



March 1, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the February 20, 2024 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Liska Chan, Ravi Cullop, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Amy Kalani, Moira Kiltie, Diana Libuda, Carrie McCurdy, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Daniel Rosenberg, Amy Salmore, Philip Speranza

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw Architects), George Bleekman (CPFM), Janell Cottam (CPFM), Larissa Ennis (University Advancement), Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (Community Relations)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Next Generation Housing Development Plan and East Campus Plan Update – Introduction

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to introduce the Next Generation Housing Development Plan and East Campus Plan Update process and gather early feedback.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) shared the purpose of the meeting and planning effort, East Campus Plan ([2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area](#)) and East Campus Area overview and background, City of Eugene zoning code information, planning process and timeline, project need, history, Campus Planning considerations, and next steps.

Michael Griffel (Housing) clarified the project components.

#### Discussion:

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

Regarding the project timeline and planning process:

- Member: When is CPC Meeting One for the New Residence Hall, E.g., site selection?
  - Eng: CPC Meeting One for the New Residence Hall is still in the planning process, however, will likely be held during Spring Term.
- Member: Where is this project in the planning process?
  - Eng: This project is at the beginning of the process. There is a consultant team that includes Rowell Brokaw & Associates, Mithun (the same design team that designed Unthank and Residence Hall Buildings B & C), and Cameron McCarthy. The team has been gathering information and studying to better understand the project needs and create design concepts. The project is seeking feedback to help inform those concepts, and there will be a March 13<sup>th</sup> Open House where initial draft concepts will be presented. The East Campus Plan update has yet to begin and will start towards the end of the Next Generation Housing Plan process. There will be additional conversations with the committee through this process.
  - Guest: Each part of the project is building upon the other. First is the Next Generation Housing Plan, which will inform the next step of the East Campus Plan amendment, and the last step will be going to the city for land use code updates.
  - Eng: There will be a second Open House this fall to present concepts for the East Campus Plan update and land use code updates. During the East Campus Plan update process Campus Planning staff will be working with the committee and neighbors. The goal is to have a plan that works for the community, university, university housing, and internal stakeholders.
- Member: Should students attend the Open House?
  - CPFM is setting up a meeting with ASUO representatives prior to the Open House to gather student input and provide information regarding the Open House.

Regarding the City of Eugene zoning code:

- Member: Is it not feasible to lobby the city for a change to the land use code so a taller building can be built in the Limited High-Density Residential/Limited Institutional zone? Member support for making this change; the height restrictions on buildings in Eugene is outdated and this would be a step in the right direction.
  - Eng: This is what the City of Eugene land use code process is as a part of this project, E.g., it's an application to the city to update what is in this overlay zone;

the format of the change is to be determined. It could be a code change, or it could be a removal of the overlay, with the goal to update city code to meet university needs.

- Member: The Next Generation Housing Development Plan is exploring what university needs are and what has the right feel to make a gentle, appropriate transition to the neighborhood.
- Griffel: Appreciation for the support of housing.

Regarding project planning:

- Member: How do these zones relate to the *Campus Plan* walking circle, and what could be potentially built knowing restrictions?
  - Eng: The East Campus area is currently outside the walking circle for designated classrooms; therefore, the project is not envisioning many classrooms in the area. The east campus area is mainly for housing, support services, and other institutional uses that may be suitable in the area, however, this would not rule out classrooms, but recognizing classrooms would not be heavily used by those who have classes in the core of campus.
- Griffel: There are many long-term ideas and visions for what could be helpful in the area, from satellite health services to recreation services. There are many programs and services there currently that are important.
- Member: This is the university's remaining area of land to develop, and the goal is to be very deliberate and intentional. The project is meeting with and providing outreach to stakeholder groups that have activities and programs in the area to learn about their needs, gather feedback, input and ideas, and support.
- Member: Does the planning include residential college or houses? E.g. The University of Virginia (UVA) residential college project.
  - Griffel: Residential colleges or neighborhoods are not currently a part of this plan; however, long-term they are appealing. These would be designed in such a way that could create a type of residential college around them just as the possibility in several other areas.
  - Eng: Residential communities was mentioned as a part of the planning process.
- Member: Consider the usefulness of looking larger scale at these ideas to see the relationship to the larger campus. E.g., at UVA, there was a clear idea to relate the residential college design to the UVA lawn with a modern interpretation. It is an assembly of space, more than a building and related to the landscape. Looking at the larger campus and larger green spaces, it would require a significant portion of the East Campus Plan. Think broadly, not a building at a time, but in terms of open spaces.

- Griffel: This is understood as we look at places that are now office buildings and department unit offices that used to be residence halls and various neighborhood concepts. For this plan and the current stage, residential colleges are not the direction it is headed, however, will think long term if the university is interested, as there are several areas to think of these considerations.
- Member: Design around open spaces and green spaces that create the connective tissue between buildings, otherwise results are only buildings and less of a glue that is characterized as a campus.
  - Griffel: Green spaces are an important part of the planning effort.
  - Guest: Part of what the long-range plan is looking at is how to inform changes to the *Campus Plan* to reflect the designated open spaces, not only the building sites, and tie it back to campus.
- Member: The city's Planning Commission website does not indicate when the next meeting is, however, it does have contact information. If valuable, consider sending an email and ask to meet informally first before approaching the Planning Commission to ask them to make a recommendation to City Council. Proceed first with a simple overview, which provides an informal, less pressured setting for the request to increase height restrictions.
  - Eng: This is the exact approach to working with city staff to inform them early on. The city's Planning Director is aware and there will be a meeting soon between Campus Planning and city staff.
  - Guest: The UO Government and Community Relations team are meeting with planning commissioners to establish those connections.

Action: No formal action was requested.

## **2. 2024 – 2026 Biennial Capacity Plan – Review and Action**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the 2024-2026 Biennial Capacity Plan (BCP).

CPC staff reviewed relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, background information, and draft key findings.

### Discussion:

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

Regarding the Biennial Capacity Plan draft key findings:

- Member: What is finding number five?
  - Member: Finding number five means that the current East Campus Design Area does not have enough allowable capacity which the Framework Vision Project (FVP) identified as needed to meet future university needs.
  - Member: At the time the FVP was created, did it align with the East Campus Plan?
  - Member: The East Campus Plan and FVP did not align at that time and do not currently align. There is a planning process underway with a consultant team exploring that need with the Next Generation Housing Development Plan.
  - Guest: Planning has used the FVP to update all *Campus Plan* design area densities, leaving the East Campus Design Area for this process that is currently happening.
  - Member: The East Campus Design Area is a large area requiring a comprehensive study.

Regarding the BCP map and remaining capacity:

- Member: One of the areas shown on the map as leftover capacity overlaps with non-UO owned property at the corner of 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Columbia Street; are these proposed areas in hopes the university acquires them?
  - Member: This is something Campus Planning can shift. The leftover capacity is shown on the map as diagrammatic and does not mean there would be a building in that location.
- Member: Regarding where capacity is shown where Hamilton Hall exists, will that location be using some of the planned open space for the replacement of the previous Humpy Lumpy green space that was lost and planned to be regained from the construction of Unthank Hall?
  - Member: This location is a future building site that was part of the Student Housing *Campus Plan* amendment; the Humpy Lumpy open space replacement will be using the area south of that site after Hamilton is removed.
  - Member: This site is the future planned beach volleyball site.

Regarding the other campus projects:

- Member: What is the enrollment threshold for transitioning to additional development?

- Member: Enrollment peaked around 2011-12 and has decreased through the loss of some international students. Recently, enrollment has started to increase. The goal is to intentionally build infrastructure to support anticipated growth.
- Member: Is the current renovation work at Kalapuya Ilihi Hall the reason Hamilton Hall is still extant?
  - Member: Hamilton Hall will remain until the Kalapuya Ilihi Hall work is complete. The timeline is not finalized; however, work is being done.
- Member: Are there any projects planned for new classroom buildings?
  - Member: The Classroom and Faculty Office Building on the site of the Collier House has been put on hold, however, other projects are addressing classroom needs, E.g., Tykeson Hall, various building renovations adding better classrooms, and improved classrooms as a part of the Heritage Project (Villard and University Halls).
  - Guest: Do the new residence halls, E.g. Unthank Hall, and Buildings B & C, have classrooms?
    - Member: The new residence halls have multi-purpose spaces that provide learning areas for the communities within, however, not general pool classrooms.
    - Member: Other existing residence halls, E.g., Global Scholars Hall and LLC, have multi-purpose rooms that are scheduled as part of the general classroom pool.

Regarding BCP process:

- Member: Is the committee's recommendation that the BCP is in line with the *Campus Plan* allowable densities?
  - Staff: The key findings, such as number five, can be considered for future *Campus Plan* amendments; we know that this planning process has already begun.
  - Member: It is in line with the current plan for updating the *Campus Plan* and East Campus Plan. The finding is that the current plan does not have enough allowable capacity for all future growth in the East Campus Design Area.
- Member: Are there currently three projects shown as anticipated expansion?
  - Staff: There are capacity placeholders shown for the future Knight Campus Phase III building and initial future Next Generation Residence Hall buildings.
- Member: Consider the word biennium; typically, only one project is submitted every biennium. The next biennium project will be a UO Portland campus project not a UO

Eugene campus project. There are several projects that future capacity is reserved for as shown on the BCP map, and many projects that have been considered that have not materialized, however, they still exist for potential future projects. In the future, consider not referring to the biennium, as the biennium used to be 15-20 projects that would be in a list together, however, now it is only one or two.

- Is the reassessment of capacity that is referred to in the draft key findings limited to East Campus as called out in number five, or is this a more general project for the Campus Planning office and the committee to look at capacity across campus? Why is East Campus called out as the only area that needs further assessment?
  - Staff: Number five is called out as a key finding for the East Campus Design Area. When looking at the density table in Principle 3 of the *Campus Plan*, all design areas, except for the East Campus Design Area, have been updated over the past 2-3 years to align with the future speculative growth informed by the FVP. The East Campus Design Area allowable densities have not been updated anticipating a need to look broadly at the future growth in the East Campus area.
- Member: The *Campus Plan*, page 33, states the committee will review the BCP and determine that “sites meeting the requirements of the Plan are identified for the first-biennium projects...” Is this being met, and addressing the need for expanding capacity for future housing projects?
  - Staff: The *Campus Plan*, page 33, states “sites meeting the requirements of the Plan are identified for the first-biennium projects, or, revisions are identified if they are needed.” The BCP draft key finding number five addresses that the East Campus Design Area has been identified as an area that is needing a revision for allowable capacity to align with speculative growth.
- Member: Is, “in the aggregate, sufficient siting opportunities exist for the remaining identified capital projects,” (*Campus Plan*, page 33) met?
  - Member: There is enough overall capacity in the East Campus Design Area for the next residence hall project, possibly the next couple of projects, however, not for all future projects over the next 20 years.

Action: With 14 in favor and 2 abstentions, the committee agreed that the 2024-2026 Biennial Capacity Plan findings are consistent with the *Campus Plan*, recommended to the president that it be approved, and 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 which will remain until the completion of the Housing Transformation Project that will demolish Hamilton Hall, after which there will no longer be a deficit.
- The East Campus design area, and multiple sub-areas within, do not have the capacity for potential future institutional and student housing building opportunities that were identified in the Framework Vision Project (FVP), therefore, additional density should be comprehensively assessed for the entire design area.

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.