



February 20, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
Campus Planning and Real Estate

Subject: **Record** of the February 11, 2008 Campus Planning Committee Meeting,

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Nancy Cheng, Samantha Chirillo, Will Cooksey, Darin Dehle, Tom Driscoll, Frances Dyke, Ally Frueauf, Rich Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Chicora Martin, Kevin Nute, Briana Orr, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Greg Stripp, Donald Swain

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (University Planning)

Guests: Bob Beals (Athletics), Bob Kline (Harlow Neighbors), Gene Mowery (Campus Planning), Greg Rikhoff (Community Relations)

**Agenda:**

- **Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 1 Field Package – Meeting One**
- **Campus Heritage Landscape Plan Final Report and *Campus Plan* Amendments – Review**

**1. Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 1 Field Package – Meeting One**

Background: Bob Beals from Athletics introduced the project, which is divided into two phases to allow the project to move forward as quickly as possible. Phase 1, the Field Package, will ensure that the field and temporary structures are ready for use by February 2009. In the meantime specific program components of the larger stadium project, such as the overall capacity and amenities, are being clarified so that the second phase can follow quickly.

Gene Mowery from Campus Planning and Real Estate reviewed the project proposal as described in the meeting mailing. Supporting the student athlete experience was the primary criteria upon which the site selection was based. The firm CMGS Landscape Architects has been hired to complete Phase 1.

Gene reviewed the user group membership and applicable patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing. The pattern list is abbreviated to accommodate the off-campus site and limited scope of the project. For example, no building patterns are identified because Phase 1 does not include any permanent buildings.

Staff clarified that no formal action is required. This is an opportunity for the committee to provide input about which *Campus Plan* policies and patterns should apply to the project. Not all patterns and policies apply to track “C” off-campus projects. The committee’s comments will be considered by the Vice President for Finance and Administration when she establishes *Campus Plan* policies, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues for the Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 1 Field Package. The committee will use the identified list of applicable patterns and policies when it formally reviews the project’s schematic design.

Gene said that programming and conceptual design work for Phase 2 already is under way. Staff clarified that Phase 2 will come back to the CPC as a separate project beginning with Meeting One. This will allow the CPC to comment on broader stadium design elements.

In response to the chair’s question, staff explained that temporary structures are not subject to CPC review because they will be replaced during Phase 2, which is scheduled to proceed immediately following Phase 1. If for some reason Phase 2 is not completed in a timely manner, the CPC could request review of the “temporary” structures.

Discussion: Members made the following comments:

- Ensure that temporary Phase 1 structures meet relevant policies and patterns (e.g. universal access).
- Consider how Phase I work will fit into the larger stadium project. In particular, ensure that decisions made during Phase 1 allow the larger project to properly address edges and building design.
- When Phase 2 is initiated, expand the list of policies and patterns to address edges—how the stadium relates to Autzen Stadium and the neighborhood (MLK Jr. Blvd.), in particular building facades.
- Clarify how ticketing and stadium access will be addressed. Describe how the existing ticketing facility will tie into the new stadium.
- Be sure to address universal design even during the temporary Phase 1 stage as appropriate.
- Refine the proposed field siting taking into consideration applicable policies and patterns.
- Consider ways to integrate sustainable design concepts for the existing large gravel parking area design—e.g., integrate green landscape elements.
- Ensure that traffic flows and parking needs are handled well and modified as needed (for Autzen Stadium and the baseball stadium).
- Address traffic and parking needs from a comprehensive transportation planning perspective. Address and encourage alternate modes of transportation to meet needs. Review and modify the Autzen Stadium Transportation Demand Management Plan as needed.
- Respond to appropriate portions of Policy 2: Open-space Framework and related patterns such as Positive Outdoor Space and Outdoor Classroom. Ensure that the stadium’s design, layout, circulation pathways, etc., relate to the adjacent complex of buildings and uses.

Action: No formal action was requested. The committee’s comments will be considered by the Vice President for Finance and Administration when she establishes the *Campus Plan* policies, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues for the Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 1 Field Package.

## 2. Campus Heritage Landscape Plan Final Report and *Campus Plan* Amendments – Review

Background: Staff briefly reviewed the project's history and contents of the Campus Heritage Landscape Plan final report. She reviewed the related proposed *Campus Plan* amendments as described in the meeting mailing.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, staff confirmed that the proposed amendments were designed to help inform proposed changes to historically significant landscapes such as the proposed obelisk. Existing policies provide good direction, but the proposed amendments along with the new survey data would help clarify the intent of these policies.

In response to a member's question, staff said the project consultants suggested an amendment to the Pioneer Axis designated-open-space boundaries to better preserve the Women's Memorial Quadrangle configuration and the elliptical pathway. She said it might be possible to add this boundary change to the list of proposed policy amendments.

In response to a member's question, staff said the survey rankings assigned to buildings and landscapes (primary, secondary, tertiary, and non-contributing) are not linked directly to required policy actions. The rankings serve to describe an identified level of historic significance in order to help determine appropriate treatment strategies (preservation, rehabilitation, continuation) as described in the Campus Heritage Landscape Plan.

A member indicated overall support for the project. Another added this is an important project because the landscape is what the UO campus is known for. The plan does a good job describing the importance and history of the landscape. It will help us make informed choices.

Staff confirmed that she plans to move forward with the DPIT Subcommittee's suggestion to add cross-references to the Campus Heritage Landscape Plan final report, related amendments, and the *Campus Plan's* sustainable development policies.

Action: No formal action was required. The committee's comments will be taken into consideration as the project moves forward.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Renee Baumgartner, Athletics
- Bob Beals, Athletics
- Ken Boegli, DPS
- Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division
- Joe Giansante, Athletics
- Terri Harding, Eugene Planning
- Roger Kerrigan, Facilities Services
- Bob Kline, Harlow Neighbors
- Gene Mowery, Campus Planning
- Greg Rikhoff, Community Relations
- Gordon Sayre, English (University Senate)