

December 11, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: Record of Campus Planning Committee meeting,
November 19, 2003

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), G. Z. Brown, Nancy Cheng, Garry Fritz,
Cynthia Girling, Bryn Hammond Anderson, Bethany Larson, Gregg
Lobisser, Eugene Luks, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey,

Gary Seitz, Michael Stamm, Greg Stripp,

Christine Theodoropoulos, Rodrigo Moreno Villamar,

Mick Westrick

Guests: Ed Fredette (EMU Outdoor Program), Drew Gilliland (PARS),
Melinda Grier (General Counsel), Brent Harrison (PARS), Jan Oliver
(Administration), Peg Peters (SUNA), Alison Shaughnessy (ODE), Rand
Stamm (DPS), Sandy Vaughn (EMU Club Sports), Dan Williams
(Administration)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: Arena Project - CPC role in the design process

1. Arena Project - CPC role in the design process

Background: Staff referred the CPC to the letter from the president outlining the CPC's

role in the arena design process (contained in the meeting mailing).

Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration, summarized the arena site-selection process (described to the CPC at its May 27, 2003 meeting). After conducting an initial analysis of twenty-one sites, seven sites were selected for further analysis. The key factors considered were accessibility to students (e.g., proximity to campus), size, proximity to appropriately sized transportation systems, and ownership (owned by the university or available for purchase). The project consultants met with all interested and potentially affected parties to collect information about the potential impacts on all seven of the sites' existing occupants and neighbors.

Dan said that initially Williams Bakery was the preferred site, but it was not possible to purchase. Howe Field eventually was selected for the arena site because it best meets the site selection criteria. Although the building will exceed the allowed area density, the use fits in with the area's athletic and recreational uses. A central campus site is beneficial because required arena parking will serve a double purpose: it will meet event-parking needs and daily campus parking needs. Dan acknowledged that developing this site will present challenges, as would all of the sites.

Dan described how the arena will be built by a non-profit subsidiary at the request of the donor. There are two reasons for this arrangement. First, it will exempt the project from public processes making it possible to negotiate contracts to gain greater value. Second, it will give more control over the time schedule to ensure the arena is ready for the 2006 basketball season. Although the non-profit is separate from the university, the university has certain assurances that it will have reasonable review over the process. This is similar to the way the Chiles Center and the Bowerman Family Building were constructed.

The proposed arena will have about 13,000 seats compared to 9,000 in McArthur Court. It will be a single building (about 380, 000 to 400,000 gsf) designed to maximize the existing facilities in McArthur Court (e.g., practice facilities). A firm site plan has not been established.

Dan explained why the new arena is being built. It will allow Athletics to generate more revenue by increasing capacity rather than ticket prices. Athletics is a self-sufficient department with only two venues for generating revenue: football and men's basketball. These revenue streams finance the other athletic programs.

Dan said NCP has been hired to manage project. NCP will be responsible for and have decision-making authority over the arena construction. The university will be responsible for the siting, design, and construction of the relocation facilities. Dan is not certain which existing facilities will have to be relocated. It is clear that the Outdoor Program Barn and Howe Softball Field will be relocated. It may be necessary to reconfigure or relocate the Student Tennis Center, and the development may encroach upon some fields along 18th Avenue.

Dan said the new arena will bring more people to campus about 16-25 nights per year. It is clear that parking and traffic issues must be addressed. A member said the new parking will also increase neighborhood traffic during the day. Dan said the location of the parking will determine where traffic impacts will occur. For example, if a parking structure is placed near Franklin Boulevard, neighborhood through-traffic should not occur. Dan has met with neighbors and will work with them to address traffic issues.

Discussion: In answer to a question, Dan said the university (and CPC) will be responsible for relocations even if they occur within the athletics super block area.

A member pointed out the importance of the State Energy Efficiency Design (SEED) Program and asked if the arena must meet these requirements. Melinda Grier, General Counsel to the University, said the architects have expressed an interest in energy-efficient design. She is not sure if the private entity must meet state regulations. A member encouraged the university to get a commitment in writing stating that SEED will be met. Another member said Athletics has an incentive to build energy-efficient buildings because it has to pay for operations.

In answer to a member's question, another member said the arena must follow the Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP) to the degree described in the president's memorandum to the CPC. The Sustainable Development Plan is specifically mentioned. To a degree, the university has to rely on good faith since the university is the recipient of the building after it is completed.

Melinda said it is important not to portray the building as subject to state regulations, since doing so might jeopardize the independent status of the entity. A member said the university can still be proactive and strongly encourage designers to pay attention to campus planning and design policies.

Staff said the CPC can make suggestions in a response to the president.

In response to a member's question, another member said that typically a package of campus planning information is provided to project designers. However, a large component of the typical planning process is the process itself. User groups are educated and engaged directly in the design process. Although the arena design process does not allow for this level of engagement, the university can convey important LRCDP policies to the designer to ensure up-front knowledge.

Dan confirmed that the donor was not involved in the site selection process.

Dan said a group of representatives from relocated facilities has been established to ensure there is clear communication. In response to a guest's concern about coordinating relocations as part of the arena's fast-track process, Dan said it is his responsibility to keep both processes on pace. Dan said it is likely that Howe Field will move to the Autzen area, but no other relocation sites have been identified.

The CPC chair conveyed the CPC's intent to accommodate the project's schedule, which may mean limited meeting notice or more meetings than typical.

A member said it appears that the university is establishing a significant, new review process and asked how the larger design community will be involved. Another

member said this process only applies to the arena. Hopefully, we will learn from this experience. If subsequent planning and design changes are suggested, there will be a broader discussion and opportunity for input.

A guest questioned why the project is so rushed. Dan said, thus far, the project has not moved faster than is reasonable. However, time is money in the construction business so it is essential to ensure the design process proceeds without delay.

Staff confirmed that a city Conditional Use application would be required. This process, which includes a public hearing, will give neighbors an opportunity to express their views.

In response to a question, a member said the University Planning Office (UPO) will not have a typical project-planner role. The UPO has been asked not to participate to ensure separation between the public and private process. Staff have been invited to participate as guests, however, and it is quite likely there will be some informal communication with the architect. Since the university will not have control over the project, the UPO has asked not to directly participate. A member wondered how the university's "conscience" will be represented as this project proceeds.

A member said the required LRCDP amendment process (to address increased density) may also provide an opportunity to address other campus planning issues. Perhaps greater protection should be given to the remaining fields. This is an opportunity to think about the future of the super block in a comprehensive way.

The chair asked members to identify key points to convey to the president.

A member reiterated the importance of complying with SEED.

A member said the project should follow all guidelines in the LRCDP and related plans. A strong offer should be made to provide relevant information directly to the architect. A member said the president's letter does not include all LRCDP policies, but it covers the most significant ones. It also adds some guidelines beyond the LRCDP that should help the CPC review the project.

In answer to a question, another member said the public comment session will take place on campus. The campus community and neighbors will be invited. It is not clear who will make the presentation, but typically the project architect is responsible. A member said the CPC should clarify how the session will occur. The CPC should not be responsible for presenting the project; it should serve as host and recorder.

A member said proper timing of the open houses and CPC reviews is essential to provide effective input. A two-step review process was recommended: one at the beginning of the design process and another near the end of the schematic design phase. Another member suggested regular project updates to the CPC.

A member said it is important that the CPC does not hold up the process. To prevent this from happening, the CPC needs to clarify what information it needs to proceed with the tasks identified by the president. A chart listing the CPC tasks and a draft summary of the information required prior to CPC action were reviewed at the meeting (refer to the last page of this record).

In response to a question, staff said the CPC could report back to the University Senate by sending it a copy of the meeting record.

A member said the CPC's response to the president should be positive and convey that the CPC is pleased to participate.

A member said the CPC should be careful not to assume ownership of the project because the university will not have the opportunity to be an active participant during the design process. The CPC should maintain its role as a review board, not a direct participant. Another member said the university will eventually become the building owner and, therefore, needs to take some responsibility now.

The CPC chair confirmed that the 1983 process for privately-managed and financed projects referenced in the LRCDP is no longer in effect according to Legal Counsel. The president's letter establishes the design process for the arena project. The CPC has been directed to establish a new process for future projects, but it will not affect the arena project.

In answer to a member's question about the CPC relocation subcommittee, the CPC chair said those who serve will be relieved from existing subcommittee duties. User groups for each relocated facility will be established and staffed by the UPO.

The CPC chair said she and staff will draft a response to the president incorporating the key comments made by the committee. She will send it to the CPC for comment before forwarding it to the president.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to direct the CPC chair, with staff assistance, to prepare a response to the president's memo about the CPC's role in the arena design process. The response will address the key issues identified by the committee including:

- o SEED compliance,
- o LRCDP compliance (and transmitting relevant information),
- o integrating the relocation of facilities into the project timeline,
- o effective opportunities for CPC and public input, and
- o open house facilitation.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

c'. Bob Beals, Athletics

Lowell Bowditch, University Senate President (Classics)

Ed Fredette, EMU Outdoor Program

Dave Frohnmayer, President

Dan Geiger, EMU Outdoor Program

Drew Gilliland, PARS

Melinda Grier, General Counsel

Brent Harrison, PARS

Tim King, Facilities Services

Steve McBride, Athletics

Dennis Munroe, PARS

Jeff Nelson, Fairmount Neighbors

Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning

Jan Oliver, Administration

Peg Peters, South University Neighborhood

Alison Shaughnessy, ODE

Rand Stamm, DPS

Kristen Taylor, Fairmount Neighbors

Sandy Vaughn, EMU Club Sports

Dan Williams, Administration

Lew Williams, Foundation

Chart reviewed at CPC 11/19/03 meeting:

DRAFT 11/19/03

Arena Project- CPC's Role in the Design Process

The CPC is directed to take the following six steps (listed in the order they are likely to occur):

- 1. Form a subcommittee of CPC members to work with facilities users displaced by the project to suggest replacement sites.**

Report to the CPC and then forward a recommendation to the president.

Information needed to complete the task: ID displaced facilities.

- 1. Amend the LRCDP as needed.**

Information needed to complete the task: Approximate size (coverage and FAR) of proposed arena.

1. Host an on-campus public comment session.

Report the outcome to the president.

Information needed to complete the task: Arena's Initial Design Concepts and/or Schematic Design.

1. Review the Arena's design using specified criteria.

Forward comments to the president.

Information needed to complete the task: Arena's Schematic Design.

1. Review the proposed schematic design of each relocated function in accordance with the LRCDP.

Information needed to complete the task: President's response to the CPC's site relocation recommendations and subsequent schematic designs for each site.

1. Review and update the 1983 policy for design review of privately managed projects.

Information needed to complete the task: Not time critical. Need time to consider appropriate alternatives.