

April 18, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the April 5, 2005 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, Michael Fifield, Gregg Lobisser, Randall McGowan, Gordon Melby, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey, Robert Ribe, Michael Stamm,  
Greg Stripp, Christine Theodoropoulos

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: **Campus Planning Committee Enabling Legislation - Proposed Revisions  
Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Proposed  
Revisions**

**1. Campus Planning Committee (CPC) Enabling Legislation - Proposed Revisions**

Background: All members were given a copy of the proposed revisions to the CPC Enabling Legislation that were submitted to the CPC chair and staff April 4, 2005 by the University Senate president Andrew Marcus. The proposed revisions are as follows:

“(1) As part of its reporting duties to the University Senate, the Campus Planning Committee will provide an oral report to the Senate in the autumn on progress on major projects over the previous year and a look forward to significant projects that are anticipated

or under consideration. Major projects are defined as those projects requiring authorization from the legislature via the Capital Construction Budget Request or the Emergency Board;

(2) A faculty member of the University Senate will be appointed by the Senate President to a one-year term as a voting member to the Campus Planning Committee. This member will inform the Senate of projects that do not meet the threshold of appearing on the Capital Construction Budget Request, but which might be of interest to the university community.

(3) The Senate will receive announcements regarding Campus Planning Committee meetings and public forums where major projects are being reviewed.”

The University Senate is seeking the CPC’s input prior to presenting the proposed revisions as motions to the University Senate on April 13, 2005.

Chris Ramey explained that the proposed revisions originate from the University Senate’s desire to establish a better link to the CPC. Members of the University Senate expressed an interest in making the revisions in response to a presentation about the draft updated Campus Plan at their March 9, 2005 meeting. The proposed revisions were discussed in greater detail at a follow-up Senate Executive Committee meeting.

Chris said an additional motion will be proposed at the same time to address the University Senate’s interest in hearing about proposed capital projects as early as possible to avoid last minute surprises and concerns. The motion requests the Provost to report to the University Senate on major intended project(s) at the earliest date that is reasonable and always prior to seeking authorization for funding of capital construction projects.

The CPC chair apologized for the lack of advance notice for this agenda item. The short time frame made it impossible to do so. She added that the committee has the option to vote to delay action and take time to discuss the matter at a later meeting.

Discussion: A member said the effort to better link the CPC to the regular committee structure of faculty governance began a few years ago. At that time the University Senate amended the CPC's enabling legislation so that the CPC would be required to report to both the Administration (the President) and the University Senate.

A member said the proposed oral report requirement would be the responsibility of the chair. If the chair does not object, then the committee should not.

A member said he sees no harm in the proposed changes; in fact they are beneficial because they will lead to a broader discussion of planning issues on campus. A member added that the changes might diffuse controversial issues and put some of the responsibility on the University Senate.

A member said it might be difficult to define "major projects." Notification should be given to the University Senate about all projects.

A member said the motion requesting reports from the Provost may help address the CPC's concerns about when and how projects are initiated.

Chris confirmed that the proposed motions do not conflict with the student-funded construction project authorization process. The University Senate will not have a decision-making role.

Action: The Campus Planning Committee voted unanimously to accept the three motions to revise the CPC Enabling Legislation proposed by the University Senate. The CPC suggests that the third motion be revised to read as follows: "(3) The Senate will receive announcements regarding Campus Planning Committee meetings and public forums where ~~major~~ projects are being reviewed." This CPC vote of support is given with the understanding that it will have the opportunity to review any subsequent changes to the proposed motions.

## **2. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Proposed Revisions**

Background: The committee continued its review of the draft version of the Campus Plan. Staff described the draft plan's proposed changes as outlined in the *Summary of Proposed Revisions*

provided in the February 22, 2005 meeting mailing. She asked for committee feedback.

Staff clarified that the “Patterns” section will be reviewed at a later meeting.

Discussion: Members made the following comments and suggestions about the draft Campus Plan:

- Ensure that the percentage of open-space improvements included in the open-space enhancement requirements are appropriate. Chris said the required percentage of open-space improvements was based upon past projects researched during the East Campus Development Policy Update. He added that it would be possible to look at a few more recent projects (e.g., the Living-Learning Center) to test open-space enhancement requirements.
- Research ways to strengthen the requirement for individual projects to contribute to campus-wide infrastructure improvements. Encourage Facilities Services to be more proactive by identifying and requiring long-term improvements.
- The proposed design areas oriented around the open spaces work well.
- Design Area D: Science and Oregon Hall may be too isolated, but an alternate solution is not evident.
- Address edge issues as discussed at a prior meeting.
- Establishing maximum densities is essential and the “desired” densities are a helpful tool.
- Proposed density increases are appropriate.
- Specify that the Classroom Committee has jurisdiction over general-pool classrooms.
- Clarify that there are other areas used as “outdoor” classrooms in addition to those shown on the Outdoor Classrooms map that merit protection and preservation.
- Describe unique outdoor use situations (e.g., the Longhouse sacred ground, and the outdoor play areas at the children’s centers).
- Change the transportation policy text to state that the university is responsible for providing “reasonable levels of” instead of “adequate” affordable parking for students, faculty, and visitors.

Action: No formal action was required. The committee’s comments will be taken into consideration when preparing the final version of the document.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning