



June 28, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Eleni Tsivitz, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the June 1, 2018 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks, Selena Blick, Greg Bryant, Jane Brubaker, George Evans
Kassy Fisher, Hilary Gerdes, Alicia Going, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato,
Josh McCoy, Kevin Reed, Bitty Roy, Christine Thompson, Rob Thallon, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Steve Mital, Gene Mowery, Aaron Olsen, Tom Shepard

CPC Agenda:

1. Knight Campus - Update

Background: Mike Harwood updated the Campus Planning Committee on the progress of the Knight Campus Project. The evening street shut-down will end next week after the stormwater line around the building has been tied in and mass excavation will start the following week.

The restoration work at the Millrace has begun. The steep banks close to the future building are being laid back. Native plants will be planted, but will take two years to become fully established.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- The project team has research showing what the Millrace was like historically.
- The native overstory of the Millrace will be preserved.
- CPFM and the design team understand that restoring native plants along the water is essential and the Knight Campus Project plans to undertake this restoration along the section of the Millrace that is included in this project.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, the project team provided

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

the following clarifications:

- 400 feet of the Millrace will be restored at this time. There are ongoing discussions about ways to achieve a restoration of the Millrace along its full length.
- The project team has had many discussions with experts in ecology on campus. Faculty and students helped to compile information on the history and ecology of the Millrace. That information was funneled into a landscape architecture studio that helped to give the team a vision of how that area could look in the future. Information shared with and studies generated by the university academic community are available on the UO Sustainability website.
- The Millrace will become part of the research and learning inventory of the university. It is an example of how the university is a lab in itself. The university is using the knowledge that was gained in the research phase to restore it so that it can be a more environmentally sound area and a better resource to the university.

Action: No action was requested.

2. Campus Plan Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) Amendment - Public Hearing and Action

Background: CPC staff introduced the purpose of this agenda item, reviewed proposed amendments to the OMSD as discussed at previous meetings and described changes that were made in response to feedback from CPC members.

Public Hearing: No comments or questions were raised during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Discussion: There was a robust discussion about habitat and ecology and how those topics might be further addressed in the OMSD. Staff described (per the advanced mailing materials) how those elements are addressed elsewhere in the Campus Plan and its subject plans and how additional information about specific ecological features will be addressed in the upcoming North Campus Plan amendments. A suggestion was made that the CPC revisit the discussion about ecosystems and habitat in the Fall Term, in concert with the North Campus Plan amendments.

Members proposed a modification to the wording regarding gender-inclusive restroom facilities in the social equity section of the People Goal.

Action: A motion passed with a vote of 13 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions to include the following sentence at the end of the "Principle Refinements" section of the OMSD:

"Principles 2 and 12 are particularly relevant to maintaining and enhancing the ecosystems of campus."

In the "Foster Social Equity" section of the People Goal, one of the examples of how to achieve this goal was revised to read:

"Providing gender-inclusive restroom facilities so that all individuals have access to restroom facilities"

The committee agreed unanimously that the proposed **Campus Plan Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) Amendment** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

3. Classroom and Faculty Office Building - Primary Sites - Discussion

Background: Staff introduced the purpose of this agenda item and reviewed information that had been covered in previous CPC meetings related to this topic. She presented all of the permissible building sites identified in the Framework Vision Project (FVP) that could accommodate the building program. She subsequently identified a number of fatal flaws (based on the previously confirmed site selection criteria) which eliminated approximately half of the potential sites. The remaining five sites will be analyzed in much greater detail on the basis of the site selection criteria.

Discussion: The committee agreed that the sites with fatal flaws identified thus far are appropriate for removal from further consideration.

The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- The Collier House site is important from an ecological point of view as it is part of a bird and wildlife corridor through campus.
- Building on existing surface parking lots would be positive from an ecological standpoint.
- Given the program of the building, adhering to the 7-minute walking circle/instructional core seems to be a key criterion.
- It is reasonable to take the Esslinger redevelopment site off the list of potential sites for this building. There are plans for a carefully considered relocation of existing uses in that building in the future.
- Placing a building on the edge of campus could encourage the expansion of campus. Ensure that the walkability of campus is carefully considered in siting this building.
- A surface parking lot (like the PLC lot) is an undesirable anomaly in an urban center.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, the project team provided the following clarifications:

- The project does not currently account for a specific amount of parking replacement.
- It is most expensive to replace parking in an underground structure, somewhat less

expensive to replace it in structured parking, and least expensive to replace parking in a surface lot.

Action: No action was requested. The committee's comments will be considered as site selection proceeds with a more detailed analysis of the five primary sites.

4. North Campus - Conditional Use Permit - Update

Background: The CPC Chair reviewed what the CPC's role and actions have been in reviewing the North Campus Conditional Use Permit (CUP). He described the Senate resolution on the CUP and the President's response to that resolution. The President declined to retract the CUP but has directed the CPC to work with Campus Planning and Facilities Management on a recreation field location study to explore all options for locating recreation fields on- and off-campus. This study will begin in the Fall Term when faculty, and students have returned from the summer break. The CPC will also engage in a series of discussions with the university and community regarding the upcoming North Campus Plan amendments and the CPC will help to ensure that the outreach events associated with these amendments are scheduled at times that are convenient for faculty and students.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- Another important point in the President's response was his commitment that projects north of the railroad tracks will not follow the Track C process.
- The study of recreation field locations is separate from the CUP process and timeline.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, Campus Planning staff provided the following clarifications:

- The President has called for a study of recreation field locations to address concerns about recreation fields north of the railroad tracks.
- Campus Planning is reaching out to interested parties to ensure an understanding of what is proposed in the CUP and to ensure that Campus Planning is aware of any outstanding concerns.
- The review of the CUP is a city process and the timeline is not yet known.
- Campus Planning is studying the possibilities within the framework of the CUP.
- Campus Planning has been working on items required to complete the CUP application after the initial submission was deemed incomplete, which is the typical process.

Action: No action was requested.

Please contact this office if you have questions.