



January 23, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Clare Kurth, Campus Planning  
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the January 06, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Deborah Butler, Liska Chan, Janell Cottam, Emily Eng, Amber Geiger, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Diana Libuda, Taliek Lopez-DuBoff, Taylor McHolm, Kevin Reed, Janet Rose, Hal Sadofsk, Amy Salmore, Owen Speigel, Philip Speranza

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), Brian Boram (Rowell Brokaw), Colin Brennan (CPFM), Tom Driscoll (Dinning Services), Jamie Moffit (VPFA), Prissila Moreno (ASUO), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (UO Communications)

**CPC Agenda**

**1. Campus Planning Committee – New Member Welcome**

Background: Jamie Moffitt (VPFA) welcomed new members and thanked members for their service and work on the committee.

Action: No formal action was requested.

**2. Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal for Non-Standard Signage for the Next Generation Housing Phase 1 Residence Hall**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the request for non-standard

signage for the Next Generation Housing Phase 1 Residence Hall. This proposal included three unique signage proposals for three separate dining venues operated by UO Dining Services.

CPC Staff reviewed the project history, the UO *Outdoor Sign Plan* review criteria, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw) discussed the proposed signage for each dining venue within the Next Generation Phase 1 Residence Hall dining venue and the unique justification for the signage due to the outdoor entrances for each venue unlike other dining venues on campus. Andrejko shared general information about the project location, sign materials, overall themes for each dining venue, and design details. The dining venues and the proposed signage were discussed as an important element to engage the Next Generation Residence Hall Phase 2 and the proposed adjacent open spaces. The design considers how future changes to the dining venues will allow for ease in changing signs if needed.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Chris Andrejko, Brian Boram (Rowell Brokaw), Tom Driscoll (Dinning Services), Michael Griffel (Housing), and Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning):

- Member: What are the dimensions the sign will project from the building and what is the design of the light element of the sign?
  - Andrejko: The signs will project a few inches from the wall, and the light element will be a light box style sign.
  
- Member: Are these UO vendors or outside vendors for the dining venues?
  - Driscoll: The concept is to feel like outside vendors, but these will be self-operated by UO Dining Services.
  
- Member: These venues seem to have a heavy theme element. What is the cost and likelihood of interior elements that can be reused if the venue changes?
  - Driscoll: The cost will likely be minimal and is considered a cost of doing business.
  - Andrejko: The signs and details are designed to be easily changed if the venue themes change in the future.
  
- Member: Is there a precedent for this type of signage on campus and would this be future precedent for signage at other buildings on campus?
  - Griffel: The justification for this signage is because of the distance of this dining from the campus core, efforts to establish a neighborhood and community feel in this space, and to attract students to this space who typically travel away from this site rather than toward this site. Non-standard signage is reviewed on a case-by-case basis. This project cannot speak to future precedent or projects.
  - Olsen: There is an example at the Duck's House that has some exterior

facing signage, although not as strongly as this proposal. The *Campus Sign Plan* does not allow commercial signage, such as the external vendors in the EMU.

- Member: Consider that there is a distinction between commercial vendors and UO dining service vendors. What is the effect of these specific vendors in creating a commercial look and feel on the campus edge?
  - Olsen: The commercial signage restriction is related to legal reasons for advertising on campus.
  - Member: The main reason is the legal reason and the free speech realm and controlling speech on campus that has been discussed with General Counsel.
- Member: Overall support of the signage and the look and feel the design is attempting to create, but asks for clarification on the difference between signage for contracted commercial vendors versus UO Dining Services.
  - Driscoll: UO Dining services is a self-operated, self-funded auxiliary service and is not for profit.
  - Olsen: Dining Services is a UO Department, which is the difference regarding the Sign Plan. There is an opportunity to review non-standard signage on campus related to UO departments, but commercial signage is prohibited.
  - Member: The sign plan aims to help balance limiting signage and sign clutter while also allowing necessary signage. Campus Planning does acknowledge the challenge for contracted commercial vendors.
- Member: Asked for clarification on how this site is affected by students' travel patterns compared to other dining venues on campus.
  - Griffel: Everyone is welcome; community is welcome to use these dining venues. Most students live north of this site and travel away and toward the campus core. This signage helps encourage students to travel towards these dining venues.
- Member: Consider that other UO departments on the edges of campus are held to a higher standard on UO branding guidelines and signage. Is there enough UO branding incorporated in the proposed signage?
- Member: What are the limits on the signage?
  - Olsen: The signage is required to follow the City of Eugene code where the Government Office (GO) signage standards apply. There are no limits within the UO Campus Sign Plan. The signs would generally follow the design plans presented.
  - Griffel: What is being presented is generally what the signs will be.

- Olsen: What is being presented is the general design. There may be minor adjustments, but no major modification to size or location.
- Member: When there is new signage, is it the committee's responsibility to review?
  - Olsen: Yes, any non-standard signage is to be reviewed by this committee.
- Member: This is a residential edge of campus, not commercial. Consider the impacts on the adjacent residential areas. Is there a precedent for allowing an exception to existing signage standards?
  - Griffel: Consider the commercial area near 19<sup>th</sup> Ave and Agate St, where Prince Puckler's is located, where commercial businesses are in a residential neighborhood. There is no precedent for signage since each sign proposal is determined on an individual case-by-case basis. This sign proposal seeks to create a special neighborhood experience.
  - Member: Another example of this is the Financial Wellness Center Sign on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave (Global Scholars Hall) that is also located near a residential neighborhood.
- Member: Consider the context of the open space and area of campus immediately adjacent to this project site that the design is trying to create. Expresses overall support for the signage, stating this seems appropriate given the context of the site.
- Member: What is the cost of not doing this? How would this be consistent, or not consistent, with Unthank Residence Hall?
  - Driscoll: The feeling of the street will be more effective in attracting students to the area and recruiting students to the campus. This helps create a cutting-edge community residential space.
- Member: There may be some confusion that the meal plan points work here if it does not look and feel like other UO dining venues. Consider other advertising options behind signage to support dining options on campus.
- Member: Word of mouth is the number one way that students learn where they can eat. Do the signs need to be exterior, or could they be more subtle?
  - Olsen/Member: Interior signs that are visible from the exterior are considered exterior signs.
- Member: Expresses support for the proposal. The sign proposals do not appear cluttered and appear to provide a cleaner environment than the sandwich boards.
- Member: Supports this signage proposal and expresses that this type of signage looks less

cluttered than sandwich boards.

Action: With 17 in favor, and 1 abstention the committee agreed that the ***Campus Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal for Non-Standard Signage for the Next Generation Housing Phase 1 Residence Hall*** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

### **3. Campus Planning Committee – Year in Review**

CPC Staff provided an overview of the 2024-2025 committee's activities and highlighted anticipated activities for the 2025-2026 academic year.

Action: No formal action was requested.