



May 24, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the May 5, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Bob Choquette, Emily Eng, Cooper Foushee, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Josh Kashinsky, Ken Kato (chair), Moira Kiltie, Savannah Olsen, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Avi Shugar, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), George Bleekman (CPFM), Larissa Ennis (University Advancement), Lindsey Hayward (Office of the Provost), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Chris White (JSMA)

CPC Agenda

1. Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art – Open Space Proposal – Siting

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the siting for the Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art Open Space Proposal.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) shared the project background and siting information, form, and location regarding the physical art proposal. The artist's intent, initial concepts, materials, and elements, as well as the campus community support and project interest, were also shared.

Chris White (JSMA) shared the artist's process and considerations during the art proposal's development.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Members support the project.

Regarding 1% for art:

- What is the 1% for Art program?
- There is a 1% for Art committee that reviews the art content.
- Is the art committee membership new for each project, or the same for all projects?

Regarding the art siting:

- Is the committee reviewing multiple sites independent of what the artwork may look like?
- Will the new open space site be designed together with the art?
- Consider the location of the Kalapuya Ilihi residence hall and wayfinding; the residence hall with the same name as the art proposal is not adjacent to the site which could lead to confusion in wayfinding.

Regarding the review process:

- When will the committee review the project again?
- The committee is reviewing the multiple sites which will allow the process to move forward.
- Is the committee reviewing the safety and maintenance of the art?
- Is the endowment piece of this project outside of the realm of this committee?

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Olsen, White, and CPC Staff provided the following clarifications:

Regarding 1% for art:

- 1% of project funding on all capital projects with a budget over five million dollars is dedicated to funding art.
- The art committee is assembled for each project and comprised of a local artist, representatives of the specific project team, and other university representatives. Typically staff from CPM and Campus Planning serve on the committee in an advisory role and are non-voting.

Regarding the art siting:

- A unique aspect of the proposed art is the process of a project advisory group that will advise on the final design of the sculpture. The overall intent of the art (siting, scale, material considerations) has been shown, however the final design will be developed with collaboration of the project advisory group, art selection committee, and project team. There are multiple possibilities for the final location within the open space that the committee is reviewing.
- The design of the new open space is complete. The intent of the artist is to integrate the art into the surrounding open space; small changes to the design will be coordinated with the design team as needed.

Regarding the review process:

- It will not be necessary for the committee to review the project again once the general siting for the art is approved. If there is a need to return to the committee, that can be identified by the committee. The art siting meeting is typically one meeting.
- The committee is reviewing the art siting and aspects of the art that are related to the *Campus Plan* key principles and patterns that have been identified for this project, including safety and maintenance.
- The endowment piece of the project will be a separate process outside of this committee's review.

Action: With 13 in favor and 1 abstention, the committee agreed that the Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art Open Space Proposal Siting is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art – Secure Bike Parking Facility Proposal – Siting

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the siting for the Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art Secure Bike Parking Facility Proposal.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) shared the proposed location, materials, artist intent and design, project precedents by the artist on campus, lighting, and the bike facility materials.

George Bleekman (CPFM) shared safety and lighting information.

Chris White (JSMA) shared details the artist has considered for this project.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Members support incorporating art into the bike facility site.

Regarding the art siting:

- Is the committee reviewing whether this is the appropriate place to site the art?
- Consider that the art seems to stand out and be radically different from its surroundings and the campus design and could become dated.
- The art will be most visible to residents in the residence halls.

Regarding safety:

- How transparent will the proposed art be considering the ability to see in and out of the facility? Transparency is important to consider.
- How secure are the metal pieces when they are attached to the shelter?
- Consider that students will climb the bike facility if the metal art allows for a toe hold or grip.
- Consider the materials and whether there will be increased heat inside the facility if the materials are less transparent.
- Will there be cameras in the facility?
- What are the options for providing secure doors?
- Being in a visible courtyard, there's less likelihood of security concerns for the doors.
- Consider the underlying structure and the spacing of the metal fencing to prevent someone from being able to reach into the enclosure and gain entry, even if the artwork is removed.
- A deeper roof overhang may prevent climbing onto the roof.
- There is potential to make the facility well-lit without lighting up the entire courtyard.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Olsen, White, Bleekman, and Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw) provided the following clarifications:

Regarding the art siting:

- The committee is reviewing whether this site is the appropriate location for the art.
- This site is publicly visible from the promenade; however, sheltered from views of 15th avenue and will have less public exposure than other art pieces on campus.
- We cannot predict how or when art could become dated; however, with the abstract geometry of the design it may be less likely.
- Housing representatives on the art selection committee are supportive of the proposed art location.
- The artist chose this site for their proposal; within the courtyard space there was a desire to include art.

Regarding safety:

- The intent of the art is to have a similar level of transparency as the original design to see in and out of the bike facility; it is important that the art does allow for some visibility into the shelter and is being considered.
- A rigid attachment for the art to the facility is being coordinated with the architects.
- There is camera coverage both inside and outside of the facility with secured entry access.
- Visibility will be discussed with the artist as the design progresses; there are two exits provided from the enclosure.
- Access control with card access will be required for accessing the facility. The project is working with the artist in and around the doors to ensure security.
- The overhang of the roof is approximately three feet past the structure. The size of the mesh is a heavy gauge welded wire fabric material.
- The lighting of the facility will be considered.

Action: With 14 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Housing Transformation Project 1% for Art Secure Bike Parking Facility Proposal Siting is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

3. Proposed Amendment to the Campus Plan for the Density Refinement Process - Introduction

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to introduce the proposed amendment to the *Campus Plan* for the density refinement process.

Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning) introduced the proposed amendment, reviewed previous proposed amendment information, relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, the amendment process, and timeline.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

Regarding the amendment process:

- The depth and complexity surrounding density amendments is broad. Density is an important tool for planners; however, the committee has previously struggled as a group with this complex information. The goal of the amendment is to formalize that the Campus Planning office is authoring density changes, and the committee is providing feedback.
- Is it correct to characterize expert opinion as the same thing as authority in matters of determining what the *Campus Plan* is? These questions belong in the purview of this committee; density is a crucial tool of this committee in determining recommendations and feedback and the committee will have opinions about density and be able to state those opinions. It is appropriate to think about the committee as having some kind of authority over the question of density. However, it doesn't necessarily have to be expressed through the current process, yet we do not want to record that the committee cedes its authorial role in creating statements about density on campus.
- Member support for streamlining process and reducing the number of meetings. Consider that taking away influence and opinions from this committee, which includes faculty and campus community members, may give power to a smaller group of people making decisions and with fewer questions.
- Member support for the committee's strong role in reviewing densities. Consider removing the committee from reviewing the mathematical intricacies of density changes. This amendment does not propose a major overall change to how the committee reviews changes, however, proposes changing the process and time spent specifically reviewing the *Campus Plan* density table.
- What is the appropriate tool for Campus Planning to bring to this committee that allows us to capture appropriate feedback for density?

- This amendment proposes whenever there is an update to the *Campus Plan* density table, the process would not require an amendment process but an update process. Updates to densities would still be brought to the committee as informational. The committee still has the opportunity to review and recommend the Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP) every two years and when capital projects are moving forward for review; if there are any subsequent changes to density, they would be a part of review for that specific project.
- BCP review determines what density amendments are needed; however, as to what exactly those calculations are, that is not completed during the BCP development.

Regarding density:

- Is demolishing buildings and rebuilding new ones the only way density can change in the Academic and Historic Core Design Area?
- Projects that move forward drive the change in capacity. Campus Planning is completing the work of the BCP project by project.
- The BCP drives the density changes, which this committee reviews and makes a recommendation on. When amendments are made to density, it is in response to the BCP, which evaluates density in the *Campus Plan* and if there is enough density for all potential future projects.
- There are many principles and patterns in the *Campus Plan*, and policies in play, that a decision to demolish a building would not be made by Campus Planning.

Additional required processes include:

- Capital budget requests,
- the site selection process, and
- in-depth feasibility studies for a building project. There is an established process for how building projects happen. The allowable density informs how much maximum total square footage is allowed in a design area, and in general, how much of a building footprint can cover the ground in a design area. This is a tool to help maintain the look and feel of campus and the ratio of open spaces to buildings.
- What if there's a conflict in allowable density? The amendment provides no opportunity to resolve conflict.
- When Campus Planning proposes updates, it is in response to the BCP or to a building project that is already happening or in the early stages of the project and there is a density issue. Any density conflicts will have ideally been resolved when completing the BCP.

Regarding the amendment language:

- What is the difference between an update vs. an amendment to the *Campus Plan*?
- Create a diagram to show the original process of an amendment/update, vs. what is changing in the process of an amendment/update, compared to the proposed process of an update/amendment, and the building process to clarify the committee's role.
- Articulate in the amendment about the Biennial Capacity Plan review?
- The goal is to indicate an update is less burdensome than an amendment.
- Campus Planning will refine the language and return to the committee for review.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Thorstenson provided the following clarifications:

Regarding the amendment process:

- An update to the *Campus Plan* is a minor change, E.g., updating base maps, and would not require committee review. An amendment to the *Campus Plan* is a change that requires a review process by the committee and a public hearing as per *Campus Plan* Principle 1: Process and Participation.
- Committee action is retained when reviewing the BCP.

Regarding density:

- Allowable capacity for density does not equate to building demolition; allowable capacity is a guideline for campus development.

Action: No formal action was requested.