



UNIVERSITY OF
OREGON

Campus
Planning

June 29, 2026

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the June 12, 2026, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Deborah Butler, Janell Cottam, Emily Eng,
Amber Geiger, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Taliek Lopez-DuBoff,
Janet Rose, Hal Sadofsky, Andrew Weaver

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), Paul Comery (Transportation Services),
Tom Jordan (Community Member),
Matt Roberts (UO Community Relations), Benjamin Steingart (CPFM),

CPC Agenda

1. Streisinger Hall Electrical Transformer Project – Schematic Design Review

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

The project will install new electrical transformers in the courtyard between Streisinger, Klamath, and Huestis Hall to improve electrical distribution and resiliency to nearby science buildings. The new electrical transformers will improve down times during switchover and simplify sequencing of work to support research work in the nearby labs and allow for safer replacement of the units.

The committee held one previous meeting for this agenda item on March 20, 2026, where the committee voted to delay action. The primary issues needing resolution were confirming that

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

the siting is compatible with adjacent research activities and impacts to views.

CPC Staff introduced the agenda item, provided an overview of the project, reasons for the action to delay at the previous meeting, discussed relevant principles and patterns, and reviewed the project location.

Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw) reviewed concerns discussed at the previous CPC meeting and outlined steps taken to address them. He presented the site plan and project scope, including strategies to maintain site circulation, existing utility facilities, and provided an overview of each site considered, discussing the advantages and disadvantages that informed the proposed location. He also reviewed the acoustic report demonstrating that projected noise and vibration levels are below the range expected to impact adjacent research facilities. This determination is based on the proposed design, which introduces physical separation between the unit's concrete pad and the building (unlike existing equipment installation) and the use of wet (oil-filled) units that generate lower noise and vibration than the current dry units.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests, with responses from Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw) and Benjamin Steingart (CPFM):

- Member: After the transformer units are installed, will another test be done to confirm the projected acoustic and vibration impacts? Or if any construction happens to this building site, which might affect the current acoustics, would another test be done to assess unexpected construction impacts?
 - Steingart: This can be considered. The timing of the construction will be done outside of the sensitive research window to minimize impacts.
 - Andrejko: Project construction will be the main source of impacts.
- Member: Appreciates the due diligence done on this project.

Action: With 10 in favor, the committee agreed that the **Streisinger Hall Electrical Transformer Project Schematic Design** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Proposed Amendment to the *Campus Plan* – Principle 9: Transportation – Public Hearing and Action

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold a public hearing for the proposed amendments to the *Campus Plan*, Principle 9: Transportation.

Following the recent completion of the *Campus Transportation Plan*, there is a need to update the *Campus Plan* Principle 9: Transportation. Currently, the *Long-Range Campus Transportation*

Plan (1973, rev 1976) and *Bicycle Plan* (1991) are subject plans, which are part of the *Campus Plan* but approved as separate documents. The intent of the *Campus Transportation Plan* is to be an implementation plan that provides greater detail on how to implement *Campus Plan* principles related to transportation, replacing the 1976 and 1991 subject plans. The purpose of the amendment is to simplify planning documents to improve clarity, increase usefulness, and maintain relevance by updating *Campus Plan* – Principle 9 with relevant principles from the *Campus Transportation Plan* and eliminating the 1976 and 1991 subject plans. The amendment will also incorporate the bicycle routes map and relevant principles from the *Bicycle Management Program*, which is an implementation plan and not part of the *Campus Plan*.

A public hearing was required as the proposed amendments will result in a change to a *Campus Plan* principle and amendments to patterns or principle refinements.

The committee held two previous meetings for this agenda item on February 20, 2026, and May 15, 2026.

Public Hearing:

Public guests were invited to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair Bob Choquette opened the public hearing and invited members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment portion of the meeting was closed, and the committee reviewed the final draft of the proposed amendments and took action.

CPC Staff reviewed the public hearing procedure, introduced the proposed Principle 9 amendment, discussed the project timeline and previous meetings, and reviewed relevant *Campus Planning* principles and patterns.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) discussed the proposed updates to *Campus Plan* Principle 9: Transportation, with an emphasis on aligning with the current *Campus Transportation Plan*. She reviewed how the 1976 *Long-Range Transportation Plan* and the 1991 *Bike Plan* will be retired under the updated approach, while the *Bike Management Program* and the recently completed *Campus Transportation Plan* will remain as implementation plans. Draft revisions to Principle 9 were presented, highlighting the incorporated *Campus Transportation Plan* principles and revisions based on comments from the previous meeting. Key amendments include the addition of guiding principles from the *Campus Transportation Plan*, updates to the modal priorities, and the addition of an active transportation section. The updates to Principle 11: Patterns that were discussed at the previous meeting were reviewed. She also discussed that, based on comments from the previous CPC meeting, the revised Principle 9 draft includes the Good Neighbor pattern in the pattern summary list and references the *East Campus Area Plan, 2024*, to address limiting vehicle impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

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

- Member: What was the reason for removing the reference to Emergency Vehicles

from the modal priorities?

- Eng: Access for emergency vehicles was moved to the section above in bullet (a) to address emergency vehicles as the highest priority.
- Member: Appreciates the addition of the Good Neighbor pattern to the pattern summary. However, consider the overemphasis on traffic impacts to the East Campus neighbors by referencing the *East Campus Area Plan*, and that the South University neighbors are not included. Consider that the South University neighbors are impacted by parking and traffic when there are UO events.
 - Eng: The language for this section was taken from the *East Campus Area Plan, 2024*, but this was intended to address impacts to both neighborhoods. The reference to the *East Campus Area Plan* can be removed.
- Member: Consider that e-micromobility is different from standard micromobility and has different safety concerns and impacts when moving through campus. Consider that etiquette and operational standards could be put in place to manage the speed differences and safety considerations
 - Eng: The *Campus Transportation Plan* treats both the same. Micro-mobility can be managed by operational policies and procedures, rather than through the *Campus Plan*.
 - Member: Consider someone reading the plan who uses e-micromobility may feel they can't be bound by operational rules that are different from standard micromobility. However, the footnote regarding "unique needs" and referencing the *Campus Transportation Plan* may be enough to cover this concern.
 - Member: Consider that there may not be a *Campus Transportation Plan* principle to address increased hazards from e-micromobility. Consider that Principle 9 should not lock us into treating e-micromobility and standard micromobility the same.
- Member: Consider that e-micromobility and standard micromobility are different. Consider that restrictions on speed and regulations on etiquette may be beneficial.
 - Comery: Standard and e-micromobility are grouped together because they use the same infrastructure, similar to a semi-truck and a passenger car that use the same infrastructure, but are different types of vehicles and have different impacts. There are policies in place to regulate e-micromobility and standard micromobility differently. Transportation Services is partnering with other campus departments to promote appropriate micromobility etiquette. We recognize the safety considerations associated with e-micromobility compared to standard micromobility, particularly with increased weight and speed. Additionally, we are collaborating with Cascadia Mobility (PeaceHealth Rides) as they

- expand their fleet to include e-bikes, to regulate the speed of bikeshare devices on campus. However, we do not have the same ability to regulate privately owned e-micromobility devices.
 - Member: Consider the impact difference of a collision at different speeds. What seems like a relatively small speed difference can have a large impact.
- Member: How was the public hearing noticed?
 - CPC Staff: Discussed public hearing noticing requirements outlined in Principle 1. Confirmed that the public hearing notices were sent to the required neighborhood association leadership and city staff 30 days before, and that the public hearing was published in the Daily Emerald at least 10 days before (June 1, 2026) as required in the *Campus Plan*.
 - Guest: UO Community Relations has also talked extensively with the neighbors about the proposed amendment.
- Member: The Principle 9 amendment incorporates feedback that was provided during the previous CPC meetings well.

Action: With 11 in favor the committee agreed that the **Proposed Amendment to the Campus Plan - Principle 9: Transportation** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.