the newly restored lower terrace.

*Existing Conditions*
Severance Hall Court
Category 1 or 2 Project

- Remove maintenance intensive shrubs that block windows looking into the court.

- Restore lawn. Consider installation of irrigation system. Consider use of spring bulbs, such as crocus, scilla, or daffodils in the lawn.

- Replace shrubs with a light, airy grove of trees that have the lowest branches seven feet above ground at time of installation.
Lake House Road
Category I Project

- Overgrown hemlocks block views from this dramatic point.

- Selective views from the road and from the court between Lake House and Tower Court should be established (see View Shed maps).

Existing Conditions
Tupelo Point and Lake Edge
Category 3 Project

- Tupelo Point should be included as part of a lake edge restoration project.

- A careful study needs to be completed to design bio-engineered, sustainable solutions to erosion problems of the lake edge.

- The majority of the lake edge is in good condition but specific areas, particularly areas where people enter the water, are prone to erosion which has continued unchecked.

- Granular soils and delicate lake edge plantings have given way in many areas around the lake to eroded pockets which continue to destabilize the shoreline.

- Annual maintenance of lake edge pathway with wood mulch should be included as part of annual maintenance.
Boat House Parking
Category 3 Project

- The entire boat house area feels overworn and stressed.
- A study to redesign the parking area and boat launch area should be part of the Service Parking area redesign.
- Pedestrian access to this point from Tower Court Hill is makeshift.
- Paving area should be reduced if possible and circulation studied.
- Access to this area is linked to new drive connecting Tower Court and Lake House service area (see Master Plan).
Beach Area
Category I Project

- This popular spot requires much more intensive ongoing maintenance.

- Consider the installation of irrigation to extend the lawn from Severance Green down toward the Lake. Other work that is necessary is soil improvement which includes the incorporation of organic material to increase the ability of the area to retain moisture and support lawn grass.

- Annual sand replenishment is necessary to compensate for erosion.
Munger Quad
Category 3 Project

- Remove shrubs that block entrances and others that do not contribute to the overall quality of the space.

- Replace small patches of lawn with ground cover areas interspersed with bulb plantings.

- Eliminate small ornamental trees that block views.

- Plant tall, high-branched shade trees to provide solar protection and to allow views out and below their canopy.

- Restore center lawn and add irrigation.

- Restore railings and metalwork.

- Consider creating a small terrace at outside doors.

- Reset stone pavement where necessary.
Munger Viewshed
Category I Project

- Remove lower branches of pines to allow views out from central stair terrace toward Norumbega Hill and Stone Tower.
Route 135 at Munger Hall
Category I Project

- Prune evergreen shrubs below window height.
- Remove shrubs that do not contribute to overall quality of the space.
- Rejuvenate the lawns. Consider drought tolerant grass species that do not require frequent mowing. Do not create a highly manicured edge along the entire length of the campus on Route 135.
Hazard Quadrangle at Route 135
Category 1 Project

- Remove or lower the height of the high maintenance shrubs.

- Restore the lawn as a special moment along the Route 135 corridor. Change from an infrequently mown and drought tolerant grass to a more refined lawn in this area.

- Consider the use of irrigation in this area.

- Plant overstory trees that are appropriate for the formal quality and scale of the building facade.

- Many of the curbs and walks will soon need repair or replacement.
Entry Court at New Dorms
Category I Project

- This small piece of lawn is typical of many that should be eliminated for maintenance and design reasons.

- Small pieces of mown grass are initially a low installation cost, but these become expensive and an ongoing maintenance problem.

- The ubiquitous presence of mown grass adds to an overall suburban feel. Although more expensive initially, the use of lower maintenance perennial and ground cover beds interspersed with spring bulbs will restore diversity, intricacy, and seasonal variety to the landscape.

- The preponderance of pavement in this area could be mitigated with new shade trees.

- Walks and pavements in this area are new. The eventual replacement of concrete curbing with granite curbs as shown here is a good long term investment; granite holds up much better to snow plows and is reusable.
Sage Area
Category 3 Project

- Initiate a project to restore or create a meadow in this area.

- Extend meadow to pavements/edges.

- Add new high-branched trees immediately in front of Sage Hall to add shade and block light from the building. Be careful to coordinate tree locations with operations of the observatory.

- Eliminate parked cars as part of Grey Lcc / Water Tower Hill parking project.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Steering and Advisory Committees
FROM: Matthew Urbaniski, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Inc.
DATE: 8 June 1998
RE: Follow-up to comments regarding Working Paper Eight

The following is feedback to various questions that have arisen in response to Working Paper 8. Following our discussion of these points at the June 8th meeting, these items will be incorporated into the final form of Working Paper 8.

Meadow restoration project

The meadow landscapes are critical elements in the mosaic of landscape types of the campus. The meadows contribute to the diversity of types of experiences for campus users throughout the year. The Master Plan research has established the importance of the unique Wetlands tradition of a campus form and structure that is site specific, building on the indigenous geornorphology and natural plant communities associated with these forms. The significant loss of the area of wet meadows on campus, which includes losses of meadow area to parking in Founders, Service, and Gray lots and losses of meadow area to, active recreation on Munger, plus the continual filling and mowing on Science Meadow has left the few remaining meadows weak vestiges of their original strength potential. It is exactly this suburbanization and removal of diversity and plant specificity that the Master Plan has specifically targeted to task and recommends reversing. As this subject pertains to maintenance, the conversion of the meadows to native plantings also will reduce the maintenance and upkeep of these areas to a small fraction of the amount needed for lawns. Initial establishment of native plantings will require a considerable amount of effort, but the reduction of future irrigation, fertilizers, pesticides, and mowing will have long term cost benefits in addition to adding to the campus in terms of the seasonal complexity, beauty, biodiversity, and wild life habitat.

The meadows, once established, will require cutting or burning once a year. This removal of ripened plant material should happen in late winter or very early spring. If timed correctly, this maintenance will result in a bare landscape for approximately two weeks that will be followed by a vigorous flush of bright green spring growth. The grasses and wild flowers will grow, unimpeded by sowing or parking throughout the summer. The bright green of early spring will be followed by more muted green and wild flowers of summer, followed by the ochre and russet foliage of fall and the muted tans, browns, and greys of winter. The plant material should be left to stand all winter, thereby camouflaging the presence of paddles that may (and should) occur in those areas during that time.

The contemporary understanding of plant communities as living systems has, hopefully, allowed the possibility of conceptualizing the importance of these areas as something much more than aesthetic amenities. Therefore, the conscious cultivation of the wet meadow landscapes will be a renewed extension of the historic Wetlands tradition of cultivated nature.

Stone Davis Viewshed

The Master Plan suggests that each Hillside courtyard should have a south slope that is managed and pruned to provide views. It is suggested that Tower Court should have a relatively narrow slot centered on the landscape torus, the Hazard Quad should have lateral openings that are aligned on the circulation ways leaving the center obscured. For Stone Davis, the bowl shaped landform suggests the courtyard should have a more sweeping view out beneath a thinned, high layed overstory canopy on the hillside. The creation of this condition has been complicated by recent clear cutting of trees and understory in the slope area, which has caused a significant management problem. Black Locust, a species that under different circumstances would be considered beneficial, has, because of clear cutting, been stimulated to produce thousands of root shoot trees all of which are presently about 6' high in a dense thicket. Sprinkled amongst the locust are other beneficial seedlings including sugar maple and white oak. The challenge is to thin the young Black Locust seedlings without causing more root sprouts, but without killing all the saplings with herbicide. It would perhaps be best at this point to let the thicket grow for a few years and let competition between the trees help to determine which should be retained. After approximately two years a selective and intensive weeding (not cutting) of many of the saplings will leave the select few that are desired.

Hemlocks and wooly adelgid (Adelges tsugae)

The following information was obtained from Dr. Mark McClure, the chief scientist of the valley laboratory of the Connecticut experiment station. Dr. McClure is the foremost authority on wooly adelgid. Dr. McClure and his colleagues have been studying the introduction of a natural predator of the adelgid insect, a beetle from Japan commonly known as the Ladybird Beetle (Harmonia axyridis). Dr. McClure believes that the beetle will not be available for use by the public to combat adelgid for one or two years. The beetle does possess important biocontrol characteristics. Dr. McClure is working under grants from the U.S. Forest Service. Dr. McClure has specific knowledge of the Wetlands Campus and for the immediate future he recommends the following approach:

1. Careful and thorough examination of the trees on campus for adelgid. (Dr. McClure has personally spotted it on campus)
2. Immediate treatment of affected trees with oil or insecticidal soap. The oil which is usually used in dormant periods can also be used in the summer as a thinner dilution.
3. Continued and eradicating of adelgid in the affected areas.
4. Introduction of the Ladybird Beetle when it becomes available in the future.

Our initial estimate of $500.00 per tree for dormant oil treatment seems high to Dr. McClure and more discussion with arborists on that subject is needed. Also it should be noted that it is much easier to treat isolated trees. Forested areas like Christmas Tree Alley and the Hillside north of Tower Court are virtually impossible to treat so every effort should be made immediately to contain the infestation before it spreads to the forested areas.

Irrigation

The Appendix One of Working Paper 8 describes 32 areas and gives recommendations of how those areas could be modified through design and maintenance changes. There are several instances where the introduction of irrigation is recommended, specifically in the area north of the Lake Waban Beach and the entry lawn to Hazard Quad turn around. As has been mentioned in Working Paper 4 the Master Plan recommends the use of irrigation in select and specific areas. The Master Plan does not recommend the use of irrigation as a general rule. Irrigation supports a specialized group of plants, generally, European lawns grasses that once established require frequent watering to look as intended. This has two consequences: a uniformity of appearance that in places is desirable, but as a general treatment is monotonous and suburban. Secondly, irrigation is a resource dependent system that requires maintenance and upkeep to function properly not to mention lots of water. Irrigation also selects for grasses that require more cutting in the hot months and is usually associated with more fertilizer and pesticide dependent lawns. Therefore for much of the campus the Master Plan has recommended that plant communities present be augmented and that the complexity of the Wetlands landscape and the natural qualities that do exist determine the nature of certain areas. Native communities that do not require irrigation are recommended for most large areas, these include especially the meadows and the forested hillside but would be extended to certain other areas such as the grass verges along Central Street where drought tolerant species should be used.
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Preface

The architectural component of the Wellesley College Campus Master Plan included the following tasks:

• General evaluation of the built fabric of the campus in concert with the landscape architect.
• Evaluation of the six programs/reports and building outlined in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update.
• Participation in the identification of buildable sites.
• Participation in ascertaining the preliminary physical configuration of buildings proposed by the Master Plan.
• Preparation of conceptual construction cost estimates for the architectural programs under consideration.

The process of the Master Plan study prompted a series of questions, conversations, and exchanges which produced three unanticipated results:

• The area of the campus under consideration for buildable usable sites expanded substantially to the west with the necessity of the treatment of hazardous materials at Paint Shop Pond. This area relaxed the need to use existing meadows for sports programs and provided space for an indoor tennis pavilion, playing fields, and parking.
• A number of new architectural space needs developed as Wellesley programs were discussed and conditions reviewed. These programs include a number of performing arts programs, parking structures, multi-use/events space, new dormitories, a visitor/information center, and administrative and classroom spaces (see Section II).
• Restoration emerged as an important consideration in lieu of incremental adaptations and renovations. (This report makes a formal recommendation regarding restoration (see Summary Report - Item 13)).

This report uses the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update as foundational material. In all cases other than the Margaret Clapp Library and the Houghton Memorial Chapel, a more expansive view is taken of the action that needs to take place in order to renew the spirit of generosity of the buildings and the campus, to move the campus toward the future and to celebrate the rich architectural history of Wellesley.

Method of review

2. Walk-by with MVV and design team (ME) on 20 August 1997.
3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DLY).
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DLY).

Architectural Notes - Summary Report

Background

Current Student Enrollment 1997: 2136
Current Faculty and Staff: 1200
Student Enrollment in 1980: 1894
Student Enrollment in 1990: 2088
Growth Rate in Enrollment: 14.2 students per year .7% ave. annual growth 11.4% total

Area of Campus: 700 acres
Total Gross Square Footage of Buildings: 2.3 mil sq. ft.
Gross Square Footage per Student: 077 sq. ft.

Summary Report

Architectural Notes - Summary Report

In the course of the master plan investigations, presentations, and exchanges several unforeseen architectural conditions, needs, and possibilities emerged. These items, rather than detracting from the outcome of the study, have ultimately led to richer considerations.

1. Treatment of hazardous materials at Paint Shop Pond has opened a whole new zone of the west campus, relaxing the need to occupy less appropriate areas with athletic activities and facilities. Specifically space is now available for outdoor tennis courts as well as various playing fields and parking (see sketch G).
2. Investigation of current activities in and around Alumnae Hall and the sports complex uncovered several important issues. The first is the importance of the theater/drama program and the performing arts in general on campus. 2. Theater voiced a need for rehearsal space(s) not readily available in Alumnae Hall. The configuration of the performance hall in Alumnae Hall does not lend itself to the multitude of current performance, meeting, and events formats. 4. The black box theater is an important aspect of one theater programs but has no architectural presence on the
campus. 5. The dance program, currently located in the athletic facility, is a mislocated element of the performing arts. 6. Outdoor performances and events are currently difficult to stage because of the lack of convenient power sources, truck access, and performance area. Disturbance and repair of the meadows is a maintenance concern. These items, when considered collectively begin to form a substantial program of performing arts activities and facilities. Such a program could extend the physical presence of the arts into the west campus in and around Service Lot meadow, incorporating Alumnae Hall and exploiting the strong adjacency to the other arts at Jewett Art Center and Davis Museum. Parking facility locations suggested earlier in the master plan study are complimentary to this consideration. Such a program for the performing arts could function independently of or in conjunction with a campus center program or a partial campus center program (see study sketches B-1, B-2, B-3).

3. In identifying "buildable" sites the promontory west of and above Service Lot meadow has emerged as the last "hilltop" site remaining and available. As such it can be considered for any number of future uses. However, as a site for dormitory space it has a special and similar relationship to the other "hilltop" dormitories. It has strong visual access to Tower Court, Beebe and Shafer Halls and the Stone Tower at the academic quad. A dormitory in this location would successfully populate the entire campus with living quarters, providing convenient dorm rooms for those students involved in the arts and athletics. Such a dorm could house summer visitors to programs at the performing arts facilities. Should a detail study of the existing dormitories indicate a need to relax the population of the existing dormitory buildings, this site should be considered a prime candidate for new dormitory space (see study sketch F).

4. A need for fifty (50) new dorm rooms, fully air conditioned, for summer uses such as continuing education programs was identified. The expansion of the "new dorms" at McAfee, Bates or Freeman Halls is a strong candidate for such a facility given its close proximity to the Wellesley College Club, Clapp Library, the Chapel, and Schneider Center, all of which could function in unison in support of the summer programs. Building in this location also affords Wellesley College more presence along Washington Street and the "new dorms" become a more active participant in the architectural fabric of the campus (see study sketch I).

5. Concerning a campus center, the dueling requirements of parking versus a location close to or in the historic core have generated extended conversations and left the master plan study in the posture of presenting options. These options are described as Option One, Option Two and Hybrid Option Three.

- Option One - Total Campus Center Program at Service Lot site

This option combines a total program of approxi-
mately 64,000 gross square feet of Campus Center requirements (inclusive of a 10,000 square foot computer/study center) with structured parking and with the newly developed theater/performing arts/special event programs of approximately 48,000 gross square feet. This proposal is similar to the first proposal that the committee reviewed that placed the campus center at this site. It differs by virtue of the addition of the performing arts programs (see study sketches A-1 and B-1).

- Option Two - Total Campus Center Program at the Schneider site
  This option locates a total program of approximately 64,000 gross square feet of Campus Center requirements (inclusive of a 10,000 square foot computer/study center) adjacent to Music and Billings Halls at what is now called Schneider Center, taking advantage of 24-hour parking at Founder's Lot and the proposed structured parking deck at Water Tower Hill (see study sketches A-1 and B-2).

- Hybrid Option Three - Modified Campus Center Program at both the Schneider site and the Service Lot site
  This option looks at the campus as it extends its activities to the west sports complex and to the east to the suggested new dormitories and summer program activities at the library, chapel, Schneider and College Club complex. It proposes the location of highly active/automobile supported programs in Service Lot/performing arts/sports centers area and quieter more contemplative programs at the Schneider site (see study sketch A-3 and B-3).

From this writer's point of view, Hybrid Option Three serves the general campus in a comprehensive and broad reaching way that is somewhat curtailed by Option One or Two (see considerations for a Campus Center.) Hybrid-Option Three transfers a portion of the campus center program to the west campus at Service Lot and combines it with the newly developed program for theater and performing arts. It encourages activity both east and west of the academic quad and makes sense of the need to bring ears into the campus at specific places at specific times, for specific purposes. It also honors the continuing reality that Wellesley College is a unique and beautiful place of dispersed architectural fabric; that the closeness that students develop and their identification with the institution is somehow, at least partially, derived from this particular physical construct.

6. Although a detailed study to assess the need for new classroom space was beyond the scope of the Master Plan study, the Wellesley College preference for multi-program buildings suggests the possibility of new classrooms at several locations, such as the Theater/Performing Arts area, the Portal Structure, spaces reclaimed in the course of restoring or renovating existing structures (Green Hall, Pendleton, etc.) or even perhaps in the Campus Center proper.

7. The lack of sites on campus available for new surface parking resulted in a proposal of three (3) structured parking decks (see study sketches J and K).

8. Study of the Gray Lot area resulted in a recommendation to create an open green space with a parking structure tucked into Water Tower Hill. This action led to an evaluation of the site lines connecting the Gray area to Founders Lot and to the Chapel prompting a recommendation to demolish the western most addition of Simpson Infirmary leaving the Van Brunt & Howe/Coolidge section intact. This will eliminate eight (8) single occupancy dorm rooms. (see study sketch H).

9. Of architectural concern is the 'vacant' expression of the north facade of Sage Hall and the lack of definition of the space connecting Sage Hall with the Observatory. A highly architecturalized landscape treatment of the facade and the space could resolve both difficulties.

10. Realignment of the campus entrance along Washington Street adjacent to East Lodge suggests that the three (3) dorm rooms be removed from East Lodge and relocated to a site more conducive to residential use.

11. Location of the interfaith/non-denominational worship/meeting space may or may not be included in the Campus Center proposal. A 'stand alone' structure, beautifully sized might lend itself more clearly to quiet contemplation and inspiration than a space embedded in a highly active complex. Billings Hall might also be a good choice for this program. Still under consideration is the lower level of Houghton Memorial Chapel.

12. It should be noted that the report for the six buildings put forward in the Wellesley College Buildings Study July 1997 Update, are valuable documents; extremely important in considering the extent of a greater Master Plan. They served as a sound foundation for further comments and observations. The six buildings are as follows:
   - Campus Center
   - Green Hall
   - Houghton Memorial Chapel
   - Margaret Clapp Library
   - Pendleton Hall
   - Stone/Davis

In the case of the Campus Center, this report extends the commentary and expands the possible configurations of a campus center beyond those envisioned in Working Paper One or the William Sloan Associates report.

13. Restoration of architecturally important structures emerged as a continuing topic of conversation. Because the Wellesley College Campus is rich in its architectural heritage with important structures from every generation of occupation, restoration should be instituted as a way of thinking about ongoing campus maintenance and use of buildings. Restoration does not preclude the creative and continuing re-use of buildings. It simply means that buildings need to be treated in architecturally sympathetic ways and used for programs and activities that are appropriate. As with landscape, an architect expert in restoration, presentation...
and reuse might be retained on a continuing basis to help with the difficult balance of renovation and restoration.

14. The additional land and additional programs developed in the master plan process work in concert to restore a sense of generosity to the built environment of the campus. The new Master Plan indicates opportunities to move toward a renewed and expanded Wellesley environment of graciousness.
Architectural Programs

I. Evaluation of the six programs/reports and buildings outlined in Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update.

A. Campus Center

A-0a. Background

Name: Music Hall / Billings Hall / Schneider Student Center

Date: 1881 / 1904 / 1969

Architect: Ware and Van Brunt / Angell and Swift / Donald Gellespie

Square Footage: 36,000 sq. ft. total (13,500 GSF at Music Hall) (21,500 GSF at Billings Hall)

History: The Schneider Student Center joins what was originally two separate halls: Music Hall and Billings Hall (currently the dining area) which were connected as part of the Billings Hall addition in 1904. These facilities were used as teaching and performance spaces for music until these functions were moved to Jewett Arts Center. In 1969 the facilities were remodeled into the Schneider Student Center and at that time the Billings Hall was converted into the multi-level platformed space. Exterior decks were added to the West side and the porte-cochere was replaced by a one-story entrance addition. The two original parts of the building are distinct, combining predominantly Gothic Revival architecture with Romanesque detailing. The primary wall fabric is brick with a granite foundation. The roof is original and is shingled in grey-green slate.

A-0b. Method of review

2. Walk-by with MVV and design team (ME) on 20 August 1997.
3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DY).
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).

A-0c. Observations

1. The campus center is the most complex of the projects presented for review. While located at what appears to be the geographic center of the campus and close to the lake, access to the campus center is pedestrian, precluding all but limited automobile access or visitor accommodation. It seems almost too exclusively student-oriented to be labeled a "campus center." The general feel of the library / campus center / "rhododendron garden" area is one of under-utilization, under-population, and a little out-of-the-way.

2. The two original buildings are not only gorgeous in their spaces and brick work, but are also of significant architectural value, most notably the Music Hall by Ware and Van Brunt (designers of notable Boston buildings including Memorial Hall at Harvard University).

3. Currently, the building(s) are an amalgamation of different eras of architecture, use, and planning interests. As such, the whole tends to lack a unity, with many of the parts compromised, spatially and aesthetically. The insertion of the multi-level platforms is particularly disruptive to the understanding of what is a very fine interior space at Billings Hall. The platforms promote a visually crowded or cluttered condition.

A-0d. Considerations

1. The question of Campus Center versus Student Center appears to be a philosophical issue on many levels. How important is the interface between Wellesley and the community beyond the college boundary? This is an issue that is associated directly with on-campus/off-campus activities, the use of the automobile, and any trends in student habits and activities at Wellesley.

2. What are the future desires/plans according to dining? How are traditional customs of eating in the dormitory weighed against desires to provide centralized dining should Wellesley traditions be radically altered, somewhat altered, or only supplemented in some fashion?

3. Neither the Music Hall nor Billings Hall were intended to be components of a multi-disciplinary large-scale campus center. Most notably the Music Hall is a building of intimate scale, made up of small rooms. In incorporation of the buildings into a new campus center complex will need to be done with no little architectural skill.

4. Given their proximity to the lake, the library and the Chapel, these two buildings are ripe for reprogramming. Any number of programs would suit their distinct combination of small spaces (Music Hall) and large gathering space (Billings Hall), external scale and appearance, and campus position. Suggestions include an annex for the library, classroom and seminar facilities, reception and social space, supplementary Chapel space, etc.

A-0e. Recommendations

1. Before any further renovation work is envisioned and completed in either Music Hall or Billings Hall (new offices, maintenance, code compliance, etc.) the future of these buildings should be considered. Both should be scheduled for restoration.

2. The dueling requirements of parking versus a location close to or in the historic core have generated extended conversations and left the master
3. All options use the William Sloan Associates

Program Outline published in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update and reproduced here as the basis for a Campus Center program. Modifications are suggested on the particular location depending on campus for each option.

4. Student Center Study - Program Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafe Hoop</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Center Offices</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities Offices</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel Lounge and Kosher Kitchen</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident Student Lounge, Study and Kitchen</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge Areas, Lobby</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Area (seating for 200-250)</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Storage Areas</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub with performance space (seating for 75-100)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Room</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mailboxes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZLY Radio Station and Lounge</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge Areas</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infraactivities center</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td>7900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen and Sorvery</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retail</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Retail Space</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Room (seating for 100-125)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Student Activity Space</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge Areas, Lobby</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td>5800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching Center</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Offices</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy Offices and Lounge</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NET SF</td>
<td>22900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From “Student Center Study” by William Sloan Associates dated June 1996 and included in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update. For purpose of the Master Plan study the William Sloan Associates report serves as the basic program of needs for a campus center. Certain modifications are suggested depending on the location on campus of the campus center — see Indication One, Two and Hybrid Three.

(n) Indicates current location in Maec Hall.
(b) Indicates current location in Williams Hall of Arts.
(c) Indicates current location in Capp Library.
(d) Indicates current location in “other” location.
(e) Indicates current location in Pemberton Hall.
A-1a. Option One - Total Campus Center Program at Service Lot site.
This option combines a total program of approximately 64,000 gross square feet of Campus Center requirements (inclusive of a 10,000 square foot computer/study center) with structured parking and with the newly developed theater/performing arts/special events programs of approximately 48,000 gross square feet. This proposal is similar to the first proposal that the Steering Committee reviewed that placed the campus center at this site. It differs by virtue of the addition of the performing arts programs (see study sketches A-1 and B-1 and see section H, I, J, K, L, M, N and O for Performing Arts programs).
This option assumes the restoration of Music Hall and Billings Hall (see section S and T).

A-1b. Adjustments to Student Center Study - Program Outline* for Option One - Total Campus Center Program at Service Lot site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Gross Area (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total program NSF x 1.773 building grossing factor†</td>
<td>38650 NSF x 1.773 = 68,530 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for multipurpose/special events rooms located in restored Billings Hall</td>
<td>- 2000 NSF = 36650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>††Program space available in the Music Hall (considering accessibility improvements)</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ‡</td>
<td>32450 NSF x 1.773 = 57,537 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ***</td>
<td>32450 NSF x 1.5 = 48,675 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† † † Media Center/Study Space</td>
<td>+10000 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ‡</td>
<td>42450 NSF x 1.773 = 75,268 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ***</td>
<td>42450 NSF x 1.5 = 63,675 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts Program</td>
<td>+ 47,850 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ***</td>
<td>111,525 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal Building/Structure with program</td>
<td>+ 35,700 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF ***</td>
<td>147,225 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From "Student Center Study" by William Sloan Associates dated June 1996 and included in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update.
‡ 24-hour operation.
† This area is included in the Sloan program, but is subtracted here. A restored Billings Hall becomes new multi-purpose room.

Option One
Locate Total Campus Center Program at Service Lot site.
A-1.C. Option One

Locate the entire program for the Campus Center at Service Lot meadow along the south and west sides of Physical Plant and combine with those theater/performing arts programs newly identified.

Positive
1. Site accommodates parking (300 ± cars).
   Parking is also available at Alumnae Hall and the Distribution Center site.
2. New construction at this site participates in the reclamation of Service Lot meadow and helps mend the rift in the campus caused by the presence of the Physical Plant building.
3. Site is large enough to accommodate the campus center program (64,000± GSF) as well as those performing arts programs (48,000± GSF) identified during the master plan study process.
4. Extends campus activities from the academic quad toward the west.
5. Relieves Billings Hall and Music Hall of program and allows for their restoration and reprogramming.
7. Leaves Schneider site open for library expansion, interfaith center, or other programs.

Negative
1. Drains activity away from the east campus.
2. Acoustical control of equipment at Physical Plant would be required.
A-2. Option Two - Campus Center

A-2a. Option Two - Total Campus Center program at the Schneider site

This option locates a total program of approximately 64,000 gross square feet of Campus Center requirements (inclusive of a 10,000 square foot computer/study center) adjacent to Music and Billings Halls at what is now called Schneider Center, taking advantage of off-hour parking at Founder’s Lot and the proposed structured parking deck at Water Tower Hill (see Study Sketches A-2 and B-2).

This option assumes the restoration of Music Hall and Billings Hall (see Sections H, I, J, K, L, M, N and for the Performing Arts programs).

A-2b. Adjustments to Student Center Study - Program Outline* for Inclination Two - Total Campus Center Program at Schneider Center Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total program NSF x 1.773 building grossing factor*</td>
<td>38650 NSF x 1.773 = 68,530 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Program for multipurpose/special events room if located in restored Billings Hall</td>
<td>-2,000 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>††Program space available in the Music Hall (considering accessibility improvements)</td>
<td>36,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF *</td>
<td>32,450 NSF x 1.773 = 57,537 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF †</td>
<td>32,450 NSF x 1.5 = 48,675 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Center/Study Space</td>
<td>10,000 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF *</td>
<td>42,450 NSF x 1.773 = 75,268 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF †</td>
<td>42,450 NSF x 1.5 = 63,675 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From “Student Center Study” by William Sloan Associates dated June 1996 and included in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update.


‡ 24-hour operation.

‡‡ This area is included in the Sloan program, but is subtracted here. A restored Billings Hall becomes new multi-purpose room accommodating performance seating for 100-125 people.

‡¶ This 4,200 NSF in Music Hall could continue to house the Chaplaincy offices (1,500SF), Residence Offices (700SF) and another 2,100SF of selected program.

Option Two

- Shown: 100’ x 170’ = 17,000 SF/floor
- Sloan program + media/center
  - 63,675 GSF at 1.5 grossing factor
  - 3.75 floors will accommodate program

Note that the height of the new floor is ten (10) stories below the Chapel site.

Height at Music Hall = 60 ft
Height at Billings Hall = 40 ft

Sloan report envisioned at 2-4 story structure at this site.

Study Sketch A-2
A-2c. Option Two

Locate the entire program for the Campus Center at Service Lot meadow along the south and west sides of Physical Plant and combine with those theater/performance arts programs newly identified.

Positive

1. Places campus center at the perceived center and historic core of the campus in close proximity to the library and chapel.
2. Places the building in relationship to Lake Waban like no other building on campus.
3. Relieves Billings Hall and the Music Hall of program and allows for their restoration and reprogramming.
4. Site has good automobile access for drop-offs from the road looping south of the chapel.
5. Service access from south end of Billings Hall.
6. Proximity to Clapp Library suggests that the Campus Center may incorporate programs that could help relieve space needs at the library.

Negative

1. Site will not accommodate parking
2. Site requires a variance of wetlands buffer regulations (see study sketch A).
3. Without a variance a five-story building will accommodate approximately half of the Campus Center program or 36,000+ GSF (see study sketch ___).
4. Service access across site and into building properly will require careful architectural treatment.
A-3. Hybrid Option Three - Campus Center

A-3a. Hybrid Option Three - Modified

Campus Center Program at both the Schneider site and at Service Lot site

This option looks at the campus as it extends its activities to the west sports complex and to the east to the suggested new dormitories and summer program activities at the library, chapel, Schneider and College Club complex. It proposes the location of highly active/automobile supported programs in Service Lot/performing arts/sports centers area and quieter more contemplative programs at the Schneider site (see study sketch A-3 and B-3).

This option assumes the restoration of Music Hall and Billings Hall (see section S and T).

A-2b. Adjustments to Student Center Study - Program Outline* for Hybrid Option Three - Modified Campus Center Program at Service Lot Site and Schneider Center site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>existing</th>
<th>proposed</th>
<th>Schneider site</th>
<th>Service Lot site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafe Hoop (a)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms (b)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 @ 600 SF each - Billings)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Center Offices (c)</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities Offices (d)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel Lounge and Kosher Kitchen</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident Student Lounge, Study and Kitchen (e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge Areas, Lobby (f)</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6450 NSF</td>
<td>12900 GSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Area (g) (seating for 200-250)</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Storage Areas (h)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pub with performance space (seating for 75-100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Mailboxes (i)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WZLJ Radio Station and Lounge (j)</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge Areas (k) and study areas</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby (l)</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info/activities center (m)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>21350 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12200 NSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22400 GSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen and Servery (b)</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore (p)</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retail</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Retail Space (q)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Multi-purpose Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(performance seating for 100-125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Student Activity Space</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>††Student Lounge Areas, Lobby</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12800 NSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22400 GSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching Center (c)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Offices (m)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>††Chaplaincy Offices and Lounge (m)</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Net SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7200 NSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Gross SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11880 GSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NET SF</td>
<td>22900</td>
<td>38650</td>
<td>47,175 GSF</td>
<td>26,700 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF</td>
<td>68530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Program Considerations

- Cafe/Vending (24 hours) 500
- Computer/Study Center 10,000
- Interfaith Space 1,000
- Visitor Information Center 500
- Classrooms (2 @ 600 SF each) 1,200

* From "Student Center Study" by William Sloan Associates dated June 1996 and included in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update. For purpose of the Master Plan study, the William Sloan Associates report serves as the basic program of needs for a campus center. Certain modifications are suggested depending on the location on campus of the campus center - see Option One, Two and Hybrid/Three.

mm Building grossing factor of 1.5 for Master Plan Study - Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, May 1998.

(m) Indicates current location in Music Hall.
(b) Indicates current location in Billings Hall of Link.
(p) Indicates current location in Clapp Library.
(q) Indicates current location in "other" facilities.
(r) Indicates current location in Kendall Hall.

* From "Student Center Study" by William Sloan Associates dated June 1996 and included in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update. For purpose of the Master Plan study, the William Sloan Associates report serves as the basic program of needs for a campus center. Certain modifications are suggested depending on the location on campus of the campus center - see Option One, Two and Hybrid/Three.

mm Building grossing factor of 1.5 for Master Plan Study - Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, May 1998.

(m) Indicates current location in Music Hall.
(b) Indicates current location in Billings Hall of Link.
(p) Indicates current location in Clapp Library.
(q) Indicates current location in "other" facilities.
(r) Indicates current location in Kendall Hall.
Sloan report envisioned a 3-4 story structure at this site.

Note that the tennis court portion of the site is 1' lower than the Chapel site.

Hybrid Option Three

- Shown: 100' x 170' = 17,000 SF/floor
- Modified Sloan program + media/study center = 40,000 SF GSF at 1.5 grossing factor
- 2.5 floors will accommodate program

or (b) 12,000 SF/floor
- 4 floors will accommodate program

or (c) 9,600 SF/floor on 5 floors
A-3c. Option Three

A third possibility emerges from the speculations about the first two sites in the form of a distribution of program elements between the two sites. Locate activities at the Service Lot site which are related to and associated with theater and the performing arts and that are best served by direct automobile access and parking. Locate activities at the Schneider Center site which are related to and associated with full faculty dining, study and learning, and religious activities, all of which require only limited automobile access. Student parking could be made available at Founder’s Lot after regular campus hours.

This hybrid scheme is driven by the continuing reality that Wellesley College is a unique and beautiful place of dispersed architectural fabric; that the closeness that students develop and their identification with the institution is somehow, at least partially, derived from this particular physical construct.

Positive
1. Allows a comfortable fit of program to space available at both sites.
2. Encourages student activity at west campus without "draining" activity from east campus.
3. Does not "overburden" either site and allows buildings to maintain a moderate scale.
   (47,000 GSF at Schneider site and 37,000 GSF at Service Lot site).

Negative
1. Is not as centralized as a campus center located totally either at Service Lot site (Option One) or the Schneider site (Option Two).
2. Schneider site requires a variance of wetlands buffer regulation.

B. Green Hall

B-0a. Background

Date: 1931
Architect: Charles Z. Klauder (Ralph Adams Cram, design architect)
Square Footage: 98,650 sq.ft.
Characteristics: Built in the collegiate Gothic Revival, Green Hall was designed to suit the topography of Norumbega Hill. Gaien Stone Tower is 185 feet high. The exterior walls are brick and granite with Indiana limestone trim. The interior hallways are substantial and pleasant, marked by deep Gothic door arches and high ceilings.

Functions: The building currently houses College Administration offices (Registrar, Alumnae Office, Publicity, Bursar, Admissions, Deans of the Classes, President, etc.) and Language departments (French, Spanish, etc.). It serves as the physical and iconographic "center" of the campus, given its architectural presence (the tower), location (gateway for processions, etc.) and function (Office of the President of the College, etc.).

Renovations: Include Human Resources, Resources, President’s Office, Alumnae Office, masonry and roofing repairs. Dates n/a.

B-0b. Method of Review
2. Walk-by with MVV and design team (ME only) on 20 August 1997.
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).

B-0c. Observations
1. Green Hall is a unique and particular building. It sits with great strength on the academic quad with its horizontal disposition and tall tower. It mediates the topographic change from the quad to the meadow below through a most astonishing sectional and vehicular adaptation. While of the Academic Gothic style, it closely enjoys the automobile and celebrates its entry and arrival on campus via the porte cochere and winding drive. One can imagine roadsters with energetic young women at the wheel gloriously making their way up the incline. The general exterior appearance is one of sound condition.
2. During the initial walk-by, Pam Gentile voiced concern for the roofing and brickwork as well as some structural concern for the tower. Some of these issues have been identified in the July 1997 Update study.
3. On the interior, the test installation of the cooling system, while minimal in terms of a retrofit, gives some pause with regard to the architectural integrity of the interior spaces.
4. A general erosion of Green Hall’s interior integrity has occurred over time with incremental programs of renovation and adaptation.
5. There is a general sense that Green Hall is operating at over-capacity.

B-0d. Considerations:
1. Issues of the programmatic use of Green Hall along with a general need for restoration of the interior leads to the question of a total review of Green Hall versus the current program of incremental actions. It is clearly a building worthy of such consideration.
2. A complete program analysis might reveal the possibility of "found space" or suggest relocation of programmatic elements either into or out of the building. (Example: could Admissions work more
comfortably in conjunction with a new campus center? Are there other candidates? Such a study could recognize the possibility of a major restoration serving the campus for many future generations of administration and students.

3. The structural evaluation given by the 1997 Update of the building cladding and tower appears appropriate.

B-0e. Recommendations

1. Schedule Green Hall for a comprehensive restoration program.

2. Implement any on-going incremental actions under the guidance of expert restoration architect so that these programs will work as effectively as possible with a greater restoration program.

3. Relocate program from Green Hall in order to relieve cramped conditions in some areas. The Portal Building program suggest a 10% - 12% absorption of Green Hall programs.

C. Houghton Memorial Chapel

C-0a. Background:

Date: 1897

Architect: Heins and LaFarge

Square Footage: 20,068 sq. ft. (on two levels)

Characteristics: The Chapel is a Gothic Revival building with a granite base and walls of Amherst Stone. The cornice is built of copper with architectural details in terra-cotta. The roof is constructed of red slate. The building was designed in a Greek cross plan with interior walls of brick with dark oak woodwork and pilasters and columns of stone. There are examples of Tiffany and LaFarge stained glass windows.

Functions: The Chapel is a setting for lectures and community meetings as well as religious services and concerts.

C-0b. Method of review


2. Walk-through with MVV and design team (ME only) on 20 August 1997.

3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DY).


5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).


C-0c. Observations

1. Like Pemberton Hall, Green Hall, Music Hall and Billings hall, the Chapel is a unique and intriguing structure. Its interior space, unlike the classical cathedral space, is more bulky and rambling and somehow mindful of the revival tent, the Chataqua Pavilion, or a Friends meeting hall. Spatially, this seems curiously appropriate for a non-denominational meeting space.

3. The Wellesley College community continue to promote the coexistence of various religions and spiritual beliefs.

4. The basement space is a large area, underutilized but restricted by a low floor-co-structure dimension.

C-0d. Considerations

1. It seems inappropriate to radically change the Chapel unless there is an altered commitment to religions and spiritual beliefs at Wellesley.

2. Clearly, facilities placed in the basement will be secondary to the space of the Chapel. While this may be acceptable for social and educational functions, spatially, it is problematic for a truly integrated and egalitarian community of religions and beliefs.

3. There appears to be no easy solution for the Chapel in terms of a multi-faith worship space. It poses the difficult question of the need to create an ecumenically neutral space.

C-0e. Recommendations

1. With the exception of the question of the renovation of the lower level as the multi-faith worship space, all other improvements envisioned by the Wellesley College Building Study: July 1997 Update are either necessary or highly desirable:

   - public restrooms/handicapped access
   - landscaping/site improvements
   - improvements to the main chapel
   - stain glass window restoration
   - furnishings for the main chapel

2. Because there remain some questions about the spatially restricted basement of Houghton Memorial Chapel as an appropriate home for the Inter-faith programs, the Master Plan suggests two options.

C-1. Option One - Houghton Memorial Hall

C-1a. Location

Combine with the basement area of Houghton as the designated location of the multi-faith space.

C-1b. Program

For purposes of this study consider renovation of the total basement area or approximately 10,000 SF.

C-1c. Positive/Negative

Positive

1. Places the multi-faith space in the historically identifiable location of activities.

2. The space exists and is available.

Negative

1. The configuration of the basement space, beneath the upper chapel, with restricted floor to structure height, and for the most part windowless, clearly
marks the space as secondary to the greater chapel.
2. Gives no visual signal of the presence on campus of multiple forms of faith or religion.

C-2. Option Two - Houghton Memorial Hall

C-2a. Location
Locate the multi-faith space outside of Houghton Memorial Chapel.

C-2b. Program
For purpose of this study consider 2,000 GSF adequate program area.

C-2c. Positive/Negative
Positive
1. Potential to architecturally express the presence of multiple faiths and religions on campus.
2. Potential to make inspiring architectural space.

Negative
1. Requires new construction.

See section T - Multi-faith Space for several possible options for the multi-faith space.

D. Margaret Clapp Library

D-0a. Background:
Date: 1910

Architect: Shelpley, Rutan & Coolidge
Square Footage: 180,000 sq. ft.

Characteristics: The original building style is Renaissance Revival. The exterior walls were constructed from Indiana Limestone with a granite foundation and art stone ornamentation. The bronze doors at the main entrance are a centerpiece for the tripartite facade.

Functions: The College Library's holdings number more than 1.3 million items. Interlibrary loans and other resource sharing projects through membership in the Boston Library Consortium augment the College's own collections. The Special Collections include letters, manuscripts, and rare books; the Archives contain materials documenting the history of the College. The new Knapp Media Center provides a campus focus for instructional technology.


1997 (MS, ME, DY).

5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).

D-0c. Observations
1. Both the original library building and the addition are quite handsome and preside nicely over the rhododendron garden and Severance Green.
2. The new Media Center appears to be a very successful re-use of space. Not only does it seem pleasant internally—a very appropriate and generous space for the use of computers—but it also seems very well located and accessible, from the Chapel / Student Center side of the Campus.
3. The archives appear to be at capacity.
4. The archival collection of architectural models and original drawings of Wellesley campus projects is very special.

D-0d. Considerations
1. Could the archives be relocated to provide additional library space?
2. What is the ideal location for additional book storage?

E. Pendleton Hall

E0-a. Background:
Date: 1935
Architect: Charles Z. Klauder
Square Footage: 80,000 sq. ft.

Characteristics: The building was designed in the Collegiate Gothic Style, constructed of brick with limestone trim and a grey-green slate roof. The building is designed to fit into the existing hillside of Norumbega Hill, with snaggled interior floor levels. The plan is a broadened "V" with the main entrance located at the back of the "V" on the south wall. The major entrances are covered by pointed Gothic arches.

Functions: Originally built to house the Physical Sciences, the building now houses the Social Sciences on the east and the Studio Arts on the west.

E-0b. Method of review:
2. Walk-by with MVV and design team (ME only) on 20 August 1997.
3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DY).
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).
E-0c. Observations
1. As with Green Hall, Pendleton Hall anchors the academic quad and mediates the topographic change from the quad to the meadow below and is a key architectural figure in the historic core of the Wellesley Campus.
2. Internally, Pendleton Hall is a collection of extremely nice spaces appropriate to the studio arts and lectures.
3. Particularly in Pendleton East, there is a sense of disorganization and discontinuity probably due to overcrowding and incremental changes of unsympathetic character.
4. Under-utilization of Room 112 may stem as much from out-dated equipment (seating, window treatment, AU capability, etc.) as from simply being the wrong size.
5. It was not clear that flattening the stepped floor in Room 112 would be a simple task.
6. Some improvements in Pendleton Hall, while relieving organizational and space needs, out of character with the original building and erode the integrity of the buildings interior.
7. For a casual visitor to the campus to bookstore is extremely difficult to find.
8. The building appears structurally and materially substantial on both the exterior and the interior.
9. Notes in the Wellesley College Building Study July 1997 Update are extensive enough from Pendleton East Hall to indicate that the social sciences have researched and are clear about their needs.

E-0d. Considerations
1. Coupled with accessibility issues, the work at Pendleton Hall appears extensive enough to merit the consideration of a complete restoration/renovations program rather than a continuation of incremental changes.

E-0e. Recommendations
1. Based on the quality of the architecture, the importance to the configuration of academic quad, and the extent of the work needed, the Master Plan recommends a comprehensive restoration/renovation project.
2. If a comprehensive project is not possible, incremental changes should be sympathetically made with restoration as the ultimate goal. The original building is its own best evidence.
3. Relocate the bookstore to a more obvious and communal place.

F. Stone-Davis Dormitory

F-0a. Background
Date: 1928
Architect: Charles Klauder
Square footage: 85,624 sq. ft.
Characteristics: Stone-Davis Hall is situated on the site of the 1880 Stone Hall which was destroyed by fire in 1927. Built in the Collegiate Gothic Style, the two wings of the building mirror each other in plan and detail. The construction of the building is brick with Indiana limestone trim and copings and a moss-green slate roof.

Function: Dormitory
Renovations: Dining Rooms: 1964, Shepley Bulfinch
Richardson & Abbot
Bathrooms: 1985

F-0b. Method of review
2. Walk-by with MVV and design team (ME only) on 20 August 1997.
3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DY).
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).

F-0c. Observations
1. In a partial walk-through, the two dining rotundas, several "living-rooms", several corridors, and example dorm rooms were observed.
2. From the exterior Stone-Davis appears to be in generally good condition. Particular problems were not obvious from casual observation.
3. On the interior it was observed that the general condition of corridors, baths and dorm rooms is weak, making a strange contrast to the generosity and elegance of the original "living" room.
3. Resident Advisors quarters appeared to be inadequate that personal items, furniture and household goods, were collected in the corridors and "living" rooms.

F-0d. Considerations
1. The condition of Stone-Davis, internally, should be considered with respect to equivalent facilities at other institutions.
2. The two dining rotundas are pleasant spaces and could be adapted to a range of activities such as seminar or conference spaces, lecture or classrooms, should the decision be made "not to dine" at Stone-Davis.
3. Corrective work and accessibility issues appeared extensive enough to merit the consideration of a comprehensive program of action rather than further incremental changes.

F-0e. Recommendations
1. In order to properly evaluate any single dormitory or dormitory complex, an overview of housing needs for the future is highly advisable. Not only could this affect existing dormitories, by relieving current space pressures and providing the scheduling flexibility for comprehensive renovations, but it can be equally important to the campus Master
Plan and future density of the student population across campus.
2. In evaluating the condition of Wellesley dormitories, take into account the competition of similar academic institutions.
3. Given the quality of the architecture of Stone-Davis and the extent of the work at hand, the Master Plan recommends a comprehensive program of restoration/renovation.
4. If only incremental changes can be continued, they should be undertaken sympathetically with a view toward restoration as an ultimate goal.

II. New Architectural Programs

G. Parking Structure

G-0a. Background
Parking to date on the Wellesley Campus has been accommodated by surface lots and street side parking.

G-0b. Method of Review
Refer to the Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates extensive research on this topic in Working Paper Two: Circulation and Parking.

G-0c. Observations
1. Because there are currently no parking structures on the Wellesley Campus, there is no precedent.
2. The campus offered up few new opportunities for surface parking. To the contrary, by general observations, some surface lots and street side parking appeared imply to be in the wrong places.

G-0d. Considerations
1. Consider parking structure as a means to better organize the campus and to reclaim certain landscapes as green areas.
2. Parking structures on the Wellesley Campus will, by nature of the architecture of the institution and the topography need to be carefully considered.

G-0d. Recommendations
1. The master plan recommends three parking structures at following locations:
   - Alumnae Hall lot - 220 spaces
   - Service lot site - 300 spaces
   - Water Tower Hill - 450 spaces
2. Budgeting for parking structure should take into account that these structures must be specially considered in order to work architecturally on the campus.

H. Alumnae Hall

H-0a. Background
Date: 1923
Architect: Cram and Ferguson
Square Footage: 37,823 Gross Square Feet
Characteristics: Alumnae hall is a handsome three story structure of brick and lime
stone, which houses a sloped floor concert hall with balcony, seating 1,500, on the main and upper floor area and a large ballroom on the lower floor. The Ruth Nagle Jones Theater, a black box experimental theater, is located on the lower (ballroom) level.

Functions: The Ruth Nagle Jones theater along with various other spaces supports the dramatic/theater program. The concert wall is the only large site special events space on campus. The lower level accommodates a variety of alumni functions, social gatherings, formal dinners, etc.

H-0b. Method of review
1. General observations on self-directed visits (ME, DY and MS).
2. Input from Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates.

H-0c. Observations
1. Alumnae Hall is quite handsome, will proportioned and beautifully detailed.
2. Like Green Hall it sits at a unique spot on the campus. The building negotiates a change in elevation from the north arrival side (140' a) to the ballroom level (125') and down through an amphitheater to the meadow level (110'). Like Green Hall the environmental experience from one side of the building to the other is completely different.
3. The building in general appears to be in good condition.
4. General investigation of current activities in and around Alumnae Hall, in the performing arts, and concerning special events uncovered several important issues. 1. The first is the importance of the theater/drama program and the performing arts on campus. 2. Theater voiced a need for rehearsal space(s) not readily available in Alumnae Hall. 3. The configuration of the concert hall in Alumnae Hall does not lend itself to the multitude of current performance, meeting, and events formats. 4. The black box theater in the lower level of Alumnae Hall is an important aspect of the drama program, but lacks architectural presence on campus. 5. The dance program, currently located in the athletic facility, is a mislocated element of the performing arts. 6. Outdoor performances and events are currently difficult to stage because of the lack of convenient power sources, truck access, and performance area. Disturbance and repair of the meadows is a maintenance concern.

H-0d. Considerations
1. The items, listed in 4 above, when considered collectively begin to form a substantial program of performing arts activities and facilities. Such a program could extend the physical presence of the arts into the west campus in and around Service
Lot meadow, incorporating Alumnae Hall and exploiting the strong adjacency to the other arts at Jewett Art Center and Davis Museum. Parking facility locations suggested earlier in the master plan study are complimentary to this consideration.

2. A program for the performing arts could function independently of or in conjunction with a campus center program or a partial campus center program (see study sketches B-1, B-2, B-3).

**H-0e. Recommendations**

1. The master plan recommends the incorporation of a theater/performing arts program special events facility, and outdoor performance space in and around Service Lot meadow (now referred to in the master plan as Alumnae Valley). (See Sections I - Multi-use/Events Space and J - Theater/Performing Arts.)

2. Recommendation 1 above leads the master plan to recommend that Alumnae Hall be restored to its original configuration and used ceremonially only for those activities and functions that are timely appropriate. Such a program of use would have special significance and emphasis to those activities which take place in Alumnae Hall.

3. The one exception to Recommendation 2 might be the inclusion of a visitor/information center in Alumnae Hall (see Section 3 - Visitor/Information Center).

**J-0a. Background**

Wellesley Campus currently has no multi-use/events space that accommodates 1,200-1,500 people and can adapt itself to multiple event formats.

**J-0b. Method of Review**


2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

**J-0c. Observations**

1. Refer to Section H-0c. Alumnae Hall - Observations.

2. It is not unusual for colleges and universities to have multi-use/events spaces for the accommodation of special programs, conferences, meetings, etc. for the academic community. Often such facilities function as assets to the institution in the promotion and attraction of programs outside the establish academic schedule.

**J-0d. Considerations**

1. Consider locating such a facility so that it could function a part of a performing arts complex and/or as part of a campus center.

2. Parking for visitors to the campus is of prime importance to such facility.

3. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-use/Event Space</th>
<th>18,500 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate 1,200-1,500 for special events: (divisible for smaller functions)</td>
<td>15,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Catering services</td>
<td>2,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage/technical equipment</td>
<td>500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office suite</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NSF</td>
<td>18,500 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF</td>
<td>27,750 NSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J-0e. Recommendations**

1. The master plan recommends the addition of a multi-use/events space to the program.

2. Locate the facility as part of a theater/performing arts complex in and around Alumnae Hall and the Service Lot meadow (see study sketches A-2, B-2 and C-2) to take full advantage of the proposed parking facilities and to extend activities from the Davis Museum and the Jewett Art Center area toward the west.

**J. Theater/Performing Arts**

**J-0a. Background**

In its architectural fabric, the Wellesley Campus currently celebrates the visual arts and music to a far greater extent than the performing arts: theater, dance, performance, etc.

**J-0b. Method of Review**


2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

**J-0c. Observations**

1. Refer to Section H-0c. Alumnae Hall - Observations.

2. The presence of the Ruth Nagle Jones theater indicates a strong interest in contemporary theater at Wellesley.

**J-0d. Considerations**

1. Consider adding a theater/performing arts program to the master plan.

2. Parking for visitors to the campus is an important issue regarding the location of such a program.

3. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theater/Performing Arts</th>
<th>8,400 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Box Theater</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage/Seating (seat 300)</td>
<td>600 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>800 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>2,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspaces</td>
<td>1,600 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Studios (2 at 800 SF each)</td>
<td>1,800 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Rehearsal Rooms (3 at 600 SF each)</td>
<td>1,200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Dance Classrooms (2 at 600 SF each)</td>
<td>400 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lounge(s)</td>
<td>13,400 NSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-0e. Recommendations
1. The master plan recommends the addition of a theater/performing arts program.
2. Locate the theater/performing arts complex in and around Alumnae Hall and the Service Lot meadow (see study sketches A-2, B-2 and C-2) to take full advantage of the proposed parking facilities and to extend activities from the Davis Museum and the Jewett Arts Center area toward the west.

K. Outdoor Performance Space

K-0a. Background
Wellesley has a long history of outdoor events taking place in the meadows and Severance Green, but has no accommodations for large scale events requiring truck access, power for lighting and sound, or an area where performance may take place.

K-0b. Method of Review
2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates’ various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

K-0c. Observations
1. It is not unusual for colleges and universities to host large scale performance events.
2. The meadows at Wellesley form natural bowls suggesting that large groups could assemble and have extremely good visual access to a performance space.
3. Refer to Section H-0c. Alumnae Hall - Observations.
4. An outdoor performance space could be effectively used during summer months by entities other than Wellesley College.

K-0d. Considerations
1. Consider adding an outdoor performance space program to the master plan.
2. Parking for visitors to the campus is an important issue regarding the location of such a program.
3. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan:
   - Outdoor Performance Area: 7,500 SF
   - Equipment building: 1,800 SF
   - Staging area: 9,000 SF
   - TOTAL NSF: 19,500 NSF
   - TOTAL GROSS SF*: 29,250 NSF

K-0e. Recommendations
1. The master plan recommends the addition of an outdoor performance space program.
2. Locate the outdoor performance space in and around Alumnae Hall and the Service Lot meadow (see study sketches A-2, B-2 and C-2) to take full advantage of the proposed parking facilities and to extend activities from the Davis Museum and the
L. Portal Building and Physical Plant Promenade

L-0a. Background
The notion of a 'portal' building, located at the east end of Physical Plant, and a promenade along the south face of Physical Plant evolved over the course of the master planning process as a result of conversations surrounding the west facade of Davis Museum, entry into the Service Lot meadow, the extension of the Jewett Arts Center/Davis Museum promenade, to the west, and the interface of automobiles and pedestrians.

L-0b. Method of Review
2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

L-0c. Observations
1. The Physical Plant, although effectively placed for engineering purposes at the center of the campus, disrupts the continuity of the meadows and lends nothing to community life per se.
2. New facilities around the Physical Plant perimeters can facilitate student activity and extend administrative and academic functions into west portion of the campus.
3. Currently the Davis Museum/Jewett Arts Center promenade has "no place to go".
4. Currently there is no building on campus capable of absorbing program from those buildings which are experiencing full or over capacity conditions.

L-0d. Considerations
1. Consider adding a Portal Building and the Physical Plant Promenade to the master plan.
2. The Portal Building could absorb capacity from Green Hall or other academic or administrative buildings.
3. Academic and administrative functions at this location extend the activities of the academic quad in a position motion to the west.
4. If the west end of Physical Plant is demolished to make room for parking, the Portal Building could absorb office programs.
5. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan:
   Portal Building
   Administrative space
   (12% of Green Hall program) 11,800 SF
   Physical Plant and security offices 8,000 SF
   Classrooms (3 at 600 SF each) 1,800 SF
   Information/Visitor Center/Tickets 500 SF
   Mail boxes 1,000 SF
   Vending/mini campus shop (other retail) 8,000 SF
   TOTAL NSF 23,800 NSF
   TOTAL GROSS SF 35,700 NSF

Physical Plant Promenade Structure
This space could be entirely open and treated as
an urban landscape element of shelter, paving, sidewalk amenities and plant materials. The primary issues is one of linkage of the academic quad through Jewett Art Center and Davis Museum across the road and through a portal that introduces the Service Lot meadow and athletic facilities beyond.

However, this structure could contain certain programs such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vending/mini campus shop</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition/gallery space</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk cafe (cafe hoop?)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student lounge/social space</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NSF</td>
<td>13,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SF</td>
<td>19,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Plant Building

Service Building at west end (demolish) 11,800 SF

L-0e. Recommendations

1. The master plan recommends the addition of the Portal Building to the east end of Physical Plant and a promenade structure along its south face.
2. Scrutinize academic and administrative programs to determine the most effective program for the Portal Building.
3. Demolish the west end (Service Building) of Physical Plant to accommodate parking and the theater/performing arts/events space programs.

M. Keohane Sports Center: Tennis Pavilion

M-0a. Background

While the Wellesley Campus have a number of tennis courts, they are all out of doors, rendering their use during the academic year very limited.

M-0b. Method of Review

2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

M-0c. Observations

1. Treatment of hazardous materials at Pinkwater Pond has opened a whole new zone of the west campus, relaxing the need to occupy less appropriate areas with athletic activities and facilities. Specifically space is now available for indoor tennis courts as well as various playing fields and parking (see study sketch C).
2. Competitive tennis on the college level requires year round training and play.

M-0d. Considerations

1. Consider adding an indoor tennis pavilion to the program.
2. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan:
   Keohane Sports Center
   Tennis pavilion (six indoor courts) 44,400 SF
M-0e. Recommendations
The master plan recommends the addition of tennis pavilion in the vicinity of the proposed playing fields and the existing Distribution Center.

N. Keohane Sports Center: Exercise/Weight Rooms

N-0a. Background
Currently dance studios are located in sports center. There is a need at the sports center for exercise space and a weight room.

N-0b. Method of Review
2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

N-0c. Observations
1. Dance is a member of the performing arts community and as such is mislocated in the sports center.
2. Sports are becoming programatically more and more important to young women. Sports facilities and programs may determine the choice of college or university for entering freshmen.

N-0d. Considerations

1. By relocating dance to the performing arts, space in sports becomes available for reprogramming.
3. In lieu of a given program assume the following for the purposes of the master plan that the space of the dance program will be adequate for exercise and weights.

N-0e. Recommendations
The master plan recommends the relocation of dance and the accommodation of exercise and weights at the sports center.

O. Music Hall
See section A - Campus Center for comments on Music Hall.

P. Billings Hall
See Section A Campus Center for comments on Billings Hall.

Q. East Lodge

Q-0a. Background
Currently East Lodge houses three (3) dorm rooms.

Q-0b. Method of Review
2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates’ various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

Q-0c. Observations
Realignment of the campus entrance along Washington Street adjacent to East Lodge suggests that the three (3) dorm rooms be removed from East Lodge and relocated to a site more conducive to residential use.

Q-0d. Considerations
1. Reprogram East Lodge.
2. Consider adding East Lodge rooms to new dormitory program. (See Section U - New Dormitory Rooms.)

Q-0e. Recommendations
Relocate East Lodge dorm rooms.

R. Simpson Infirmary

R-0a. Background
Date: 1882/1942
Architect: Van Brunt & Howe/Coolidge
Square Footage: 30,114 Gross Square Feet
Characteristics:
- Functions: The building accommodates the campus infirmary and eight (8) dormitory rooms.

R-0b. Method of Review
2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates’ various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.
3. Dormitory occupancy by room type - Physical Plant Department.

R-0c. Observations
Study of the Gray Parking Lot area resulted in a recommendation to create an open green space with a parking structure tucked into Water Tower Hill. This action led to an evaluation of the site lines connecting the Gray area to Founders Lot and to the Chapel prompting a recommendation to demolish the westernmost addition of Simpson Infirmary leaving the Van Brunt & Howe/Coolidge section intact. This will eliminate eight (8) single occupancy dorm rooms. (see Study Sketch H).

R-0d. Considerations
Relocate eight (8) eight dormitory rooms to the New Dormitory Rooms facility. See Section U - New Dormitory Rooms.

R-0e. Recommendations
Take action spelled out in Considerations R-0d above.

S. Visitor/Information Center

S-0a. Background
Currently, visitor information is locate with security at

1' = 100' Study Sketch H
T. Multi-faith Space

T.0a Background
Wellesley's attitude toward its student body ensures that there is diversity of faiths and religion represented on campus. Though the Houghton Memorial Chapel was intended to be non-denominational, it has a strong Christian iconography. Even its plan is a cross configuration. It is reasonable to consider that those of non-Christian faiths and religions would feel less than comfortable in the Houghton Chapel proper and perhaps even less comfortable in the basement space below the Chapel.

T.0b Method of Review
1. See Section C - Houghton Memorial Chapel.
2. There was no detailed program of requirements published in the Wellesley College Building study 1997 July Update.

T.0c Observations
See Section C - Houghton Memorial Chapel.

T.0d. Considerations
1. Consider a ‘free-standing’ structure that would be easy to find and identify.
2. Consider locating the Information Center in Alumnae Hall.
3. In lieu of a given program assume, for the purposes of the master plan, a program of 750 GSF.

T.0e. Recommendations
Work with graphics consultant to best establish the location of a visitor’s center.

T.1. Option One - Locate Multi-faith Space at the Lower Level of Houghton Memorial Chapel

T.1a. Location
See section C - Houghton Memorial Chapel

T.1b. Program
See section C - Houghton Memorial Chapel

T.1c. Positive/Negative
See section C - Houghton Memorial Chapel

T.2. Option Two - New “Free-standing” Building

T.2a. Location
Locate a multi-faith worship space as a free-standing building in a location of some significance, perhaps in the Houghton Chapel vicinity or close to the Chaplaincy offices. See Section A - Campus Center.

T.2b. Program
In lieu of a given program, assume that 2,100 gross square feet will accommodate the following:
- Inspirational Space: 800±SF
- Space for ‘gear’ (20 @ 205SF each): 400SF
- Foyer: 200 SF
- Total Net SF: 1400NSF
- Total Gross SF: 2100GSM

T.2c. Positive/Negative
Positive
1. A ‘stand alone’ structure, beautifully sited might lend itself more clearly to quiet contemplation and inspiration than a space embedded in a highly active complex.
2. Has potential to give architectural presence to the many religions and faiths on campus outside of Christianity.
3. Has the potential to be ecumenically neutral in its architecture while providing individual presence for each entity.
4. Is an extremely rich and challenging program.
5. If located close to Houghton Chapel and Music Hall the group could function as a larger multi-faith center.

Negative
1. Requires new constructions
2. Site dependent on other Master Plan decisions.

T.3. Option Three - Multi-faith Space as Integral Part of New Campus

T.3a. Location
Locate a multi-faith space in a new campus center, taking advantage of the traffic generated by the greater facility and making associations with other programs via adjacencies.

T.3b. Program
For program assumption see T-2b above.
T-3c. Positive/Negative

Positive
1. Would be in a high traffic area.
2. Could be closely associated with other programs such as Chaplaincy offices, multi-use/events spaces, and student lounges.

Negative
1. Would be in a high traffic area.
2. Has less potential to give architectural expression to the presence of the multi-faith groups.
3. Special care would need to be exerted to establish a presence within the other campus center elements.

T-4. Option Four - Locate Multi-Faith Space in restored Billings Hall

T-4a. Locate a Multi-faith Space

Because of the fine quality of Billings Hall, the Master Plan recommends that it be restored and used in ways appropriate to its spatial configuration.

T-4b. Program

Programmatically Billings Hall has approximately 3,600 square feet of space in the great room on the ground level. This should be adequate for the functions of the multi-faith space allowing room for he specific gear and vestments of the various groups.

1. The space of Billings Hall is extremely handsome.
2. The space is iconographically neutral.
3. Proximity to Houghton Chapel and the Music Hall suggests that they collectively function as a larger multi-faith center.
4. Adequate space for the program (as assumed).
5. Great space could also function for lectures and meetings is scheduling permitted.

Negative
1. The Gothic Revival architectural style is not free from Christian connotations.

U. New Dormitory Rooms

U-0a. Background

A need for fifty (50) new dorm rooms, fully air-conditioned, for summer uses such as continuing education programs was identified.

U-0b. Method of Review

2. Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates' various meetings with Wellesley staff, students and faculty.

U-0c. Observations

1. Currently no dormitory rooms are air-conditioned for summer use.
2. These rooms could provide some incremental change.
space for other dormitories during construction periods.

3. The dorms at McAfee, Bates or Freeman Halls are strong candidate for the location of this facility given its close proximity to the Wellesley College Club, Clapp Library, the Chapel, and Schneider Center, all of which could function in unison in support of the summer programs. Building in this location also affords Wellesley College more presence along Washington Street and the “new dorms” become a more active participant in the architectural fabric of the campus (see study sketch 1).

U-0d. Considerations

1. Consider expanding the fifty (50) rooms program to accept eight (8) dorm rooms from Simpson infirmary and three (3) from East Lodge.

2. Consider the McAfee, Bates, Freeman Hall as the site.

3. In lieu of a give program assume for purposes of the master plan 300 GSF per room:
   
   \[ 61 \text{ rooms} \times 300 \text{ GSF} = 18,300 \text{ GSF} \]

U-0e. Recommendations

Take actions indicated in U-0d Considerations above.
### Architectural Programs - Conceptual Construction Costs Estimate†
#### Wellesley College Campus Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Campus Center</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Option One: Total Campus Center Program at Service Lot site</td>
<td>64,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$12,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Option Two: Total Campus Center program at Schneider site</td>
<td>64,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$12,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hybrid Option Three: Program at Schneider Center site Program at Service Lot site</td>
<td>47,175 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$9,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,700 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$5,340,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Green Hall (comprehensive restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98,650 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$19,730,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Houghton Memorial Chapel</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Option One: Selective restoration both levels</td>
<td>20,067 SF</td>
<td>$175/SF</td>
<td>$3,511,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Option Two: Selective restoration on upper level only</td>
<td>10,000 SF</td>
<td>$175/SF</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Margaret Clapp Library (selective restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reclaim media center (10,000 SF) Reclaim teaching-learning center (3,000 SF) Convert central space to reading room (6,300 SF) Convert reading areas to collection (2,400 SF)</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
<td>$175/SF</td>
<td>$3,779,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Pendleton Hall East (comprehensive restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton Hall West</td>
<td>50,000 SF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,500,000†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Stone-Davis (comprehensive restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85,005 SF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Parking Structures</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alumnae Hall deck</td>
<td>220 spaces</td>
<td>$16,000/space</td>
<td>$3,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Service Lot site deck</td>
<td>300 spaces</td>
<td>$16,000/space</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Water Tower Hill deck</td>
<td>450 spaces</td>
<td>$16,000/space</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. Alumnae Hall (comprehensive restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000 GSF</td>
<td>$150/SF</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Multi-use/Events Space</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Box Theater (12,600 GSF)</td>
<td>26,850 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$5,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Studios (2 @ 800 SF each) (2,400 GSF)</td>
<td>22,500 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Rehearsal Room (1 @ 600 SF each) (2,700 GSF)</td>
<td>12,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library (1,000 SF) (1,500 GSF)</td>
<td>5 Theaters/Classroom (2@ 600 SF each) (1,800 GSF)</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Offices (5 @ 1200 SF each) (600 GSF)</td>
<td>600 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Student Lounges (400 GSF) (600 GSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. Outdoor Performance space</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Performance area (7,500 SF @ $200/SF)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Equipment Building (6,500 GSF @ $200/SF)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Staging Areas (9,000 SF @ $100/SF)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. Portal Building/Structure</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 At garden wall only</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 With program (highly variable)</td>
<td>600 SF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M. Keohane Sports Center: Tennis Pavilion     | units | unit price | total       |
|                                                |       |            | $120,000    |
| (six indoor tennis courts)                    |       |            |             |

| N. Keohane Sports Center: Exercise/weight rooms | units | unit price | total       |
|                                               |       |            | $120,000    |
| (occupy space of existing dance studios-remodel) |       |            |             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. Restoration of Music Hall</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,500 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. Restoration of Billings Hall</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,200 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$3,040,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. East Lodge (restoration)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,600 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R. Simpson Infirmary (Demolish west wing and restore)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Visitor/Information Center (new construction)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If located in Alumnae Hall consider part of restoration cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. Multi-plex space</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Option One - Lower level of Houghton Memorial Chapel</td>
<td>10,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Option Two - New &quot;free-standing&quot; building</td>
<td>2,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Option Three - Integral part of new campus center</td>
<td>2,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Option Four - Restore Billings Hall for this purpose</td>
<td>15,200 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$3,040,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U. New Dormitory Rooms (600 rooms at 300 GSF each)</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>unit price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Dormitory Rooms (600 rooms at 300 GSF each)</td>
<td>21,000 GSF</td>
<td>$200/SF</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Conceptual Construction Costs Estimates numbers are based on 1998 dollars unless otherwise noted.
‡ From Wellesley College Building Study: 1995. Restoration/renovation in Pendleton East, ...could result in the need to spend up to $1.5 million on occupied work in Pendleton West.
+++ Assumes removal of old and restoration of original structure including basement area.
†† Note: Soft costs (tests, etc.) average approximately in addition 28% of the construction costs.
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Partial Working Paper Number One
Review of Architectural, Programmatic, and Space Needs

- Introduction
- Goals
- Background
- Method of Review
- Observations and Considerations Concerning the General Campus

7 October 1997
[revised: 29 May 1998]
Introduction
The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First, it serves to record the working notes of our involvement, as we become familiar with Wellesley College, and the research and planning which has already been performed to date concerning its future. Second, it provides the necessary framework for the reconsideration of the Wellesley College Campus, from the perspective of its architectural, programmatic, and spatial needs. This paper is neither a master plan per se, nor a critique of the current Master Plan, nor a set of pointed recommendations at this time, but it is rather an attempt to ask the right questions to the administration, faculty and students of the College, in order to provoke response toward renewing and setting a vision for the College in the near and long-term future.

Method of review
2. Walk-through with MVV and design team (ME) on 20 August 1997.
3. Group Meeting with Adel Rida on 20 August 1997 (ME, DY).
5. Review Walk-through on 8 and 9 October 1997 (MS, DY).

Goals
1. To gather, generate, and assemble the information necessary for intelligent decision-making concerning the Wellesley campus, and to format the information so that it can be kept current, supplemented as needed, and used for decision-making over a long period of time.
2. To understand the essence of Wellesley College and the Wellesley experience so that it may inform decision-making.
3. To help identify and address issues that will keep Wellesley competitive and highly sought after as an institute for the education of young women.
4. To weave the building tradition at Wellesley into contemporary needs and energies of today’s young woman.
5. To take utmost advantage of the existing campus fabric while suggesting new approaches to recognized problems and future growth areas.

Observations
1. The general diversity of architectural styles lends a richness to the Wellesley community. However, incremental renovations have tended to erode the integrity of certain buildings particularly the interiors.
2. In general, the campus is well served by building clusters positioned discreetly in the landscape around the campus. Internally, these clusters (such as Tower Court and Freeman/Bates/McAfee) have a strong identity and interaction. However, building clusters have lost visual connections amongst one another, and to the lake.
3. Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr.'s words concerning the Wellesley Campus, from nearly one hundred years ago still ring true: 'I must admit that the exceedingly intricate and complex topography and the peculiarly scattered arrangement of most of the buildings somewhat baffled me and that I came away with a less clear and comprehensive grasp of the whole situation than I could wish.
4. For all the apparent openness and generosity of the college landscape, there appears to be a certain "scarceness" of primary hardscape elements such as stairs, ramps, and gardens, unless they are directly associated with a dormitory cluster.
5. There is a general "feast" that campus buildings are operating efficiently, but at capacity, with the exception of the Jewett / Davis / Pendleton complex, the Science Center, and the Keohane Sports Center. The generosity of the greater campus does not extend into facilities that seem to be operating at capacity.
6. Housing in particular appears to be at capacity. Student housing should be evaluated with regard to national standards or standards set by similar institutions.
7. The issue of "to dine" or "not to dine" at various housing complexes is as much or more a philosophical, social, and campus structure / tradition question as it is a physical plant question.
8. There appears to be a lack of general gathering spaces for university conferences, receptions, seminars, non-denominational religious groups, etc.
9. Parking: what are the current needs and future strategies?
10. The area at the northeast corner of the campus at the stone gate seems strangely remote and under-utilized.
11. A number of isolated "events" need consideration:
   a. The approach from the power plant area to the loading dock face of the Davis Museum.
   b. The orientation and view from the amphitheater at Alumni Hall. The parking and tennis courts in this area are a strange visual interruption.
from Alumnae Hall to the lake. The area seems under- or mis-utilized. This area is a natural path between the athletic center and the student housing to the east and south, and should be reconsidered.

c. The mound at the lake at the end of the Irving Wall seems unconsidered.

d. The great stone entry gate at the northeast corner of the campus gives a confusing signal. Is this the main gate to the Campus?

12. In conclusion, there appears to be a need to re-affirm and/or re-evaluate certain philosophical positions of the college with respect to its future physical, spatial, and architectural growth. The continuation, or a departure from, certain traditions may be the deciding factor in this decision making process.

Considerations

1. In association with the mission statement of the College are there more specific long range goals or objectives, academic or otherwise that Wellesley has in place? How does Wellesley identify current and/or forecasted trends in higher education and respond? How has Wellesley set a vision for itself concerning the education of future generations of young women, and how might this be manifested in the physical setting of the campus?

2. What is the philosophical attitude towards the public image of the Wellesley campus? Does Wellesley College see itself moving outward toward the community (local and regional) in terms of student living arrangements, educational programs, and community interaction? In regard to plans for a new Campus Center, existing vehicular entrances and paths through the campus, and the number of students who currently live "off-campus", is the college better served by its current relationship with the town, or a more explicit linkage?

3. What is the philosophical and pedagogical attitude towards the daily life of the Wellesley student? Is the faculty and student body in favor of a decentralized living, eating, and social life, or one which is centralized and focused in a fully functional Campus Center, or some hybrid complementary program?

4. The Wellesley College Campus is unique in its spatial make-up. It is not a campus defined by one single place but rather a collection of interwoven places; it is experienced in a linear / meandering manner. At a given point in a student’s experience of the place, she can rapidly move from a very clustered built place to an empty meadow, providing for a very individual interpretation and appreciation of the College. New buildings, exterior spaces, and facilities can be consciously designed to fit into this landscape of buildings. Discreet linkages between buildings, separate buildings rather than single buildings, and the insertion of buildings into the landscape are all strategies which can be employed.

5. Visual connections between buildings and clusters, aimed at creating a more cohesive experience, are entirely possible with some serious attention to environmental over-growth. A "peek-a-boo" effect could be re-established giving the campus a more connected feeling while also reinforcing its vital inward focus. Particularities of place (such as Lupine Walk and Severance Green) could be realized through their discrete reconection.

6. What are Wellesley’s strategies concerning student enrollment and physical plant capacity? According to the student population data collected above, there appears to be less of a conscious "growth plan" than a "population creep" situation, which often results in unexpected capacity usage. Space planning can anticipate this "slow growth" without an overt expansion of the campus.

7. It is not clear that a re-programming of existing facilities will provide adequate space for a sense of generosity in space utilization. If re-programming of existing buildings does not result in adequate program space, densification of certain currently occupied areas such as hill tops may be a possibility. This would be in lieu of building in important open spaces.

8. Specific considerations:

a. How does the Clapp Library envision its future as a facility? Does the library see its role expanding to serve the public at larger with more research opportunities and facilities (i.e. its role in the Boston Library Consortium) or instead focusing to augment service primarily for the close-knit Wellesley community (i.e. the new Knapp Media Center)?

b. The area adjacent to the physical plant and the area at the northeast corner of the campus (nearest town, by the un-used entrance gate) appear prime for re-evaluation.
Wellesley College 1998 Landscape Master Plan

Statement of Probable Construction Costs

Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Inc., Landscape Architects
1 June 1998
## Summary of All Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>East Lodge Entry to Dormer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372,260.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>College Club Lot Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,729.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Gray Lot Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346,547.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Water Tower Hill Parking Deck (450 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,920,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Westen Terrace Entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261,686.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Roadway Reconfiguration &amp; Meadow Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>948,066.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Brick Walk Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,589.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Severance Green/Rhododendron Dell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,586.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Tupelo Point/Scheider Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Munger Hall Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Pendleton Hill and Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215,677.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Green Hall Courtyard Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,718.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Academic Quad Jewett Hill Ramp Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Hazard Quad Area Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>616,789.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>Close Route 135 Entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,705.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>Athletic Center Parking Deck (200 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,685,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Alumniae Valley Area Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,992,838.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Alumniae Valley Parking Deck (200 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,832,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>Stairway from Lake House Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485,998.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>Tower Hall Courtyard Renovation/LC Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>Distribution Ctr/W. Lodge Entry/College Rd. Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,447,396.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>West Campus Athletic Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,339,162.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>Lake Edge Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: Landscape Projects

|   |   |   |   |   | 45,176,533.73 |
## Architectural Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>East Lodge Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>New Dormitory Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,270.00</td>
<td>4,270,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Simpson Building Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>720,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Stone - Davis Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>73,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Campus Study Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,378,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Restoration of Music Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,970,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Restoration of Billings Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,344,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>Performance Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,077,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>Alumnae Hall Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Multi-use/Events Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,007,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>Portal Building/Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>Visitor Information Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>Keohan Sports Center; Tennis Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,768,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal: Architectural Projects** 62,645,005.00

**Grand Total** 107,824,438.73
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>East Lodge Entry to Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372,269.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete walks</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1,968.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree removals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleaning &amp; grubbling</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove existing stone walls</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil m³</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>5,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughline grading</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, haybales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: New bit. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>34,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>40,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move one stone planter</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Stone walls</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>10,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>37,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toppoll, respread</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toppoll, new</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>3,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,900.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,961.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>East Lodge Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore East Lodge</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>College Club Lot Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,129.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. topcoat only</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>16,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3,678.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3,678.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4,224.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughline grading</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5,022.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: New bit. conv. &amp; base (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>24,538.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaired - bl. conv. only (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>20,779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>16,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstate granite curbs</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pkg. lot striping</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>431.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Tree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2,002.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, resprayed</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,269.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,078.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>New Dormitory Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Dormitory Building Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,620,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Gray Lot Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346,544.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, sig., topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>43,588.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, sig., topcoat only</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>1,732.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete works</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>12,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tres removals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>759.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove lighting (35' Cobra head)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, subgrade topsoil</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough finish grading</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5,764.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, haybales</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: New bit. conv. &amp; base (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>5,472.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaired - bl. conv. only (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: concrete walks</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>14,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstate granite curbs</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Pedestrian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, resprayed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow restoration</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>23,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,851.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,447.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Simpson Building Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>720,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>720,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>SURTOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Water Tower Hill Parking Deck (450 spaces)</td>
<td>450 SPACES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>720,000.00</td>
<td>7,920,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Weston Terrace Entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree removals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile top soil</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, hay/bees</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: New bit. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; plkg.)</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>16,687.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>7,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>19,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway sigs</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, reseed</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>Roadway Reconfiguration &amp; Meadow Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plkg. &amp; topsoil &amp; base</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>21,969.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plkg. topsoil only</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>25,284.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete walls</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1,327.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree removals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree transplanting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile top soil</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3,888.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: New bit. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; plkg.)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>76,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaved - bit. conc only (roads &amp; msg.)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>36,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weeds, concrete</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>15,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>95,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retaliating granite curbs</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>442.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plg lot striping</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Pedestrian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestal parking gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.05 PLANTING

- New Trees @ Science Center: 150 EA @ 750.00 = 112,500.00
- New Trees: 100 EA @ 750.00 = 75,000.00
- Seed, soil: 2,500 SY @ 50.00 = 125,000.00
- Topsoil, topdressing: 430 CY @ 5.00 = 2,150.00
- Meadow Restoration (27,965 s.f.): 27,965 SY @ 4.50 = 125,842.50
- Selective Pruning, etc.: 1 ALLOW @ 12,000.00 = 12,000.00
- General Conditions (5%): 37,553.44
- Contingency (20%): 151,693.00

10.00 Stone, Davis Improvements 73,881.00

10.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

- Remove pavement: mlds, plg, topdressing & base: 952 SY @ 9.00 = 8,568.00
- Tree removals: 5 EA @ 400.00 = 2,000.00
- Tree protection: 600 LF @ 2.50 = 1,500.00
- Hillside clearing: 1 ALLOW @ 10,000.00 = 10,000.00

10.02 EARTHWORK

- Soil stockpile topsoil: 1030 CY @ 8.00 = 8,240.00
- Bulk excavation: 1440 CY @ 12.00 = 17,280.00
- Rough/fine grading: 1,200 SY @ 3.50 = 4,200.00
- Erosion control, haybales: 200 LF @ 2.00 = 400.00

10.03 SITE UTILITIES

10.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

- Paving: New bit. conc. & base (roads & plg.): 80 SY @ 17.10 = 1,368.00
- New granite curbs: 80 LF @ 22.00 = 1,760.00

10.05 PLANTING

- New Trees: 5 EA @ 750.00 = 3,750.00
- General Conditions (5%): 2,938.20
- Contingency (20%): 11,744.80

11.00 Brick Walk Restoration 35,985.31

11.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

- Remove pavement: concrete walk: 611 SY @ 12.25 = 7,573.75

11.02 EARTHWORK

- Rough/fine grading: 1,223 SY @ 3.50 = 4,277.00

11.03 SITE UTILITIES

11.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

- Walks, brick with mortar on concrete slab: 611 SY @ 16.00 = 9,776.00

11.05 PLANTING

- Seed, soil: 1,222 SY @ 2.25 = 2,749.50
- Topsoil-New: 68 CY @ 30.00 = 2,040.00
- General Conditions (5%): 2,170.81
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Severance Gleen/Rhodes Avenue Dell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,707.25</td>
<td>86,586.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: midas, plg. topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2,730.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete walks incl. base</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1,912.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading &amp; grubbling</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1,442.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>866.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1,284.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2,943.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>29,845.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>18,750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, reapread</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,450.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,553.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Tupelo Point/Schneider Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tupelo Point restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Campus Study Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,378,590.00</td>
<td>10,378,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Study Center Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>9,435,000.00</td>
<td>9,435,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>943,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Restoration of Music Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,970,000.00</td>
<td>2,970,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration of Music Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>2,700,000.00</td>
<td>2,700,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Restoration of Billings Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,344,600.00</td>
<td>3,344,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration of Billings Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>3,040,000.00</td>
<td>3,040,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Munster Hall Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape/ Courtyard Restoration &amp; HC Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Contingency (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Peabody Hill and Davis Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211,577.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>4,120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. face only</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1,980.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, soiltop &amp; topsoil</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>680.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4,380.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2,222.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, hydrasites</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving, Repaved - blk. conc. only (roads &amp; pkg.)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>6,480.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>37,980.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete retaining</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>22,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stairs, concrete</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstal granite curbs</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>740.00</td>
<td>56,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,460.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,852.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Green Hall Courtyard Improvements</td>
<td>$7,718.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement, roads, pkg., topsoil &amp; base</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4,590.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2,730.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstal granite curbs</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1,560.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA, Access walk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1,755.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,339.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,235.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Academic Quad Jewett Hill Ramp Area</td>
<td>$162,460.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement, roads, pkg., topsoil &amp; base</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7,470.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement, roads, pkg., topsoil only</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2,059.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5,450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5,002.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>675.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, soilsep topsoil</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3,955.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaved - bl. conc only (roads &amp; plg.)</td>
<td>470 SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>3,807.00</td>
<td>3,807.00</td>
<td>3,807.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>250 SY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
<td>11,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstat granite curbs</td>
<td>980 LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>11,760.00</td>
<td>11,760.00</td>
<td>11,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA: Access walks to Quad</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>40 EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>1,000 SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil/topdressed</td>
<td>10 CY</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,466.40</td>
<td>6,466.40</td>
<td>6,466.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,993.60</td>
<td>25,993.60</td>
<td>25,993.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical connection for light poles</td>
<td>6 EA</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjust drainage structures</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>Hazard Quad Area Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,789.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>COURTYARD IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,942.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg, blt conc &amp; base</td>
<td>220 SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1,980.00</td>
<td>1,980.00</td>
<td>1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg, topcoat only</td>
<td>825 SY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6,600.00</td>
<td>6,600.00</td>
<td>6,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete walks</td>
<td>1,270 SF</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1,587.50</td>
<td>1,587.50</td>
<td>1,587.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove concrete curbs</td>
<td>900 LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>870 LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,740.00</td>
<td>1,740.00</td>
<td>1,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective pruning of existing trees</td>
<td>20 EA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective pruning of existing shrubs</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove existing fence</td>
<td>80 LF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove bicycle racks</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove and store irrigation</td>
<td>20,440 SF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5,110.00</td>
<td>5,110.00</td>
<td>5,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,786.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil, 6’ depth</td>
<td>190 CY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>685.00</td>
<td>685.00</td>
<td>685.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>252 CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3,024.00</td>
<td>3,024.00</td>
<td>3,024.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>1,130 SY</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4,520.00</td>
<td>4,520.00</td>
<td>4,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut and fill to new seawall</td>
<td>75 CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light poles</td>
<td>6 EA</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical connection for light poles</td>
<td>6 EA</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjust drainage structures</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,856.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: new bltuminous concrete top coat</td>
<td>625 SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5,625.00</td>
<td>5,625.00</td>
<td>5,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: new bltuminous conc pavement and base</td>
<td>115 SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>1,986.50</td>
<td>1,986.50</td>
<td>1,986.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: new brick walks w/concrete base</td>
<td>1,010 SF</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>14,140.00</td>
<td>14,140.00</td>
<td>14,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: repair terra cotta tiles in arcade</td>
<td>435 SF</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3,480.00</td>
<td>3,480.00</td>
<td>3,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: repair damaged brick walkways</td>
<td>1,170 SF</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7,020.00</td>
<td>7,020.00</td>
<td>7,020.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granite curbs</td>
<td>1,465 LF</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>28,235.00</td>
<td>28,235.00</td>
<td>28,235.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking lot striping (HC)</td>
<td>40 LF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone sitting wall</td>
<td>80 LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New bicycle racks</td>
<td>12 EA</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painting, Miscellaneous doors etc.</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,457.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous shade trees, 4’ caliber</td>
<td>16 EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrub planting</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore lawn areas, seed</td>
<td>70 SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>157.50</td>
<td>157.50</td>
<td>157.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 21.2.00 ROUTE 135 ENTRANCE COURT IMPROVEMENTS

#### 21.2.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove plant: verge, phyto, conc. &amp; reuse base</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$4,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove pavement: concrete walk and base</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove concrete curb</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1,487.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree removals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub removals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective pruning of existing yew hedges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective pruning of foundation shrubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and grub lawn areas</td>
<td>30,360</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$15,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2,060.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $31,292.00

#### 21.2.02 EARTHWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New lawn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$30.26</td>
<td>$453.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $450.00

#### 21.2.03 SITE UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building layout at entry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical connection for lights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $7,000.00

#### 21.2.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paving: new bituminous concrete route base</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
<td>$10,582.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite curb</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$11,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving: miscellaneous routes etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $22,337.00

#### 21.2.05 PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous shade trees, 4&quot; caliper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sod at center lawn panel</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$68,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove lawn areas, soil</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$6,131.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implantation at lawn panel only</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$110,840.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $80,011.25

**Route 135 Entrance Court Improvements Total:** $82,348.25

#### 21.3.00 EAST SERVICE AREA IMPROVEMENTS

#### 21.3.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, phyto, conc. &amp; base</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$2,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, topsoil only</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove pavement: bituminous conc. walk</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
<td>$711.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove concrete stepped walkway</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective pruning of existing shrubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective pruning of existing trees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree removals, 6&quot; caliper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $17,205.00

#### 21.3.02 EARTHWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk excavation at walk</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$1,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel/stone grading</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap erosion of steep bank</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1,920.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $4,300.00

#### 21.3.03 SITE UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light poles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical connection for light poles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $6,500.00

#### 21.3.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

**Total:** $42,350.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement: new bituminous concrete top coat</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstall granite curbs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granite curbs</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$16,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$2,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stepped walkway, concrete</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$10,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.3.05 PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$3,048.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.3.05 EAST SERVICE AREA IMPROVEMENTS

21.4.00 WEST SERVICE AREA IMPROVEMENTS

21.4.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$11,205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.4.03 SITE UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.4.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

21.4.05 PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$708.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.6.00 SOUTH SLOPE IMPROVEMENTS

21.5.01 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46,320</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$11,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1,480.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.5.02 EARTHWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.5.03 SITE UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.5.04 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.00 Close Route 135 Entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>Athletic Center Parking Deck (200 spaces)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Center Parking Deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Tennis Courts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Alumnae Valley Area Landscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement; roads, plkg. topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>17,960</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement; roads, plkg. topcoat only</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement; concrete walks</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement; concrete slabs</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement; tennis courts</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree removal</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>13,355</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove concrete w/brick walls</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stolpcte topsoil</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughline grading</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control</td>
<td>1 ALLOW</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving; New bit. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; plkg.)</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving; Repaved - bit. conc. &amp; only (roads &amp; plkg.)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving; Concrete terrace</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stairs, concrete</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstall granite curbs</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting; Street</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete staining</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Hill Wall &amp; Ramp</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conc. stairs @ Athletic Hill Wall</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New trees</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>Alumnae Valley Parking Deck (302 spaces)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>Performance Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>Alumnae Hall Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumnae Hall Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-use/Events Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>Portal building/Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portal Building/Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>Visitor/Information Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor/Information Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>Cliffside/Lake House Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. topsoil &amp; basm.</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, plg. topsoil only</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove &amp; store granite curbs</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree removals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree protection</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove existing concrete walls (18&quot; thick)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demo, brk garage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolt excavation</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughinive grading</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>SY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, haybales</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Site Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>Paving: New blt. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; pkg.)</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>10,602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaved - blt conc only (roads &amp; pkg.)</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>22,923.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>49,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstal granite curbs</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pkg. lot striping</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New walls (18&quot; thick)</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>250.50</td>
<td>115,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New stair and concrete walk to Lake House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New stair to replace brass stair</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>11,970.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,533.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69,802.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tower Hall Courtyard Renovation HC Access

- **Total:** 600,900.00

### Demolition and Site Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.01</td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, pkg. topcoat &amp; base</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove pavement: roads, pkg. topcoat only</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1,134.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>53,257.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Earthwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>Strip, stn-in-stn topsoil</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>31,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughfront grading</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>16,135.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>Storm system extension</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catch basins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical system extension</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>Paving: New blt. conc. &amp; base (roads &amp; pkg.)</td>
<td>136,066</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>2,165,988.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving: Repaved - blt conc only (roads &amp; pkg.)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1,548.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls, concrete</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>107,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stairs, concrete</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New granite curbs</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>77,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway striping</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pkg. lot striping</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1,179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting: Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Softball field (55,000 sf)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>168,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, lawn</td>
<td>17,780</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>40,005.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, reseeded</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation of fields</td>
<td>554,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>415,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Pruning, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183,269.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>745,159.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>Kochane Sports Center: Tennis Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>11,100,000.00</td>
<td>8,880,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kochane Sports Center: Tennis Pavilion, Landscape Allowance (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>888,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>West Campus Athletic Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing &amp; grubbing</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>405,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.02</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip, stockpile topsoil</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>240,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk excavation</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>720,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rough/fine grading</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>630,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion control, haybales</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>SITE UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks, concrete</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>10,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting, Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>54,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Remediation @ Paint Shop Pond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field hockey field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>127,320.00</td>
<td>254,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>235,320.00</td>
<td>235,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer field and track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>885,320.00</td>
<td>885,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-purpose field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>466,200.00</td>
<td>466,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, reseeded</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil, new</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>678,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>505,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Conditions (%):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>573,596.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,294,206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>Lake Edge Restoration</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>213,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 213,750.00
12 October 2020

President Diana Walsh
Wellesley College
106 Central Street
Wellesley, MA 02181

Dear President Walsh,

Last weekend I stopped by the campus to see the changes brought about by the 1998 Landscape Master Plan; it seems like only yesterday that it was finished! My last visit was several years ago, and I wanted to check on your continuing progress. Again, I want to congratulate you on the exceptional accomplishment of raising the money to complete the ambitious but vital project. Back in the late 1990s, approximately $55 million seemed like so much money—which it was in many ways! The significance of the Wellesley College landscape to your alumnae is reflected in their generosity.

My visit started by entering the campus from Route 16, at the newly restored East Lodge entrance. This entry makes Wellesley’s impressive history again a part of the act of arrival, and having the East Lodge gatehouse functioning again establishes an immediate connection to Wellesley’s extraordinary architectural heritage. (I had almost forgotten what architectural gems East Lodge and West Lodge are.) As soon as I passed East Lodge, I saw Merrill Hall’s beautiful new dormitory, designed almost twenty years ago now. The new dormitory complex combines so well with Bates and McAfee to create a veiled entry building, and the courtyard garden follows in the great tradition of residential courtyards at Wellesley.

Turning to the left on the new alignment of College Road, it is hard to imagine that the road was not always there, with its long and welcoming vista of Lake Waban that actively engages the lake as a key element in the arrival sequence. Remember the ambiguity at the moment of arrival, as experienced with the old Route 16 entry? I was most excited to pass Stone Davis and see the tall grasses and wildflowers of the enlarged meadows in front of the Science Center. Your commitment to the meadow restoration in 1998 was critical in establishing these crucial open spaces on campus and counteracting the suburban sameness that was slowly eroding portions of Wellesley’s remarkable landscape legacy. Of course, having College Road turn once again toward the Chapel now seems so natural that it is hard to believe that it used to skirt the center of campus. (I can only surmise that this misguided decision came at a time when people began to lose an understanding of the relationship between daily physical experiences and a strong sense of place and community.) At that moment I remember being lost the first time I visited the campus back in 1997. What felt like such a controversial change has so improved the ambiance and safety of the campus—and its presentation to the public—that it seems remarkable that we worried so much about it. Of additional benefit, with this new alignment of College Road, potential students and other visitors are properly introduced to the organization and the beauty of the campus. Now as before they are a given glimpse of Severence Green and the Dell, not to mention the Library and the Academic Quad. Remember how, with the old 1960s road alignment, the Science Center seemed like the only important building on campus, as the road focused on it for so long as part of the arrival sequence? The resulting confusion of whether you were at Wellesley College at all has been completely alleviated.

While on campus, I noticed that cars were driving more slowly on College Road as a result of the tighter curves of the realigned road. I remember how in the fall of 1997, two students were almost killed by speeding cars cutting through the campus, incidents that helped convince the Committee to change the road to the safer, slower, more circuitous alignment.

As I made the turn in College Road and passed below Green Hall, it was helpful to see the Science Center again as part of this new movement sequence and to understand how close the Science Center is to Wellesley’s historic academic core. I also noticed that the turn accommodated a big Fine Arts Express trailer that was headed over to the Davis Museum. (By the way, Matt Urbanski’s 1998 Master Plan proposal to veil the front of the Science Center with new groves of native trees between the stair towers succeeded in nicely de-emphasizing that building’s violation of Olmsted’s principle of not building in the valleys. The new trees create their own hillside-like grove and make the building feel more integrated into the landscape, similar to the other buildings on campus.)

As I continued along College Road, and passed the bottom of the Pendelton Ramp, it was amazing to come upon the hillside on the left draped with the new planting of tall native trees and understory plants, with a carpet of New England wildflowers and ferns below. The fall foliage and red seed heads of false Solomon’s seal, plus the fading pale yellow foliage of hsy-devoured fern evoked the feeling of “cultivated nature” recommended in the 1998 Master Plan as an historically responsive antidote to the suburban feeling that had settled over that part of the campus. It was rewarding to notice how well this band of trees (extending all the way to the edge of the Davis Museum loading dock) effectively knits the Davis into the larger campus landscape, a problem that seemed almost too hard to solve back in the 1990s.

Of course, my greatest delight was to note the transformation of the valley in front of Alumnae Hall—restored to a landscape and re-joining the campus to Lake Waban. Alumnae Hall and the New Theater looked majestic with the open valley landscape on the Lake Waban side, replacing the sea of cars that had marred this area for decades. The new parking garage tucked into the small hillside at the end of the Power Plant, and the beautiful pedestrian connector that carries people across the front of the Power Plant to the base of the Davis Museum, nicely mitigates the overly functional feel the Plant had before. It is gratifying to observe how well the parking structure succeeds in being almost invisible, despite its capacity to hold the 300 cars relocated from the former Service Lot, from around the Chapel lawn, and from the Jewett Ramp.

The decision to create a new Theater / Performance Building integrated within this new parking structure next to the Power Plant seems to have achieved our goal of adding life to an area of campus that used to feel empty and forgotten. Alumnae Hall and the new Parking / Theater complex now work as a performing arts area—connecting the academic core on Norumbega Hill with the Davis Museum and making a nice transition to the adjacent athletic complex. It is hard to remember that in the 1990s, the underutilized Alumnae Hall was not held in the high esteem with which it is now regarded by alumnae and students; the restoration is exceptional.

The extension of College Road past the front of Alumnae Hall and up the hill to the playing fields seemed so radical in 1998 and everyone was right: some fine civil engineering was needed to traverse
the topography between Alumnae Hall and the Field House. But the new road alignment worked out even better than we had imagined. As I drove up the hill, students were walking on the well lighted path along the side of the road, and the whole athletic area felt vitally connected with the rest of the campus.

At the top of the hill, I realized that I had already passed the new Alumnae Parking Structure outside Alumnae Hall. The enveloping landscape in front of the parking structure apparently did a more than adequate job of obscuring the structure that was embedded into the grade where the old gravel pit existed before. (I think I saw Professor Ferguson jogging back from his swim at the recreational facility. It is so fortunate for Wellesley that he has not yet retired!)

Almost as rewarding as the restoration of the Alumnae Valley to a green landscape was seeing the greatly expanded varsity and intramural playing fields on the old Paint Shop Pond site. The Field House and these new playing fields are a world class facility. How fortunate that the mitigation of this hazardous site could also address the need for more playing fields that was such a pressing concern in 1998. The cost of the Paint Shop Pond mitigation was daunting indeed, but Wellesley gained needed recreational space for the long term. It also will be part of Wellesley's legacy that you were inventive in recreating wetlands and using new plantings of trees that are both visually attractive and valuable as wildlife habitats in this part of campus.

I parked in the new 300-car surface parking lot near the West Lodge entrance by Route 135. A generous canopy of relatively young trees shaded the car. Since it was Parents' Weekend, the lot was nearly full, probably because no one ever parks on the meadows anymore. Back in 1998 it seemed so radical to ban parking on the Science Center meadows, but how sensible a decision in retrospect!

The new grove of trees around West Lodge foils the presence of the end of the Field House, creating a truly pleasant arrival space from Route 135. The new campus signage by H Plus now provides clear and reliable directional information. I found myself noting how appropriate it was that one of the main entrances to Wellesley presented an image of the campus that combines the historic presence of West Lodge with a thoroughly modern vision of the new playing fields.

Because we had focused on the pedestrian experience in 1998, I decided to take a walking tour of the campus. I walked down the new stairs by Alumnae Hall that form part of the masonry wall of the extension of College Road at the end of the Field House. The top of this stair framed a magnificent panorama from the Stone Tower of Green Hall across Alumnae Valley. This vantage point reveals Olmsted's vision of how Wellesley's valley, although highly irregular in their topographic forms, create a remarkable series of open spaces that truly are the essence of the campus landscape. These views deserve protection in perpetuity, and we have made a good start.

Descending the new stairs into Alumnae Valley, I strolled to the edge of Lake Waban and noticed several red-winged blackbirds in the reclamed marsh inlet that we built at the mouth of the valley. As I approached the beach, I realized that Julie Messervy was right: a smaller grass beach is much more appropriate than the old sand. The entire riparian edge of Lake Waban appears to have been restored. What a desperately needed transformation! As I looked back to the Paint Shop Pond area from the edge of Lake Waban, the new dense groves of trees were effective in veiling the complex of playing fields.

Next, I climbed up the hill to Tower Court to see the restored Fletcher Steele Garden which was spectacular. The flower borders had thick plantings of New England asters and Nippon daisies, both still blooming profusely in October. Passing down the terraced steps toward the Library, it was especially rewarding to see the restored brick path leading past the library all the way to the College Club—embodying the Master Plan proposal to reaffirm the diversity of Wellesley's historic paving materials.

The new Campus Center (tucked behind and adjacent to the former Schneider Center) almost caught me by surprise. Although this site is not on a hilltop (too bad one was not available in the center of campus!), I think Olmsted would have appreciated our decision to use the Schneider Center and the Chapel to nestle this rather substantial structure into the campus. I also applaud your international search to hire such an insightful architect to design this especially fine example of contemporary architecture. I particularly liked the way the architect resolved the external cladding of the building to complement the broad stylistic range of adjacent buildings. How great, also, to find the front of the Chapel not hemmed in with parked cars. Instead, the relatively slow pace of cars passing along the nearby edge of College Road presents a civilized mix of pedestrians and cars in one space.

Walking over to the Science Center, it was gratifying to see this area of campus not jampacked with parked cars. The new parking structure, built into the side of Water Tower Hill, was a triumph of careful site planning, using the plantings on rooftops to counterbalance the strong but understated modern architecture that provided space for 450 cars! Remember Grey Lot from the late 1950s, wasn't it a sad site? Who would guess today that this wonderful turf lawn, which now works as a landscape lantern—letting sunlight filter into this dark part of the campus—was an ugly parking lot only twenty years ago? And weren't we fortunate that the cave for the hemlock-threatening woody adelgid was found, and all those Hemlock trees were not lost along Christmas Tree Alley as we feared might happen?

I doubled back to visit the Academic Quadrangle; it was great to see all the newer trees mingled with the much older trees. The new ADA-compliant wheelchair access to the Quadrangle was also welcomed. As I walked around Green Hall, it was nice to note the modest simplicity of the courtyard without cars that faces east and offers a welcoming greeting to prospective students as they arrive. I paused to savor the improved level of landscape maintenance that resulted from the (was it as many as eight?) people that were added to Patrick Willoughby's staff.

By the time I left the Quadrangle, evening had arrived, and the new lights with their better color rendering lit the campus with a safer and songlining halo. The wash of light that gently made visible the face of the Library and the surface of Stone Tower was majestic indeed. I walked through the new landscape of the Alumnae Valley, feeling confident that we met the challenge of revitalizing Wellesley's great landscape legacy.

While the 1998 Master Plan was in process, the question came up of whether the plan was mostly a restoration plan, or something else. Upon reflection it seems to me that the best term that describes our recommendations is to refer to the '98 plan as a plan for the Renewal of the Wellesley campus. We all agreed that the genius of the campus form and spirit extends directly from Olmsted's 1902 recommendations to President Caroline Hazard to make a campus that built upon the complexity, diversity, and subtlety of the natural landscape. This respect for "found site conditions" eventually resulted in a campus decidedly unlike most other American collegiate environments. The condition of the campus in 1995— in some places quite beautiful and in other places quite eroded—required us to recommend a renewal process that was sometimes almost purely restoration (such as the edge of Lake Waban and the remaking of Alumnae Valley), while at other times the changes were historical hybrids
of sorts (such as the road alignments), which restored the two historical campus entrances and also segments of the pre-1960 College Road but combined these with other design decisions that were driven by contemporary concerns. This type of hybrid recommendation grew out of timeless concerns, such as the virtue of beautiful, simple, and clear entrances, plus our desire to reinvigorate the more general way that roads and our movements along roads work in complex and multivalent ways: to reveal the structure of a community, to present for our enjoyment the landscape and the architecture of the campus, and to emphasize the importance of safety. Our 1998 attitude about the road (unlike the 1960s realignment of College Road through the meadow edge) was not to shun the automobile, but to appropriately embrace it while realigning the roads to calm the sometimes dangerous speed of cars on the campus roads in the 1990s.

The need to collect and store cars in parking structures, which in 1998 were lined up and tucked in every road edge and nook and cranny on campus, was our reconciliation of the present dependency on cars with the romantic traditions of the past. To achieve a more historically grounded feel on the campus required us to propose our most contemporary Master Plan decision: to park cars in structures and to make the campus both safer (by removing the congestion or parked cars) and more beautiful (by re-opening the sight lines into the campus from places like the Jewett Ramp).

So in the end, the campus renewal that grew out of the 1998 Master Plan has added to the reading of the Wellesley Campus as a palimpsest, with some pieces of the campus surviving intact from the 1800s, others being restored, others being slightly modified, and other parts being completely new. Compared to the late 1990s, the campus in 2020 is far more pedestrian oriented, far less dominated by parked cars, and much more cohesive. The higher level of maintenance and the newly established landscape maintenance endowment also has improved the feeling of the level of care on campus from twenty years ago.

I am confident that the careful but flexible reading of the campus that guided the 1998 Master Plan, based on the exigencies of our times and tempered by the complexity of understanding landscape as a dynamic condition, belongs with the same set of ideals that motivated Olmsted and the creators of the 1921 Master Plan. Their plan—and ours—advocates an irregular and complex campus form that is based on a reading of existing strengths of the landscape rather than imposing an ideology from some other place. Hopefully, you are as rewarded by the results as we are. It has been a pleasure and great fun to recapture the evocative resonance of the campus landscape and its poetry.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Van Valkenburgh

cc: Matthew Urbanski
Ellen Gill Miller