Feedback from Outreach/Engagement Process for 3 Building Projects

10/2/14 notes from focus group meeting with EMU/Outdoor Program representatives

Attendees: Laurie Woodward, EMU director; Suzanne Hanlon, Outdoor Program assistant coordinator; Dan Geiger, Outdoor Program coordinator; Dana Winitzky, EMU associate director, facilities & operations

- The outdoor program's location is valuable and convenient to a substantial number of students who take advantage of the outdoor program's offerings.
- The turning radius and drive-through capabilities existing at the outdoor program's barn is an integral feature that has to be maintained throughout its use, and the access must be maintained and left open during any construction on the softball site.
- There are a number of special and unique features to the building (e.g., greywater system, solar panels, etc.) that have been provided through earlier capital projects and any relocation/displacement should account for full-value replacement of these sustainability features.
- Timing of any replacement/displacement is key, and there should be no interruption of service/functions for the outdoor program (I.e., a new facility should be completed with a quick move-in from the existing location, rather than having some protracted period without having the building and its functions while a new one is being constructed).
- Staging as well as construction for the new softball stadium should be considerate of ongoing operations at the outdoor program facility, and guard against potential negative impacts to the outdoor program (e.g., restricted access, encroachment upon parking on-site, etc.).
- Parking/loading and unloading area on the perimeter of the outdoor program site and the turning radius needs to be protected and maintained during construction and after.
- Any future relocation should consider proximity to the EMU as an issue for staff and patron/student convenience. Quality of location/visibility and distance are all factors to be considered.

10/7/14 notes from focus group meeting with Campus Operations management team

Attendees: George Hecht, associate VP-Campus Operations; Brett Rogers, Facilities Services director; Debbie Cadigan, Campus Relations manager; Jon Marchetta, Administrative Services director; Kevin McGlinchey, IT manager; Shelley Whitaker, executive assistant

- About 93% of freshmen are now in on-campus housing; would like it to be at 100% of incoming freshman class housed on-campus.
• Old student dorms are functionally obsolete and need to be renovated or replaced.
• The Riverfront Research Park could be renewed and redeveloped, though understand there are issues with building north of the railroad tracks.

10/7/14 notes from phone conversation with James Hutchison, chemistry faculty
• He hadn’t heard about the Framework Vision Project until recently, and from architects in Portland.
• Science – interested in connectivity with existing science complex and implications of how the future building and users relate to other possible moves/renovations.
• He referenced the need to replace Onyx Bridge (where his office is located) due to seismic needs, and potential relocation of AAA functions from Lawrence Hall. The moves are like a game of chess.
• Some recent improvements (Lokey Labs) have worked great; others (LISB) is a work in progress.
• There is a need to tie together the academic plan needs and hiring aspirations/cluster hires with building, construction and planning activities.
• He's unclear who is the owner of the longer-range discussion (Research & Innovation leadership or who), and how/when to get involved to make sure the concerns/issues he and other researchers have are heard, since the implications of the moves and how/where executed will be long-term.
• He understands that the Advisory Group is well represented by CAS and Research & Innovation, but would like to make sure they hear from those who have been around longer and have more intimate understanding of their practical issues.

10/7/14 notes from focus group meeting with Fairmount Neighborhood Association executive committee
Attendees: Co-chairs Patrick Deegan and Steven Asbury, Sue Jacobosky, Heather Seliecki, Kay Porter, Danny Klute, Camilla Bayliss, Kay Rose
• Why add a residence hall; why not rent out existing student housing developments?
• Site A would provide a better corridor for science.
• There are/would be parking conflict with expanded softball use at Howe Field; you'll hear about it from SUNA – student parking along University Street will conflict with games.
• UO is eating up open space on campus (e.g., Lewis); there are constraints in building at the Riverfront Research Park, but it could also be a beautiful space for campus growth.
• The central kitchen project ignored the FNA and they feel railroaded by UO decision-making process. Despite what the UO/City may say, neighbors will be
impacted by 6:00 am deliveries, backing beepers, and traffic cutting through the neighborhood rather than designated routes (i.e., trucks will avoid Agate St.).

• The residence hall project will displace parking, which will generate more impacts on neighborhoods. The University needs to address parking or enforce and protect the Fairmount neighborhood.

• Suggest looking at a longer-term plan for a softball site. The Howe Field site is needed for academic uses close to the campus core. Instead put the stadium by the river; even Glenwood would be okay.

• Allen Hall was just renovated and is out of space – there is a need for more academic space.

• Like the idea of blending academic and stadium uses, though not hopeful that athletics will go along with it.

• I challenge the UO and campus planning to think big – step back, look at gateways to campus and Franklin Blvd; suggest putting softball on the river – could be done sensitively with creative architectural solution.

• Proceeding with the three projects in advance of the Framework Vision Project is backwards mode again.

• Planning at the UO is poorly coordinated; each school has its own plan, politics and turf.

• Onyx Bridge needs to be replaced; concerned about more pavement/hardscape with new science library entrance project.

10/8/14  Campus Open House – Lewis Integrative Science Bldg

• The preferred options make sense to me. I’m glad to see the riverfront was not considered preferable for the residence hall or softball field. I’m in favor of the higher density residence hall to maintain compact growth.

• Do not like Options D2 or E. Too much impact on campus + grounds operations, as well as Olum Child Care. D1 has the least impact.

• Science location proposed is superior to others, but removes convenient parking for science faculty/researchers.

• Science building: Great site selection close to campus. Would like to see general use classroom space added to scope of project. Garage parking, if existing parking affected. – Mike Jeffers (Registrar’s)

• Please consider adding a handful of classrooms to both the research building and residence hall. Classrooms provide a life to a building by giving a reason for faculty and undergrads to mingle. With the skybridge to the new research space crossing Franklin shouldn’t be a problem. And we need more classrooms for 21st century learning.

• The residence hall project seems like a great opportunity to also expand Olum CDC. The physical structure of Olum is inadequate for the numbers of families on campus who could want to access this service. The UO has a real opportunity to be a leader in providing family friendly resources + enough day care for all faculty as a recruiting tool. My family loves Olum but we are in the minority of faculty who have been able to get into [the] center.
• Science building – It will be very important for this to be an exciting, stimulating work environment, rather than an isolated location. A crucial element would be a café where scientist[s] would be likely to interact. Also a seminar room that would attract other scientists from other parts of campus. – Karen Guillemine

• Residence Hall – If this were to be sited where Olum Center is located, this could be an opportunity to solve a huge problem on campus that there is insufficient infant care for our faculty (meaning that we lose the opportunity to be competitive in attracting young faculty, especially women). The current Olum building is absolutely inadequate and includes a moldy 20 year old trailer from Portland State. – Karen Guillemine

• Science – Site A (Franklin Blvd) definitely preferred:
  a) Proximity to Lewis and all of the other Natural Science department homes;
  b) Skybridge as a visual declaration of UO on both sides of Franklin
  c) Proximity to the science park

Consideration: there is a power feed coming in from the north, and another from the south; we are currently doing work to extend north power feed into Deschutes to eliminate a single point of failure issue in our machine room. Both power feeds need to reach the new building for the same reason. – J. Sventek (head of CIS department)

• Softball - I realize these kinds of decisions are based on business sense and practical reasons...so I’ll start with a couple of those:

  The Oregon softball program has recently built a substantial fan base that includes UO students – and psychological studies show that convenience for participation is a huge issue. Taking softball off campus would be a significant threat to the ability to maintain the growing student fan base.

  There is ample room on the current site to relocate home plate toward center field so new stands, locker rooms, concessions, etc. can be built behind it – and I believe leaving room for other needs beyond the outfield fence. There might actually be room for a couple sand volleyball courts which would bring yet another women’s sport onto campus.

  The academic buildings that are slated for this block in the somewhat distant future can still be built to the north of Mac Court and go up 4-5 stories instead of being 2-3 stories and spread out.

  The Outdoor Program might be able to stay if it would end up in foul territory, but it has a small footprint and would be easier to relocate.

  Leaving the field at HOWE means the UO does not have to purchase property...aw we already own it.

  And I can’t help but add a couple of heart-felt thoughts:

  Oregon softball has a history of being bumped around from location to location. The team has played on Gerlinger Field, practiced behind the library and played at Amazon Park, was moved to Rec Field #3 down by the track, and eventually landed at Howe. Let the program keep this wonderful
location that has finally been “home” for the last 20+ years! This is the site where the quality of this program has been re-built and confirmed. Howe Field is a beautiful and historic location and it keeps a top 5 NCAA program on campus. And, of course, we have an extraordinary opportunity to right the largest gap in the university’s compliance with Title IX issues so I believe a campus site is crucial.

I’ve spoken with about a dozen softball alumni in the last week and to a woman they support and, frankly, are praying for the team to stay at home.

One concern: I understand this block has been considered for classroom buildings, but there will be a significant conflict with the volume of the public address system, music and marketing that goes along with today’s athletic events and this would be a certain disturbance to classes close by.

I would caution the committee to avoid the creation of additional bad feelings between faculty and the athletic department. I would advise moving new classrooms to the north of Mac Court. – Peg Rees

10/10/14 notes from focus group meeting of on-campus ‘neighbors’ proximate to proposed residence hall area

Attendees: Gwen Bolden-Parking & Transportation; David Hubin-President’s office; Gordon Bettles-Many Nations Longhouse steward; Jason Younker-Assistant VP & Advisor to the President; Amy Ripley-Olum Center director; Becky Lamoreaux-Moss Street Children’s Center director; Darin Dehle-CPDC, Capital Construction director; Tom Shepard-CPDC Capital Construction manager; Michael Griffel-Housing director; Gus Lim-Housing Facilities Services director; Garrick Mishaga-Campus Operations Exterior Team supervisor

• Why can’t a residence hall be sited immediately east of Global Scholars? [Answer: adopted plan/zoning restrictions allow for medium-density on-campus student apartments, but not a residence hall]
• Prior agreements – some verbal understandings – made with prior UO presidents related to protecting solar access during the winter solstice to an honoring place. Look at the Johnpaul Jones study that established an honoring place.
• The 9 nations were opposed to the Global Scholars Hall but Johnpaul Jones brought understanding from the tribal point-of-view.
• It’s not a sin to talk to neighbors about possible rezoning.
• The winter solstice is important to religious beliefs of tribal members; need to look at future generations, not just today’s need. Need to maintain access to the Longhouse, and part of the earlier agreement was to provide parking for the Longhouse – the CPC hasn’t honored that.
• The Global Scholars project was improved due to Johnpaul Jones’ engagement. There was a formal agreement for tribal space and expansion of the Longhouse, but the vision was not formally ratified by the CPC, but understood that the Many Nations Longhouse axis was to be a significant major entrance to campus.
• The process of visioning with the tribes takes a long time. Just now hearing about impacts to solstice views. Tribes need an understanding of what things will look like within 20, 50 years. They need an ability to accomplish ceremonies. The function of the Longhouse as an embassy for the tribes has to be maintained.
• Issues of the abutting neighborhoods pales to that of tribal councils.
• Time is what is important in ceremonies; the issue is about the elevations of the future buildings.
• Retaining views of the winter solstice sunrise is important; law school eliminated the northwestern solstice view from outside the Longhouse – retaining the SE solstice view is important.
• Ask that Johnpaul Jones assist in design solutions early.
• Native American Student Union met last night and passed a resolution that they couldn’t support the residence hall project if it didn’t honor the values and cultural practices of the Longhouse.
• SLATS (former Native American law school association) also agreed nothing should go forward until these needs are discussed and met.
• Native American Strategies Group (faculty, staff and students group) said they’d like to meet with the CPC.
• Northwest Indian Language Institute directors had concerns as well that this could impact NILI.
• Suggest taking more time to determine siting and get more options.
• It was noted that the earlier Johnpaul Jones study identified future development SE of the Longhouse.
• Verbal understanding was that the view of the horizon/hills could be preserved.
• Re: parking loss, knowing what is coming is important. It could be possible to look into rules changes-e.g., limiting freshman from bringing cars to campus.
• Question about if this building could be built low and replacement of Bean being higher. [Answer: this project presumes money will be available to renovate, but not replace older dorms, per 2011 feasibility study]
• Goal is to integrate academics and housing, and not to replicate dining facilities, but use existing food service facilities adjacent that have capacity.
• Could it be possible to locate this east of Moss Street and swap densities in the SE quadrant, plus build in some parking for the Longhouse.
• Such planning with neighbors could add a year to the project, and additional expense that would break the budget. UO needs the bed space.
• Issues of the arena and neighbors were resolved at the Longhouse. The Longhouse is a spiritual place, available for conversations.
• Agreements concerning the UO and child care facilities relate to siting and the gentle edge to the neighborhood. Concern is not just in this project, but in services for graduate students in the surrounding area.
10/10/14 e-mail re: Residence Hall – Becky Lamoureux, UO Student Life, director of Moss Street Children’s Center

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me yesterday. The information you shared demonstrated a thorough process for site selection for important campus projects. It was exciting to see the plans for the future. I also appreciate your interest and willingness to think out loud with me about what is next for the neighborhood surrounding Moss Street Children’s Center.

For the past 40 years, the student families at Moss Street have benefitted from the support of the institution, students, staff, faculty and administrators. The thoughtful positioning of the center in a residential neighborhood consisting of many U of O housing units available to student families has been part of this support. As these homes age and the U of O looks to locate the many facilities necessary to provide services for the current and projected enrollment, staff and faculty I find it prudent to consider Moss Street Children’s Center’s future. I would ask that those planning for the use of this are consider the continued need for our service and the possible impacts of the current and future projects.

If you have not done so already, please consider the topics listed below in your site analysis, design and visioning.

1. The importance of our services to student families and the university community. Many University families would not be able to pursue their academic goals without our services. In addition, many students rely on Moss Street for employment, internships, practicum, observations and opportunities for experience with young children.

2. The importance of the relationship of the Center to family student housing in the neighborhood. By design, many Moss Street children live in the neighborhood surrounding Moss Street.

3. Careful planning for calm traffic patterns and features that enhance safety for all forms of transport. The families that commute to Moss Street need safe passage and access as they travel by stroller, trike, bike, foot, bus and car.

4. Prioritization of green space, light, low levels of noise for aesthetic and recreation. Perhaps allowing for spaces in new buildings that could compliment the center like indoor activity areas for groups of children, playgrounds, activity fields that could be used to provide service for children for conferencing, orientations, etc.

I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these points with you when and if it would be appropriate to your planning process.

10/13/14 notes from focus group meeting of representatives of Many Nations Longhouse

Attendees: Gordon Bettles-Many Nations Longhouse steward; Jason Younker-Assistant VP & Advisor to the President; David Hubin-President’s office; Christine Thompson-CPDC; Phil Farrington-CPDC

• As shown, building massing on D1 option won’t work for the Longhouse; discussion about siting requirements to preserve the winter solstice view
• Some agreements made by former president Lariviere were written into the campus plan; but there were additional agreements not written into the plan. Tribal chairs made these understandings in good faith.
• This is an opportunity to get very creative; this could either harm relations with the tribes or make them stronger.
• The tribes see the Longhouse building as half-done; the Native American vision is forever. If the building was designed based upon UO promises and honored the purposes of the Longhouse, then the UO president can stand behind that.
• What would it mean to respect the traditions of the Longhouse with any future development?
• Need to Longhouse parking for elders, young mothers/babies, access for events/ceremonies. Respect for the solstice architecturally and physically, and interpret it on the site.
• See the design by Johnpaul Jones for the Expression Place and the east open space axis. Need to attach funding for development of the Expression Place
• Question about where parking would be relocated that would be displaced by the residence hall. Part of preserving the Longhouse is making it fully functional and accessible.
• Include the center of the Expression Place as the point for measuring the solstice sunrise.
• President Coltrane is scheduled to appear at a tribal council in Umatilla next February.
• Consult with Johnpaul Jones on aspects that would make the site viable.
• Tribal representatives can announce that we are looking at sites and engaging Johnpaul Jones in further design and analysis.
• Characteristics that should go into the project to make it viable include: preservation of winter solstice solar access, honoring place and open space axis, expansion capability for Longhouse, parking/future needs.
• Potential to incorporate interpretation into outdoor improvements (e.g., as was done at Museum of Natural and Cultural History), perhaps as 1% for art – e.g., bronze plaques/line in pavement interpreting solstice angle and its importance.
• This could be a long-lasting legacy with tribal nations. Would be nice if we could reserve space/a wing in the residence hall for Native American incoming students.

10/14/14 Campus Open House – Ford Alumni Center
  • Excellent job; love the schemes. – Daniel Klute (South University neighbor)
  • When renovating parking, add conduit for electrical vehicle parking, especially for residence hall(s). Buildings should look at a 100-year horizon, so add conduit now since 20+ years from now we will need it to power all vehicles. – Phil Barnhart (state legislator)
• 1,500 seats isn’t enough for women’s softball – even 2,500 for tournament play is inadequate, even to start out. The sport is growing and needs to be accommodated – as proposed it won’t meet expectations. Parking is another huge issue. A different location would be better, especially at Autzen. Could the Howe site be a better fit for academic uses? Would prefer to take another 1-2 years to explore and make available an alternative site other than Howe Field. Give it more time. – Carol Anthony (fan, former softball athlete, parent of former softball athlete)

• Logistics/loading docks for science shouldn’t be an afterthought, but integrated up front; this is VERY important! The science building should also have a commercial mixed-use component with coffee/food, to replace what was removed and to support use of the building and area. Also, the design of the building needs to look at vibrations and stability for the science site and future functions within that building. – Michael Strain (UO faculty and South University neighbor)

• Where is the area for batting cages? The space seems limited – where is the area for a 3rd or 4th team to warm up while a game is going on – or at least an infield area? How does seating for 1,500 compare to stadiums at other top 10-rated programs? Parking is a huge concern. What is happening to address this problem? – Becky Sisley

• Curious about the potential for a thoughtful, well-insulated, well-defined child care center (Olum addition or replacement) as 1st floor of new dorm (Global Scholars has 1st floor classrooms). As model, consider daycare center @ Roybal Fed Bldg in downtown LA (Pregerson Center). Olum/UO needs more/better space to help with faculty attraction and retention, would benefit from, e.g., commercial kitchen and many other updates. Hard to raise $ for Olum (?). Olum employs many student workers, hours of Olum operation tend to be relatively “quiet” undergrad hours – low likelihood of disruptions. I have not discussed with Olum leadership – Rebekah Hanley (Assistant dean, UO law school)

• Housing – Generally feel the one buiding option is best. If going with an option that displaces Grounds Crew building, need to replace it. – Grounds crew staff

10/14/14 notes from focus group meeting with South University Neighborhood Association executive committee

• SUNA neighbors urge the university to focus on new construction and expansion in locations that are not close to residential neighborhoods.

• Pamela Miller, SUNA co-chair, urged the university to consider public-private partnerships for housing and use/renovate already existing apartment housing instead of building brand new housing and saturating the market even more.

• Re: softball – you should look at Civic Stadium as an option.
• SUNA neighbors are concerned about parking in the neighborhood for softball games if Howe Field is selected for stadium site. They have experienced significant parking relief since Mac Court stopped being a host site for basketball and volleyball. Still, they are looking for more parking relief.
• Karen Hyatt noted that after I left board discussion ensued: they agree on encouraging development elsewhere to relieve pressure on the neighborhoods south and east of campus, but are not ready as a group to specifically recommend the Riverfront Research Park area for development.
• Karen also noted that SUNA is continuing to pursue asking the university to purchase or at least finance existing private single-family homes and make them available/affordable for new faculty and staff, or at least urge people to buy and live in the dwellings in their neighborhood. They are trying to avoid more single-family dwellings becoming student rentals.
• Karen also noted that someone brought up the possibility of changing 2-hour parking limits to seven days a week like Fairmount, but others objected vehemently.

10/23/14 e-mail re: Residence Hall Site Selection – Karen Longvin, Director, Work-Life Resources, Human Resources

I’m writing to share the input on the three sites under consideration for the new residence hall as it relates to the Vivian Olum Child Development Center. Thank you for sharing this with the Advisory Group and the Campus Planning Committee as appropriate to the selection process.

Site D1-Across Columbia and within the parking lot presents the most compatible location of the three sites for the center. One concern is the elimination of parking spaces available to parents which are in close proximity to the center. Many parents park in that lot and drop their children off at the center and then walk to their classes and offices, which supports the UO’s commitment to sustainability and reduction of traffic as they are then not parking and driving through campus twice to get to work or school. Reduction of spaces will make this more challenging.

Site D2-As this option displaces the center, our understanding is that the project would include replacing the center at a different location. Although a daunting proposal, this is not necessarily disadvantageous and might allow the center to remedy some challenges with the current facility due to changed state child-care regulations and increased need for faculty and staff child care.

Site E-This site is the most incompatible with the center as it would create a large building immediately adjacent to the center, eliminating the ability to expand or reconfigure the child-care facility to successfully serve faculty and staff parents or to address changed regulations.
10/24/14 e-mail re: Residence Hall Site Selection – Members of the Vivian Olum Parent Council

Signed by: Laura Lee McIntyre, professor & co-director, School Psychology; Michael J. Peixoto, adjunct instructor, Clark Honors College; Eleanor Vandergrift, associate director of the Science Literacy Program & senior instructor in Biology; Kelly Hoell, adjunct instructor, PPPM; Sara Starlin, speech pathologist, Springfield Public Schools; Heather McClure, research associate, Center of Equity Promotion, College of Education; Thomas L. Evans, adjunct faculty, Anthropology Dept.

We write in our capacity as the Parent Council at the Vivian Olum Child Development Center, but also as faculty and staff of the University of Oregon. We have recently learned of the plan to build a 500-bed residence hall on campus. While this is an exciting time for the University’s development and growth, we write to share some concerns and ask some questions.

As you may know, Vivian Olum Child Development Center is a year-round, child-care program dedicated to providing comprehensive child care and education to the children of faculty, staff and graduate students of the University. It serves children eight weeks through eleven years of age. Olum has seven classrooms that serve 109 children. The Vivian Olum Child Development Center is a model program that fosters and promotes child development through planned activities that nurture children’s language, cognitive, social-emotional, and physical growth and development. Children and teachers take advantage of our outdoor space at the Center and routinely take walks and explore the neighboring buildings, sites, and green spaces in our neighborhood. Indeed, the campus is our children’s neighborhood.

Although we are excited about the growth and expansion of the university, a new 500-bed freshman residence hall in our Vivian Olum neighborhood may indeed have a potential negative impact on our children and their child care program. We have reviewed the three potential sites under consideration for the construction of the new residence hall and would like to provide input to you and your team.

Site D1 is across Columbia and within the parking lot. Site D1 may present the most compatible location of the three sites for the Center. However, one concern is the elimination of parking spaces available to parents which are in close proximity to the Center. Parking is an ongoing challenge at the University. With the elimination of these parking spots, many parents will not have available parking near the Center. One of the advantages of available parking near the Center is that parents are able to drop-off children and walk to their offices or classes on campus. While we understand that displaced parking spaces would be preserved elsewhere on the campus, parking sites located a greater distance from the Center would not have this advantage, thus costing faculty parents a great deal more time spent in commuting and parking and adding to the existing congestion in university lots. Beyond parking, we have more general concerns about the footprint and height of the residence hall, the increased traffic in the area, the removal of green spaces that are routinely utilized by our children and staff at Olum, and the blockage of views and sunlight that create the natural beauty of the environment our children and Olum teachers enjoy.
Site D2 displaces Vivian Olum Child Development Center. It is our understanding that the building project would include replacing the center at a different location and that the center would be moved to a comparable (or better) location. We have many questions about this option given that a move for us could potentially be advantageous or could be disastrous. We currently are at capacity and have fully utilized all classrooms and available child care spots. There are new Oregon state child-care regulations and increased need for child care for our University faculty and staff, particularly with the future addition of 150 new tenure faculty lines. Thus, a lateral move or move to a more desirable location could allow for an expansion of our center while retaining critical elements (e.g., adequate playground space for all classrooms, an open community room space in the center, etc.). We feel uneasy recommending Site D2 without more information on an alternative location for Vivian Olum. Would such additional information be available to consider and could we (or our representatives) have a voice in this matter?

Site E—This site is the most incompatible with the center as it would create a large building immediately adjacent to the center, eliminating the ability to expand or reconfigure the child-care facility. There is already considerable need to expand childcare options on the university, both an important recruiting tool and a necessity for the work-life balance of many faculty parents. Site E would limit the potential for the Olum Center to help address these growing needs for the university as a whole in the future. We have significant concerns about this option. The placement of a residence hall immediately next to the Center not only would limit light and green spaces, but the close proximity of the finished residence hall would create a safety concern for the children at the Center. Furthermore, as in option D1, site E also eliminates useful parking spaces and increases traffic. Finally, the construction of such a massive project abutting a child-care facility for small children would have significantly negative impact on the quality of childcare in the short term while the site is under construction.

We have more general questions and concerns about the process, timeline, and potential involvement of parents/faculty/staff and Olum administrators in the usergroup forum. We are committed to ensuring that our children continue to have high quality child care in a facility that promotes optimal development.

We are part of a community at the University and wish to be good, gracious, and understanding neighbors. It is our hope that our input will receive careful consideration and that we can engage in a partnership with you and your team to ensure that priorities and goals of both of our groups are achieved.