



UNIVERSITY OF  
OREGON

Campus  
Planning

June 01, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 15, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Deborah Butler,  
Cheyenne Dickenson, Michael Harwood, Taliek Lopez-DuBoff,  
Taylor McHolm, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Hal Sadofsky,  
Owen Spiegel

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Summer Burnett (Student), Andrew Graber (Student),  
Annika Holecek (Student), Roshan Naidu (Student),  
Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), David Reesor (Transportation Services)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. *Campus Plan* Amendment – Principle 9: Transportation – Discussion

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

Following the recent completion of the *Campus Transportation Plan*, there is a need to update *Campus Plan* Principle 9: Transportation. Currently, the *Long-Range Campus Transportation Plan* (1973, rev 1976) and *Bicycle Plan* (1991) are subject plans, which are part of the *Campus Plan* but approved as separate documents. The intent of the *Campus Transportation Plan* is to be an implementation plan that provides greater detail on how to implement *Campus Plan* principles related to transportation, replacing the 1976 and 1991 subject plans. The purpose of the amendment is to simplify our planning documents to improve clarity, increase usefulness, and maintain relevance by updating *Campus Plan* – Principle 9 with relevant principles from the

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*

*Campus Transportation Plan* and eliminating the 1976 and 1991 subject plans. The amendment will also incorporate relevant principles from the *Bicycle Management Program*, which is an implementation plan and not part of the *Campus Plan*.

CPC Staff introduced the Principle 9 amendment, discussed relevant planning documents, and reviewed the previous CPC meeting dates for the Principle 9 amendment and the *Campus Transportation Plan*.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) discussed the proposed updates to *Campus Plan Principle 9: Transportation*, with an emphasis on aligning with the current *Campus Transportation Plan*. The discussion reviewed how the 1976 Long-Range Transportation Plan and the 1991 Bike Plan have shaped campus development, and how the updated approach will retire these subject plans but keep the *Bike Management Program* and the recently adopted *Campus Transportation Plan* as implementation plans. Draft revisions to Principle 9 were presented, highlighting updates to modal priorities, integration of micromobility (including e-mobility), deliveries, near-campus living, addition of active transportation principles, and removal of city-required minimum vehicle parking requirements. Updates to Principle 11: Patterns were introduced to ensure consistency with Principle 9, including a new pattern; Pathway Design.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with responses from David Reesor (Transportation Services) and Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning):

- Guest: What are the proposed changes to motorcycle parking?
  - Olsen: There are no changes proposed to motorcycle parking. The modal priorities help inform decisions in relation to other modes. As an example, motorcycle parking may be accommodated on campus, closer to a building, similar to bikes and micromobility.
  - Member: The modal priorities are used to start a conversation about how to address parking and priorities on campus.
  
- Member: Consider checking the wording for relevance regarding the statement, “encouraging housing for UO community.” What is the university's plan to encourage living close to campus?
  - Olsen: The lens for this item is to encourage the city to continue code changes and policies (Urban Growth Strategies project) to increase housing and types of housing near campus to support fewer vehicle trips.
  - Member: This statement is loose to maintain flexibility for the intent of more housing near campus that is convenient and affordable. Statements like this help us consider opportunities that make sense and are in alignment with university plans.
  
- Member: The current parking ratio is 7:1 (*Campus Transportation Plan*). Is there a philosophy around this ratio?
  - Reesor: The *Campus Transportation Plan* notes that under existing conditions the plan is to keep the ratio at 7:1. Other scenarios and ratios

were explored, considering parking demand and budget constraints. This ratio aligns with the UO sustainability and travel options. This ratio also provides a balance of allowing the university to operate smoothly without increasing single-occupancy vehicle traffic to campus.

- Member: Consider that structured parking is not a new idea, but it is good to explicitly capture it. The University has been moving parking from the core of campus since the 1970's, but it hasn't been stated.
- Member: Reducing parking on campus can negatively impact employees on the lower end of the wage scale who cannot live close to campus or public transportation. Consider employees who commute from outside Eugene/Springfield (e.g., Cottage Grove or Sweet Home).
- Member: Supports the improvements made in the proposed amendment, such as separating modes and improved consideration for accessibility. Consider also adding the Good Neighbor pattern to the Principle 9 pattern summary to acknowledge potential impacts to the neighborhood from campus traffic.
  - Member: The Good Neighbor pattern could be included in Principle 9 pattern summary, and Campus Planning could look at referencing the *East Campus Plan* more in the pattern description.
  - Olsen: Campus Planning could also look to the *Campus Transportation Plan* to see if there is other language to reference.
- Member: Why are bikes and micromobility listed above the campus shuttle and transit on the modal priorities list?
  - Olsen: The priority list was based on the 1976 *Long-Range Transportation Plan*.
  - Member: The priorities consider the vulnerability of each transportation mode.
  - Reesor: The point of a campus shuttle would be to move people around campus safely and efficiently. A campus shuttle would not replace public transit, such as LTD services.
- Member: Have park-and-rides been considered?
  - Reesor: Park and rides have been tried throughout the years at the motor pool in Glenwood and at Autzen Stadium. Neither option was well used. However, the park-and-ride at Glenwood has been well used by contractors working on campus.
- Member: How many people commute to campus on public transit?
  - Reesor: Explained the effects of COVID on decreased transit ridership and approximate ridership numbers for students and staff commuting to campus.

- Member: Consider that people may choose to drive to campus, and the limited parking, exacerbated by events, may cause frustration.
  - Reesor: This scenario was considered with the *Campus Transportation Plan*. Different levers to effectively manage parking enforcement were considered. The practical limitations of the budget and cost of additional parking facilities were discussed.
  
- Member: Visitors come to the university for academic and other events (e.g. theatre, music, and dance). Consider parking for these events as well as sporting events.
  - Olsen: Surface parking lots are considered buildable sites. There may be a day when there is a need for the development of a building, and we will need to look at the costs and budget considerations.
  
- Guest: Would the separation of modes include developing new pathways?
  - Olsen: Discussed the examples of the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Redesign project strategies used to separate modes, bollards added to Agate Street to separate bikes from vehicles, and Onyx Bridge pavement markings for improved safety and the pinch point.
  - Member: Separation is considered on a case-by-case basis. The mixing of modes can be beneficial for slowing down micromobility traffic. However, opportunities to address near misses should be addressed.
  - Olsen: Consider that delineation of modes is not always a physical separation.
  - Member: 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue poses unique challenges due to the multi-directional travel of traffic near Lillis and the Memorial Quad.
  - Olsen: Consider that etiquette and education are operational components that also improve safety.
  
- Member: Where would bike racks on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue go if they were removed?
  - Olsen: Discussed goals, plans, and rationale to align bike parking with demand. Some bike racks may be removed, and others will be clustered.
  - Member: The bicycle racks may be removed where they are under-utilized.
  - Member: Historically, bike racks have also been used to deter vehicle parking. As vehicles are removed from campus streets, there will be less need for bike racks in these areas.
  
- Member: Supports explicitly calling out accessibility and safety for future project considerations

Action: No formal action was requested.