

From: David Thaemert

Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 4:29 PM

Subject: RE: Special Meeting of the Oregon Tech Board of Trustees

Sandra:

Please include my following commentary on agenda item 3.2, for the Board's short-notice meeting of 15 December 2015, to be included in the Board's record of public input.

I fully support development of a NCAA-standard soccer facility on Oregon Tech's campus for two reasons: 1) such an on-campus facility is important for building both institutional reputation and student camaraderie out of the classroom during more of the academic year; and 2) an on-campus facility reduces off-campus rental expenses of a non-state-owned facility, while being an effective use of allocated state/OUS bond funds.

That stated, the "time-sensitive" soccer facility proposed in the second agenda item should be denied by the Board in its present incarnation on the following bases:

1. Financial footing: Such a soccer facility was initially proposed during Summer 2014 with no consultation across campus, but then tabled until the 2015-16 academic year because the university's funding position at the time was not strong enough to support further development. During the following Fall 2014 academic term, there was significant faculty pushback on yet another university facility/structure being implemented without the input of various university constituent groups and without a clear financial plan. During a meeting of the university's Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) just last week (2 December 2015), this very topic was brought up, asking if there were any plans to continue with soccer facility development in 2015-16, but such a scheme was not "on the radar" for the university administrative staff in attendance. Putting forth a "time-sensitive" agenda item that spends millions of dollars without the full knowledge of Business Affairs Office staff causes further concern. The proposal increments the overall project by putting lighting into an unscheduled and presently unfunded second phase, which is unrealistic considering the number of soccer matches at Steen Sports Park that have required lighting to complete the game.
2. Facilities master plan: Flat ground on the Klamath Falls campus is at somewhat of a premium, and the ground to be occupied by this is regularly used by the rugby club and several other intramural sports, along with other periodic events such as student-faculty competitions, Engineering Week competitions, summer camps, and academic learning evolutions such as the 2014 respiratory care event that included landing an Air Link medical helicopter on that field. Parts of this area have, at various times, been indicated for siting of new academic buildings, including some concepts of the proposed Center for Excellence in Engineering & Technology structure. This field also forms a significant (albeit poorly implemented) pedestrian corridor from on- and off-campus parking into the core of the campus. Nothing in the submitted agenda materials indicate any coordination with a facilities master plan or any acknowledgement of these other uses (other than to state that the rugby club would have to relocate to some other undisclosed location). Other than a mention of construction estimates exceeding available funds in 2014, the proposal fails to acknowledge the current condition and any future plans for Moehl Stadium, and how that

existing facility could become a more efficient and productive component of campus infrastructure.

3. Shared governance: While I believe many faculty colleagues would also be supportive of bringing soccer on campus based on my initial reasoning, this proposal has once again completely shortcut any shared governance processes, and thereby loses faculty support by that constituent body being excluded from any portion of the evaluation and decision process. There has been no apparent consultation with Facilities Planning Commission, FOAC, Faculty Senate, or Administrative Council consultation to determine that this location is the best use of available ground on campus, that this partial development is the best use of already-allocated state bond funds, that the future unfunded phase is a suitable encumbrance to future university finances, that the possibility of not achieving funding for the future phase is a manageable risk rather than a future journalistic “black-eye,” and that campus stakeholders’ perspectives have been accommodated or at least acknowledged.

Thanks for consideration. Please let me know any questions or comments.

Regards,

David K. Thaemert, PE, PhD

Associate Professor

Oregon Institute of Technology

Civil Engineering Department

david.thaemert@oit.edu | 541.885.1518 (office) | 541.885.1654 (fax)

3201 Campus Drive, Klamath Falls, OR 97601-8801

www.oit.edu

Sara Reuter
1510 Pleasant Avenue
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

December 9, 2015

Dan Peterson
Member, Oregon Tech Board of Trustees

Bill Goloski
Member, Oregon Tech Board of Trustees

Dear Dan and Bill,

I have read the agenda for the December 15, 2015 Special Meeting of the Oregon Tech Board of Trustees, and have some questions that may be of value in assisting the Board with their decision regarding the Soccer Field Capital Project.

First, I would like to clarify the authorization for the June 2014 bond sale as follows:

In early 2014 OUS offered to move \$1,950,000 of unused legislatively approved system-wide Rehab and Capital Renewal bond funding to Oregon Tech, if Oregon Tech had eligible rehab projects and income streams to cover the debt service. A rehab of Moehl Stadium and upgrades in Housing were hastily developed and approved by OUS.

The bond sale in June 2014 provided funding for the following projects:

1. \$1,850,000 was to rehab the Moehl Stadium bleachers (including ADA issues) and the adjacent field to accommodate additional sports, and specifically to accommodate collegiate soccer. The project budget was developed by the then Executive Director of Facilities, Eric Rulofson.
2. The remaining \$100,000 of the \$1,950,000 Rehab and Capital Renewal funds was to provide funds for Housing to upgrade their facilities. (Housing used \$30,723 of these funds)
3. Another \$100,000 of bonds were sold at the same time for Student Building Fee use. This bond funding was approved as part of what at the time was the OUS Student Building Fee (SBF) fund. The SBF fund was funded with the mandatory building fee collected from students across all 7 OUS institutions. The collected funds were then used to pay debt service on bonds issued in connection with student buildings on all campuses.

Question 1. What Housing and College Union projects are being delayed by the re-allocation of those funds to this project?

Question 2. How much contingency is built into the current \$1,880,112 construction budget for Phase I?

Question 3. Will the field be functional for NAIA Collegiate Soccer without lights?

Question 4. Without any revenue offset will the field increase annual operating costs?

Question 5. In order to replace the field in 8 years \$62,500 must be put into reserves each year to accumulate the \$500,000 needed. What is the source of funds for the annual reserves?

Question 6. How much revenue is expected to be generated by the field? What are the actual sources and what basis is being used to estimate the revenues?

Question 7. Who are the members of the staff recommending the project?

Question 8. Did the Facilities Planning Commission recommend the project?

Question 9. What is the cost if any to return the remaining bond funds to the State if the project does not go forward?

Comment. Any current revenue streams diverted to cover the debt service or other ongoing costs for this project increases the amount of the required general fund support for Athletics due to the revenues no longer covering existing Athletic operating costs; so in effect though not directly the general fund is paying the debt service on these Athletic bonds and any other costs that will be paid from current Athletic revenue streams.

I appreciate you taking the time to consider my questions and comment.

Sincerely,



Sara Reuter

December 9, 2015

Oregon Tech Board of Trustees
3201 Campus Drive
Klamath Falls, OR

To whom it may concern:

Let us first introduce ourselves, we are the group of ladies that will be seniors next year for the OIT women's soccer program. Most of us have been here at OIT for the past three years and have been apart of the program ever since. Coming into college, we all had an image of being able to play soccer on campus like any other school, but as soon as we got here we learned that we didn't have a field on campus instead we would be playing at a community field off campus. The three main reasons we would love to have a field on campus is to be closer to the athletic training room, to make it more convenient for our players to get to practice, and lastly, to build a student fan base.

As we all know, soccer is a very physically demanding sport. With that being said, we would like to have an easier access to the athletic training room in times of need, which is everyday. Trainers are often busy trying to facilitate multiple teams and are unable to always accommodate to our needs based on our location. With the field on campus, we will be able to make use of all the available equipment that every other team on campus has access to. It would also help the trainers be able to treat all the different athletes in a more efficient and timely matter.

Playing at Steen's has added more stress for incoming freshman during their first year at Oregon Tech. Our freshman year, we were fortunate enough to have one other freshman player with a car to help us get to practices. We know that the freshman classes after us also struggled with this as well. For being college students, we spend a great amount of money on gas, driving to and from the school, to the field, back to the school, and our houses. With the field on-campus, it allows us to save money and spend more time on our school work rather than driving.

Having a field on campus would also make it a lot easier for students to come support us, and it would mean a lot to us seniors in our last year. We have a great amount of students on campus and they often do not have a car, that means they are not able to get to Steens Sports Park to come to our games. We have talked to many students around campus and have mentioned that they would come to our games but unfortunately they aren't aware of where Steens is located or do not have the transportation to be able to make it.

As the senior class, we would like to thank you for giving us an opportunity to say how we feel on the subject at hand. It would mean a lot to us to have a field on campus for our final year of playing the sport that we love.

Sincerely,

Daisha Acorda, Molly Orr, Tarryn Miyamura, and Tori Roberts

Ian Tarnovsky
11463 SE Rimrock Dr.
Happy Valley, OR 97086
December 10, 2015

Oregon Tech Board of Trustees
3201 Campus Dr.
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Dear Oregon Tech Board of Trustees:

I am writing today to show my strong support of the Soccer Field Project. On behalf of my teammates, I'd like to share that we all desire the new turf soccer field to be constructed on campus for the upcoming season in the summer and fall of 2016.

As you may know, we currently play our home games at Steen Sports Park, an obscure location that doesn't allow the men's or women's soccer teams to garner an adequate amount of support. The drawbacks of playing at Steen Sports Park are numerous: the vast number of mosquitoes, muddy and chewed up fields, lack of spectator seating, limitations on stadium lights, and difficulty in parking. Many athletes often have to leave class early - or even miss class - in order to get to the sports park for practice or games on time. Furthermore, many athletes who live on campus do not have a viable means of transportation, and struggle to find rides to the field. I believe that implementing the new soccer field on campus will eradicate many of these issues.

Not only will many inconveniences to our current athletes and supporters be resolved, but by putting a turf field on campus, the both the men's and women's soccer programs will be able to thrive in the future. Having home matches on campus will make the student body more inclined to support the teams, as games would be close and accessible. This increased support will help the soccer teams to perform better, and achieve more success as a whole. The student-athlete experience will be enhanced by playing on campus, potentially inspiring athletes both on the field and in the classroom. Aesthetically, the new turf field would provide a spectacular and gorgeous view when driving along Dan Obrien Way, as compared to the run down patch of grass that is there currently. Truly, an on-campus pitch would help the soccer programs to attract recruits and improve the quality of the athletic department.

Sincerely,

Ian Tarnovsky

12/10/2015

Dear Board of Trustees,

Faculty Senate Executive Committee has received and would like to share thoughts from faculty surrounding the Oregon Tech soccer proposal. You will notice that this agenda item proposal is a staff recommendation, not a campus wide decision. There are a couple critical points that seem to be missing that deserve attention.

1). Shared Governance: Our University should require campus involvement in strategic university decisions as the capital project proposal submitted doesn't seem to have any endorsement or much less a review from a representative campus body. Although faculty colleagues may be in support of improving our athletics and soccer program based on short notice conversation, however, this proposal has once again utterly shortcut, any shared governance processes, and thereby fails faculty support We would hope the board would demand that this take place before deciding on approval.

2). Strategic Plan/Mission of the University: Safeguard the board's review and approval process links strategic spending proposals to the pedagogical, or more appropriately strategic mission of the university. The soccer proposal does not accomplish this nor apparently even attempt to try. Part of our faculty role should be to pressure the board to ensure it has a robust review process linking spending to the academic mission. It appears much of the debt servicing is planned to come from the Foundation. That precludes use of those Foundation funds for academic purposes. Is the Foundation not supposed to support the core mission of Oregon Tech?

3). Financial Concern: Approving a short notice proposal item that spends in excess of two million dollars without the full knowledge of the campus is concerning use of allocated state/OUS funds. Even if the facility did generate some income (estimated at possibly \$10K a year), that would be significantly less than the cost associated with the debt service for 20 years and the periodic turf replacement. It is fiscally irresponsible. What is the cost of the second phase of this project? How necessary is this phase for the long term support of an endeavor like a soccer field? In other words, how well can the field be operated under the Phase I proposed investment – and what is a timeline for a Phase II? Can Athletics identify potential sources to pay for the cost of Phase II of this project?

4). Campus Facilities Master Plan: No such plan exists. Tentatively scheduled to Start FY2016

5). Community Support: The community places high value on the Steen's Complex. It is conservatively estimated that these partnerships led to foundation contributions. Steen Sports Park offers a wide variety of benefits to the Klamath County Community. It would be a huge disservice to pull out of this affiliation. We need to work smart by partnering to provide opportunities for our students and our community.

Respectfully submitted,
2015-2016 Senate Executive Council
Robyn Cole, President
Terri Torres, Vice President
David Thaemert, Secretary
Maureen Sevigny, Member
Mason Marker, Member

To: Oregon Institute of Technology Board of Directors
RE: Decision to take on additional debt for a soccer field at the Klamath Falls campus
From: Grant Kirby for Wilsonville faculty
Date: December 13, 2015

Dear Board members

It came to the attention of the Wilsonville faculty on December 7th, that a Request for Approval for a \$2M soccer field construction bond was on the agenda for Dec. 15th. This very late notice of such an important expenditure has created angst within the faculty ranks at Wilsonville. We are strongly opposed to the board taking on this level of debt for a facility only available to such a small group of students on just one of our campuses without a thorough review of the proposal by all affected stakeholders. We understand that bonding of this nature is not easy to get in the state system, but taking on high levels of debt just because we can seems to be a very bad idea in this economic climate.

In every consideration of the strategic plan for Oregon Tech there is no mention that sports is the way to offset the declining fund balance, or to positively impact student tuition. On the contrary, our administration has made it very clear that our fiscal success depends primarily on the tuition of our students, and that it is the revenue generated in the classrooms and online that define our fiscal health. With the declining fiscal contributions through the state legislature and the lack of fund raising from our administration, it seems clear that taking on additional debt has the net effect of forcing increases in tuition from all students, across all campuses.

After reviewing what information was available, it is clear that the initial construction of the new field at about \$2M, is only part of the ongoing costs associated with continual maintenance, staff support, recruiting, team travel, turf replacement and other related variable costs. The report written by Matt Miles implies that incremental athletic activity associated with a new soccer field is a sure path to revenue growth for the school, and that taking on the additional debt service for this soccer field is justified by the increases in student athletes that result from this one field. If the athletics department is a net 'profit center' as the article claims, that net profit is now swept into the general fund by the administration, and is not enough to offset the rising costs of the campus as shown by our declining fund balance. Using those 'net income' dollars currently supplied by athletics to fund the soccer field simple means that even less money would be available in the general fund to pay our bills. At the end of the day, the debt service for this proposal will almost certainly fall on the shoulders of the faculty in the form of stagnate salaries and to students in the form of tuition raises, or weak student services. The faculty who are continually asked to do more with less, and the students who are paying ever higher tuition rates should not be asked to support additional debt service for the benefit of the athletics staff and a few student athletes.

With the last minute discovery of this agenda item, we were not able to get a document reviewed and signed by all the faculty, so I am writing on their behalf, with verbal support from those in the discussion. It is my considered belief that the majority of the Wilsonville faculty want to see more accountability for this kind of accumulation of debt. We are requesting the board to institute a reasonable review procedure to require notification in a timely manner, and to provide full disclosure of the information so stakeholders can prepare reasoned responses to the administration and the board.

This kind of back-door accumulation of debt is very discouraging to those of us who teach on the front lines, and it is ethically unsound to ask all students to pay higher tuition for a facility that is used by so few at a single campus when it is not tied to our strategic goals of education. We do respect the hard work of our administration in running the school, and the good work of our athletic department. We also understand that debt accumulation can sometimes be necessary to leverage key opportunities to grow or sustain our school. We don't think that a soccer field fits any of those criteria. We ask the board to deny this bonding opportunity as we do not believe it serves the strategic interests of our school at this time.

Grant Kirby, Wilsonville faculty member

-----Original Message-----

From: Gerardo Skewes

Sent: Sunday, December 13, 2015 8:14 PM

Subject: Soccer field on campus

Dear Oregon Tech Board of Trustees,

My name is Gerardo Skewes and I am a freshmen on the mens soccer team. I'm writing this letter in hopes that we, the soccer team, could have a spot on campus for the soccer field next year. I believe a soccer field on campus would benefit everyone involved. For starters, having the field on campus would be much more convenient for not only the players, but for the fans as well. Having the support of fans on our own home pitch is a big factor on us mentally. We simply feel much bigger than our opponent when the stands are full of students, staff, and family cheering us on. In addition, many of our teammates have no cars. We do offer rides to those who don't have a ride but there were times this season where all of us couldn't get to practice because of the fact that some of us had no way to get there.

Most of these problems happened to the people who lived in the dorms, that wouldn't of happened if we had the convenience of having a field right here on campus.

Having a field on campus would have us more "in touch" with the school and the vibe it comes with. I wasn't a big fan of finishing up a game or practice, then getting in my car and driving to school. I would have much rather liked just walking up to the village where I live. After the games, everyone would just rush to their cars and go home, no one really had the chance to hang out after and say, "good game." I feel as if the school would much rather drive down to the field on campus than driving to someplace they aren't familiar with.

While I was being recruited this time last year, I was told there would be a field on campus next year. It was a big factor on where i would commit too and I know I made the right choice coming here, I love it. Having the field on campus would only make all of the mens soccer team beyond grateful. It could also motivate other potential recruits to consider Oregon tech in coming on board with us. This field would greatly help us in our journey to becoming one of the top dogs in our conference and it'd be a big step in helping us become the team we want to become.

-----Original Message-----

From: Matt Munhall
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 10:50 AM
To: Sandra Fox <Sandra.Fox@oit.edu>
Subject: FW: Update on Board of Trustees Meeting

Hi Sandra,

Please see the below email from Lodewijk Bloemzaad, one of our soccer athletes in support of the soccer project on campus. He is currently traveling home to the Netherlands and sending an email is the only way that he could send this in right now.
Thank you for your time with this.

Regards,

Matt Munhall, B.A., M.S.
Head Men's Soccer Coach
Oregon Institute of Technology
Office: 541-885-0055
Cell: 314-779-9279
Fax: 541-885-1633
<http://www.oit.edu/athletics/mens-sports/soccer>

-----Original Message-----

From: Lodewijk Bloemzaad
Sent: Sunday, December 13, 2015 4:20 PM
To: Micheal.schell@oit.edu
Cc: Matt Munhall
Subject: RE: Update on Board of Trustees Meeting

Hey coach, haven't been able to access a word processor lately so I'm writing my letter in the email, hope it can still contribute.

Dear Oregon Tech Board of Trustees and Whoever It May Concern.

I am writing you regarding the soccer facility agenda topic of your meeting and would very much like to take this opportunity to support the existing plans of building a new on-campus soccer facility for the Oregon Tech soccer teams.

Analytical thinking about this topic has helped me to conclude there are several dimensions of benefits to building such a facility. Starting off, I would like to communicate the direct benefits for the OIT soccer programs:

- Having an exciting new facility will help attract elite recruits to help build the soccer programs as athletes and the student body when they excel academically.
- Not having to commute over 10 miles every day will help student-athletes focus better on academics and athletics.

- Having an own facility on campus will attract more fans from the student body and help create a home advantage in the soccer teams their games.
- Having an own facility as opposed to renting an off campus one grants the Athletics Department the naming, advertisement and concession rights for the to be build stadium, resulting in an opportunity to actually bring in revenue as soccer programs.

Besides those direct benefits for the soccer programs, there are also more general benefits for the entire Oregon Tech community:

- With the state of Oregon being home of the current MLS champions and soccer being both the biggest sport in the world and the fastest growing sport in the United States, potential incoming students will want and expect a vibrant soccer community and team to cheer on, on campus as part of their college experience. Something an elite soccer facility on campus can accomplish by both supporting the on campus vibe surrounding the soccer games and helping to actually grow the soccer programs.
- Besides helping make the school look more attractive for potential students, it will also enhance the Klamath Falls campus in two ways. Namingly, an elite soccer/sports facility where now the underdeveloped Purvine Field is, will enhance the looks of campus. Especially when you consider Purvine is the first thing you see when driving up on campus. Besides, it will also encourage athletes to live on campus more and thereby enhancing the resident life culture with these high impact profiles residing on campus rather than off.
- Lastly, with being Southern Oregon University being the only other competitive Southern Oregon soccer team, considering they do not have a soccer only facility, building an elite soccer facility on the Oregon Tech campus would make Klamath Falls and OIT in particular the premier soccer destination for the entire region. Giving the opportunity to host prestigious soccer events and help advertising Oregon Tech.

Furthermore there also some general aspects for the community to be considered, since having the Owls soccer teams move on campus and off Steens will help free up space for the athletic and personal development of younger Klamath Falls generations as the OIT teams will no longer take in fields or even parking space on shared game days there.

In summary, I think there are ample reasons and a arguments to realize an elite soccer facility on campus for the Oregon Tech soccer teams, as would be fitting with the school'is striving for excellence. If you have any questions on the points and/or ideas I just communicated feel free to email me at lodewijk.bloemzaad@oit.edu or contact me through men's soccer coach Matt Munhall.

Thank you,
Lodewijk Bloemzaad
Marketing Student and Soccer Player at Oregon Institute of Technology.

Sandra Fox

From: Brandi Ronco
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 1:47 PM
To: Sandra Fox
Subject: OIT soccer field

OIT is in need for a new soccer field on campus. There are many reasons as to why it would be beneficial to have a soccer field built on campus. There is the obvious, because neither the women's nor the men's teams have a field they can practice/play on that is on campus and owned by the school. The main reasons why OIT should build a field on campus is for the students in general. Neither of the soccer teams get very many fans out to watch their games, and a main reason of that is because the fields we play on are simply too far away from campus and quite frankly they are inconvenient for students to have to car pool and hitch rides to the field to watch the games. If the field was on campus we could get more students out there supporting their school and having good clean fun on Friday and Saturday nights (or whenever the home games are scheduled). We want our fellow students to come out and support all athletic teams and be able to do so at ease. It also is more convenient for other schools we are playing against and also family from out of town to find the location of the field if it is right there on campus.

Help our institute, and our school spirit grow by approving that we build a soccer field on the OIT campus.

Thank you,
-Brandi Ronco (OIT Women's soccer player)

Sandra Fox

From: Bailey Whitehurst <bkwhitehurst@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 4:09 PM
To: Sandra Fox
Subject: Soccer field

Hello

My name is Bailey Whitehurst and below is the reason I believe the soccer team wants a field on campus.

The reason why we want a field on campus is because of the fans. When we go around campus and tell people about our games they always ask where it is. When we tell them it is not on campus they say they can't go because they can't get to the fields. This last year we had a decent amount of fans and honestly it helped us grow more as a team. When we are hearing fans cheer from the stands, it boosted our spirits and made us play harder than if we had no fans. Another part of having fans there is not just about motivating us but also intimidating the other team. I know from my experiences when we go to a game and the entire stadium is filled it is kind of scary. It makes a difference in how both teams play. So the reason why we want a field on campus is not convenience for us or because we think it would be cool. The reason we want it is convenience for our fans.

Thank
Bailey

Board of Trustees
Oregon Institute of Technology
3201 Campus Drive
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601

December 14, 2015

Dear Oregon Tech Board of Trustees:

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has received, and would like to share with the Board, thoughts from faculty surrounding the Oregon Tech soccer proposal. You will notice that this agenda item proposal is a staff recommendation, not a campus-wide decision. There are a couple critical points that seem to be missing that deserve the Board's attention.

1). Shared Governance: Our university has long committed to institution-wide involvement in strategic university decisions. The submitted capital project proposal doesn't seem to have any endorsement or, much less, review from any representative campus body. Although many of our faculty colleagues are in support of improving our athletics, and particularly soccer, program, this short-notice proposal has once again utterly shortcut any shared governance processes, and thereby fails to garner further faculty support. We would appreciate the Board's direction to ensure sufficient shared governance review and concurrence before approving this course of action.

2). Strategic Plan/Mission of the University: The Board's review and approval process should evaluate such spending proposals in the context of the pedagogical and strategic missions of the university. Based on current faculty awareness and responses, the present soccer facility proposal does not accomplish such linkage, nor apparently even attempt to try, relying solely on a dubious short-notice funding scenario.

3). Financial Concern: Approving a short-notice proposal item that spends in excess of two million dollars without the full knowledge of the institution generates significant faculty concern regarding the use of allocated state (or remnant Oregon University System) funds. Even if the facility did generate some income (estimated at possibly \$10K per year), that inflow appears to be significantly less than the cost associated with the debt service for 20 years. The stated intent to use synthetic turf also has generated concerns relative to player injury and maintenance and periodic replacement costs. Note that such a soccer facility was initially proposed during Summer 2014 with no consultation across campus, but then tabled until the 2015-16 academic year because the university's funding position at the time was not strong enough to support further development. During the following Fall 2014 academic term, there was significant faculty pushback on yet another university facility/structure being implemented without the input of various university constituent groups and without a clear financial plan. During a recent meeting of the university's Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC; 2 December 2015), this very topic was brought up, asking if there were any plans to continue with soccer facility development in 2015-16, but such a scheme was not "on the radar" for the university administrative staff in attendance. Putting forth a "time-sensitive" agenda item that spends millions of dollars without the full knowledge of Business Affairs Office staff causes further concern. The proposal increments the overall project by putting lighting into an unscheduled and

presently unfunded second phase, which is unrealistic considering the number of soccer matches at Steen Sports Park that have required lighting to complete the game. How necessary is this phase for the long-term support of an endeavor like a soccer field? In other words, how well can the field be operated under the Phase I proposed investment, and what is a timeline for Phase II? Can Athletics identify potential sources to pay for the cost of Phase II of this project? It appears much of the debt servicing is planned to come from the Foundation. That precludes use of those Foundation funds for academic purposes. Is the Foundation not supposed to support the core mission of Oregon Tech? The proposed project currently appears to be is fiscally irresponsible.

4). Campus Facilities Master Plan: No such plan apparently exists at present, but we understand such planning is tentatively scheduled to start in the coming year. That said, flat ground on the Klamath Falls campus is at somewhat of a premium, and the ground to be occupied by the proposed soccer facility is regularly used by the rugby club and several other intramural sports, along with other periodic events such as student-faculty competitions, Engineering Week competitions, summer camps, and academic learning evolutions such as the 2014 respiratory care event that included landing an Air Link medical helicopter on that field. Parts of this area have, at various times, been indicated for siting of new academic buildings, including some concepts of the proposed Center for Excellence in Engineering & Technology structure. This field also forms a significant (albeit poorly implemented) pedestrian corridor from on- and off-campus parking into the core of the campus, and may have existing utility infrastructure conflicts as well. Nothing in the submitted agenda materials indicate any coordination with a facilities master plan or any acknowledgement of these other uses (other than to state that the rugby club would have to relocate to some other undisclosed location). Other than a mention of construction estimates exceeding available funds in 2014, the proposal fails to acknowledge the current condition and any future plans for Moehl Stadium, and how that existing facility could become a more efficient and productive component of campus infrastructure.

5). Community Support: The community places high value on the Steen's complex. It is conservatively estimated that these partnerships have led to foundation contributions. Steen Sports Park offers a wide variety of benefits to the Klamath County community. It would be a huge disservice to pull out of this affiliation.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these faculty perspectives.

Respectfully submitted,
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Robyn Cole, President
Terri Torres, Vice-President
David Thaemert, Secretary
Mason Marker
Maureen Sevigny