



December 10, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)
From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning
Subject: **Record of the November 20, 2007 CPC Meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Nancy Cheng, Christian Cherry, Samantha Chirillo, Will Cooksey, Darin Dehle, Tom Driscoll, Frances Dyke, Michael Fifield, Ally Frueauf, Richard Linton, Chicora Martin, Randall McGowan, Garrett McSorley, Kevin Nute, Briana Orr, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey, Dale Smith, Donald Swain

Guests: Ken Boegli (DPS)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

1. Campus Planning Committee Orientation

Background: Carole Daly, chair, reviewed the responsibilities of the committee and the subcommittees as described in the mailing.

Staff presented the campus planning slide presentation and distributed the *Campus Plan* to new members. In addition, she reviewed how campus-planning documents relate to the *Campus Plan* as described in the handout.

Staff reviewed the CPC 2007-8 work plan as described in the handout.

Discussion: A member expressed concern that more projects are falling under the category of privately controlled construction projects (identified as "C" projects in the *Campus Plan* Construction Project Planning Process Flow Chart, p. 14). If this is an indication of how future projects will be handled, the member questioned how the CPC could be more effective.

In response to this question, Frances Dyke, Vice President for Finance and Administration and CPC member, asked other CPC members if they thought CPC review of the Academic Learning Center (ALC) was effective. Members said the project's site, patterns, and policies were established before CPC involvement; therefore, the design team was not as open to the CPC's feedback. The CPC provided a series of recommendations, not conditions; it is not known if the

UNIVERSITY PLANNING OFFICE

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 www.uoregon.edu/~uplan

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

designers have addressed them.

A member said it is beneficial to have CPC input in all projects to ensure that broader campus-wide issues and opportunities are addressed. For example, the university has a great opportunity to establish a new gateway and public front on the east side of campus. Part of this opportunity may have been lost with the ALC project due to minimal CPC involvement. Many members are concerned that the potential to address this opportunity as part of the Arena project will be lost as well. Staff confirmed that the president established a planning process for the Arena project prior to the 2005 *Campus Plan* adoption. It is a privately managed project outside state-approved campus boundaries. The CPC will have an opportunity to comment but not to engage in formal review.

A member said early CPC input about potential project sites, particularly before donor involvement, is beneficial. A member added that the planning process must allow for meaningful input. This requires proper timing for input and a clear response mechanism. A member said the *Campus Plan's* category "B" planning process has been used for quite some time and is working well. It is important to follow this path for projects whenever possible.

A member suggested spending more time defining desired characteristics of the campus's open spaces, in particular gateways, to plan for future development. Chris Ramey, Associate Vice President for Campus Planning and Real Estate and CPC member, said he has requested additional staffing to allow time for this type of proactive planning. Ideally, sub-plans for campus areas could be prepared as well.

A member said the new provost has a strong interest in the planning process.

In response to a question, a member said the Baseball Stadium project would be a category "C" project because, while the proposed site is on university-owned land, it is not within the state-approved campus boundaries. The first step in the planning process will be for the CPC to help determine which *Campus Plan* policies and patterns apply.

Staff confirmed that the proposed Hayward Field Wind Screens project has not moved forward. If plans change, the project would come back to the CPC for review.

Action: No formal action was required.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Ken Boegli, DPS
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division
Greg Rikhoff, Community Relations
Gordon Sayre, English (University Senate)
Phil Weiler, Media Relations