



June 12, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 31, 2024, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Hunter Carey, Ravi Cullop, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Savannah Olsen, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Hal Sadofsky, Philip Speranza

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Eric Alexander (EMU), Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw Architects), Valentine Bentz (Student), Phil Chesbro (CPFM), Larissa Ennis (Community Relations), Dorothy Faris (Mithun), Ann Greenfield (University Advancement), Taliek Lopez-DuBoff (ASUO, Student), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (Community Relations)

CPC Agenda

1. Next Generation Housing Development Plan – Check-in

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to check-in regarding the Next Generation Housing Development Plan.

Dorothy Faris (Mithun) shared a Next Generation Housing Development Plan progress update, including: pedestrian connectivity and the existing open space framework, creating a destination/campus heart, existing trees, recommendations for how to expand the open space framework while connecting this area of campus to all of campus, campus scaled blocks, Moss Green expansion, student centric spaces, dining, axes, street treatments, E.g., raised intersections, expansion of open space between Global Scholars and Kalapuya Ilihi Halls, ecological landscapes and habitat, safe campus pedestrian circulation, pedestrian flows and safe intersections, service routes, internal service networks, displaced uses, parking, zoning updates and changes, transition zones, building height recommendations, overall building scale and context, gateways, and campus connections.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with clarification comments from Faris and Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning):

Regarding parking and traffic:

- Member: How is traffic flow to the future proposed parking structure envisioned?
 - Faris: This level of detail is developing, E.g., the project traffic engineer is looking at a larger traffic study for all of campus. Currently, the project is studying overall demand for the area and residential development impacts, assuming first-year students in new residence halls will not be provided parking.
 - Olsen: Agate Street and 17th Avenue are currently identified as a potential location for a parking structure, and the project assumes that these streets would primarily support traffic flow, however, impacts to other roads will be studied.
 - Member: Do not defer traffic considerations, as the traffic patterns, E.g., large truck circulation and a future parking structure, will be significant in the overall development of traffic flow around the neighborhood. As routes are removed for driving through the area, people will have to drive around, and it would be worth knowing how.
 - CPC staff: This plan is envisioning change over the next twenty years. As part of any project that moves forward in development, any displaced uses, E.g., parking and traffic flow, will be considered in advance.
 - Member: Consider the parking structure shown on the plans and understand how it is going to fit with traffic flow at this level of planning, before the first buildings are built and create a constrained set of possibilities for where the parking structure is located.
 - Olsen: The transportation consultant that is working on this project is also working on the transportation master plan with Transportation Services. These needs are being discussed as a part of that process. Having the parking structure located near Agate Street is something that has been consistent in the planning, and for this planning process, a site off Franklin

Boulevard near the Matthew Knight Arena. These are the two main locations that have been considered based on the support for the traffic that is there now, considering the idea of campus super blocks in the future, and not wanting to place a structure on the east or south sides in this area where there could be more traffic through the neighborhood.

- Member: There is consideration about one additional site off Agate Street that is being studied.

Regarding future open space planning:

- Guest: Regarding the Native Commons open space planning, how far along is the concept? There is previous work and research by Native American groups on campus regarding re-envisioning landscapes on college campuses.
 - Faris: Planning is conceptual and not in the design phase. This plan is proposing that that area be protected long-term as a designated open space and providing the conceptual idea of how it could take shape and used, however, it will not be designed as a part of this overall plan.
 - Member: There had been a concept plan created by John Paul Jones, “The Way of the People,” that would extend from the Many Nations Long House (MNLH) forward and this plan provides space for that concept.
 - Faris: John Paul Jones was the designer of the MNLH and developed the plan for “The Way of the People,” which is represented in the model. The goal is the idea of the Native Commons, and holding space for it, will build off of this previous concept.

Regarding the campus superblock concept:

- Member: Consider an example of the City of Barcelona, Spain, shifting from autonomous blocks to super axes (*CPC Staff Note, See: <https://www.citiesforum.org/news/superblock-superilla-barcelona-a-city-redefined/>*), and there is value and benefit to plan these issues at a larger scale of the entire campus. Prioritize large, connective, shared streets, with shared transit.
 - Olsen: The diagonal movement concept shown in the plans is a notion of within that open space framework, those axes will remain. It is recognizing the general movement that people will not prefer to walk north and west and trying to respond well to that, while maintaining an axial relationship and strength. The closing of Moss Street, like 13th Avenue, will be more of a pedestrian focused environment, while maintaining clear axes. This recognizes that as people move

toward 15th Avenue and some of the other connector streets, the movement already flows diagonally through that space.

- Faris: One analysis completed is looking at streets across campus and scoring them on a pedestrian scale. This level of refinement will develop over time as this is built, however some streets will be truly pedestrian, and some will allow some level of movement through because of the need to for larger campus blocks to function.
- Olsen: Part of the concept and goal of the superblock, E.g., 15th Avenue east of Agate Street, is to extend that axes to be a stronger pedestrian connection all the way through campus and not stop at Agate Street.
- Member: Consider Moss Street differently than Columbia Street, how it is drawn and planned, and that these will be important underlays for future decisions.

Regarding urban ecology:

- Member: Super axes / streets in Barcelona, Spain are being addressed as models for urban ecology. Does this plan study ideas of water treatment, E.g., gray & black water, energy systems, sound, questions of gentrification on the neighborhood, animals, creatures, and air pollution?
 - Faris: Sustainability and LEED considerations are being thought of at a high level, as well as opportunities with these bigger concepts. E.g., opportunities with stormwater in new open spaces. These are high level conversations that will be informing long-term how the plan is built.
 - Member: Those concepts will be defined in the *Campus Plan* amendment to the Principle 12, opportunities and constraints section and identified as opportunities.
 - Member: Think of these concepts early and integrate with design, rather than later.
 - Olsen: Ideas of stormwater, biodiversity, and ecology are all present in this plan, however, not fully developed. Although the open space framework, E.g. Columbia and Moss Streets, are represented the same in the open space framework diagram, it does not mean the character and quality of the spaces are the same. While the diagram does not delineate the differences those spaces might be, the future streets will be closed and a completely different character afterward.
 - Member: Further develop these diagrams so that these concepts are more evident, communicated clearly, and effective later.

Regarding undergraduate students, vehicles, and parking:

- Member: How many first-year students come to campus with cars and where do they park their cars? Is there any discussion of limiting first-year students in not bringing cars to campus and delay the need for a parking garage in this neighborhood?
 - Member: First-year student parking is an ongoing issue and question every year. Students bring cars and there are not many places near or on campus to park, which results in parking in off-site locations that are not university locations. There is limited overnight spots on campus available to students.
 - Member: There are about 5500 students that live on campus, and approximately 300-400 overnight parking spaces. This is a small percentage of parking spaces, and there is a very small percentage of students that bring cars to campus, however, there are more students that bring cars than there are overnight spaces.
 - Member: The need to build a parking garage is not related to students parking needs, as current overnight student parking is located several blocks away from residence halls. The parking that would be displaced in the future due to future building projects, E.g., daily parking by graduate students, faculty, and staff, would create the need to build a parking garage, not the students living in the residence halls. Items that would be considered for future parking garage need are displaced parking, demand for parking, and events.
 - Member: If there is less demand for parking in this part of campus, could displaced parking be replaced in another part of campus, E.g., the PLC parking lot?
 - Member: Some displaced parking may be located in other places of campus where there is higher demand, however, there needs to be the right amount of parking replaced in the east campus area to cover current daily uses, E.g., daily parking by graduate students, faculty, and staff, and during events.
 - Guest: These same conversations about parking and traffic exist at every campus. Consider the plan and assumptions about parking and the types and numbers of parking users, E.g., consider graduate students, students with families, out-of-state students, and event goers.
 - Member: A future 15th Avenue closure will encourage less people to drive on campus, which is within the university's transportation priorities.

- Guest: The lack of parking has encouraged students to find other ways around campus, E.g. rideshare or walking. Providing more parking may not be necessary.
 - Olsen: The plan is trying to achieve this balance to encourage other ways around campus. The planning process is considering where there is student and family housing, especially along Villard Street, of what the ratio of parking will be needed, knowing that with Residence Halls there is less need for parking, however, with student family housing there is.
- Member: While it is never popular to remove or reduce parking, consider the overarching goals for campus in terms of mode shift and climate. Research repeatedly finds that reducing parking, especially free parking, encourages people to rethink their travel options and encourages them to try alternative modes, and it is one of the most effective ways to shift campus travel modes.

Regarding accessibility:

- Member: There has been a shift over time to move parking, as much as possible, to the periphery of campus and not in shared core spaces, which contributes to more green spaces on campus. One result is it becomes less convenient for people to get where they need to be on campus. Regardless of driving habits, consider the future need for an internal small campus shuttle service or similar for mobility, accessibility, and/or convenience reasons.
 - Member: Improve introduction of first-year students to Lane Transit District.
 - Faris: The transportation engineer working on this project is considering traffic flows in and out of potential future structured parking locations and recognizing that demand may be elsewhere on campus, and outside of structured parking, there needs to be good, safe, pedestrian connectivity.
- Member: The superblocks in Barcelona are mobility plans, E.g., layering of bus, bike, and pedestrian routes. Create a larger plan of how this overlays with transit, and then layer down to make this all work.
- Olsen: The planning team is considering City of Eugene's street typologies, looking specifically at Columbia, Agate, and Villard Streets as the streets that would remain open, and looking at how the new city street design standards would impact this. The East Campus Plan currently considers and will continue to consider if the city wants to look at Villard as a city residential collector street.

Regarding neighborhood views and topography:

- Member: The surrounding neighborhood is not flat, and the area is surrounded by hills. The proposed development walls off, for students and campus, views of Hendricks Park

and other scenery, that is important to the feel of campus, and locks students into an urban grid. Neighbors that live in these areas that are somewhat elevated will be looking directly into some of the higher-level units in the future residence halls. Have views to and from the hills been considered and represented for what the neighbors will see when looking toward campus?

- Faris: The primary focus has been looking at the East Campus Plan from the university's perspective and building out capacity to provide more campus student housing. While this plan has not been looking at this as much from the neighborhood view perspective, it has focused on how to transition from the edge of campus into the neighborhood. The open space framework and having axes as designated open spaces will work to preserve views. Streets are a primary public space, and they help to preserve long-range views in and out of campus, reinforce a grid system, and they provide the necessary breathing room and visibility in and out of campus.
- Olsen: Campus has a significant number of trees to buffer views; however, buildings do stand out and the skyline will change with buildings. The new student housing buildings that were recently completed are similar in scale to what is being proposed, those views do change and are modified, however do not negate the overall sense of the campus tree canopy and the look and feel of campus currently. The distance of the proposed residence halls from the neighborhood horizontally, considering views of the residence halls, are a good distance and not much different than the same scale residence halls that were recently built that do not have detrimental impacts of views across campus. Planning will continue to think about changing views and how the architectural design can help mitigate that.
- Faris: The building designs will be thoughtful about building configuration and limiting views from units to units and can consider other view impacts.

Other considerations:

- Member: What is the computer program that was used to create the plan drawings?
 - Faris: A variety of computer programs were used, including Revit, Adobe Illustrator, and Rhino.
- Member: Does this plan effect or remove Agate Hall?
 - Faris: Agate Hall remains in this plan.

Action: No action was requested.

2. Next Generation Housing New Residence Hall Project (Phase 2 Building) – Site Selection

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the site selection for the Next Generation Housing New Residence Hall Project Phase 2 building.

CPC staff reviewed relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, siting considerations, needs and goals, the recommended site, location, and Campus Planning requirements.

Michael Griffel shared the project need and goals.

Dorothy Faris reviewed the recommended site details, including open space, zone change requirements, alley vacations, displaced uses, building density and height, capacity goals, relative scale, residential transition, dining needs, service access, 17th and Agate intersection pedestrian improvements.

Discussion:

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

Regarding the Grove Garden:

- Member: Are there potential impacts to the Grove Garden?
 - Member: Campus Planning is working with Grove Garden members to discuss impacts and options, and currently coordinating a meeting to discuss the garden's long-term needs, including a conversation about future location.
 - Faris: This building site is located adjacent to the Grove Garden and there is potential it will be impacted by construction of this building.

Regarding building height, density, and siting:

- Member: The university area of Eugene is likely the best planned area of Eugene with a mixture of density and open space that is not seen anywhere else in the city. Given the edge transition, having a seven-story building where previously there was a two-story is not a negative. Density should be promoted in every US city as populations rise especially in an area where there are housing affordability issues, students and non-students included. Support for the project work.
- Member: Support for pro-cautious density.
- Member: Support for expanding student housing on campus, using east campus for residential uses, and using sites 1 and 2 for residential uses, however, the proposed buildings are: too tall and too big to place south of 17th Avenue, there are better options

along 15th Avenue and north of 17th Avenue, which were not sufficiently considered, the buildings proposed exceed current reasonable height guidelines for this part of Eugene, and this pushes students far outside of the walking circle that is ideal for them to be in for campus. This is the wrong site for the specific construction plans that are being considered; either the buildings should be built north of 17th Avenue, or other buildings should be built south of 17th Avenue.

- Member: Regarding the reason Site 1 was proposed and selected, it is the only site where a residence hall can be currently built at the density needed, or a residence hall at all, due to the current zoning that Site 2 is being proposed in does not allow residence halls. It is the one site that is not prioritized for institutional uses, allows residence halls, and allows the density that is needed. Regarding Site 2, the residence hall needs to be near the dining for cost savings and to create a residential community.
 - Faris: Other sites have been considered, however, building north of 17th Avenue displaces many parking spaces, which adds to the overall parking issues. This plan helps the campus address parking before expanding to those sites north of 17th Avenue.
 - Member: The parking displacement is lower on the list of priorities. This project is prioritizing dining and the ability to meet the timeline for Site 1, while creating community and building out what will be a destination for this portion of campus.

Regarding adjacent uses:

- Guest: Consider the Moss Street Children's Center programming and the location where babies sleep across the street from the future construction. If the childcare center was not there, is that site another building site for a large, dense building?
- Guest: Consider solar impacts on the adjacent buildings.
 - Member: Moss Street Children's Center is a great facility, a newer building, very attractive, and welcoming. The project design will be very gracious and respectful to it.
 - Member: There might not be potential concerns for solar access of Moss Street Children's Center and Kalapuya Ilihi Hall due to both new buildings will be located to the south, and the sun will possibly be horizontal to the two buildings and not causing any blockage. Shade can be seen as a positive, E.g., during hotter summer months.

Regarding service vehicle access:

- Guest: Are service vehicles being planned to use 19th? Consider waste services in addition to food service.

- Faris: The project is considering alternative ways to avoid service vehicles on 19th Avenue due to neighborhood concerns and tight turning radiuses coming from the alleys turning right onto 19th Avenue. As part of the Phase 1 building, Moss Street Alley will be vacated, which currently provides part of the circulation around the Central Kitchen. The project will study service vehicle use surrounding the Central Kitchen and consider long term service access to limit impacts onto neighborhood streets.
- CPC Staff: As the design progresses for the buildings, it will return to the committee for review. Campus Planning has been conducting outreach as part of this project to understand all campus needs and will meet with internal CPFM groups to gather feedback and information to help better inform the project.

Action: With 8 in favor, 2 abstentions, and 1 in opposition, the committee agreed that the **Next Generation Housing New Residence Hall Project (Phase 2 Building) Site** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

3. Bronze “Thinker Duck” Sculpture – Siting Continued

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to continue review of the proposed site for a bronze “Thinker Duck” sculpture. The committee’s role was to determine whether the proposed site is consistent with *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns (e.g., location, scale, maintenance) for a sculpture.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the statue size, materials, siting considerations, previous committee meeting comments, and recommended site.

Discussion:

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

Regarding committee role:

- Member: The role of the committee is not to judge art. When the university accepts a piece of art, whether it is a fine art sculpture or a bronze duck, it has been accepted by the university and is important.

Regarding site selection:

- Member: Are previous sites being considered?

- Olsen: The site that is being recommended is Site B; previous sites under consideration are no longer recommended. The recommended site best meets the programmatic needs and the goals of placing this art piece on campus.
- Member: Why was Site A removed from consideration?
 - Olsen: Site A was removed from consideration in response to the previous comments regarding the relationship and impacts of the sculpture being too close to Lillis and the 'O'.
 - Member: Site A was also removed from consideration due to concerns about pedestrian flow and placing the sculpture in the entry plaza too close to the entrance and creating crowding.
- Member: Recommended Site B seems less disruptive to photo taking activities with the 'O'.
- Member: Any of these sites are good locations for a sculpture, however, Sites A and B meet the programmatic needs, and there were concerns about Site A.
- Member: At the last meeting did the committee have a choice of multiple sites?
 - Olsen: At the last meeting, the recommended site was Site A, and options for sites that had been considered in that recommendation were shared with the committee.
 - Member: Within the plaza in general, were there previously multiple options?
 - Olsen: There were multiple options reviewed within the plaza.
 - Member: Reconsider the previous options closer to the building and 'O' (Site A).
 - Olsen: At the previous meeting, there was not resounding support for Site A, so bringing back the same site seemed unresponsive to the committee's comments. Site B is a balance of meeting the needs of the siting from a programmatic standpoint and responding to some of the committee's previous comments.
 - Member: Campus Planning recommends Site B because it pulls the sculpture location out of the heavy pedestrian flow near the Lillis building entrance.
- Member: Has an interior Lillis building location been considered?
 - Member: A smaller duck statue is already located in the interior of Lillis.

Regarding Site B details:

- Where is Site B; is it in the sidewalk?
 - The area shown as Site B identifies two potential sites; one area of the site is south of the current planter, and one is within the planter adjacent to the sidewalk.

- Member: Site B is shown as a general area due to unknown factors that need to be considered, E.g., underground utility locations.
- Member: Does the Site B location affect the redesign of 13th Avenue?
 - Olsen: The two areas for Site B that are being looked at are outside of the main sidewalk; where the planter is currently, or south of the existing planter.
 - Member: Will the planter at the edge of the street and sidewalk be moved? If placing the sculpture there without moving the planter, it would be a constrained space with the sculpture and the planter in place.
 - Olsen: The planter will potentially be moved in either scenario.
 - Member: Support for not adding obstacles to the sidewalk, rather replace an existing obstacle in the sidewalk.
- Member: Support for Site B. The placement moves the sculpture a little away from the building and creates a second feature that could be good for photographs and character that people are likely to see as they are walking through campus; the sculpture is not going to be in the way of anything. People enjoy the other duck statue, and this one will likely be popular.
- Member: Will the tree located in the planter behind Site B block site lines to the 'O'?
 - Olsen: The tree would block site lines depending on what angle you are looking from and will be in the background of the sculpture. Limbing up the tree may be considered as an option in the future.
 - Member: Support for greenery on campus.

Action: With 5 in favor, 2 abstentions, and 4 in opposition, the committee agreed that the **Bronze “Thinker Duck” Sculpture Siting** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.