



April 13, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Clare Kurth, Campus Planning  
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the March 20, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Deborah Butler, Janell Cottam, Cheyenne Dickenson, Emily Eng, Keith Frazee, Amber Geiger, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Taliak Lopez-DuBoff, Taylor McHolm, Hal Sadofsk, Amy Salmore, Owen Speigel, Andrew Weaver

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Colin Brennan (CPFM), Paul Comery (Transportation Services), Karen Hyatt (UO Community Relations), Adam Jones (Safety and Risk Services), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Dave Reesor (Transportation Services), Matt Roberts (UO Community Relations), Benjamin Steingart (CPFM), Denise Stewart (CPFM), Chris White (JSMA)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Streisinger Hall Electrical Transformer Project – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the schematic design related to new electrical transformers proposed to be installed south of Streisinger Hall.

CPC Staff reviewed the site location, adjacent pathways and open-space, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns related to the electrical transformer project.

Benjamin Steingart (CPFM) discussed the existing transformer location, proposed transformer location, and rationale for the relocation. The benefits of the proposed oil transformer (compared to existing dry transformer units) were discussed including decreased noise

and vibration of the units, decreased maintenance needs, and use of environmentally friendly (plant based) oil used in the units. Site considerations were discussed including landscape screening to minimize visual impact, short-term impacts from trenching, and minimal pedestrian traffic in the immediate area.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) and Steingart (CPFM).

- Member: Consider the site's proximity to sensitive research facilities and the potential noise and vibration impacts on research activities in those facilities. This site is also near the main entrance to those facilities. The project needs to check in with OVPRI to address concerns about potential impacts. Has the northern side of Streisinger Hall been considered for these units?
  - Olsen: The northern side of Streisinger Hall poses challenges due to existing transformer units in that location as well as maintaining parking spaces.
  - Steingart: The existing transformers are directly under the proposed location, which makes this site ideal from a utility connection standpoint. The proposed oil units are quieter than the existing dry units on site.
- Member: Do the proposed transformers replace existing units?
  - Steingart: Yes, they are replacing existing units that are at the end of their life, and a switch is being added for backup power.
  - Member: This project is absolutely necessary. Partners within the science complex are supportive of the redundancy that the project will provide.
- Member: Can you provide additional information on the "sidewalk" that is being rerouted?
  - Olsen: That is actually a mow strip that was made wide to allow it to be used as an unofficial footpath. Its intended use is to separate landscaping from the lawn. The mow strip was widened to respond to people cutting through the courtyard.
- Member: Is the primary Science Walk Pathway located entirely to the south of the project?
  - Olsen: Correct. There is no impact to the primary campus pathways.
- Member: Are there any principles that address the noise and vibration concerns for the adjacent research activities? Does this project need additional consideration and evaluation?
  - Olsen: Principle 4 (Space Use and Organization) addresses compatibility of adjacent uses.
  - Steingart: Consider that the proposed equipment has about a one-year lead time.

- Member: Consider that the science buildings are densely populated, and this courtyard provides a nice quiet back for building users and is used for classes.
- Member: The screening for these units requires a higher level than those units on the east side of Huestis Hall as that is a walkway, and this is a well-used quiet back.
  - Steingart: Landscape screening was reviewed with the UO exterior maintenance staff who expressed a need for sightlines to the units for security.
- Member: Consider the transformer blocks the archway/alcove to the east. Is there an opportunity to rearrange them, possibly into a triangle?
  - Steingart: Yes. There is flexibility in the unit layout. However, this layout was selected to be the least impactful.
  - Olsen: Consider that these units have clearance requirements.
- Member: Consider moving the transformers further from the building wall to be more sensitive to the views from the offices looking south from Streisinger near the alcove.
  - Olsen: This courtyard is commonly used for construction staging for renovations of adjacent buildings. It is beneficial to locate the units at the perimeter to maintain future flexibility of the interior of the courtyard space.
  - Steingardt: This site was selected because of lower visual and functional impacts to the courtyard than alternatives within the courtyard.
- Member:

Given the concerns about impacts to adjacent research, the CPC should delay action so that the project can have further conversations with relevant groups.

**Action:** With 16 in favor, the committee agreed to delay action for the **Streisinger Hall Electrical Transformer Project – Schematic Design Review**.

## **2. 1678 Villard Street – Proposed East Campus House Removal**

**Background:** The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed demolition of the house located at 1678 Villard Street, in the East Campus Area. As required by the Campus Planning Principle 1, demolition of houses within the R-1 Low Density residential zone requires committee review. The house is no longer used for student housing, following recent fire damage, and is beyond a condition that is practical or reasonable for the required repairs. Following removal of the structure, the site will be back filled, graded, and a lawn will be established. Existing trees on the site will be preserved.

CPC Staff reviewed the project location, *Campus Plan Principles and Patterns, East Campus Plan* guidelines, and general project scope.

Colin Brennan (CPFM) discussed the current condition of the house, rationale for the demolition of the structure, and discussed plans for site repair following house demolition.

Karen Hyatt (UO Community Relations) discussed community outreach efforts to the neighborhood association and the abutting property owner to the north.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Adam Jones (Safety & Risk Services), Olsen (Campus Planning), and Brennan (CPFM).

- Member: Consider that the concrete steps may feel strange once the house is removed.
  - Brennan: The concrete wall and steps are proposed to remain primarily to maintain the mature tree in the front yard. A fence is being considered to enclose the site to look like a “yard” rather than a vacant lot. This approach may help the steps feel less strange. The existing driveway will also be demolished to eliminate a potential for future parking
- Member: Consider the mold in the house and proximity to the Moss Street Children’s Center (MSCC). What is the plan for mitigation during site work?
  - Jones: The mold will be removed during demolition work, and there is no risk of migration. Asbestos has already been abated.
  - Brennan: Has been communicating with MSCC regularly as part of the Next Generation Housing project, and the demolition can be brought up with them.
  - Jones: The City of Eugene has additional procedural requirements related to weather (wind direction and speed) and notifications to neighbors that will be followed. The likelihood of mold spores being spread is low.
- Member: Once the lawn is established on site, who is responsible for the maintenance?
  - Brennan: UO Housing’s landscaping would be responsible for maintenance.
- Member: What are the plans for construction access to the site?
  - Brennan: The site will be accessed from Moss Street and not from the alley near the MSCC.
- Member: What is the future plan for using this site as a residential use again?
  - Olsen: The *Next Generation Housing Development Plan* considers the R1 zoned properties along Villard Street being developed to middle housing

standards that support a variety of housing types for graduate students and student families.

- Member: What is the timeline for this project:
  - Brennan: The proposed timeline is approximately two months. It is roughly a half a day activity to demolish the house and backfill the site.
- Member: Expresses support for adding a fence and retaining the concrete wall, citing the concrete retaining wall as a “ghost mark” that contributes to neighborhood character from a historical perspective. From a historic preservation perspective, the house is identified as a noncontributing structure due to extensive façade modifications.
- Member: Consider the impact to the campus edge as these houses begin to be demolished one by one. What is the timeline for construction on the Next Generation Housing along the Campus edge?
  - Olsen: There is not a timeline, but there have been conversations of initial studies to understand what the potential may be.

**Action:** With 16 in favor the committee agreed that the **1678 Villard Street – Proposed East Campus House Removal** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

### **3. Knight Campus Phase 2 Exterior 1% for Art – Siting Review**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed exterior siting for the 1% for Art project, “I Demand To See a Face” and “Uncertainty,” at Knight Campus Phase 2. The committee’s role was to determine whether the proposed sites are consistent with *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns (e.g., location, scale, maintenance, etc.).

CPC Staff reviewed project location, relevant campus planning patterns and principles, and scope of CPC review.

Denise Stewart (CPFM) reviewed the proposed art including the concept, scale, location, and specific consideration for the siting due to how the light will interact with the art. Each location was discussed in relation to climbing deterrence, security, and required maintenance. The materials, powder coated stainless steel, were discussed in that the size of the perforations will deter climbing and only require periodic pressure washing

Olsen (Campus Planning) discussed the timeline for these sculptures anticipated for delivery and installation the week of March 23, 2026. The CPC’s review of the siting is late in the process, but determined to still be important.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Denise Stewart (CPFM).

- Member: Was there donor involvement in the sculpture placement?
  - Denise: No. Siting selection was an internal UO committee that included the building architects and the artist considering the placement of the sculptures in relation to the buildings.

Action: With 16 in favor the committee agreed that the **Knight Campus Phase 2 Exterior 1% for Art – Siting Review** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

#### 4. UO Transportation Plan

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is for UO Transportation Services to provide an overview of the completed UO Transportation Plan for information to the committee. This agenda item prepares the committee for a future review and action item to amend Campus Plan Principle 9 to integrate updated principles from the Transportation Plan, as well as establish the Transportation Plan as an implementation plan rather than subject plan. Therefore, CPC action is not required at this time.

David Reesor (Transportation Services) reviewed the UO Transportation Plan timeline, priorities, goals, community engagement, and provided an overview of the plan.

Paul Comery (Transportation Services) reviewed the UO transportation plan as it relates to safety, connectivity, transportation enhancements, parking needs, and considerations for enhancements to specific transportation corridors.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with responses from Paul Comery (Transportation Services), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), and Dave Reesor (Transportation Services):

- Member: Consider the east portion of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue in front of Matt Knight Arena. This seems to be a high-volume portion of the corridor. What are the plans for this portion of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue?
  - Comery: The Franklin Boulevard project will substantially affect this portion of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue as the City intends to realign this street with Moss Street and a roundabout.
  - Olsen: The Franklin project will provide additional space in front of the arena in this area. The sidewalk between the arena and Franklin Boulevard is an example of the type of multimodal infrastructure being considered to extend in this area. UO will provide input as part of the

### Franklin Boulevard project review.

- Member: Consider when Hayward Field was constructed, the CPC made a request for an east/west mid-block pedestrian connection on the south side of Hayward. This pathway was included in the Framework Vision Plan and an important feature to the CPC. The map in the Transportation Plan implies this pathway but it does not currently exist.
  - Olsen: The east/west pathway south of Hayward is included on the Campus Plan pathways map. However, this is not a functional pathway currently.
  
- Member: Expressed overall support for the plan. Can you provide additional information on funding sources being considered for these projects?
  - Comery: Within this plan, funds have not been allocated for a specific project. Analysis has been done on some projects to identify potential funding sources such as state funding, grants, fees, or donors as examples.
  - Reesor: Other options for projects on the periphery of campus, or projects that cross jurisdictional boundaries, create opportunities for collaboration and intergovernmental partnerships.
  
- Member: Are there projects or plans to target the streets on the periphery of campus such as 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue or Villard Street? Consider that the corridors on campus are a main concern, but LiveMove (UO student group) has heard concerns of low visibility and maintenance concerns on sidewalks on the periphery of campus. While not UO property, is there a plan for improvements or coordination with the city for improvements?
  - Comery: UO Transportation Services has had several meetings with city staff regarding city streets that are off campus to address safety concerns and make safety recommendations. They go beyond the scope of this plan, but it is important to collaborate between the UO and the city.
  - Reesor: Comery goes to a few Metropolitan Planning Organization meetings (MPOs) a month with other jurisdictions. The UO is an active partner in real-time conversations to continue improving safety on campus and in the community.
  - Member: The mid-block crossings on 18<sup>th</sup> and Agate were the result of UO advocacy and collaboration with the city. The city balances prioritizing UO priorities with getting commuters to campus safely while considering other needed livability enhancements throughout the city. However, the UO will continue to advocate for improvements near campus.
  
- Member: Expressed support for the secure bike parking that is mentioned in the UO Transportation plan and consideration for the mobility hubs for those commuting by bike to campus.

- Comery: It is a priority for UO Transportation Services to increase the amount of protected and secure bike parking on campus.

Action: No formal action was requested.