



UNIVERSITY OF  
OREGON

Campus  
Planning

July 09, 2025

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 27, 2025, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Deborah Butler, Janell Cottam,  
Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Norma Kehdi,  
Talieq Lopez-DuBoff, Kevin Reed, Janet Rose, Hal Sadofsky

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Paul Comery (Transportation Services), Amber Geiger (Student),  
Dave Reesor (Transportation Services), Matt Roberts (UO Communications)  
Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

**CPC Agenda**

**1. UO Long Range Transportation Plan – Check-in & Discussion**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to continue the check-in and discussion for the UO Long Range Transportation Plan.

CPC Staff provided an overview of relevant *Campus Plan* principles, patterns, and CPC role in transportation policy review.

Dave Reesor (Transportation Services) discussed goals and outcomes for the transportation plan in coordination with the *Campus Plan*, reviewed *Campus Plan* integration into the proposed long-range transportation plan and discussed project timeline including past community outreach and future next steps.

Paul Comery (Transportation Services) discussed corridor improvements and strategies for pedestrian improvements, separations from modes of transportation, and clear gateways to signal changes in transportation mode priorities. Additionally, the main transportation corridors were outlined, and specific corridor recommendations and corridor segment concerns and solutions were discussed.

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

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

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with clarification comments from Comery, Eng (Campus Planning), and Reesor.

- Member: Are raised crossings being proposed on Franklin Boulevard?
  - Comery: Raised crossings for Franklin Boulevard are not being recommended with this plan. Franklin Boulevard is going through a design process with the City of Eugene.
- Member: Where are raised crossings being recommended?
  - Reesor: Raised crossings are being recommended in a few areas, for example, at 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Agate Street, and possibly 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Agate Street, and will require coordination with the city as these are city owned and operated facilities.
- Member: Where are raised crossings being considered along the Onyx corridor?
  - Comery: A raised crossing is being considered where the Millrace multi-use path crosses Onyx Street north of Franklin to improve the transition from the path as people travel south into campus. The 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and University Street intersection could also benefit from raised crosswalks to address safety.
- Member: Consider right sizing the number of strategies in small spaces to avoid making it difficult for users to understand how they are supposed to interact with the proposed elements.
  - Comery: This is one reason for using the corridor approach rather than individual locations. This approach allows for consistency and continuity in communication and signage for all users, whether they are visitors here for a day, or frequent users (E.g. staff and students).
  - Reesor: Consider the *Campus Plan* Principle 9 prioritizes pedestrians over the use of personal vehicles in the core of campus. As automobiles are strategically moved to locations, such as future anticipated structured parking, rather than existing surface parking locations, there will be additional room for bike and pedestrian facilities in current parking locations.
- Member: Will these example facility treatments being presented be useful to UO and what is the project timeline?
  - Comery: The main goal of the projects is to identify challenges and potential solutions
- Member: Will the proposed bike hub at certain locations have all the amenities mentioned (E.g. showers, secure and monitored parking, valets, repair facilities)? Consider the scale of the bike hub that is necessary for the size of the campus.
  - Comery: Bike hub amenity combinations and scaling strategies have been considered; additional outreach and studies will be needed to determine the right sized approach for UO.

- Member: How many years will it take to build a parking garage in one of the proposed locations?
  - Reesor: The aspirational goal is 5 years; this would require feasibility studies and additional analysis in addition to construction.
- Member: What considerations have been made for utilizing parking and shuttling from Autzen Stadium?
  - Reesor: Shuttle services from Autzen Stadium have been considered; there are current challenges with infrastructure deficits and required intergovernmental coordination that would be needed to mitigate environmental impacts of the existing gravel parking surface.
  - Reesor: The proposed shuttle is to maintain universal access to the core of campus as individual vehicle parking is relocated. Proposed fixed route shuttles would be in addition to the existing access shuttle.
- Member: Consider that creating a false sense of safety with road markings can be more dangerous than areas with visible activity, where people tend to be more cautious.
- Member: Changing commuting habits may be challenging. Consider specific benefits the bike hub will bring to current bike commuters.
  - Comery: Some facilities and amenities proposed in the bike hubs were identified in focus groups as facilities and amenities that may encourage more people to consider bike commuting.
- Guest: Consider some students do not bike to campus due to fear of bike theft. Secure bike storage may improve bike commuting.
  - Comery: People come to campus with a different set of needs, and a different set of expectations. The goal is to provide a design with enough options so that the majority of folks can find one that works well for them.

Action: No formal action was requested.

## **2. CPC Chair Update**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to have a discussion regarding the CPC student membership composition of the committee at the request of the CPC chair

Bob Choquette (CPC Chair) provided an over of the proposal to prioritize two students from the School of Planning, Public Policy, and Management (PPPM) to serve on the committee as student representatives (1 graduate and 1 undergraduate student).

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with clarification comments from Bob Choquette (CPC Chair), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), and Liz Thorstensen (Campus Planning).

- Members: Support for the PPPM prioritized seats remaining open to general students if recommendations were not received within a certain timeline.
- Member: Support for the proposal to ensure student appointments are based on student interest in the topic.
- Member: If PPPM student candidates were not recommended and appointment within a specific timeline, should those seats be made available to the general student population?
  - Choquette: Consider that Campus Planning could work with the committee on setting a recommended date for that timeline.
- Member: Regarding the student appointment process, does this go through ASUO, or is there another process?
  - Thorstenson: In the past, if students have reached out directly to the Campus Planning Office, their interest has been forwarded directly to ASUO for them to make student recommendations. Campus Planning does not appoint committee members; however, the President's office does.
- Member: Consider the impact of setting aside two of the five student seats for the committee to be from the PPPM department. There are other academic disciplines that also have interest overlap (E.g. Architecture) within the College of Design. This may be better encouraged rather than earmarking the student positions from one particular department.
- Member: Consider committee membership could be promoted heavily within the PPPM department to increase interest and participation by students.
  - Thorstenson: The CPC chair has actively done this over the last few years with a positive response.

Action: With 12 in favor, the committee agreed that a recommendation regarding the proposal to **prioritize two students from the School of Planning, Public Policy, and Management (one graduate and one undergraduate) to serve on the committee as student representatives** should be delayed until a future meeting.