



March 23, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the March 10, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Bob Choquette, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato (chair), Carrie McCurdy, Elise O'Brien, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Avi Shugar, Cathy Soutar, Philip Speranza

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Krista Dillon (Safety and Risk Services), Volga Koval (University Health Services), Jeff Madsen (CPFM), David Mason (CPFM), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Nir Pearlson (Align Architecture), Damon Rutherford (CPFM), Cami Thompson (University Advancement), Fedor Urrutia (KPF)

CPC Agenda

1. West Science Loop High Voltage Transfer Switch Location – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the West Science Loop high voltage transfer switch location schematic design.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, Campus Planning requirements, and project location.

Damon Rutherford (CPFM) shared the project background, purpose, motivation, site, and proposed improvements.

Discussion:

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

- Will access remain to the Pacific Hall east side exterior storage lockers?

- Will the sidewalk on the south side of Cascade Annex/Onyx Bridge and access to the Science Stores remain?
- Are the concrete vault and handrails (existing loading dock area) to remain?

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

- Access to the Pacific Hall east side exterior storage lockers will remain although it requires moving a dumpster for access; the dumpsters in the proposed enclosure will be roll-away dumpsters and the proposed trash enclosure fence will have rolling gates for access.
- The sidewalk on the south side of Cascade Annex/Onyx Bridge and access to the Science Stores will remain; the proposed project will be changing the existing stairs to a sloped walk, providing improved ADA and cart access to Science Stores.
- The loading dock / concrete vault area near Cascade will be removed, along with the temporary service loading space.

Action: With 13 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the West Science Loop High Voltage Transfer Switch Location Schematic Design is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. University Health Center (UHC) Pharmacy Walk-up Window – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the University Health Center (UHC) Pharmacy Walk-up Window schematic design.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, Campus Planning requirements, and project location.

David Mason (CPFM) shared the project history, background, purpose, motivation, location, program and relevant pharmacy policy and procedures, existing site elements, and proposed project improvements.

Nir Pearlson (Allign Architecture) reviewed the proposed project design and intent.

Volga Koval (University Health Services) reviewed the project motivation, needs, and budget.

Discussion:

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

- Members support the project.
- Regarding project signage:
 - What is the intent of the *Campus Plan* Pattern: No Signs Needed?
(CPC staff note: *The Campus Plan Pattern: No Signs Needed, is to plan buildings to be as self-guiding as possible so the signs are used to supplement good planning rather than to overcome bad planning.*)
 - Ensure new student facing services are visible.
 - The interior layout should be clear in design without having to use interior signage or visuals for wayfinding.
 - Consider the health and safety of patrons trying to locate the pharmacy window as a reason to provide additional signage and lighting.
 - What type of signage, temporary or permanent, would require additional project review by the committee?
- Regarding the project design:
 - Guardrail / Handrail
 - Consider using more transparent materials and continue to refine this part of the design.
 - The existing ADA entrance access was originally intended to be visually seamless with no handrails. Ensure this design does not conflict visually with the existing ADA ramp.
 - ADA Access
 - Is there enough room for an ADA turnaround at the top of the ramp; what is the ramp width?
 - If a wheelchair turns around on the ramp, will this conflict with other traffic on the ramp?
 - Rainspouts and Rain Garden
 - Consider highlighting the water landing from the overhead rain spouts in the rain garden.
 - Consider how wind will drive the water exiting the rain spouts.
 - Is any rain garden filtration being displaced?
 - The current downspouts are not visible on the existing awnings or building; why is the project adding spouts? Refine the rainspouts design to make them more purposeful.

- What's the catchment area of the rainspouts? Is water collected from the roof of the building and/or the awnings?
- Stairs and Circulation
 - Have stairs been considered from the landing, in addition to the ramp, to facilitate an exit for high traffic volumes and usage?
 - Consider how to best facilitate the movement into and out of the ramp while keeping the design impact on the building's north facade as minimal as possible.
- Consider the existing condition of the wall that will be exposed on the north facade of the building when converting the existing planter to the ramp.
- Regarding project location and security:
 - The project is located on a designated lit nighttime safety route, has two existing campus light posts nearby, and an emergency callbox located directly across the street. It is located on East 13th Avenue where there is high traffic and visibility.

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

- Regarding the project design:
 - Consider details for the landing that would allow stairs to be added in the future as needed for a solution to potential future increased traffic volume and usage.
 - Signage that is consistent with the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan does not need to return to the committee for review. Nonstandard signage would need to return to the committee for review. Work with the design team on solutions that are as consistent as possible with the Sign Plan.
 - The *Campus Plan* Pattern: No Signs Needed, applies to the interior of the building; any exterior signage should be consistent with the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan.

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

- Regarding project signage:
 - Signage has been considered during the project design. Program information will be provided on the Health Center website.
 - The primary purpose of the pharmacy is to prioritize serving students, faculty, and staff. While the pharmacy is not a public pharmacy, the

pharmacy has network agreements that they cannot turn away a public member. This is why they are prioritizing student, faculty, and staff traffic. Placing an exterior public sign that advertises the pharmacy may create an issue in terms of service provision and would not be preferred.

- Regarding the project design:
 - Guardrail / Handrail
 - The handrail design is minimal; the project will consider further refinement.
 - There was not enough ramp distance (run) to not require a handrail.
 - ADA Access
 - The ramp leading up to the walkup window, and existing entrance access ramp, start at the same place as the existing light post, and begin together in that location.
 - The ADA turn around and clearances have been met in the ramp and at the top of the ramp.
 - Traffic on the ramp has been considered during the design; a wheelchair traveling on the ramp will be able to pass.
 - Rainspouts and Rain Garden
 - The rain garden will not be disturbed as a part of the project. The project area is replacing a decorative landscape area that does not handle rainwater, located along the existing north wall and outside of the rain garden area.
 - There are existing downspouts that drip into a small collection of drain rock; however, those would drip directly in the middle of the proposed ramp. The concept is to keep the building clean and add a feature that projects water directly into the rain garden.
 - The catchment area of the downspouts is very minimal. Water is collected from the canopy only, not the building roof.
 - Stairs and Circulation
 - Stairs have been considered during the design process, however, adding additional stairs in a way to preserve the rain garden increases costs. One solution is to place stairs that span the raingarden.

- The project has considered the existing foundation of the north façade. While there is a footing location there, it should be below grade and not visible.

Action: With 16 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the University Health Center (UHC) Pharmacy Walk-up Window Schematic Design is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

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 – Continued Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to continue the discussion regarding 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 reviewed the proposed amendment, relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, amendment process, timeline, and introduced additional amendment language regarding Principles 2 and 12.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) shared brief background information regarding the Framework Vision Project (FVP) recommendations, how they have been incorporated into the *Campus Plan*, and how the current amendment is incorporating them.

Discussion:

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

- Regarding future impacts:
 - Villard Hall Green
 - Between the official Villard Hall Green and Dad's Gates is a green space. What is the proposed change designating it an official part of the Villard Hall Green area?
 - As a designated open space in the *Campus Plan*, there are building restrictions, which would be a significant change to the landscape area north of Villard Hall.
 - There is a sign for the theater in this area, would that change?
 - There will be no changes to the sign north of Villard Hall.

- Franklin Triangle
 - Will there be changes to the Franklin Triangle parking lot? Will a building be located there?
 - There are no known plans for a building on the Franklin Triangle, however, it's envisioned that someday a building might be planned incorporating a future parking structure. This was previously discussed as part of the [2022 Franklin Triangle Campus Plan Amendment](#).
 - *Campus Plan* Principle 5: Displacement of Displaced Uses will ensure that if parking were to ever be displaced in this area it would have to be replaced.
- FVP Building Scenarios Map
 - Did one of the drawings presented show potential buildings to be demolished?
 - The FVP building scenarios looked at how to frame the open spaces and what scale of building would be appropriate in those locations, and considered the footprint and the height of what was recommended.
 - Is this map still relevant?
 - These are examples of what development could be possible.
- Regarding the FVP:
 - Use caution when using the FVP, there have been many changes since it was completed.
 - The FVP can be seen as a snapshot from 2014. While some things on the plan have been completed, some things have not. This is one way to look at the potential future growth of campus.
- Regarding densities:
 - What is driving the density increase in the Academic and Historic Core design area?
 - What drives the density increase is projected space needs; the FVP was based on a space needs projection. Scenarios shown on the map were for space needs projected over different scenarios for a certain target of enrollment. In the Academic and Historic Core, these scenarios and density changes represent a portion of the space needs that were projected, which does not mean they would all happen, or in those specific locations. This amendment also includes demolition scenarios, E.g., the Computing Center, which is a recommended site that could have more density.

- Were these calculations already built into the FVP?
- There were calculations built in, however, there wasn't enough current density allowance to accommodate all the projected building footprints, which is why there is a proposed increase.
- The goal is to be prepared for future development in a way that respects the open spaces and scale of existing buildings, while still preserving the feel of today's campus.
- This change could apply to all of the design areas; why is the larger density change in the Academic and Historic Core Design Area?
- While density is increasing, it remains lower than other design areas. The existing density is fairly low and is increasing only to accommodate potential future needs.
- It is Important to acknowledge the need to increase density to maintain existing open spaces.
- Regarding the amendment process:
 - Campus Planning has developed and been experts in calculating these densities.
 - The committee has reviewed density frequently over past years. Consider the need for committee review for each of these small changes and allowing Campus Planning the freedom to make these changes, rather than spending the time of the committee on arbitrary and complex information. Consider a larger proposal that loosens the future approach.
 - A *Campus Plan* amendment would be needed to change the process of review for density amendments to the *Campus Plan*.

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

- The FVP buildings scenarios map highlights scenarios and is not an approved map, however, is a tool to look at campus needs from a capacity standpoint.

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

- No physical changes will occur in the Villard Hall landscape green area. The change will be officially designating the additional area as a designated open space in the *Campus Plan*, in addition to the existing Villard Hall Green.
- The FVP buildings scenarios map shows proposed recommendations for buildings, which can be viewed as examples. There are many scenarios and

potential capacity in the FVP recommendations for the Academic and Historic Core.

- There have been several campus plan amendments completed before this proposed amendment that included density changes. Design area densities have been previously amended for the Franklin Triangle, Southeast Campus, Athletics, Student Support and Administration, Student Housing, Millrace, and Willamette Design Areas.

For additional information about the proposed amendment, and the previous CPC meeting presentations and records, please refer to the project website at: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment-related-framework-vision-project-and-northeast-campus-northeast-central-campus>

Action: No formal action was requested.

4. Update to Campus Standard for Exterior Emergency Phones – Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the update to the campus standard for exterior emergency phones.

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

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the proposed project details and history.

Krista Dillon (Safety and Risk Services) shared the project need and importance.

Discussion:

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

- Members support the project.
- Does this amendment provide future projects with the choice between two standard emergency phone types?
- When would it be appropriate to have an emergency phone without a camera?
- Is site and underground utility work needed for the installation of the proposed new standard?
- Is there an estimated timeline or phasing for the replacement plan?
- Member support for camera coverage near the Hedco area.

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

- This proposal would give future projects the flexibility for either type of emergency phone and not have to return to the committee for specific review for the type of emergency phones. These projects will still be coordinated with CPFM and Safety and Risk Services.
- An emergency phone without a camera could be located in an area where there is already existing exterior camera coverage. Some buildings do have pan/tilt/zoom cameras in place that provide coverage. However, if located in a space where there is no visibility in those exterior locations, that is where placement is needed for the goose neck camera.
- The ideal scenario is to locate new emergency phones where there is existing underground infrastructure. Costs would increase if locating where there is no existing infrastructure, however, it may be needed to look at some locations that are not located near infrastructure.
- The replacement plan is being developed and part of future discussions. The project is mapping where to focus and where the highest needs are.

Action: With 12 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Update to Campus Standard for Exterior Emergency Phones is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.