



May 24, 2023

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 16, 2023 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Anne Brown, Deborah Butler, Bob Choquette, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Amy Kalani, Josh Kashinsky, Ken Kato (chair), Kelly Pembleton, Janet Rose, Avi Shugar, Cathy Soutar, Lauren Stanfield, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Waymon Banks (CPFM), Larissa Ennis (University Advancement), Rick Haight (EMU), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Martina Oxoby (CPFM), Jason Younker (President's Office)

CPC Agenda

1. Erb Memorial Union (EMU) Amphitheater Cover – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the schematic design for the Erb Memorial Union (EMU) Amphitheater Cover.

CPC staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, the previous January 13, 2023 meeting record regarding this agenda item, and CPC procedure.

Martina Oxoby (CPFM) reviewed the past conceptual study images for the project, and shared the proposed canopy placement, shape, size, materials, configuration, lighting, maintenance considerations, event seating layout configurations, stormwater catchment, visibility, and acoustic details.

Laurie Woodward (EMU) shared the project goals and purpose.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Members support the project.

Regarding the canopy design:

- Will the canopy support posts block street level views of the amphitheater performances?
- Is there a mix of covered and uncovered seating?
- Consider opportunities for branding in the design for photography and media purposes.
- Will the steel frame be painted?
- Consider creating an academic feel to the space in equal prominence as the “O”.

Regarding lighting:

- Is the overhead “O” lighted?
- Consider the environmental and human impacts of the lighting and light spillage; ensure lighting does not cause glare for pedestrians passing by.

Regarding the Native American Tribes of Oregon flags:

- Does the structure accommodate differing wind conditions and the effect on the flags?

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

Regarding the Native American Tribes of Oregon flags:

- Are the flags lowered from their current height or all at the same level?
- Have any flags been moved and does the canopy go around the flags, namely the Warm Springs flag?
- As the Warm Springs Tribe has a large geographical location with respect to the Oregon map, this flag has some room to relocate slightly, however, as long as the flags are all at the same level and are flying lower than the United States flag.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Oxoby, Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), and Woodward provided the following clarifications:

Regarding the canopy design:

- To preserve the flag locations, the structure became smaller, bringing the post locations inward. The relationship between the post locations, size, materials,

and amphitheater views was considered, and views remain open from the seating and standing areas above the amphitheater.

- There is a mix of covered and uncovered seating.
- Branding ideas have been considered and will continue to be explored, including integrating appropriate frit patterns on the canopy glass, and exploring the orientation of the overhead “O”.
- The frit pattern helps to disguise the visibility of water spots from rain through the glass.
- The steel frame will be either powder coated or painted considering wear and maintainability.

Regarding lighting:

- The “O” will be a static or acoustic type of cloud element, while the ring that is part of the structure around it will be the light fixture.
- All theatrical lighting will be controlled lighting. The lighting highlighting the sloped walk to the stage will be aimed away from the seating area. Lighting will be shielded in a way to not cause glare for pedestrians passing by.

Regarding the Native American Tribes of Oregon flags:

- The flags are unchanged and all at their existing height.
- The flags will not touch the structure regardless of wind conditions.
- The flags will remain in their existing locations. The project team will continue to refine the design around the Warm Springs flag location to ensure that it maintains its prominence and has enough area for the flag to flow freely.

Action: With 14 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Erb Memorial Union (EMU) Amphitheater Cover Schematic Design is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Proposed Amendment to the Campus Plan for the Density Refinement Process - Discussion

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to continue discussion of a proposed amendment to the *Campus Plan* for the process to refine densities.

Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning) reviewed the proposed amendment process, amendment language, the committee's role in density review, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) reviewed the history of density analysis and amendments and the intent and purpose of the proposed amendment.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

Regarding the amendment and review process:

- A key goal of the proposed amendment is finding a balance between trying to make good use of the committee's time and not giving up the committee's ability to have a role in decision making.
- Quantify the difference between what might be an amendment and what might be a change. E.g., if a small amount, then it is a change, and if a large difference, then it is an amendment.
- The committee does not make final decisions, however, makes recommendations to the President.
- By moving forward with the proposed amendment, although the committee would be removing a public hearing and specific public involvement, there is zero attendance at these small incremental density amendment public hearings. By changing the density review process, the committee does not seem to be losing anything, because the public hearings are not being used and have been difficult to exercise.
- Past committee involvement has successfully helped inform campus projects.
- Member concern for lack of transparency on construction projects and involving faculty and students early-on. Concern for the committee stepping away from the process even more and relinquishing involvement from faculty and students.
- Important to understand the process to best represent colleagues and students.
- The current process is for transparency. There are additional principles in the *Campus Plan* that safeguard against only one group making density decisions.

Regarding the amendment language:

- Is there proposal language that can make the process more efficient of committee time without inadvertently removing density review?

- The diagram shown indicates the committee still has major roles to play in the plan and projects; reviewing specific density changes could be too detailed.
- Suggestion for committee action to remain, in which Campus Planning completes the in-depth density calculations, however, presents to the committee in a simpler way, while the committee reviews and makes a recommendation.
- Campus Planning can explore possibilities that align with the *Campus Plan*.

Regarding densities:

- Allowable density capacities are a tool to establish and maintain the look and feel of campus. Density is revisited during schematic design review, E.g., building mass, size, and siting, which also provides the committee opportunity to review density qualitatively.
- Do density changes typically occur with capital projects?
- Density changes are anticipated and completed ahead of capital projects, however, there are sometimes unforeseen changes associated with capital projects.
- Density concepts can seem abstract until there is an actual physical change on campus.
- Can the proposal indicate a change is anything less than a 10% change, for example, to the density in a given area, and an amendment is anything greater?
- Density change amounts are complicated due to some sites are very large, E.g., a 10% change could be a very large number change by comparison to another smaller area.
- Density is evaluated by arbitrarily predetermined design areas that don't necessarily reflect something that is seen on campus.

Regarding next steps:

- The committee supports a different tool from Campus Planning for reviewing density and future campus growth with the committee.
- Campus Planning can revise the density amendment presentation information to be less mathematical; revising the presentation style does not require an amendment.
- Campus Planning will bring the prior density amendment back to the committee for review, action, and a public hearing. It will be the last density amendment

presentation at this time, outside of potential future changes to the East Campus development policy.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Thorstenson provided the following clarifications:

Regarding the amendment and review process:

- This process began with a proposed density amendment for four design areas where two prior committee meetings were held. The discussion shifted to the amendment regarding the density review process based on committee feedback.

Regarding densities:

- Density calculation is dependent on the overall size of the design area. A small percentage change could equate to a large number for allowable capacity in a large design area.

Action: No formal action was requested.