



EXPLANATION OF THE ARENA PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS OUTSIDE OF UO POLICY 7.000 FOUNDATION PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

UO Policy Statement 7.000 Foundation Practices and Procedures: Facility Improvements Financed from Donations was adopted in 1983 (Refer to policy at <http://policies.uoregon.edu/ch7b.html>). The process set out in the policy envisions a building in which a donor proposed to assist with construction of a building related to a college, school or department. It was developed at a time when state funds provided the bulk of funding for capital construction, even when a donor made a substantial contribution. Certain steps required the Dean or Department Head to submit a statement of need and a project description to the appropriate Vice President. The Vice President forwards the documents prepared by the Dean or Department Head to the Campus Planning Committee for review. The Campus Planning Committee forwards its analysis and recommendation to the President.

In the current situation, because of the unique siting questions associated with building an arena, this procedure did not fully meet the University's needs in assessing whether to build an arena and, if so, what sites should be considered. The University hired consultants with special expertise early in the process to provide a report to the President. During the time the consultants were performing their work, but before their work was complete, a number of donors proposed a process that was somewhat different than had been used before.

In this instance, a non-profit corporation was created as a subsidiary of the Foundation. The donors suggested, and Administration concurred, that by allowing the non-profit final control of the many aspects of the design and construction process, they could ensure the project was completed in a cost-efficient and timely manner. Thus, we have set out to modify the process described in the policy so that we can follow the mission of the Long Range Campus Development Plan utilizing a slightly different role for the Campus Planning Committee.

The Campus Planning Committee will remain advisory to the President. However, its role in this project will be:

1. To amend the Long Range Campus Development Plan to reflect the President's selection of Howe Field as the site for the arena;
2. To review the arena design and to provide the comments in light of criteria in the LRCDP;
3. To host a public comment session and report comments from that session to the President;
4. To form a subcommittee that will work with facility users displaced by the project and make recommendations to the President regarding replacement sites; and
5. To review the design of the relocated functions under the appropriate criteria in the LRCDP.

The President sees the Campus Planning Committee's role as crucial in allowing us to provide input to the architects and designers that reflects the criteria contained in the LRCDP.

While we are mindful and support the purpose of involving the Campus Planning Committee in siting decisions, the timing and the possibility the site would be off-campus made that decision unworkable in this instance. The consultants were aware of the criteria the Campus Planning Committee would have used as well as other criteria, such as the relation to population and transportation, involvement of local government, and site requirements that are unique to the kind of facility that will be constructed and require special expertise.

As mentioned, the current policy was developed in 1983. It is time to review and update the policy. For example, the Chancellor's Office no longer plays a major role in design and construction on the campus. Also, methods of contracting for public improvements have changed. The Campus Planning Committee will review proposed changes and will make recommendations to the President prior to adoption of a revised policy.