



April 5, 2011

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
Campus Planning and Real Estate

Subject: **Record** of the March 7, 2011 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Gregg Lobisser (Chair), G.Z. Brown, Phil Carroll, Tom Driscoll, Nathan Howard,
Dana Johnston, Dean Livelybrooks, Roberta Mann, Chicora Martin,
Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey, Greg Rikhoff, Eric Selker, Rob Thallon

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (Campus Planning and Real Estate)

Guests: Vince Babbirk (Facilities Services), Martina Bill (CPRE), Emily Eng (CPRE), Dan Geiger (Outdoor Program), Brian Haunert (PE and Rec), Garrick Mishaga (Facilities Services), Gene Mowery (CPRE), Dennis Munroe (PE and Rec), Wendy Polhemus (EMU), Dana Winitsky

Agenda:

**Student Recreation Center Expansion and Renovation Project – Meeting One
Erb Memorial Union Expansion and Renovation Project – Meeting One**

Gregg Lobisser, AVP for Student Affairs Projects and EMU Project User Group Chair, provided an overview of both projects. He described how the projects were initiated. The Student Recreation Center project will likely have a minimal impact on the exterior character of the building. The EMU project will be more complex and may be completed in phases. The initial EMU proposal would retain the Lawrence portion of the building and replace the 1970s wing, which has numerous maintenance problems and doesn't use space efficiently. Once a proposed location for the proposed new parking has been determined it will be brought to the CPC for review.

Gregg turned the meeting over to Andrzej Proskurowski to serve as chair to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

1. Student Recreation Center Expansion and Renovation Project – Meeting One

Background: Staff reviewed the purpose of Meeting One.

Dennis Munroe, project user group chair, introduced the project as described in the meeting mailing. The project is designed to address both recreational and academic needs. The primary feature of the proposed Student Recreation Center expansion is a natatorium addition, which would require removal of the covered tennis courts. The

CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE

existing indoor Student Tennis Center would be expanded as well. The existing Student Recreation Center façade would remain intact except for a proposed relocation of the service delivery access to a more appropriate location. Pedestrian and bike access bisecting the block would be carefully preserved.

Gene Mowery, project planner, reviewed the suggested list of applicable *Campus Plan* patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing.

Discussion: Members discussed the *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project, other appropriate campus design issues, and the proposed user group representation.

Members' comments related to the project are listed below under the action item. Members noted that a number of the comments also apply to the Erb Memorial Union Expansion and Renovation Project.

Frances Dyke noted that Mac Court currently is being used primarily by Club Sports. The area containing Mac Court and the adjacent site is one of the potential sites for AAA expansion. AAA will select its preferred site by the end of spring term.

Staff clarified that this project would not be required to comply with the proposed Oregon Model for Sustainable Development. Dennis indicated a strong interest in sustainable design, noting the potential for solar water heating for the pool as an example.

Frances shared a request from the Senate Budget Committee to expand the user group representation for both projects to include another faculty member (non-AAA) in response to the broad use of the facility. Staff noted that user groups for both projects currently have faculty, staff, and student representation. Members discussed options to add another faculty member without making the user groups too large and less effective. A member noted that focus groups would offer opportunities for much broader involvement by faculty and others. Another member suggested adding a faculty member that represents a department that uses the facilities.

Action: The committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the president the following actions related to the Student Recreation Center Expansion and Renovation Project:

- A. Support of the identified *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the following comments will be considered as the project moves forward:
 1. Consider the future of Mac Court when determining how to meet programmatic needs and when designing and siting the proposed addition.
 2. Recognize the importance of Policy 8: Universal Access.
 3. Accommodate gender-inclusive spaces.
 4. Give serious consideration to Policy 10: Sustainable Development. Use this project as a test case for implementing the proposed Oregon Model for Sustainable Development policy (e.g., integrate educational components, consider alternate energy sources, remodel existing spaces to compensate for additional energy use).
 5. Enhance the existing pathway that bisects the block to provide a safe environment for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Thoughtfully consider the appropriate use of the pathway to determine appropriate enhancements.
 6. Thoughtfully address the new *Campus Plan* pattern Welcoming to All, recognizing that the SRC is a facility open to all.

7. Carefully coordinate bike parking needs with the EMU and overall campus needs. Also consider the potential to provide space for the proposed Bike Share program.
- B. Support of the identified user group representation for the project with the understanding that the following condition will be addressed as the project moves forward:
Project staff and the user group chair will determine how to best increase faculty representation.

2. Erb Memorial Union Expansion and Renovation Project – Meeting One

Background: Wendy Polhemus and Dan Geiger, project user group representatives, introduced the project, provided an overview of the project program as described in the meeting mailing. The primary goal is for the EMU to become a university center for all. Existing uses will be kept and enhanced. Student government and multiculturalism will be showcased, IT technology will be enhanced, flexibility will be maximized, open access will be a priority, and sustainability will be integrated throughout with educational opportunities emphasized.

New proposed uses include a 1,200 seat performance hall and enhanced conference functions with the goal of attracting major regional conferences for both the UO community and the greater community. The overall goal for these improvements is to better connect to the academic mission by, for example, collaborating with the School of Music and Dance (concert hall), providing additional classroom space, improving the physical connection to the SRC, and elevating the role of the “3 Rs”—recruitment, retention, and residential.

Wendy added that the project user group is fully aware of and committed to addressing the key issues of parking and traffic. Staff noted that parking would be brought back to the CPC for site approval.

Martina Bill, project planner, outlined the user group representation and reviewed the suggested list of applicable *Campus Plan* patterns and policies as described in the meeting mailing. Some of the highlighted patterns included Promenade, Family of Entrances, Architectural Style, Flexible Use, Fabric of Departments, and transportation-related patterns. She noted that the user group would work closely with the Exterior Team and an arborist to assess the condition of potentially affected trees and determine how best to protect or replace them.

Discussion: Members discussed the *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project, other appropriate campus design issues, and the proposed user group representation.

Members’ comments related to the project (including those discussed as part of the first agenda item) are listed below under the action item.

Frances shared a request from the Senate Budget Committee to expand the user group representation to include another faculty member (non-AAA) as described above.

A member said that the project’s large programmatic list makes him concerned about the total project size. Gregg said the project should add only about 30,000 square feet. This is because the poorly utilized 1970s addition (40% utilization rate) would be replaced with much more efficient space.

Action: The committee unanimously agreed to recommended to the president the following actions related to the Erb Memorial Union Expansion and Renovation Project:

- A. Support of the identified *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the following comments will be considered as the project moves forward:
 1. Recognize the importance of Policy 8: Universal Access.
 2. Accommodate gender-inclusive spaces.
 3. Give serious consideration to Policy 10: Sustainable Development. Use this project as a test case for implementing the proposed Oregon Model for Sustainable Development policy (e.g., integrate educational components, consider alternate energy sources, remodel existing spaces to compensate for additional energy use).
 4. Thoughtfully address the new *Campus Plan* pattern Welcoming to All, recognizing that the EMU is a facility open to all.
 5. Carefully coordinate bike parking needs with the SRC and overall campus needs. Also consider the potential to provide space for the proposed Bike Share program.
 6. Make every effort to coordinate functions and proposed uses with other departments and related projects (Mac Court and SRC).
 7. Determine how to address potential conflicts with desired uses and consider the resulting overall building size.
 8. Look into options to provide a faculty lounge / dining / gathering space to facilitate interdepartmental collaborations.
 9. Consider ways to take advantage of and enhance Straub Hall Green when looking for ways to address project goals (e.g., improve connections to the Student Recreation Center, enhance sustainable stormwater measures).
 10. Retain and enhance promenade access through the site 24/7. However, consider adjustments to the promenade location if it helps to enhance the building design (e.g., South-facing Outdoors, Flexible Use).
 11. Enhance pedestrian access within the entire quadrant on all sides of the building (to and through the area).
 12. Resolve existing landscaping issues whenever possible (e.g., poor condition of University Street Red Oaks due to compaction, bike parking, and numerous cut-through paths).
 13. Identify and address all associated needs with the proposed new uses, especially the 1200 seat facility, conference enhancements, and pub (e.g., parking, service access, etc). Be sure to address residential / lodging needs and related transportation issues associated with the proposed enhanced convention center uses.
 14. Recognize that the *Campus Plan* does not support parking in the campus core.
Minimize vehicular parking on site (focus on off-site options with shuttles). The proposed 250 additional parking spaces is a large number that needs to be carefully considered. If a proposed solution requires an amendment to the *Campus Plan*, thoughtfully consider other options before bringing it back to the Campus Planning Committee.
 15. Maintain and enhance adequate visitor parking and loading / drop off spaces for existing EMU and campus uses (not related to new uses) in appropriate locations. Pay particular attention to the EMU parking lot.
 16. Resolve parking traffic flow. Ensure safe access for bicyclists.
 17. Look into ways to provide water spigots at drinking fountains to promote use of reusable water bottles.

18. Carefully consider ways to provide good daylighting for general student gathering spaces (e.g., to replace the Skylight area) and for student group offices.
- B. Support of the identified user group representation for the project with the understanding that the following condition will be addressed as the project moves forward:
 - Project staff and the user group chair will determine how to best address the desire for an additional faculty member.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Vince Babkirk, Facilities Services
Martina Bill, CPRE
Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services
Darin Dehle, Facilities Services
Emily Eng, CPRE
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division
Dan Geiger, Outdoor Program
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning
Brent Harrison, SRC
Bryan Haunert, PE and Rec
Herb Horner, DPS
Dave Hubin, President's Office
Garrick Mishaga, Facilities Services
Gene Mowery, CPRE
Dennis Munroe, PE and Rec
Wendy Polhemus, EMU
Amelie Rousseau, ASUO
Fred Tepfer, CPRE
Dana Winitsky, EMU