UNIVERSITY OF OREGON | Campus Planning

November 2, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To:	Campus Planning Committee
From:	Clare Kurth, Planning Associate Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)
Subject:	**Record** of the October 9, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting
Attending:	Bob Choquette (Chair), Deborah Butler, Liska Chan, Janell Cottam, Cheyenne Dickenson, Ihab Elzeyadi, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Taliek Lopez-DuBoff, Taylor McHolm, Jett Nilprabhaasorn, Hal Sadofsk, Amy Salmore
CPC Staff:	Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)
Guests:	Darin Dehle (Design and Construction), Peng Lu (Faculty), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (UO Community Relations), Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning), Andrew Weaver (Accessibility Education Center)

CPC Agenda

CPC Update – McKenzie Hall Preservation Plan Project Now Available

Campus Planning staff provided a brief update that the McKenzie Hall Preservation Plan has been completed. This project was made possible through a $150,000 grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation's African American Cultural Heritage Action Fund's Conserving Black Modernism grant program, with generous support from the Getty Foundation. The funding enabled UO to develop a plan to help preserve McKenzie Hall and document the legacy of its architect, DeNorval Unthank Jr., the first Black graduate of the UO School of Architecture.

In addition to supporting the Preservation Plan, the grant funded student research opportunities and educational programming. Work is underway to develop interpretive elements for McKenzie Hall that will help visitors learn about potential themes such as

Unthank's life and legacy, the building's history, and the significance of modern architecture at the University of Oregon. An open house and project completion celebration are tentatively planned for Winter term 2027.

To read the McKenzie Hall Preservation Plan, please see: https://uoregon.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/O365_UPLAN-CampusPlanning/IQDVktavRI19Rr0nt-BLzndQAYFNEEnOWkM47f_gofQf-Ks?e=jR3dmd

1. **Proposed Amendments to the *Campus Plan* Principle 1: Process and Participation - Introduction**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to introduce proposed amendments to the *Campus Plan* Principle 1: Process and Participation.

CPC staff provided an overview of the *Campus Plan* Principle 1: Process and Participation, its intent, and the goal of the proposed amendments.

Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning) provided an overview of the *Campus Plan* (the Plan) Principle 1, which recognizes that periodic review of the *Campus Plan* is regular and routine, and that updates may be needed to align with evolving campus practices and processes. The role of the committee, Plan intent and development history, and amendment schedule were also reviewed.

Thorstenson noted that the intent of the proposed amendments is to keep the Plan current and useful as an effective guide for future campus development. She gave an overview of how Principle 1 establishes a planning process that relies on broad campus participation and reviewed a proposed reconfiguration of project participant roles to better align with current construction project delivery practices, which have evolved. The intent of the amendment is also to establish practices to best engage campus stakeholders and deliver construction projects while not changing tenets of ensuring broad participation.
Thorstenson reviewed other proposed changes in the principle related to the CPC role, which include removing the reference to user groups (which will align with the other updates) and review of the *Biennial Capacity Plan* (BCP). The proposed amendment also revises the appeals process for CPC recommendations.

Thorstenson also reviewed proposed changes to the CPC charge, a document separate from the *Campus Plan*, to align with proposed amendments. These proposed changes include eliminating the term limit for the chair to remove barriers to participation and removing the following from the CPC's role because these practices have become out of date: "primary author of proposed amendments and periodic updates to the *Campus Plan* (CPC is a reviewer), verifying conclusions of the BCP, serving on design team selection committees, and serving on project user groups.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Olsen (Campus Planning) and Thorstenson:

- Member: Principle 1 will still be process and participation; that is not changing. Is the text discussing implementation changing, or is the principle changing?
    - Thorstenson: Yes. The proposed amendment will not change the intent of Principle 1. The implementation details of Principle 1 will be changing to focus on the process of construction project delivery to align with current practices.

- Member: Why is the *Campus Plan* being amended to align with the current planning and project delivery process rather than requiring the process to conform to the *Campus Plan*?
    - Thorstenson: The planning and construction delivery process has evolved to better support project delivery and collaboration with partners. The proposed amendments are intended to align the Plan with current practices while maintaining a commitment to participation in the campus planning process.
    - Olsen: The proposed amendments clarify the CPC's role and align it with the committee's charge by removing outdated and overly prescriptive elements of Principle 1 that are no longer necessary to achieve the Plan's intent. The amendments reflect changes in CPFM's organizational structure and decision-making processes, improving flexibility and efficiency in project delivery while maintaining a commitment to broad participation and aligning the *Campus Plan* with current practices. Ideally, changes to the *Campus Plan* would have happened as the process evolved, but it didn't, so we are now working to bring the Plan into alignment.
    - Member: The proposed amendments are not changing the intent of Principle 1. The process and implementation are being revised as the Plan is outdated, overly prescriptive, and cumbersome.

- Member: The goal of the proposed amendment is to be user-friendly and accessible. The CPC is being asked to review whether the amendment meets the intent of Principle 1.
    - Olsen: The proposed amendments will be discussed in detail and be reviewed at multiple meetings.

- Member: Consider keeping the committee chair term limit in the charge to avoid long-standing chairs.
    - Thorstenson: The recommendation to remove chair term limits came from the president's office as a potential consideration to remove barriers to service.

  - Kurth: The committee holds a chair election every year, which is an opportunity to review the CPC chair yearly and make changes as needed.

- Member: The Principle 1 summary does not go into specific details of the amendments; It would be beneficial to be able to read and understand each topic individually.
  - Olsen: As we continue with the amendment process at future meetings, additional details will be shared. This is meant as an introductory overview of the proposed amendments.
  - Member: The amendment will be presented in a way to allow full understanding of the changes, while considering what can be reasonably reviewed in each meeting.
  - Member: A red-line version of the proposed amendment would be helpful.
  - Thorstenson: We will share a redline version of the proposed amendments at subsequent meetings.

Action: No formal action was requested.