



December 11, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the November 28, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Ravi Cullop, Emily Eng, Mike Harwood, Amy Kalani, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Janet Rose, Hal Sadofsky, Henry Schadwinkel, Philip Speranza, Lauren Stanfield

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Cami Thompson (Community Relations)

CPC Agenda

1. 10-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 that have been submitted by university leadership to the State of Oregon for the Capital Construction Budget Request and may be considered for future requests. The Campus Planning Committee was being asked to review the plan and comment about relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Mike Harwood (CPFM) shared information regarding the plan's background, purpose, procedure, priorities, project escalation costs/impacts, project budget, schedule, and scope, criteria, projects, property locations, sustainability, deferred maintenance, spending, funding sources, budget and indebtedness, studies, and future activities. He also stated that a new building for Ballmer Institute and PSI will be the next capital project request to HECC.

Discussion:

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

Regarding project escalation costs:

- Member: Do project escalation costs include product and labor?
 - Harwood: The project escalation costs include the total project costs for items related to a project.
- Member: Is the current rate of project escalation costs expected to continue?
 - Harwood: Project escalation costs will likely continue to stay elevated due to:
 - 1.) continuing loss of capacity in the labor market, E.g., fewer people are beginning careers in the construction industry, and decreased available labor means higher fees, and
 - 2.) the price of materials continues to be driven higher, E.g., while prices may decrease slightly, they may not see a decline unless there is an unlikely economic event/recession.

Regarding project budget:

- Member: What tools are available to meet project budgets, E.g., cutting scope or value engineering?
 - Harwood: Project budget tools include:
 - 1.) The biennial allocation of the CI&R (Capital Improvement and Repair Funds) from the Oregon State legislature. While there are strict constraints, CI&R is primarily used for retiring deferred maintenance (E.g., current and planned UO deferred maintenance projects include Huestis Hall, Heritage Project (Villard and University Halls), and Friendly Hall). When there are project budget gaps, some can be filled with CI&R funds.
 - 2.) The central reserves can help meet funding gaps.
 - 3.) While not a preferred method, cutting project scope.
 - 4.) Revising a construction method or material to cut costs.

Regarding State funding:

- Member: What CI&R funds does UO receive from the State?
 - Harwood: CI&R funding changes every two years. UO received approximately 26 million in the last biennium, and the prior year received a special allocation

to make up for some of the inflation impacts on projects due to Covid, E.g., approximately 25-30 million. Prior to those years, UO has received 8-10 million.

- Member: There have been recent proposals in the State legislature to cut funding for public institutions including UO. Is there something in that proposal that would impact cuts to the CI&R funds?
 - Harwood: That proposal is likely regarding a separate fund that is related to the UO operating fund. The CI&R fund is a capital allocation that is made to the seven public institutions of Oregon. The Higher Education Coordinating Committee allocates funds according to a formula, E.g., Oregon State University (OSU) typically receives a little more than UO because they are a larger campus, however, UO is typically second, followed by Portland State University (PSU) and the other Oregon public institutions.

Regarding carbon footprint and sustainability:

- Member: Consider energy efficiency and if these items were included in the carbon impact in study:
 - 1.) Although most of the electricity being considered is green, marginal electricity is not green. If UO is contributing to that margin, then somewhere else natural gas is being burnt to produce electricity for UO instead of being burnt locally.
 - 2.) The carbon costs of implementing a water-based distribution system will likely be very intensive.
 - Harwood:
 - 1.) UO has talked extensively with EWEB about understanding what are called peaking plants. When demand for electricity is high, which peaks in Oregon during winter, it will go to other plants that use diesel generators or other methods to generate electricity. This awareness is melded into the recommendations, E.g., the recommendation to scale back and stay within the capacity of EWEB (instead of replacing both UO gas fired boilers with electric and creating infrastructure expense and a peaking plant problem).
 - 2.) Regarding carbon costs, UO is studying potential costs and disruptions, E.g., the project ease and feasibility.

Regarding deferred maintenance:

- Member: In approximately 2017-18, CPFM evaluated the entire campus and calculated building deferred maintenance needs. Is this process still carrying forward and is UO staying current with building deferred maintenance needs?
 - Harwood: The study estimated around 500 million total for building deferred maintenance, and showed UO would need approximately between 40-50 million a year to catch up with building deferred maintenance in about 10-15 years with what continues to grow each year. 10 years ago, it was thought that UO's deferred maintenance overall deficit would be closer to 700 million, when today it is approximately 350-360 million. While it has grown from the original amount, which was about 250 million 10 years ago, it has not grown as quickly as anticipated. This is because almost all projects over the past 10 years, except for Knight Campus and two residence halls, have had the goal of retiring deferred maintenance. This has helped lower the total number and prevented it from growing as large as the study projected.

Regarding other specific areas of campus and other projects:

(East Campus)

- Member: Does UO own all properties in the area designated as East Campus?
 - Harwood: There are approximately five properties in the East Campus area that UO does not own.

(Romania Project)

- Member: Regarding the timing of projects and the project timeline graph, was there a pause in the Romania project?
 - Harwood: Previously the Romania project concept was thought to be a hotel, office building, residential, retail, and mixed-use development. Covid changed the need for developing an office building or hotel, and the current concept is for all residential. There was a pause due to Covid, however UO is working with the same developer who is still interested in the project.

(Knight Campus Phase 3)

- Member: Is the future Knight Campus Phase 3 project a part of the original gift or still considered tentative?
 - Harwood: Phase 3 was part of the initial concept, however, not part of the initial gift. UO is currently focused on Phase 2 of the project.

(Kalapuya Ilihi Hall)

- Member: What is the current project at Kalapuya Ilihi Hall (KI)?

- Harwood: KI will be undergoing mainly first floor repairs; the project is still undergoing scoping.

(Friendly Hall)

- Member: Why is the Friendly Hall renovation shown as the most expensive project per square foot, E.g., it seems expensive compared to other projects?
 - Harwood: This is an estimate; however, it accounts for supply chain increases and project escalation costs.

(UO Portland)

- Member: Will new buildings come online in Portland that relate to the Ballmer Institute and how it develops? Is the White Stag building for sale?
 - Harwood: The White Stag building is listed for sale and on the market, however, there is currently a challenging real estate market in downtown Portland.
 - The Law School has moved from the White Stag building to UO Portland.
 - The Architecture, Sports Product Management, and College of Business programs will move Fall, 2024.
 - A new building for Ballmer institute and PSI will be the next capital project submission to HECC, however it will not be ready for occupancy until Fall, 2027. There are short term plans for temporary use of the library building and another residential building.
 - UO is currently working on a master plan considering future demand for other projects.

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. *Campus Plan* Use and Composite Concept Studies Diagrams – Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to provide an overview of diagrams used by Campus Planning to illustrate how the *Campus Plan* provides guidance for where uses should occur on campus as well as where conceptual studies have been completed. This agenda item was informational and continued a conversation from the previous meeting. The intent was to provide a visual representation of ideas from the *Campus Plan* and conceptual studies.

CPC staff reviewed the diagram content and descriptions, and corresponding *Campus Plan* language.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) clarified the diagram intent.

Discussion:

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

Regarding the existing campus uses:

- Member: Why is the Knight Law School color shown as something other than academics/research when that is the current use? Is there a plan to replace the Law School?
 - Eng: What is shown for this area correlates with uses that are shown in the East Campus Plan, E.g., there are three distinct areas: high density institutional, limited high-density institutional, and residential which correspond to density and height limitations. As these diagrams evolve, Campus Planning can explore further. While many uses in this area are administrative, many are reserved along Agate Street for academic uses that are not located in the academic core. There is no plan to replace the Law School.
 - Member: Existing use could mean existing *Plan* designation.

Regarding the Illustrative *Campus Plan* project list:

- Member: While these are drawings from evolved studies, at other universities, is it more traditional to have a specific master plan study? E.g., is there lack of a larger plan because these concepts relate to the Christopher Alexander experiment era principles? Typically, cities refer to a master plan, and it seems there is nothing to reference because there is no campus wide master plan.
 - Member: UO has a process orientation, which is somewhat unique and not many campuses focus as much on the process. This is a legacy of Christopher Alexander's work, E.g., the democratization of the campus planning process with the goal of making it accessible to all. The purpose of the Campus Planning Committee is for campus wide participation; the *Campus Plan* principles help guide this participation. Anecdotal items shown on a master plan do not always help planning efforts or guide the process. Campus Planning has been developing these tools to help take past planning studies off the library shelf into more accessible and sharable formats.
- Member: Has there been a study for the entire campus?
 - Member: There is a current master planning effort beginning for the southeast area of campus to study student housing and other institutional needs.

- Eng: The Framework Vision Project (FVP), completed in 2016, was a master planning effort. While it was not a fixed image master plan in terms of buildings, it identified proposed building shapes and sites, and built upon the open space framework. While there is not a fixed image master plan for the *Campus Plan*, there is a fixed master plan in terms of the open spaces.
- Regarding fixed open spaces, consider that is a figure-ground reversal of the form; only holding the open spaces and nothing else. Holding to the form of the open spaces alone is an oversimplification and can run the risk of not fully assessing an area with a bigger vision. Member support for considering master plans.
- Member: Master plans can be thought of like GIS, E.g., multiple layers to build on and to think of campus in a different way. This diagram is to introduce the committee to additional Campus Planning tools and help facilitate conversations when there is a new project.
- Member: This is not a master plan because it is not explaining ideas in layers; however, future projects are shown on the diagram.
- Member: This diagram is not intended to be seen as a master plan, but a composite of past concept studies.
- Member: These are future projects that were thought about in the past, which may or may not be endorsed today. It is a repository of 20 years of past studies.
- CPC Staff: The diagram intent is to show the internal Campus Planning process, continue previous discussion, and to show past studies that have been considered.
- Eng: These are tools that Campus Planning uses; sharing with committee members to aid in the thinking process.

Regarding other campus projects:

- Member: Regarding the Franklin Boulevard Transformation Project, will there be roundabouts at the intersections along Franklin Boulevard?
 - CPC Staff: The project is still developing and in the conceptual stages. More information will be shared with the committee as the project moves forward.
 - Eng: This is a city project and shown on the diagram as Campus Planning incorporates the city's future adjacent projects that impact UO and useful to help understand context.

Action: No formal action was requested.