



October 13, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning  
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the October 3, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (Chair), Deborah Butler, Bob Choquette, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Amy Kalani, Moira Kiltie, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Kevin Reed, Janet Rose, Avi Shugar, Philip Speranza, Lauren Stanfield

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Laura Babiak (Community Member), Arthur Bryant (Bailey Glasser), Hunter Carey (Student), James Crepea (Oregon Live), Ravi Cullop (ASUO), Jason Dillard (Intercollegiate Athletics), Larissa Ennis (University Advancement), Lucy George (Community Member), Trisha Heffner (Community Member), Luke Helm (CPFM), Delaney Hopen (Community Member), Valerie Johnson (Athletics), Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services), Vignesh Madmavah (Polymath Studio), Johnny Media (Daily Emerald), Jennifer Middleton (Community Member), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Evan Reynolds (Community Member), Alicia Santiago (Daily Emerald), Ashley Schroeder (Student), Lori Schroeder (Community Member), Angela Seydel (University Communications), Devon Shea (Athletics), Lauren Stark (Student), Cami Thompson (University Advancement), Jason Wade (UOPD)

## CPC Agenda

CPC staff shared that the 2023-24 CPC Chair election will be held at the next meeting.

### **1. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Biennial Capacity Plan and Framework Vision Project for the Northeast Campus, Northeast Central Campus, Academic Center and Historic Core, and Southwest Campus Design Areas – Public Hearing and Action**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold a public hearing for the proposed amendment to the *Campus Plan* related to integrating Biennial Capacity Plan and Framework Vision Project recommendations into the Northeast Campus, Northeast Central Campus, Academic Center and Historic Core, and Southwest Campus Design Areas.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The CPC chair, Ken Kato, explained that a public hearing is a formal step to open the agenda item to the public for comments.

Public Hearing:

Public guests were invited to indicate if they were present in the room or on Zoom to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair, Ken Kato, opened the public hearing and invited any members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment portion of this meeting was closed, and the committee reviewed the final draft of the proposed amendment and took action.

CPC staff reviewed a summary of the proposed *Campus Plan* amendment, the prior CPC meeting history regarding the amendment, and the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Member appreciation for the more streamlined graphic presentation.
- Regarding future impacts:
  - Villard Hall Green
    - Why does the extension of the Villard Hall Green need to be designated in the *Campus Plan*?
    - Will the Theater sign in the area be removed?
  - Franklin Triangle Design Area
    - Consider future Theater parking needs in the Franklin Triangle Design Area.
- Regarding *Campus Plan* language:
  - Member appreciation for the Principle 12 amendment emphasizing streets as pedestrian first. Consider additional language to further define this distinction.
  - Why are the Northeast and Northeast Central Design Areas names remaining the same when north campus is a distinct area outside of these areas?

- Consider updating the wording on page 29 of the amendment tracked changes document, in the Principle 12 Gerlinger Field Green, Trees/Landscape description, from “southern” edge to “northern” edge.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, CPC staff, Emily Eng (Campus Planning), and Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) provided the following clarifications:

- Designating the extension of the Villard Hall Green in the *Campus Plan* as an open space will preclude any future development in that area and connect the existing Villard Hall Green to Dads’ Gates Axis.
- The sign north of Villard Hall will not be impacted due to the designation as an open space; the proposed amendment will be in written and graphic form within the *Campus Plan*.
- *Campus Plan* Principle 9 prioritizes pedestrians over other modes of transportation. The purpose of the proposed Principle 12 language regarding pedestrian first streets is to be more intentional about the vision for 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue prioritizing pedestrians first. As it is a remnant of a former street, it currently does not prioritize pedestrians although it limits vehicles.
- The north campus area has distinguished the Willamette and Millrace Design Areas that were created as a part of the 2020 *Campus Plan* Amendment North of Franklin Boulevard. The names of the Northeast and Northeast Central Design Areas in the *Campus Plan* could be renamed to be more intuitive and revisited in the future.

Action: With 14 in favor and 1 abstention, the committee agreed that the *Campus Plan* Amendment: Related to the Biennial Capacity Plan and Framework Vision Project for the Northeast Campus, Northeast Central Campus, Academic Center and Historic Core, and Southwest Campus Design Areas is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

- 1.) In the Principle 12 Gerlinger Field Green, Trees/Landscape description, replace the word “southern” with “northern” in the following sentence: “Although not part of the open space, the conifers along the ~~southern~~ northern edge of Pioneer Memorial Cemetery contribute to the area’s character and are maintained by the university.”

## **2. Beach Volleyball – Meeting One**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold Meeting One for the Beach Volleyball project.

As part of Meeting One (further described in the *Campus Plan* on page 27), the committee was asked to complete the following tasks:

- Site Selection - Review the proposed site and make a site recommendation.
- User Group - Review the proposed user group representation and provide comments to the CPC chair, who appoints group members (refer to page 28 of the *Campus Plan* for more information about user groups).
- Key Principles and Patterns - Identify key principles, patterns, and other relevant campus design issues from the *Campus Plan*.
- Other Campus-wide Opportunities - Identify potential opportunities to address campus-wide needs within the subject area or opportunities to cooperate with other nearby development efforts.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, user group representation, and the *Campus Plan* (pg. 25) CPC process flow chart regarding Meeting 1, the design process, and CPC Meeting 2.

Valerie Johnson (Athletics) reviewed the project need, program needs and requirements, history, and goals.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the site selection criteria and Campus Planning considerations and requirements, program needs, anticipated usage, and lighting requirements. Additionally, the pros and cons of each site studied, and the recommended site were reviewed.

### Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- A number of members expressed support for the project and recommended site. Some members expressed support for the project but questioned whether the recommended site is the best location. Each proposed site has its own unique challenges.
- Is the Gerlinger Green designated open space a site option?
- Consider the health and safety of students and athletes if the facility will be open for public use; how will general public use be limited?
- One of the first steps to being included in the *Campus Plan* is CPC Meeting One, then CPC Meeting Two. The *Campus Plan* is a process document, not a

demarcation of future projects. This process guides decisions regarding future projects.

- Members of the media may direct further questions to UO Communications.
- *Campus Plan* Principle 5: Displacement of Displaced Uses requires all projects to consider the replacement of displaced uses. If a use is displaced, there must be a conversation regarding its replacement, which is encompassed in the process.
- Consider discussing the riverfront (Site B) further.

Regarding Site A (13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St. (Hamilton Residence Hall)):

- Member support for site A, in particular:
  - The proximity to parking, E.g., Lot 37 is available on weekends and after hours for people visiting for weekend games.
  - The proximity to student athlete services.
  - The high visibility for people visiting this part of campus, E.g., during campus tours, and activation of this area of campus.
  - Increased safety with a more central campus location and access to emergency services.
- Consider lighting for evening activity and additional long-term services as an addition to this plan.
- Consider other university departments, beyond Athletics and athletic events, E.g., the Alumni Association, may be interested in involvement with activities in this location.
- Does this site impact the existing student volleyball court at Carson Hall?
- Consider the site might be an anticipated future building site mentioned in the *Campus Plan*, Student Housing Design Area (page 159).
- With the campus size of nearly 300 acres, there are limited opportunities, and no perfect location.
- Consider that the definition of temporary can be longer term, and this seems to be the optimal site at this time.
- If we were to find that this site is best for a future academic building, would we have to complete the CPC process again?
- There are many different future development scenarios; the future is unpredictable.
- What is the typical context of the other twenty university sports, E.g., in terms of a location?

- When will Hamilton Hall be demolished and beach volleyball could start games in this location?
- Members concern for the site location while understanding the project needs.
- Consider creating a future sub-committee group to continue to discuss this site. Member concern regarding repeating this process again in the future, when in the future there may be potential limitations on future site locations.
- Consider future students, E.g., 10 years from now, and how a different site would benefit them.
- Consider potential student conduct, E.g., vandalism, and placing this project close to dorms while needing to host other institutions, in comparison to a space located further away from dorms.
- Will access to the new planned open space remain open from the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue sidewalk area?

Regarding Site C (Autzen Stadium – East of Pape Field):

- Consider alternative methods of transportation to this location for football games, E.g., bus transportation, that could alleviate the demand for parking during Fall game days.

Regarding Site D (West of Jane Sanders Stadium):

- Consider exploring further potential for this site to work with a retaining wall and/or in relationship to the outdoor recreational facilities in the area.

Regarding Site E (Southwest Campus Green):

- Consider the College of Education commencement is held in this open space yearly and there is passive community use.
- While the NCAA doesn't require lighting, consider lighting at night for potential evening use by students.
- Consider the noise and activity levels of beach volleyball in this location and the adjacent uses of research, academics, and classrooms; it may be difficult to accommodate this type of activity in this location with the contrasting adjacent uses.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

Regarding Site A (13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St. (Hamilton Residence Hall)):

- Site A and the Site B (Riverfront) are both very excellent options that are very different. Beach volleyball adds to the culture of campus, especially during nice weather.
- While there is potential for disruption from the public, there is the same potential element when you move the site off campus from other potential groups.
- Beach Volleyball adds a beauty to campus and will be a beautiful feature to the open space. While a potential future building site is not ideal, Beach Volleyball is pleased to be on campus.
- Site A is better logistically for access to athletic training and the proximity to existing facilities, E.g., locker rooms.
- Consider coverage for the site to protect equipment, E.g., cover for storage and rain protection.
- The proximity to campus will attract sports fans and participants and create a greater fan base which will be a benefit to the program.
- Beach Volleyball construction is a minimal investment with a quick timeline, E.g., this site construction is feasible.
- The anticipated storage needs are minimal.
- Regarding other campus wide opportunities, consider that Transportation Services has been working with the Office of Sustainability on siting an electric bus charging station along 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Regarding process and funding:

- What is the completion timeline for other sites, if any other site than Site A were chosen?
- What donor money is available for this project?
- If Site A is the preferred site, and there was research since 2019, why is it not shown in the 2022 *Campus Plan*, and why is it now appearing in this plan?
- What steps have been made since 2013 for this process?

Regarding safety:

- Concern with the facility being open to the public and the safety of the players and functionality of the area. Other campus facilities for athletics are typically fenced and secured for use by the teams specifically for their use so that they stay secured.

- Currently at Amazon Park, the Beach Volleyball team provides maintenance like raking or cleaning out the sand for any garbage, or often concerning materials found. Will this facility be cleaned by Campus Planning or still managed by players? Will the site location impact that? (*CPC Staff note: Comment added to the Zoom meeting chat.*)
- What other UO sports have their facilities open to other students on campus and the public and how will that be regulated?

Regarding Site C (Autzen Stadium – East of Pape Field):

- Consider the con of the loss of approximately 100+ parking spaces should not outweigh the needs of other student athletes, especially if car infrastructure and the storage of private vehicles is last on the *Campus Plan* Principle 9: Transportation list of priorities. This parking lot is full limited times out of every month.
- Consider the con of this location not convenient for use by on campus students when students routinely walk to Autzen every weekend, or every two weekends, and it is not a hardship for students.
- There are limited cons for this site and appreciate the permanence and proximity to other athletic activities with this location.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Olsen, Devon Shea (Athletics), and Johnson provided the following clarifications:

- The Gerlinger Green is a designated open space in the *Campus Plan* that is used by several programs related to PE and Recreation and other university uses. There are historic preservation considerations for this site and its proximity to Gerlinger Hall. Additionally, there is consideration for the east part of this site as a potential future home for the Collier House if that were to be displaced, E.g., it would potentially preclude siting opportunities here in the future.

Regarding Site A (13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St. (Hamilton Residence Hall))

- There is no proposal to change the existing student volleyball court at Carson Hall.
- Completion is anticipated for Fall of 2025; games would begin depending on the Beach Volleyball schedule.



- The current plan for the new open space adjacent to this site is for an open lawn that one can move freely throughout. There are points of connection from the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Agate Street and the east side. There are concrete walkways that will circulate pedestrians around the space and the Beach Volleyball site will not be impactful for limiting access to the new open space.

Regarding Site C (Autzen Stadium – East of Pape Field):

- From a recreation perspective, previous Planning work received feedback that the Riverfront fields (for example, near this location) feel far or off campus.
- Parking and traffic are a well-known issue for football game days, E.g., every property around Autzen is used for parking, there is high demand, and the lot is completely full. The city requires events at Autzen to provide a certain number of available parking spaces. If that number were to change it could jeopardize the ability to meet that requirement.
- Regarding the concern of loss of space for other student activities, by comparison the location at Site A is currently an open lawn with no programmed use.

Regarding Site D (West of Jane Sanders Stadium):

- Topography is a challenge and retaining walls would be needed for this site. Additionally, overcoming the displacement of the functions of the Outdoor Program would necessitate moving and create a much larger project. From a facilities standpoint, while Jane Sanders Stadium is in this location, the support facilities for Beach Volleyball are located in Matthew Knight Arena.
- The service access that is a part of Jane Sanders Stadium and serves the facility would be disrupted by placing the project here.
- This site is also identified as a future building site.

Regarding Site E (Southwest Campus Green):

- The adjacencies of the other uses near this site are not ideal for accommodating a Beach Volleyball use.

Regarding process and funding:

- The general timeline for a site that does not have a displaced use, E.g., the timeline for sites other than Site A, after completing the site selection and design process, would be Spring – Summer construction, optimistically available

in Fall 2024, assuming there's no complications with utilities or other unforeseen construction challenges.

- Athletics can provide more information regarding donor funding.
- The *Campus Plan* does not identify future specific projects or their location; when projects are brought as proposals to the committee, a review process begins.

Regarding safety:

- There are existing facilities and recreation fields on campus, E.g., the sand volleyball and basketball courts near Carson Hall, and the shared tennis facility between Athletics and PE and Rec, that are open and not fenced.
- Examples of outdoor facilities open to students and the public include: the outdoor tennis facility, Men's/Women's golf, Baseball at the Emeralds, all of Athletics facilities that are open for rent, Autzen has flag football, peewee football, and UO commencement, and Matthew Knight Arena holds concerts, outside shows, and commencements.

Action:

#### **Site selection**

With 8 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions, the committee agreed that Site A for the Beach Volleyball project is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

#### **Proposed User Groups and Campus Plan Requirements**

Members provided the following feedback regarding user group representation:

- For the neighbor user representative, consider the neighbors of:
  - Student Housing
  - Ford Alumni Center
  - Jaqua Center

Members provided the following feedback regarding other campus wide opportunities:

- Consider that Transportation Services has been working with the Office of Sustainability on siting an electric bus charging station along 13th Avenue.

**3. Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish a Campus Standard “Trespass Sign”**

**4. Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish a Campus Standard “Trespass Sign”**

The scheduled meeting time ended before agenda items 3 and 4 were presented to the committee. These agenda items will be presented at the next meeting.