



March 19, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the March 1, 2007 CPC Meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Michael Fifield, Gregg Lobisser, Randall McGowan, Garrett McSorley, Dennis Munroe, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Ashley Sherrick, Dale Smith, Greg Stripp

Guests: Mike Eyster (Housing), Anya Dobrowolski (Architecture), Gene Mowery (University Planning), Michael Smith (Human Rights Party of Oregon)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: **Housing Strategic Plan - Comment
Site Selection Process - Discussion**

1. Housing Strategic Plan - Comment

Background: Chris introduced the purpose, scope, and content of the Housing Strategic Plan Phase I as described in the meeting mailing and attachments. He also described the scope of Phase II. In the past few months numerous campus groups have provided feedback including suggested housing objectives modifications to address top scholars, affordability, retention, and program spaces related to residential facilities (e.g., the Student Recreation Center and the EMU).

Discussion: Committee members made the following comments:

- Do not address affordability in a piecemeal way, which would make it difficult to address affordability in the housing study.
- Recognize the importance of the “residential triangle” established by the residential halls, the recreation center, and the student union. Pay attention to where students hang out and become involved during the day.
- Consider the potential disadvantages of increasing graduate student enrollment. This would require a decrease in undergraduates (due to

- maximum enrollment goals) who generally have a stronger allegiance to the university. It will be important to provide adequate housing options that enhance connections to campus for all classes.
- Focus on the ratio of housing costs to wages when addressing affordability.
 - Treat sustainability as an important factor and address early in the process. The UO has an image of strong sustainable efforts and has an opportunity to be a leader.
 - Consider how students spend their time while on campus, even those who don't live on campus.
 - Address the way housing options affect the transportation system.
 - Carefully consider how to define desirable off-campus residential areas for students. Address density, transportation, and other land use issues.
 - Consult with ASUO, which has addressed many off-campus housing issues such as housing conditions and code issues.
 - Consider the UO in an advocacy role to ensure that adequate housing is available to students.
 - Work with housing management companies.
 - Ensure access to basic services (e.g., grocery stores). This may require zoning changes.
 - Look at long-term options (e.g., Glenwood) to provide access to housing. Consider ways to resolve limited land available for student housing development adjacent to the UO.

A guest made the following comments:

- If the plan is looking at housing options outside of campus boundaries, work with property owners and engage affected neighborhood groups.
- Address affordability. This was a primary issue identified by the Neighborhood Leadership Council. Students should be able to attend the university based solely on their academic ability, not their ability to pay.
- Consider the universal declaration of human rights established by the City Human Rights Commission.

Action: No formal action was required. The committee's comments will be considered as the project moves forward.

2. Site Selection Process - Discussion

Background: Michael Fifield, member, reviewed his concerns about site selection process for recent projects as described in his written comments submitted at the February 15, 2007 CPC meeting and described in the March 1, 2007 meeting mailing. Often the staff and committee are placed in a reactionary position sometimes due to user group or donor control (e.g., the Academic Learning Center). The *Campus Plan* works well in many ways, but it could be strengthened by providing more specificity about desired site characteristics. For example, the Plan should identify specific types of uses appropriate for specific locations, such as gateways.

The chair added that the fundraising process has changed. Development projects

depend upon private donors who often want to know the project site. This means a site must be identified before the formal design process has begun and the CPC becomes involved (e.g., the Alumni Center).

Discussion: Members agreed that there is a need to improve the site selection process.

A member agreed that the Academic Learning Center siting process was not effective. It is situated in a very public location, yet its design conveys a false reality to the public about what is really happening on campus. In most departments, conditions are much worse. The Campus Planning Committee should not allow such development to occur.

Staff pointed out that concern about site selection focuses on two areas—the process (e.g., when site selection occurs and who is making the decision) and policy content (e.g., the degree of specificity provided in the policies about site selection). It appears that the former (process) is the bigger concern.

A member said a greater degree of up-front planning and definition of appropriate sites would be helpful. This would balance the user group process, which is very project specific and perhaps is given too much autonomy. It would also give more definition to siting options than the Biennial Capacity Plan provides.

Staff reviewed the *Campus Plan* policies and patterns applicable to site selection.

A member noted it would be helpful to convey the *Campus Plan*'s siting-related information more succinctly to those engaged in the site-selection process. A member added that the mission of a public university should be more prominent.

A member said the CPC should always have an opportunity to discuss siting options. Therefore, the site should not be selected before the standard CPC Meeting One. This may mean that the CPC process should be initiated earlier in the process before full project funding exists. If a site is selected during the conceptual-design stage, a time limit for the approved site could be established to ensure sites are not tied up indefinitely. If the project does not receive funding by the end of the time period, the site would be made available for other projects. Another member added that perhaps the site-selection process should be different for those that are privately funded versus those that are fee based.

A member noted that if more specific data existed it would be possible to define which sites are appropriate for upcoming projects. This would define which siting options are available to sponsors or donors. Another member said this would help only if those selecting the site consulted the *Campus Plan* and engaged in the planning process.

A member noted that the Faculty Senate is concerned about the manner in which

sites were selected for recent projects (e.g., the Academic Learning Center and the Alumni Center). If the process isn't improved, they are ready to form a subcommittee to address the issue directly.

The chair said the issue would come back to the committee to continue discussion and identify options.

Action: No formal action was requested. The committee's comments will be considered as the discussion continues and possible ways to improve the site-selection process are identified.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Linda Brady, Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Suzanne Clark, English (University Senate)
Anya Dobrowolski, Architecture,
Mike Eyster, Housing
Jennie Hagenberger, Interior Architecture
Dennis Howard, Lundquist College of Business
Gene Mowery, University Planning
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning
Michael Smith, Human Rights Party of Oregon