

May 4, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the April 26, 2005 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, Dietrich Belitz, Richard Linton, Gregg Lobisser,
Colin McArthur, Chris Ramey, Robert Ribe

Guests: Tim Bobosky (ODE), Jane Brubaker (Facilities Services), Meghann Cuniff (ODE),
Mike Eyster (Housing), Peter Keyes (Architecture), Lew Williams (Foundation)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

**Agenda: Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election
Long Range Campus Development Plan Update – Proposed Revisions**

1. Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election

Background: The chair announced that chair elections will be taking place at the next meeting. She encouraged anyone who is interested in serving as chair to contact staff before the next meeting. Typically, the chair is either a member who will be serving his/her second term or a new member who has previously served on the committee.

2. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update – Proposed Revisions

Background: Staff reviewed the proposed substantive revisions to the January 25, 2005 draft version of the updated Campus Plan as described in the *Summary of Proposed Revisions to the January 25, 2005 Draft Campus Plan*. She said the two items on the summary that were identified for future review will be covered at the committee's May 10, 2005 meeting.

Staff asked for committee comments and feedback.

Discussion: Committee members made the following suggestions and comments:

- Emphasize “campus as a whole” in the vision statement and throughout the document where appropriate.
- Note that it is useful for the CPC to see project information (e.g., conceptual studies) in advance of the formal review and approval process.
- Consider adding the conceptual design phase to the construction process chart.
- Support the idea that the University Planning Office will see all projects, including privately controlled and financed projects. This will include projects similar to the proposed Arena (the Arena will not be subject to the new process because it has already begun).
- Note that Facilities Services coordinates remodels as well as maintenance and interior projects.
- Consider changing the name of the document to reflect its emphasis on the planning process versus a fixed-image “plan”.
- Better identify the primary entrances and gateways in the edge descriptions and/or design area descriptions.
- Emphasize the importance of the overall quality of the edges, despite whether they are defined by open spaces, buildings, or landscape features.
- Note that university ownership on both sides of Franklin Boulevard gives an opportunity to convey the image of driving “through” rather than “by” the campus.
- Emphasize the importance of views into the campus as well as of the campus.
- Emphasize that campus edges, particularly Franklin Boulevard, should convey the university's public role, its mission, and its history.
- When defining edges, do not focus too much on specific views because unidentified views may mistakenly be excluded from consideration. For example, when describing Design Area A edges, add emphasis to the importance of all views of and into the campus. Use specific historic views as some, rather than the only, examples.
- Do not change the transportation policy refinement text requiring “adequate parking” to “reasonable level of parking” as proposed because it implies a lower level of responsibility to provide parking. [Note: This revision was suggested at the committee's April 5, 2005 meeting.]
- The need to provide parking should be more emphasized to address reduced staff productivity concerns caused by a lack of parking. Maintain the proposal to provide a

“reasonable level of parking” which implies criteria can be established to judge effectiveness. The term “adequate” implies an infinitely expanding definition of how much parking should be provided.

- Maintain an emphasis on the need to provide parking while preserving the quality of the campus and adjacent neighborhood environments and encouraging the use of alternative modes of transportation.
- Identify issues that should be considered when establishing criteria to define a “reasonable level of parking” when the Transportation Plan is updated. For example, criteria should address city policies, multi-model goals, and productivity for faculty/staff/students.

-
Action: No formal action was required.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Meghann Cuniff, ODE
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning