



February 7, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the January 24, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Liska Chan, Bob Choquette, Emily Eng, Keith Frazee, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato (chair), Carrie McCurdy, Elise O'Brien, Savannah Olsen, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Avi Shugar, Cathy Soutar

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Jim Brooks (Financial Aid and Scholarships), Noah Conklin (Student), Ryan Hagemann (General Counsel), Lindsey Hayward (Office of the Provost), Brian Josephson (Student), Lillian Moses (University Housing), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Gilbert Rogers (Financial Aid and Scholarships), Cami Thompson (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

1. CPC Updates

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to provide a brief update regarding the City of Eugene's Franklin Boulevard Transformation Project.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) shared details on an open house to update the community on the status of the project. Additionally, Eng shared background information regarding the project's history and timeline, including the city conducted and completed the project's conceptual design in 2019 – 2020, which was used to pursue federal funding for the project. The project plans to improve Franklin Blvd from Alder Street to Interstate 5 with pedestrian / bicycle facilities, and improved intersections / crossings, with roundabouts and other improvements.

This project was previously reviewed by the CPC on March 17, 2020 for feedback and to help inform the current conceptual design. The project introduction and design progress were shared with the committee on June 28, 2019, February 22, 2019, and January 8, 2019. The meeting record from the March 17, 2020 meeting can be found here:

https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/sites/cpfm2.uoregon.edu/files/record_03_17_20.pdf

Members were encouraged to attend the open house.

For more information, please visit the project website:

<https://www.eugene-or.gov/3830/Franklin-Boulevard-Transformation>

Discussion:

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

- Will the project return to the committee; how will future updates be shared?
- Attending the open house is encouraged for those who would like to learn more about the project.
- Member support for UO involvement in the project.
- What is the project location?

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

- The current design concept for Franklin Boulevard is located here:
<https://eugene-or.gov/DocumentCenter/View/68580/Franklin-Blvd-2023-Recommended-Design>

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

- The project foresees budgetary issues due to construction escalation and it is uncertain how much of the project can be completed with current funds; for example, the city may need to phase the project.
- The project would return to the committee if there were key changes to the concept.
- Eng listed the following as key concerns by the university: Functionality of roundabouts along university property (such as at Onyx Street, used for truck deliveries to the science complex), impacts to large trees on UO property, right of way impacts (and minimizing the amount of university property needed for these public improvements), and changes to functionality for the Matthew Knight Arena area, particularly during events.
- Campus Planning will provide additional updates as needed.

- The project location is on Franklin Boulevard from Alder Street to Interstate 5.

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. Financial Wellness Center (FWC) Sign Proposal – Exception to the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed design of the Financial Wellness Center (FWC) Sign Proposal as an exception to the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan.

CPC staff reviewed the campus standard sign types of the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan and key *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) gave an overview of the review criteria of all outdoor signage not covered by one of the campus standard designs and history of the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan. Also reviewed was a previous precedent project that allowed an exception to the standard building entrance sign.

Jim Brooks (Financial Aid and Scholarships) shared the project history, timeline, and motivation.

Gilbert Rogers (Financial Aid and Scholarships) reviewed the project mission, program, location, and educational goals.

Discussion:

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

- Members support the project.
- Regarding layout/location:
 - Is the sign adhered to the windows and transparent from outside the windows?
 - Is the sign located on the North side of Global Scholars Hall? Consider interior lighting on the north side of the building and what it will look like at different times of the day.
 - Consider scaling down the signage size.
 - Member noted this location is on the edge of campus with low visibility for students.
 - Member support for the sign size.
- Regarding process:
 - Does a temporary sign need to return to the committee for review?

- The sign requested is for one academic term, which is an exception to the sign policy. After that term is over, the FWC would have to reassess what is proposed, and would need to return to the committee for review if there is a new proposal and/or timeline.
- Consider the EMU signage along 13th avenue for storefront uses; is this project going to reopen conversation for what is allowed at the EMU?
- There is signage for the different student groups at the EMU, which is a unique condition for that area and considered secondary building signage with smaller font on the glass doors. The larger signage that exists in this location was not previously approved.
- Regarding messaging/marketing:
 - Consider including graduate student outreach.
 - Member concern the sign may be misinterpreted by vehicular traffic and/or fast movers not taking the time to read the sign and associating the meaning of the sign with money as negative.
 - The committee doesn't regulate sign content.
 - The Campus Outdoor Sign Plan requires coordination with UO Communications for graphic standards and branding.
- Regarding timeline:
 - When is the sign anticipated to be installed and what is the timeframe of the academic term, E.g., 10 weeks?
 - Consider having the sign installed for the entire Spring Term to allow for more flexibility.
 - Member support for a longer timeline into Summer Term.
 - The timeline could be adjusted based on the success of the sign.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Gilbert, Olsen, Brooks, and Michael Griffel (University Housing) provided the following clarifications:

- Regarding layout/location:
 - The sign is adhered to the windows and transparent from the outside.
 - The sign interior lighting and what it will look like at different times of the day has been considered in the design.

- Secondary building signage could be added near the north entrance to Global Scholars to achieve the goals of the signage while being more consistent with the Sign Plan.
- The text on the sign is large and easy to read with graphics.
- Regarding process:
 - If there is a new proposal for a sign that is not consistent with the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan, it would return to the committee for review.
 - Consider other Campus Outdoor Sign Plan exception precedents:
 - Student Welcome Center (2022)
 - Autzen Video Board (2019)
 - Jane Sanders Stadium (2015)
 - 510 Oak (2018)
 - It is important to think about the precedent it could set, although this sign is proposed for one term.
 - Standard secondary building signage does not come to the committee for review.
 - The committee can consider overall design and location of the sign, and if it is compatible with the character of campus and related to its surroundings.
 - The CPC doesn't regulate specific text or graphics; the content must be related to a university event, organization, or department.
- Regarding messaging/marketing:
 - The FWC marketing campaign includes tabling in residence halls, working with a marketing team, working with Quick Quacks, flyers, student ideas, and many ways to increase awareness, E.g., using social media.
 - A workshop is scheduled for graduate students working through the graduate student support services group. There is also a graduate student who is a peer financial coach at the FWC.
 - The project has coordinated with SSEM brand management for the university.
 - According to the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan, all signs must comply with the university's graphic design standards as defined by UO Communications.

- Regarding timeline:
 - The sign is anticipated to be installed by March 1, 2023.
 - There is preference for the sign to be visible to students for an entire term (10 weeks).

Action: With 16 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Financial Wellness Center (FWC) Sign Proposal Exception to the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan Design is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following condition:

- 1.) The sign shall be removed by August 1, 2023.

3. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Framework Vision Project and the Northeast Campus, Northeast Central Campus, Academic Center and Historic Core, and Southwest Campus Design Areas – Overview and Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to introduce and discuss the proposed amendment to the *Campus Plan* related to integrating the Framework Vision Project recommendations into the Northeast Campus, Northeast Central Campus, Academic Center and Historic Core, and Southwest Campus Design Areas.

CPC staff introduced and provided an overview of the proposed amendment, relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, amendment process, and timeline.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) reviewed the Framework Vision Project (FVP) context and key recommendations and guidelines.

<https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-physical-framework-vision-project>

Discussion:

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

- Do the proposed changes include the buildings that will be demolished?
- There are no current projects, however some FVP recommended building footprint locations would require demolition of existing buildings, E.g., the Onyx Bridge, which is a building at the end of its life and in need of replacement, however it would be a very complex project and is not likely to happen soon.

- For buildings planned for demolition currently, E.g., Hamilton Hall, is anything changing in that Design Area?
- The previous Student Housing Design Area *Campus Plan* Amendment (2019) factored in density for that design area prior to the construction of Unthank Hall. The current allowable Student Housing Design Area density factors in Bean Hall, Unthank Hall, and a potential future building after Hamilton is demolished north of the future planned open space.
- Member appreciation for the proposal work.
- Consider if an amendment should be required to update *Campus Plan* densities and brought to the committee for review.
- Consider the meaning and definition of *Campus Plan* design areas and their shapes.
- Consider potential future unknown Track C projects.

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

- Hamilton Hall is located in the Student Housing Design Area and is not included in the current proposed amendment.

Action: No formal action was requested. The meeting ended before further discussion as the scheduled time had been reached. The proposed amendment discussion will be continued at the next meeting.