



December 2, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the November 17, 2008 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Gregg Lobisser (Chair), Leslie Bennett, Scott Coltrane, Don Corner, Carole Daly, Tom Driscoll, Ally Frueauf, Kohlton Kauffman, Roger Kerrigan, Sean Landry, Chicora Martin, Garrett McSorley, Molly Promes, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey, George Rowe, Eric Selker, Molly Sorois, Greg Stripp, Donald Swain

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

Guests: Bob Beals (Athletics), Robert Esau (DLR Group), Allen Gidley (Housing), Larry Gilbert (CMGS), Joe Giansante (Athletics), Gene Mowery (Campus Planning and Real Estate), Levi Patterson (DLR Group), Cathy Soutar (Campus Planning and Real Estate)

**Agenda:**

- **East Campus Student Housing – Meeting One**
- **Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 2 – Schematic Design**

**1. East Campus Student Housing (now referred to as East Campus Residence Hall) – Meeting One**

Background: The CPC chair, indicated his dual role for this agenda item as CPC chair and project sponsor (and user group chair).

Staff reviewed the purpose of Meeting One for the East Campus Residence Hall project as described in the meeting mailing.

Gregg Lobisser assumed his role as user group chair and introduced the project as described in the meeting mailing. The housing project was changed from the original 65-70 unit project (known as the Moss Street Student Housing project) to the current larger 400-500 bed project to better accommodate increasing enrollment and to address both freshman and upperclassman needs. The project will include a new dining facility and academic program spaces. It will be flexible in its design to accommodate future needs.

Gregg said the preferred site is Design Area 72 in the East Campus area. Design Area 72 is the eastern portion (along Moss Street) of the large block bounded by 15th and 17th Avenues

**CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE**

and Agate and Moss Streets. The site presents exciting opportunities; it has the potential for good solar access, beautiful hillside views, and a chance to enhance the surrounding East Campus area, in particular by instituting an open-space framework plan for this area.

Cathy Soutar from Campus Planning and Real Estate presented the key *Campus Plan* patterns and policies and user group representation as described in the meeting mailing. Multiple sites were considered before selecting the preferred site, which best meets project goals and overall campus planning goals. This is the first phase of a multi-phased housing project.

Cathy indicated that the project would come back to the committee for an initial review once a draft open-space framework plan and massing design are developed.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, Cathy said the project would consider the in-progress and proposed Museum of Natural and Cultural History expansion projects. A member added that it is important to consider the relationship of the proposed building and open-space framework plan to all adjacent uses—for example, the Knight Law Center and the Many Nations Longhouse (special indoor and outdoor needs)—and to strive to make the new development and nearby area "a part" of campus.

Cathy clarified that the preferred site is specified for large-scale institutional projects in the Development Policy for the East Campus Area. A residence hall is specifically identified as a likely project for this site. Areas to the east and south are not appropriate, nor are they large enough to accommodate a building of this size as specified in the Development Policy for the East Campus Area.

A member noted that the preferred site is beyond most seven-minute walking circles; therefore, it is not suitable for most instructional uses. It is important to keep this in mind when determining what type of academic uses to incorporate into the project. For example, general use classrooms would not be appropriate.

Members noted that this project will have a large impact on the area; therefore, it is important to have campus neighbor representation (e.g., Moss Street Children's Center, Museum of Natural and Cultural History, Knight Law Center, etc.). Members discussed ways to allow broader, effective neighbor representation during the open-space framework portion of the project without burdening the user group. They suggested a separate open-space framework group with greater neighbor representation (similar to the Science Complex project format). In addition, an opportunity for input from all affected neighbors should be provided at some point in the process.

A member pointed out that Area 72 is the last large area zoned Public Lands that is available for large-scale buildings; therefore, its development should be thoughtfully considered and the land efficiently used. Cathy again indicated that the project would come back to the committee for initial review and comment once the open-space framework study and building massing are developed.

Members agreed with the identified key patterns and policies.

In response to a member's question, Gregg said that completion of this project is designed to provide the surge space needed to begin the process of replacing existing residence halls.

Action: The committee recommended to the president, with nineteen in favor and one abstention, that the following actions be taken:

- A. Approval of the preferred site for the East Campus Residence Hall project.
- B. 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. Accommodate the in-progress and proposed Museum of Natural and Cultural History expansion projects.
  - 2. Consider the relationship of the proposed building and open-space framework plan to all adjacent uses; for example, the Knight Law Center and the Many Nations Longhouse (special indoor and outdoor needs).
  - 3. Strive to make new development and the adjacent East Campus area “a part” of campus.
  - 4. Ensure that academic uses are appropriate for the location (outside most seven-minute walking circles).
  - 5. Ensure that the site is developed in a thoughtful, efficient manner. Recognize the fact that limited land remains for new, large-scale buildings.
  - 6. Bring the project to the committee for initial review and comment when a draft open-space framework plan and building massing plan are developed.
- C. Support of the identified user group representation for the project with the understanding that the following suggestion will be considered as the project moves forward:
  - 1. Ensure broader campus planning issues are addressed. Given the large impact this project will have on the area, recognize the importance of having neighbor representation (e.g., Moss Street Children’s Center, Museum of Natural and Cultural History, Knight Law Center, etc.). Provide a way to allow broader, substantive campus neighbor involvement in the open-space framework planning process without burdening the user group. For example, set up a separate open-space framework group with greater neighbor representation.

## 2. **Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 2 – Schematic Design**

Background: Staff reviewed applicable *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for this Type “C” project as described in the meeting mailing.

Bob Beals from Athletics introduced the project. He said that Phase 2 of the Baseball Stadium Project has been scaled down to address budget limitations.

Gene Mowery from Campus Planning and Real Estate explained that Phase 1 is under construction, Phase 2 is the subject of the committee’s review, and future phases designed to complete the master plan will be brought to the committee for review at a later date (timing undefined).

Levi Patterson from DLR Group reviewed the proposed design as described in the meeting mailing. Proximity to Autzen Stadium presents challenges and opportunities. The baseball stadium would be able to use some of the existing facilities, but it would be challenging to relate to, yet establish a unique identity from, Autzen Stadium, which is so much larger.

Levi said most spectators would be arriving from the south or southwest; therefore the proposed promenade is designed to address circulation and relate to Autzen Stadium. The

primary baseball stadium entrances would be located at the northwest corner and southwest corner of the baseball stadium. The northwest corner entry would face MLK Boulevard and serve as the “formal” entry. It would extend the Autzen Stadium entry plaza and is identified by a tower that doubles as the service core. The roof design (glue lams supporting a raised, tilted, canopy roof) is a gesture to the Autzen roof design as is the service ramp along the western edge, which mirrors the Autzen ramp. The circulation route between Autzen and the new baseball stadium would serve as a pedestrian route as well as a required fire lane.

Levi summarized how the project meets applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns.

Discussion: In response to a member’s question, Levi said the primary building materials would be a mix of concrete masonry units (CMU) that relate to other nearby athletics buildings. The entry tower would be brick to create a unique identity for the baseball stadium. In addition, panelized wood is proposed for a portion of the tower to add warmth to the design. The entry plaza materials primarily would be concrete with details to match the adjacent Autzen entry area. Pervious asphalt would be used in selective paved areas.

A member expressed concern about the durability of the panelized wood and the potential for vandalism. Gene said the complex is gated and would be locked when not in use. A member noted that this would not stop vandalism during operating hours.

A member stated that the main design challenge is to address the scale difference between Autzen and the baseball stadium. He suggested streamlining the baseball design (reduce the level of “fussy” details) to better relate to the functional design of Autzen. Another member noted that a primary visual design component of the complex would be the field surrounded by the large, double-light poles—not just the tower entry.

A member expressed concern about the awkward relation between the highly detailed tower and the adjacent basic locker room wall along the northern edge of the stadium. He suggested modifying the design to make these two parts better relate to one another to create a more unified design. Another member suggested replacing the proposed brick with a more appropriate material from the CMU family of materials that still provides the finer grain level of detail. This is a unique location outside of the main campus area where brick may not be the most fitting material. Joe Giusante from Athletics said brick was proposed because brick is a traditional material used for baseball stadiums.

A member noted that the proposed “O” logos on exterior walls must meet the Eugene sign code similar to those recently installed at Autzen Stadium.

In response to a member’s question, Levi said the long-term goal would be to extend the roofline and increase the number of suites when funds permit. Conditioned space (heat only) would be limited to the suites and the locker rooms.

A member noted that the existing Autzen bike parking is too far away to be functionally useful. Bike parking facilities closer to the baseball stadium's south entrance (the direction from which most riders will arrive) should be considered.

Action: The committee agreed with twenty in favor and one abstention that the schematic design for the Baseball Stadium Project: Phase 2 is consistent with the identified list of *Campus Plan* patterns and policies and recommended to the president that it be approved with the understanding that the following recommendations will be considered:

1. Ensure that all signage, including the mounted "O's", meet the Eugene sign code.
2. Evaluate the durability of the proposed panelized wood and the potential for vandalism, and consider alternate materials as appropriate.
3. Streamline the overall baseball stadium design (reduce the level of "fussy" details) to better relate to the functional design and scale of Autzen Stadium.
4. Consider design modifications to create a more unified design and better relate the highly detailed tower to the adjacent basic locker room wall along the northern edge of the stadium.
5. Consider replacing the proposed brick tower material with a more appropriate material from the CMU family of materials that still provides the desired finer grain level of detail.
6. Consider installing bike-parking facilities closer to the baseball stadium south entrance if at all possible.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Vince Babkirk, Facilities Services  
Renee Baumgartner, Athletics  
Bob Beals, Athletics  
George Bleekman, Facilities Services  
Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services  
Jim Conley, DLR Group  
Darin Dehle, Facilities Services  
Sam Dotters-Katz, ASUO  
Jon Erlandson, Museum of Natural and Cultural History  
Robert Esau, DLR Group  
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division  
Joe Giansante, Athletics  
Allen Gidley, Housing  
Larry Gilbert, CMGS  
Mark Gillem, Fairmount Neighbors  
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning  
Karen Hyatt, Community Relations  
Herb Horner, DPS  
George Horton, Athletics  
Sue Jakobosky, Fairmount Neighbors  
Roger Kerrigan, Facilities Services  
Gene Mowery, Campus Planning and Real Estate  
Levi Patterson, DLR Group  
Judi Pruitt, Museum of Natural and Cultural History (Building Manager)  
Dennis Reynolds, Moss Street Children's Center  
Greg Rikhoff, Community Relations  
Cathy Soutar, Campus Planning and Real Estate  
Fred Tepfer, Campus Planning and Real Estate  
Paul van Donkelaar, Human Physiology (University Senate)  
Nancy Wright, Housing