

February 27, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Emily Eng, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: Record of the February 18, 2020 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (chair), Christopher Chavez, Emily Fenster, Michael Harwood,
Shawn Kahl, Dean Livelybrooks, Terry McQuilkin, Maxwell Mindock, Juliae Riva,
Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

Staff: Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning)

Guests: Matt Roberts, Sam Alig, Luke Helm, Tom Shepard, Eric Roedl, Matt Koehler,
Phil Carroll, Devon Shea, Bitty Roy, Allen Hancock

CPC Agenda

1. New Video Board at Autzen Stadium – Schematic Design (Signage)

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review and take action on the schematic design for the proposed new video board at Autzen Stadium. The Athletics Department proposes to install a large new video board above the end-zone terrace at the east end of the stadium. While the video board (186' x 65.8') will be viewed from within the stadium, the backside of the video board will include a smaller video screen (46.8' x 26.4') that will be visible outside the stadium, intended to display event-related information to attendees in the parking lot of the Autzen complex during events. While signs located within outdoor sports facilities that are not visible from the exterior of the facility are allowed as exceptions to the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan and not subject to CPC review, the outward-facing component of the video board requires review by the CPC as an exterior sign not covered by the campus standard designs.

Emily Eng provided the committee with an overview of the approval criteria in the Sign Plan and reviewed the “Good Neighbor” pattern in the *Campus Plan*. Eric Roedl with the Athletics Department described the purpose and need for the new video board,

which is planned to be operating by football season 2020. The current equipment at Autzen Stadium is almost 20 years old and is not meeting the expectations of fans, which impacts ticket sales. Football drives 70% of Athletics revenue. The new video board will be much larger and come with an updated sound system. The intent is to bring the best technology to Autzen Stadium for the best possible fan experience. Matt Koehler with Cameron McCarthy Landscape Architecture and Planning, the project's consultant, described the design and other details of the proposed video board project:

- Will aesthetically blend with Autzen Stadium as much as possible. Includes metal design elements, and a silver and black color scheme similar to the materials and colors at the Autzen Stadium complex. Board will be black and grey when video is not playing.
- Intent is to not be visually overpowering from outside the stadium. Does not go higher than the existing roofline and is within 26 feet of it.
- Will have a limited visual impact on the surrounding area. The view of it from MLK, Jr Blvd, the nearest major public street, would be mostly blocked by a very dense line of trees.
- Will require a sign variance, a Type II land use review by the City of Eugene.

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members regarding the exterior-facing side of the video-board:

- Is the video board meeting the wind/sheer load requirements?
- How often would the video board would be operating? For example, will it be on all the time?
- Would the video board be on only for event purposes?
- How large is the screen compared to the existing "O" on the stadium?
- Would there be any negative impacts to solar access for the other fields (i.e. Pape Field, etc...)
- Would the new sound system be directed into the bowl?
- Would there be commercial advertising?

The following is a summary of comments from guests:

- A guest noted that the sound effects used for practice have been an issue for people using Alton Baker Park and for the Nearby Nature program.

In response to questions from committee members and guests, Koehler and Roedl provided the following clarifications:

- The project team is working with engineers to make sure it is structurally sound.
- The video board will be operating only for event purposes and won't be on at all times. Football will be using it for the 7 home games and 1 spring game each year. It has not been yet been determined how much programs outside football will use it, but it is possible the video board will be on for other events. There are 75 days of events at Autzen throughout the year.
- The video board screen is likely similar in height to the existing "O" and somewhat more in width.
- The video board will not block solar access for the soccer facility.
- The sound system will be in the same location and directed downward similar to how it is now.
- While all content is not yet known, it is intended for game highlights to be shown on the video screen. Commercials may be aired as part of those highlights, but the intention is not to advertise.
- This is a different sound system than the one used for practices. Also, the new coaching staff don't use the sound system in the same way as the old staff during practice, so sound effects during practice should not be as big an issue for those using Alton Baker Park today.

Action: With 10 in favor and 2 abstentions, the committee agreed that the proposed New Video Board is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Campus Plan Amendment – North of Franklin Boulevard (Introduction)

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to give an introduction to the *Campus Plan* Amendment to incorporate the university's land between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River into the *Campus Plan*. Aaron Olsen, Landscape Planning Associate, reviewed the purpose, scope, and process for the proposed amendment, and provided an overview of the primary Principles of the *Campus Plan* that will be amended (Principle 2: Open-space Framework, Principle 3: Densities, and Principle 12: Design Area Special Conditions). This was the first in a series of CPC meetings that will discuss and review this *Campus Plan* amendment.

Presentation materials are available at: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment>

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, and clarifications by Olsen and others:

- A guest stated that the planning process for the North Campus Conditional Use Permit (CUP) happened during the summer and holidays when it was difficult for faculty to be involved; therefore, she felt that engagement did not encompass a wide array of voices. Also, students use the land and so it is important for them to participate. She noted that some people were upset because the CPC approved allowing recreation fields north of the railroad track, and that the UO Senate voted against the CUP.
- A member reminded the committee that the CPC recommended approval of the CUP with a 10-1 vote.
- Another member stated that the Senate voted against putting fields in North Campus, and asked about engagement with Senate in campus planning process. Olsen indicated that the CPC is the primary review body for *Campus Plan* amendments. The CPC includes representation from the Senate.
- Another member noted that he is representing the Senate currently.
- A guest asked if the *Campus Plan* defines active and passive recreation, and suggested looking at the Whilamut Natural Area (East Alton Baker Park), designated by the City for passive recreation, for examples and a definition. A member added that the *Campus Plan* defines open spaces as “formal” (designed for scheduled, organized activities) and “informal” open spaces (designed for more casual, non-scheduled activities).
- The guest asked if the Recreation Field Location Options Study was completed. Olsen noted that the study is complete, but he is still working on the final formatting. All information and analysis is on the project web page (and the report will be posted there when complete):
<https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/recreation-field-location-options-study>
- Concerning “areas unlikely to change,” a member asked if the development in the campus operations/power station area within the Millrace Design Area would be subject to CPC review. Another member explained that major changes (such as a new building or major shift to service circulation) would go through CPC review, similar to other areas of campus. Minor changes may not

be subject to CPC review (although they would be internally reviewed by the Office of Campus Planning).

- A member noted the importance of considering the 7-minute walking circle in relation to the area to inform proposed uses, such as classrooms. Another member noted that the *Campus Plan* (and Framework Vision Project) used the 7-minute walking circles to inform proposed uses. Generally, classrooms are not encouraged in this area, except when associated with specialized studio classes and research needs (for example, the College of Design art studios).
- A member emphasized the need to think about providing the ability to grow Knight Campus programs as the needs arise, including potential classrooms serving those programs.
- Another member emphasized the importance of recreation fields, used by at least 4,200 students annually. She was also supportive about opportunities to move Outdoor Program functions to the riverfront because of the program's connection to river recreation.
- A member reminded the committee about the importance of assessing each open space and to carefully consider what we are trying to achieve when we draw an open space line. The member also suggested assessing the benefits of extending the E-W open space axis shown north of ZIRC further east.
- A guest advised defining more carefully the kinds of open space. The ecology is different when talking about the river. A member noted that there appear to be four primary types of open space in this area. Olsen noted that the *Campus Plan* currently describes each designated open space on campus and will describe the unique types of open spaces in the area.
- Members advised keeping in mind the greater context, such as the City's development projects adjacent to this area and the new giant student housing complex.
- A member appreciated the amendment will consider the ZIRC facility staying in the foreseeable future, a beacon to science research here.
- A member, who could not attend but provided written comments, felt that the FVP and CUP do not provide a fully satisfactory basis for the *Campus Plan* amendments related to the riverfront land north of the railroad tracks for the following reasons (read aloud by the CPC Chair in full and summarized below):
 1. The FVP does not specifically assign importance to the preservation of natural areas and to their enhancement. The Campus Plan gives no specific weight to natural areas.

2. The CUP permits construction of large, fenced, floodlit artificial-turf playing fields in proximity to the river. Now (during this *Campus Plan* amendment process) is therefore the time to rule out construction of artificial turf rec fields on the land between the railroad tracks and the river.
3. The FVP should be regarded as providing no useful guidance. While the FVP maps indicated the possibility of rec fields in this area, the FVP did not undertake a study of alternative uses of the riverfront land.
4. The UO Senate opposed the CUP application emphasizing the importance of protecting and enhancing the unique features of the Willamette River and associated habitats.

Action: The CPC was not requested to take action at this time.