



November 13, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 31, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Deborah Butler, Hunter Carey, Ravi Cullop, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Amy Kalani, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Janet Rose, Henry Schadwinkel, Michael Slater, Lauren Stanfield

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services), Jamie Moffitt (VPFA), Matt Roberts (Community Relations), Cami Thompson (Community Relations)

CPC Agenda

1. Campus Planning Committee – New Member Welcome

Background: Jamie Moffitt (VPFA) welcomed new members and thanked continuing members for their service and work on the committee.

CPC Staff provided an overview of the 2022-2023 committee's activities, highlighted anticipated activities for the 2023-2024 academic year, and reviewed typical CPC meeting procedures.

Discussion:

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

Regarding CPC Procedure:

- Member: Describe the difference between CPC Meeting 1 and Meeting 2.
 - Staff: CPC Meeting 1 includes identifying site selection as applicable to the project, review of the project's user group representation, key *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, and identifying any other potential campus wide

opportunities related to the project. The specific individuals for user group representation are identified after 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. Site selection is only applicable to projects that do not have an existing site.

- Staff: CPC Meeting 2 includes project schematic design review. *(CPC Staff note: See Campus Plan pages 25-30 for a detailed description of CPC Meeting One and Meeting Two procedure.)*

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. Framework Vision Project (FVP) Retrospective

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to provide an overview of how the UO Campus Physical Framework Vision Project, also known as Framework Vision Project (FVP), has been integrated into the *Campus Plan* since the FVP's completion in March, 2016. The goal of this agenda item was to familiarize members with concepts from the FVP, share progress, and to prepare the committee for anticipated future amendments related to integrating the FVP.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item and available online resources.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) gave an overview of the Framework Vision Project (FVP), including history, use, purpose, project team, timeline, process, goals, capacity, open space framework, and key findings, opportunities, integration into the *Campus Plan*, appropriate permissible activities, growth scenarios, progress, and next steps.

Discussion:

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

Regarding the Millrace and Willamette Design Areas:

- Member: The Willamette River Natural Area has a new program manager/steward position that will be dedicated to this area.

- Member: The Millrace Natural Area has been reinforced through projects such as the restored section behind Knight Campus, and the design work for Millrace Millpond area.
- Member: Consider the Riverfront recreation fields are difficult for sports activity due to uneven surfaces.

Regarding the planning process:

- Member: Consider the opportunity to explore other planning models that may allow campus to envision the look of campus if future larger capacity needs are known.
 - Eng: A master plan can inform the look of campus and is a tool to refer to that does not need to be a part of the *Campus Plan*.
- Member: Is it possible to combine a process document, such as the *Campus Plan*, and a repository of all the hopes and dreams for campus? Campus Planning has been involved with many studies over the past 20-30 years, which may not be common knowledge; having a place to reference these studies would be helpful, however, the planning process is necessary for projects even though the process document (the *Campus Plan*) does not provide specific vision for projects. (*CPC Staff note: For a list of completed Campus Planning projects and studies, visit: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/completed-projects-and-studies>*)
- Member: There is opportunity to consider the whole campus related to neighborhoods, campus function, and energy in various parts of campus.
 - Eng: Campus Planning can consider developing tools and discuss the meaning of formalizing such planning tools. A process plan does not envision all future uses and needs.

Regarding other potential projects:

- Member: Is there a vision for the Romania site?
 - Eng: UO is engaging with a developer on a ground lease to redevelop the Romania site. The anticipated intent is for mostly housing, with the preservation of the historic Romania showroom. CPMF is preparing to have all occupants vacate the Romania warehouse by August 2024; it is currently being used as storage and other Facilities functions.
- Member: Will the FVP vision for a pedestrian bridge over Franklin Boulevard be developed?
 - Eng: A new pedestrian bridge is cost prohibitive; no funding is available. The concept that was shown in the FVP is prohibited by the existing site grade

differences; the grade difference from the open space to across where the bridge was proposed to land is too great that it is not feasible and unlikely. A project concept like this can be seen as an opportunity to leverage this concept with potential future projects. An improved pedestrian crossing across Franklin Boulevard may be more feasible.

- Member: Was the Classroom Office Building project put on hold?
 - Member: The Classroom Office Building project was put on hold about five years ago. The project largely anticipated growth and a need that did not happen. Other projects and factors lessened the demand for classroom and faculty office space, E.g., efficient use of existing classroom and office space, and COVID impacts on office usage patterns.
- Member: What other infill opportunities are available in specific areas of campus, E.g., near Straub Hall?
 - Eng: The FVP building scenarios shows infill, E.g., where there is room for building additions or new buildings among existing. Prior to the FVP, the historic campus was thought to require a lower density and the *Campus Plan* had a lower limit for capacity; however, through the FVP, the design team found that the ratio of buildings to open space, while keeping a more human scale feel, would remain if providing infill. Projects that resulted from this were Tykeson Hall, built in 2019, and the Classroom Office Building, which was not built.
 - Member: There is no current plan for a Straub Hall addition. Many older campus buildings have had 3 – 5 discreet additions, although they may look like only one building. There is still room for some older campus buildings to have additions that would then complete the original design intent of their corresponding open space, E.g., a north Hendricks Hall addition would reinforce the completion of the historic plan for the Women’s Quad and the existing open space edges.
 - Eng: Straub Hall has had previous infill development with an added lecture hall.
- Member: During the time of the FVP, was there discussion regarding buildings and the future of campus that included moving the Collier House and demolishing McArthur Court. Are those projects moving forward?
 - Eng: During FVP study discussion there was a Classroom Office Building Open House, and an Open House regarding moving Collier House because of that project. Collier House and McArthur Court are still there and there are no current or planned projects for those buildings.

Regarding space use and organization:

- Member: Consider that classrooms, labs, and faculty offices are in the center of campus, and housing, parking, and support functions are located further out, all in relatively discreet zones rather than neighborhoods or connection points. Consider how to create a sense of integration, where faculty and students are in the same spaces, creating networks and communities, integrating and interconnecting students, activity, and a more dynamic experience.
 - Member: Where the students are is where there is action.
 - Member: Students are often segmented from where faculty, labs, and classes are; create integrated learning and people sharing spaces. Conversations about interconnectedness are important.
 - Member: The FVP is not the final ultimate document, and did not anticipate all campus outcomes and growth, E.g., because of the new student center in Unthank Hall, there is increased student activity at 15th Avenue and Agate Street. As projects come forward, the committee will need to consider how projects fit into the context of *Campus Plan* principles, the physical challenges of a real site, budget, and specific program needs.
 - Eng: Campus is set up to efficiently get students and faculty to their classes; if locations are more dispersed and spread out, efficiency is lost.
 - Member: Member appreciation for the compactness of campus, the ability to move quickly from one classroom to another, and landscape quality. When considering the growth pattern and where to locate campus activity centers, keep in mind the idea of compactness and the ease of movement among classes.
 - Eng: *Campus Plan* Principle 4: Space Use and Organization, includes a map and definition of the seven-minute walking circles, which are a general representation of the distance a student can travel within the ten-minute class break. It assumes seven minutes of walking time at a walking speed of three miles per hour.
 - Member: Cities around the world desire a ten to fifteen-minute walking distance; UO has achieved this.

Regarding next steps:

- Member: What are the next steps?
 - Eng: We are reviewing the FVP, completed in 2016, to look ahead at the next phase of planning. Much of the *Campus Plan* has been updated to integrate the

FVP, however, the East Campus area is the last area of campus the FVP provided recommendations for that have not been fully implemented. The East Campus area is complex and needs further study. In the process of starting preparation work for a Next Generation Housing Development Plan, which is essentially a master plan of housing for the next twenty years that will help inform an update to the East Campus Plan (also twenty years old), it will allow us to meet our future housing and other institutional needs. The committee will be hearing more about the Next Generation Housing Development Plan and updating the East Campus plan early next year.

Action: No formal action was requested.