



November 1, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 20, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (Chair), Bob Choquette (Interim Chair), Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Amy Kalani, Moira Kiltie, Janet Rose, Hal Sadofsky, Philip Speranza

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Ravi Cullop (ASUO), Larissa Ennis (University Advancement), Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services), Vignesh Madmavah (Polymath Studio), Lillian Moses (University Housing), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Martina Oxoby (CPFM), Matt Roberts (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

1. Campus Planning Committee – Chair Election

Background: The CPC chair reviewed the process for electing a new chair as described in the meeting mailing.

Ken Kato nominated Bob Choquette to serve as the next term's 2023-2024 chair.

Action: With 8 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed to elect Bob Choquette as chair of the 2023-2024 Campus Planning Committee.

2. Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish a Campus Standard “Trespass Sign”

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposal to establish a campus standard “Trespass Sign” in the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan. The new standard will

reflect the current university brand, clearly provide information, and reinforce the university's identity in the campus outdoor environment.

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

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the project proposal, need, goals, intent, design, and size requirements. Context of the outdoor sign plan, purpose of signage on campus, sign types, and sign placement preferences and locations were also reviewed.

Lillian Moses (Student Housing) emphasized the project need for campus residents.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Olsen:

- Member: Member support for the project.

Regarding sign intent:

- Guest: How will this sign help prevent bike theft?
- Member: The sign is intended to help the bike theft enforcement process.
 - Member: A no trespassing sign increases enforcement options for UOPD.

Regarding sign history:

- Member: Are there informal versions of no trespassing signs that exist on campus?
- Olsen: There are minimal existing ageing no trespassing stickers scattered around doors and fences on campus.

Regarding sign design, size, and wording:

- Member: Is the increased sign size to ensure it meets the legal standards and qualifies as being visible?
- Member: Consider placing the no trespassing words at the top of the sign.
- Member: General counsel reviewed the sign; the concept focuses on a balance between being visible and remaining friendly.
- Olsen: Every intent is made to minimize signage on campus, while considering each proposal carefully. Signage should contribute to the “welcoming to all” feel of campus.
- Olsen: General counsel reviewed the sign size and determined a 1” font size meets the standard for enforceability.
- Olsen: The committee reviews the scale, size, and intent of the sign, while UO Communications reviews the specific wording.

- Member: Consider the needs of wanting an open and public campus balanced with the need of wanting protection.

Regarding sign location:

- Member: Are the proposed locations specific or in general areas?
- Member: Who will decide final sign locations?
 - Olsen: As part of the proposal for standardizing the signs, UOPD and Campus Planning would work together to determine appropriate future sign placement. It is not intended for the committee to review every proposal.
- Olsen: Other considerations for signage placement are potential future maintenance needs.
- Member: Consider a future sign location near the Miller Theater Complex trash enclosures.
- Guest: When available, please share the proposed layout for sign locations with Housing.
 - Olsen: Copies of the proposed sign locations will be shared per request.

Action: With 8 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish a Campus Standard “Trespass Sign” is consistent with the Campus Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved.

3. Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish Approved Banner Locations on Campus Light Poles

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposal to establish approved banner locations on campus light poles

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

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the proposal intent, history, needs, goals, locations and location types, and requirements.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Olsen:

Regarding proposal intent:

- Member: Is this proposal consistent with current practices?
 - Member: This proposal helps specify what poles on each street or open space can be used for banners; this will help keep banner locations consistent and direct where future banners will be located.
 - Olsen: There was previous lack of clarity on where banners could be used on campus, specifically regarding light poles. This proposal adds some pedestrian areas to locations for banners.

Regarding banner management:

- Guest: Currently at the city streets of Agate Street and 13th Avenue (east of Agate Street), 15th Avenue (east of Agate Street), and Riverfront Drive (by Knight Campus extending to the Riverfront Research Park locations), UO has a mutual agreement with the city that UO will manage these banner programs. (The city has jurisdiction over these banner locations as they are part of the city's banner program.) Consider feedback from the city regarding placement of banners near the Ruth Bascom Bike Path.
- Guest: In the anticipated redesign of Leo Harris Parkway, there are plans for new light poles to have pole banners. Consider proposing to the city that UO manages this location as well to help identify UO and Athletics in the banners.
- Olsen: The committee has previously approved seasonal banner locations related to different events/ locations (E.g., McArthur Court, Jane Sanders Stadium, and Miller Theater.)
- Guest: During the anticipated future Franklin Boulevard Transformation Project, consider a potential desire to take more ownership of the banners on Franklin Boulevard.
- Guest: Managing additional future banner locations along Franklin Boulevard may overburden UO. As part of the Franklin Boulevard Transformation Project, all utilities are anticipated to be moved underground with new light poles placement; future management of light pole banners could be further explored as that project progresses.

Action: With 9 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Campus Plan Outdoor Sign Plan – Proposal to Establish Approved Banner Locations on Campus Light Poles is consistent with the Campus Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved.

4. 13th Avenue Redesign - Schematic Design – Meeting One

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold Meeting One for the 13th Avenue Redesign – Schematic Design Project.

As part of Meeting One (further described in the Campus Plan on page 27), the committee was asked to complete the following tasks:

- User Group - Review the proposed user group representation and provide comments to the CPC chair, who appoints group members (refer to page 28 of the Campus Plan for more information about user groups).
- Key Principles and Patterns - Identify key principles, patterns, and other relevant campus design issues from the Campus Plan.
- Other Campus-wide Opportunities - Identify potential opportunities to address campus-wide needs within the subject area or opportunities to cooperate with other nearby development efforts.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, and proposed user group representation.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the project history, goals, funding, vision, concept plan design, and *Campus Plan* process.

Martina Oxoby (CPFM) emphasized the multi-modal impact of the project and reviewed the project outreach process with on and off-campus groups and partners through the schematic design process, and design schedule.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Olsen and Oxoby:

- Members and guests support the project.

Regarding project funding:

- Member: What is the funding status after schematic design?
 - Olsen: There is currently no funding for this project beyond the schematic design phase. CPFM is supporting and funding the schematic design effort.
 - Member: CPFM is funding schematic design to be prepared with a design when funding opportunities become available.
- Member: Who is supporting the project; is there a budget?
 - Member: The conceptual design (pg. 137) contains budget details.
 - Olsen: The conceptual design prepared a cost estimate and gave an idea of scale; the exact numbers are in the report.
- Olsen: The conceptual design gave different implementation strategies for implementing the project as a whole or in phases.
- Guest: Does CPFM have the capacity to write or apply for grants?

- Guest: Transportation Services is involved in a larger scale campus wide transportation planning project. A project goal is to identify potential funding sources for needed projects on campus, such as the 13th Avenue Redesign project.
- Guest: Consider potential regional funding opportunities.

Regarding other campus wide opportunities:

- Member: Consider the unique needs of the University Health Center.
- Member: Consider encouraging support for this project as very important to emphasize designing for pedestrians and people instead of vehicles.

Regarding User Group representation:

- Member: Consider adding a city planner to the user group representation.
 - Member: A city planner was on the conceptual design advisory committee for this project.
 - Member: Consider if the city supports pedestrianized streets.
 - Guest: The city's 8th Avenue project, currently under construction, is pedestrianized.
 - Guest: A city planner representative could help this project coordinate with future new off-campus private residential and retail development along 13th Avenue.
 - Guest: Transportation Services has excellent relationships with city transportation planning staff; they will be involved, consulted, and providing feedback as part of this project.
 - Olsen: A city transportation planning staff member was engaged during conceptual design on the advisory group and may be included in the focus group for schematic design.
- Member: Consider Housing, Athletics, and the EMU for user group representation.
- Oxoby: Focus groups are created by subject area of interest. Specific information is collected from each of those groups to bring back to the user group committee to inform how the design will move forward, to be successful, and weigh the needs from all these different groups.

Regarding CPC process:

- Member: Is design being reviewed at this meeting?

- Olsen: The purpose of CPC Meeting One is to make a recommendation on user group composition, review *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns, and review potential other campus wide opportunities. (*CPC staff note: See Campus Plan pages 25-30 for a detailed description of CPC Meeting One procedure.*)
- Guest: What is the CPC process for choosing individual user group members? Can the number of proposed members be changed?
 - Olsen: The committee reviews and recommends the user group composition, not the individual people on the user group. The project sponsor, CPFM Owner's Representative, and Campus Planning work with the CPC Chair to propose the specific members of the group; the Chair approves and appoints those members.
 - Olsen: The proposed user group numbers can be changed as a recommendation by CPC.

Regarding other information:

- Guest: Consider recommendations from adjacent projects, E.g., the UDBA 13th Avenue (from Kincaid Street to Ferry Street) beautification streetscape study project for opportunities to work together and coordination.
- Guest: All members and guests are encouraged to attend the Thermal Task Force forum for the potential thermal transition project and support of 13th Avenue Redesign. More information is available on the Office of Sustainability website:
<https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/office-sustainability>
 - Olsen: 13th Avenue has been identified as an opportunity if there is any need to complete major infrastructure changes as part of the thermal transition project.
- Olsen: The committee's comments will be considered as the project moves forward.

Action: With 8 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed project user group representation, *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, and other campus-wide opportunities for the 13th Avenue Redesign – Schematic Design – Meeting One are consistent with the Campus Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved.