

March 4, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the February 15, 2005 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Sebastian Collet, Michael Fifield, Rich Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Gordon Melby, Steve Pickett, Andrzej Proskurowski, Robert Ribe, Michael Stamm

Guests: Tim King (Facilities Services)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: **Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Plan Review Process and Proposed Revisions**

**1. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Plan Review Process and Proposed Revisions**

Background: The committee chair introduced the draft version of the updated Campus Plan. She explained that committee review will focus on key issues. If desired, smaller groups can be formed to further discuss issues that require more focused discussion time (similar to the two work sessions that were held previously). The goal is to have the updated Campus Plan completed by the end of spring term. The number of meetings will be determined by how much time the committee wants to spend to ensure everyone has a chance to provide input. Staff added that editorial comments are welcome. She encouraged members to mark up their draft copies and submit them to staff.

Staff reviewed the draft plan's Vision and Policy chapters and asked for committee feedback.

-

Discussion: Members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Change the use of "piecemeal growth" in the Vision statement to avoid a negative connotation and better reflect the desire to have a cohesive campus design.
- Review the Oregon Experiment principles, in particular organic order, to ensure they are

still appropriate to use.

- Focus attention on defining the existing and desired character of open spaces.
- If changes to allowed densities are proposed, consider making reductions, not only enlargements.
- Consider the appropriate role of the user group, particularly as related to the architect selection process. Ensure that the Campus Planning Committee and the user group clearly share this role in order to meet broader campus needs.

Action: No formal action was required. The committee's comments will be taken into consideration when preparing the final version of the document.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

. Tim King, Facilities Services  
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning