



March 11, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the February 20, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Janell Cottam,
Cheyenne Dickenson, Emily Eng, Kieth Frazee, Amber Geiger,
Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Taliek Lopez-DuBoff,
Taylor McHolm, Hal Sadofsk, Amy Salmore, Owen Speigel, Andrew Weaver

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Luke Helm (CPFM), Karen Hyatt (UO Community Relations),
Prissila Moreno (ASUO), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning),
Daffney Pattrick (ASUO), Erin Reaney (Daily Emerald),
Dave Reesor (Transportation Services),
Matt Roberts (UO Community Relations), Devon Shea (Athletics),
Jenna Shope (CPFM), Jody Sykes (Athletics),

CPC Agenda

1. Beach Volleyball Scoreboard Project – Schematic Design

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposal for the scoreboard on the west side of the beach volleyball facility previously reviewed by the CPC.

CPC Staff reviewed the project history of CPC review related to the beach volleyball facility, and relevant *Campus Plan* patterns and principles related to the scoreboard project.

Jody Sykes (Athletics) introduced the beach volleyball program and shared recent matches and program highlights.

Luke Helm (CPFM) provided an overview of the beach volleyball facility project and the Hamilton-Walton Transformation Project as it relates to the beach volleyball site, adjacent open-space framework, and the beach volleyball scoreboard project proposal. The proposed scoreboard siting was reviewed including the site lines for the score board (both from spectators and from 13th Avenue), scoreboard dimensions, and integration of the scoreboard into the site.

Devon Shea (Athletics) discussed the goal of keeping the scoreboard low to the site to integrate with the site and the storage building, but high enough for clearance to maintain site lines above spectators.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Helm (CPFM), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Shea (Athletics), and Sykes (Athletics):

- Member: What is proposed for the back of the scoreboard?
 - Helm: There are no plans for anything to be placed on the back. It will be black finished sheet metal to allow it to blend into the site. There is also a row of trees along 13th Avenue and Columbia Street (Ford Alumni parking lot) that will partially screen the scoreboard. So, it will have a low visual impact.
- Member: Consider not missing the opportunity to put an “O” or an opportunity for visitors walking from the 13th Avenue garage to the New Student Welcome Center to have as a background for pictures.
 - Olsen: Consider that any signage on the back of the scoreboard would be required to meet Eugene sign standards.
- Member: Consider opportunity to include language in the recommendation for approval to allow non-standard signage on the back of the scoreboard in the future without additional CPC review.
- Member: Consider what the plans are for the space to the east of the scoreboard. Is there a plan to activate or screen this area?
 - Helm: The trees were removed to the east, but not as part of the scoreboard project. It was due to the health of the trees and there is a plan to replace them.
- Member: Is the proposed scoreboard large enough that it will be visually readable for spectators?
 - Shea: The proposed scoreboard is a standard size for outdoor tennis and volleyball courts and has been determined to be appropriately sized.

- Member: Provide clarification on the timeline of the beach volleyball project compared to the Hamilton-Walton Transformation Project. In 2020 when the Hamilton-Walton Transformation project first came to the CPC it did not include the beach volleyball project and can we clarify the open-space that is being maintained in exchange as a replacement for the former Humpy Lumpy site
 - Member: Yes, the Hamilton-Walton Transformation Project first came to the CPC in 2020. The Beach volleyball site selection first came to CPC in 2023.
 - Olsen: The Humpy Lumpy open-space replacement was the site north of Unthank Residence Hall. To clarify, the replaced designated open space (New Green) does not include the portion of the site south of 13th Ave where the beach volleyball site is proposed to be located. The beach volleyball site has been identified as a future building site.

- Member: Is the beach volleyball facility temporary and if so, when will it be replaced? Consider the investment of infrastructure for a temporary use.
 - Olsen: It is temporary in the sense that the site has been identified as a future building site, but the word “temporary” may not be the best. It has not been determined when there may be a future building on this site.

- Member: Is the sign high enough to discourage tampering?
 - Helm: It is a balance we have been working with, but it should be high enough to discourage tampering.

- Member: Can you provide a ballpark construction cost on the total cost of the beach volleyball facility project?
 - Helm: Provided a figure of \$2.2 to 2.3 million, but followed up that he is unsure if that is for the entire project or a portion and further research is needed to provide an accurate cost of the project.

- Member: Are the beach volleyball athletes supportive of the scoreboard, and do they feel this strikes a good balance of not feeling overbuilt?
 - Shea: Yes. The athletes are supportive of this design. Most peer programs have similar scoreboards. Some have more imposing scoreboards or video scoreboards. This scoreboard proposal tries to strike a balance of being as understated as possible and being shielded by the trees will assist with that.

- Member: Consider that no sponsorship or advertising needs to be a part of this conversation. Is there a plan to advertise on the scoreboard?
 - Shea: No. It has not been a part of the conversation.
 - Member: Consider that the scoreboard is not the place for sponsorship.
 - Member: Expresses additional support that there should not be

- sponsorship on the scoreboard.
- Olsen: Clarified that the *Campus Outdoor Sign Plan* prohibits commercial advertising.
- Shea: Raising money for this project gets harder with these constraints.
- Member: Naming of facilities goes through a process with Advancement and the president. It's outside of the CPC process.
- Member: What aspects of the beach volleyball facility will be reservable?
 - Shea: The beach volleyball courts will be reservable and open for student use when not used by athletics, but details have not been determined.
- Member: Will the restroom building be open for public use?
 - Shea: No. The restroom facility will be open for athlete use only. UOPD supported the facility being closed to the public.
- Member: What are the anticipated parking impacts during games?
 - Shea: Spectators for games are expected to be in the low 100's not the 1,000's. Parking will be managed for games similar to other events on campus.
- Member: Where will the fencing be around the site?
 - Helm: Fencing will be around the northern edge of the site only. The rest of the site will be open.
- Member: For clarification, there is no additional site lighting proposed for the scoreboard that would interfere with migratory patterns.
 - Helm: Correct. No additional site lighting was proposed for this project.
- Member: Consider placement of the scoreboard on top of the building for better integration into the site?
 - Member: This has not previously been considered, but would cause structural concerns.
- Guest: Expressed support for the scoreboard project. This is a beautiful facility. However, expressed support for something on the back of the scoreboard.

Action: With 16 in favor the committee agreed that the **Beach Volleyball Scoreboard Project – Schematic Design** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

1. No permanent commercial advertising on the scoreboard.

2. Campus Plan – Principle 9: Transportation Amendment - Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to discuss forthcoming proposed amendments to Principle 9 in the *Campus Plan*.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) provided an overview of a proposal to update and consolidate the university's transportation planning documents in relation to the new UO Transportation Plan being completed by Transportation Services. Emily reviewed the idea of amending Principle 9 to integrate relevant transportation principles from the two current subject plans (1976 Long-Range Campus Transportation Plan and 1991 Bicycle Plan) and the new UO Transportation Plan, while eliminating the subject plans, and establishing the UO Transportation Plan as an implementation plan and keeping the Bicycle Management Program as an implementation plan. The intent is to simplify the university's planning documents to improve clarity, increase usefulness, and maintain relevance, while allowing the UO Transportation Plan to remain agile so that Transportation Services can strategically implement transportation planning principles. The timeline for Principle 9 updates and amendments was discussed.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Eng (Campus Planning) and Olsen:

- Member: Provide clarification of potential community engagement events. Will this be specific interest groups or broad community engagement?
 - Eng: The level of community engagement will depend on the level of proposed changes, but will likely involve specific groups rather than larger community engagement.
- Member: The CPC has done site selection or other specific design review for transportation projects in the past. Will these projects still come to the CPC for review if the transportation plan is no longer a subject plan?
 - Eng: Yes, those are physical changes to campus that would still require CPC review. The transportation plan may be better as an implementation plan to allow for greater flexibility due to potential for change.
- Member: Consider that a bicycle is no longer a bicycle (E.g. e-bikes). Consider how Principle 9 will adapt to keep up with changing transportation trends and what we want campus to look like.
 - Eng: That is where Principle 9 would be updated to address micromobility and discuss how different transportation modes should be treated and prioritized.
 - Olsen: This approach removes the implementation portion from the *Campus Plan*, but keeps the policy framework within the *Campus Plan*.

- Member: Expressed support for streamlining Principle 9 and the UO transportation planning documents.

- Member: Is there a scenario that would deemphasize walking and biking in the future and how would it change the CPC's role in managing the campus as a walking/bike campus?
 - Eng: Principle 9 would remain the primary policy guiding transportation and continue to prioritize active transportation. There would not be such a scenario unless Principle 9 changed to deemphasize walking and biking.

- Member: Would this help Principle 9 be in better alignment with other campus planning principles?
 - Olsen: Yes, this would put Principle 9 into better alignment with other campus planning principles.

- Member: When the Principle 9 proposal returns to the CPC please include clear guidance on how the CPC's role would change and include a strikeout version for review prior to the meeting for review.

Action: No formal action was requested.