



December 13, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the November 30, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Claressa Davis, Kassy Fisher, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Stephanie Prentiss, Kevin Reed, Madison Sanders, Cathy Soutar, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

1. Ten-Year Capital Plan – Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review and comment on the Ten-Year Capital Plan. The goal of this review process was to facilitate coordination between academic and physical campus planning endeavors.

This plan outlined current and anticipated capital construction projects for the next ten years. This included projects identified by university leadership that will be submitted to the State of Oregon through the Capital Construction Budget Request process. The Campus Planning Committee was asked to review the plan and comment about relevant plan policies and patterns, in particular, Principle 3: Densities.

Michael Harwood (CPFM) shared the project background information, definitions, and categories. The Ten-Year Capital Plan is an annual presentation given to the Board of Trustees every December, specifying projects likely to happen in the next 10 years.

Capital plan goals, space needs analysis tracking, completed projects, projects underway, potential projects, and anticipated projects were also shared.

Discussion:

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

- Members asked for a copy of the presentation.
- Considering recent inflation in building material costs, how will this impact the ability to lower the amount of deferred maintenance?
- Seismic upgrades were not included in the projected future deferred maintenance costs. Is there a percentage of completed seismic upgrades on campus?
- What is the status of the Romania site project?

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

- Does the Ten-Year Capital Plan incorporate maintenance of off-campus building locations, e.g. the Charleston and Pine Mountain locations?

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

- Staff will send a copy of the presentation.
- Design and Construction is working on solutions to reduce project costs without affecting the program, to the degree possible. There is a real risk to many capital projects due to inflation.
- The OUS system completed a systematic evaluation of seismic in 1994; this is the data currently used. While the deferred maintenance assessments don't include seismic deficiencies, they are addressed and factored into capital project budgets. Every deferred maintenance project completed in the last approximately 15 years has addressed seismic issues, and there are still several buildings with seismic upgrades yet to be completed.
- The Capital Plan includes projects over 5 million dollars that require board approval. The Charleston and Pine Mountain locations typically don't include projects approaching 5 million dollars.
- COVID stalled the development of the Romania site project. Future possibilities for this site are being considered by the same private developer.

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. 2021-2023 Biennial Capacity Plan – Review and Action

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item, as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns. The purpose of this agenda item was to review the 2021-2023 Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP).

Complementing the Capital Plan, the Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP) is completed every two years (refer to page 33 in the *Campus Plan*) as a means for examining the campus's capacity and the ongoing effectiveness of the *Plan*. The *Campus Plan's* founding premise is that it is a user-driven process rather than a fixed image plan to allow for maximum flexibility to respond to unpredictable changes when planning. The BCP is created within this planning framework. It is designed to ensure that there are continued sustainable and viable development opportunities by examining the campus's development capacity and the ongoing effectiveness of the *Campus Plan*. In particular, the BCP calculates the maximum allowed build-out of campus (established by Policy 3: Densities, pages 49-52) and determines whether adequate siting opportunities exist in aggregate to accommodate identified campus building needs.

The 2021-2023 Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP) can be found online in the following location: https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/sites/cpfm2.uoregon.edu/files/2021-23bcp_report_.pdf

Staff gave an overview description of the Biennial Capacity Plan and *Campus Plan* densities, Design Areas and Sub-areas, and shared the draft key findings of the 2021-2023 BCP.

Discussion:

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

- It appears the last biennial review was completed in 2012; why?
- The Framework Vision Project (FVP) incorporated the biennial review effort in 2016. In-house biennial review work has been completed as follow-up after the FVP, however, it was not brought to this committee.
- The main approach is to consider how to move forward with the key findings identified in this BCP, and how to move forward with future development.
- Is this standard practice; do other institutions have a similar approach?

- Many campuses have a similar approach, and many are subject to the jurisdiction's land use requirements which are often much stricter, e.g., OSU requires a series of steps and reviews within the jurisdiction. Other institutions have no requirements; there's a broad range among institutions.
- The goal is to think more carefully about change, not restrict change.
- Member support for the first three findings.
- Consider a less detailed approach; reconsider the shapes of the Design Areas?
- This is a high-level approach for the needs of this committee. It's a planning tool, however not the full answer.
- There is value in completing the BCP, e.g., value for future development considerations.
- Member support for the application of the BCP.
- Priorities are set for buildings within the Design Areas, e.g., the Student Housing Design Area.
- Consider a proactive approach to Design Areas densities and creating a sub-committee to reevaluate the densities.
- Campus Planning currently does this; however, it requires time, budget, and effort. The FVP reevaluated Design Areas densities.
- Did the FVP result in proposed changes to the Design Area densities?
- The FVP proposed density changes in many areas, most notably in North Campus and East Campus.
- The *Campus Plan* density amendment process could be compared to an extension of the city's process; it's a way to communicate with neighbors and the city while working through a variety of projects or issues. E.g., it is similar in process to how the city evaluates various neighborhoods and sub areas of the city when creating their strategic plans.
- The *Campus Plan* is process-driven; this is a systematic way of working through these issues.
- If helpful, a wooden site model (of campus) could be made by the Architecture department.

Action: With 13 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the **2021-2023 Biennial Capacity Plan** findings are consistent with the *Campus Plan*, recommended to the president that it be approved, and unanimously agreed to the following:

1. Sufficient land exists, in aggregate, to accommodate approved construction projects,

2. Sites meeting the requirements of the *Plan* are identified for approved (first-biennium) projects, or, revisions are identified if they are needed, and
3. In the aggregate, sufficient siting opportunities exist for the remaining identified (next biennium) capital projects.

These findings are submitted with the understanding that the committee should further consider all identified needs for *Campus Plan* amendments as described below:

- In the Student Housing Design Area, there is a deficit in available building footprint and gsf because the DeNorval Unthank Jr. Residence Hall (completed in 2021) was approved by the Campus Planning Committee with the understanding that Hamilton Hall would be demolished after completion of phase II of the Housing Transformation Project (Walton Hall replacement). It is assumed that Hamilton Hall will be demolished, after which there will no longer be a deficit.
- In the Southeast Campus Design Area, there is currently no available building footprint or gsf. Additional density needs to be assessed to accommodate potential future needs for academic, recreational, and athletic uses.
- Many of the design areas do not have the capacity for building opportunities that were identified in the Framework Vision Project (FVP); therefore, additional density should be comprehensively assessed for these areas. For example:
 - Multiple sub-areas in the East Campus Design Area do not have enough capacity for potential future institutional and student housing needs, as identified in the Framework Vision Project. Therefore, additional density should be comprehensively assessed for the entire design area.
 - The Northeast Campus Design Area does not have enough capacity to replace aging lower-scale buildings with inefficient footprints, such as Onyx Bridge and Columbia Hall, with more space-efficient well-placed buildings to meet potential future needs and enhance the open space framework.

Also, the committee's comments are made with the understanding that it will have an opportunity to review proposed project sites and designs at a future date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* principles and patterns are met.