

May 21, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee  
From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning  
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)  
Subject: Campus Planning Committee Meeting, May 29, 2020

The next meeting of the 2019-20 Campus Planning Committee (CPC) will be held on Friday, May 29, 2020 from 10am - 12pm in Microsoft Teams.

All meetings are open to the public.

**REMOTE MEETING**

This will be a remote meeting in real-time using the Microsoft Teams app on your own device. There is also an option to join on the web for those who do not have the Microsoft Teams app. This meeting will be recorded for record keeping purposes. To join the meeting, please click on the following link:

[Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

**Agenda:**

**1. Campus Plan Amendment: Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan - Map Update**

**Background:** The purpose of this agenda item is to review the proposed Outdoor Lighting Walkways map update for the Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan and determine whether the update is consistent with *Campus Plan* principles and patterns. The Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan is a Subject Plan of the Campus Plan; therefore, CPC review is required as described in the Campus Plan (See page 23).

As described in the attached description, a maintenance update to the Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan is needed to reflect current built campus conditions.

Please refer to the attached background materials for more information. Also, please review relevant Campus Plan principles and patterns, in particular:

- Principle 2: Open-space Framework
  - Pathways
  - Landscape Fixtures
  - Campus Safety / Environmental Design
    - (b) Campus Lighting
      - Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan

Action: The committee is being asked to determine if the proposed update for the Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and to formulate a recommendation to the president. Typically, the committee takes one of the following four actions:

1. Recommends approval
2. Recommends approval subject to a series of conditions
3. Does not recommend approval
4. Delays action until a future meeting

## **2. Campus Plan Amendment: North of Franklin Boulevard – Discussion**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item is to have continued discussion about a Campus Plan amendment, incorporating the university's land between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River. Topics for this discussion will include:

- timeline/process updates,
- review of additional background related to the area's land use, resolutions, and studies,
- draft language for a new type of designated open space called "Natural Area," and
- updates to the open-space framework for the Millrace Design area.

This amendment will establish a framework of designated open spaces and major campus pathways, establish building density guidelines, and identify development opportunities and constraints. This is the third in a series of CPC meetings that will discuss this Campus Plan amendment.

This Campus Plan amendment is part of a multi-year, multi-step planning process led by the Office of Campus Planning for university land north of Franklin Boulevard. Previous

steps have included the Framework Vision Project (2014-16), the North Campus Conditional Use Permit Project (2016-18), and the Recreation Field Location Options Study (2018-19), all of which have included extensive public outreach and CPC input. On November 28, 2017, the CPC agreed with ten members in favor and one opposed to recommend to the president the North Campus Conditional Use Permit be approved as a land use application to submit to the City of Eugene, with the understanding that a Campus Plan amendment for this area of campus would come back to the CPC for further discussion. The City of Eugene approved the North Campus Conditional Use Permit on October 21, 2018.

The CPC held two previous meetings for the Campus Plan Amendment North of Franklin Boulevard on February 18, 2020, and March 6, 2020. The following are previous comments, questions, and clarifications from those meetings:

CPC Meeting 1:

- A guest stated that the planning process for the North Campus Conditional Use Permit (CUP) happened during the summer and holidays when it was difficult for faculty to be involved; therefore, she felt that engagement did not encompass a wide array of voices. Also, students use the land and so it is important for them to participate. She noted that some people were upset because the CPC approved allowing recreation fields north of the railroad track, and that the UO Senate voted against the CUP.
- A member reminded the committee that the CPC recommended approval of the CUP with a 10-1 vote.
- Another member stated that the Senate voted against putting fields in North Campus, and asked about engagement with Senate in campus planning process. Olsen indicated that the CPC is the primary review body for Campus Plan amendments. The CPC includes representation from the Senate.
- Another member noted that he is representing the Senate currently.
- A guest asked if the Campus Plan defines active and passive recreation, and suggested looking at the Whilamut Natural Area (East Alton Baker Park), designated by the City for passive recreation, for examples and a definition. A member added that the Campus Plan defines open spaces as “formal” (designed for scheduled, organized activities) and “informal” open spaces (designed for more casual, non-scheduled activities).
- The guest asked if the Recreation Field Location Options Study was completed. Olsen noted that the study is complete, but he is still working on the final formatting. All

information and analysis is on the project web page (and the report will be posted there when complete): <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/recreation-field-location-options-study>

- Concerning “areas unlikely to change,” a member asked if the development in the campus operations/power station area within the Millrace Design Area would be subject to CPC review. Another member explained that major changes (such as a new building or major shift to service circulation) would go through CPC review, similar to other areas of campus. Minor changes may not be subject to CPC review (although they would be internally reviewed by the Office of Campus Planning).
- A member noted the importance of considering the 7-minute walking circle in relation to the area to inform proposed uses, such as classrooms. Another member noted that the Campus Plan (and Framework Vision Project) used the 7-minute walking circles to inform proposed uses. Generally, classrooms are not encouraged in this area, except when associated with specialized studio classes and research needs (for example, the College of Design art studios).
- A member emphasized the need to think about providing the ability to grow Knight Campus programs as the needs arise, including potential classrooms serving those programs.
- Another member emphasized the importance of recreation fields, used by at least 4,200 students annually. She was also supportive about opportunities to move Outdoor Program functions to the riverfront because of the program’s connection to river recreation.
- A member reminded the committee about the importance of assessing each open space and to carefully consider what we are trying to achieve when we draw an open space line. The member also suggested assessing the benefits of extending the E-W open space axis shown north of ZIRC further east.
- A guest advised defining more carefully the kinds of open space. The ecology is different when talking about the river. A member noted that there appear to be four primary types of open space in this area. Olsen noted that the Campus Plan currently describes each designated open space on campus and will describe the unique types of open spaces in the area.
- Members advised keeping in mind the greater context, such as the City’s development projects adjacent to this area and the new giant student housing complex.
- A member appreciated the amendment will consider the ZIRC facility staying in the foreseeable future, a beacon to science research here.
- A member, who could not attend but provided written comments, felt that the FVP and CUP do not provide a fully satisfactory basis for the Campus Plan amendments related

to the riverfront land north of the railroad tracks for the following reasons (read aloud by the CPC Chair in full and summarized below):

- The FVP does not specifically assign importance to the preservation of natural areas and to their enhancement. The Campus Plan gives no specific weight to natural areas.
- The CUP permits construction of large, fenced, floodlit artificial-turf playing fields in proximity to the river. Now (during this Campus Plan amendment process) is therefore the time to rule out construction of artificial turf rec fields on the land between the railroad tracks and the river.
- The FVP should be regarded as providing no useful guidance. While the FVP maps indicated the possibility of rec fields in this area, the FVP did not undertake a study of alternative uses of the riverfront land.
- The UO Senate opposed the CUP application emphasizing the importance of protecting and enhancing the unique features of the Willamette River and associated habitats.

#### CPC Meeting 2:

##### Densities:

- A guest asked if an artificial turf recreation field would count as “coverage.” Olsen explained that “coverage” means building coverage, so artificial turf fields would not count.
- Another guest asked what is included in “open space.” Members provided answers on what is included (i.e. landscape, courtyards, streets, parking, etc...). A member suggested more clearly defining what we mean when we talk about open space (i.e. natural area, courtyards, roads, plazas, etc...).

##### Circulation:

- A member advised looking at opportunities and constraints from the City’s new Franklin Blvd design and how it will tie into the open-space framework and circulation systems.
- A member noted the railroad tracks as a significant barrier and the difficulty of tunneling underneath. Another member acknowledged there would not be much opportunity for more underpasses except potentially at one new location somewhere west of what is now called “Gallery Walk.”
- In response to discussion about service access to the western portion of the property, a guest noted that the land includes a future underpass identified in the City of Eugene Transportation System Plan at Alder Street that would connect to the river bike path, and reminded the committee that the university’s Conditional Use Permit promised not to inhibit this connection.

The current diagram showing service circulation along the train tracks may not be possible due to geography.

#### Willamette Design Area:

- A member said that it was important to address Principle 10 (Sustainable Development) and advocated adding an open-space category called “Natural Area” to the university’s system of Quads, Axes, Promenades, and Greens to Principle 2 (Open-space Framework). The member felt that the definitions of open spaces in the Framework Vision Project and *Campus Plan* were too limited, and that the proposed “Willamette Green” needed to be broken out in its own category to preserve ecosystems. Then there could be a discussion on how much area should be dedicated to the natural form. The member noted that many universities specifically recognize natural areas. .
- A member explained that “Greens” cover many types of open spaces ranging from plazas to landscaped areas, and that the “Willamette Green” would be described to address its unique natural area attributes in Principle 12 (Design Area Special Conditions). Another member felt that definitions matter, and that calling the Willamette River riparian area a “Green” was stretching the definition a bit much.
- Members agreed that adding a new Natural Area or Natural Edge category should be considered. This would allow for a more accurate description of the amorphous shape that is natural and not rectilinear.
- Olsen reminded the members and guests that Principle 10 (Sustainable Development) doesn’t just apply to open space, but to all types of development.
- A member reminded the committee about the rationale behind the 200-foot riparian enhancement setback, which was based on much thought and study, including a riparian assessment report.
- A guest commended the flexibility in UO planning, but noted that the weakness of the designated open-space system is that, while the designated open spaces are set aside so you know where you can’t build, no areas are prioritized for ecological functions.
- A member asked if there was a priority for either active or passive recreation in the area, and if there should be. He also noted that there was advocacy for recreation fields at the previous meeting, but those members were not here today. Olsen explained that overall, active and passive recreation would be allowed. In the designated open space, there would be no active recreation such as recreation fields, which are specifically not allowed; therefore, there is a priority for passive recreation in the designated open space (in addition to other uses typical in conservation areas).

- Members and guests discussed the aspirational nature of restoring the river's edge. Is the restoration just aspirational? Why does the Conditional Use Permit say the university will restore the river's edge "if funding is available"? A member explained that the entire *Campus Plan* is aspirational and not an implementation plan. It provides direction to projects when they happen. This amendment is about the direction we want to provide for future development.
- A guest suggested removing the language "if funding is available."
- A member explained that the language "if funding is available" was probably included so the university was not tied to a commitment at the City level. He envisioned expectations for the Willamette River restoration to be the same as for the Millrace restoration. The university hired a consultant to scope out restoration along the entire Millrace (and the section along the Knight Campus project was improved along with that project). The university will soon be issuing a request for proposals for a more in-depth study on the Millpond section to help the university figure out the cost.
- A member asked if we were limiting ourselves too much with the emphasis on active or passive recreation. For example, it might limit the Outdoor Program from being located in an area if the emphasis is too much on passive recreation. The member suggested looking back at the university's mission statement for guidance.
- A member referenced the 35-year history of opposition to development along the riverfront and asked why the past University Senate resolutions have not been listed in the presentations along with the previous planning efforts and studies. The member stressed the importance of student/faculty appreciation for areas like these ("jewels"). Another member explained that the Campus Planning Committee reports to the president, who has provided his direction in his 6-page letter to the Senate, written in response to the last senate resolution. The letter directs us on how to move forward and addresses the history of resolutions. Other members noted that all of this has been considered and will be considered as we move forward. A member liked the idea of including acknowledgement that we were thinking about the resolutions.
- A guest asked why this site (north of the railroad tracks) is being considered for recreation fields when there is now a final report of the Recreation Field Location Options Study that identified alternative sites to be considered.
- Olsen reminded everyone that the university is trying to meet its needs, and balance its various needs.

- A member noted that the existing recreation field is physically in the way of restoring the river's edge. The member advised the committee to not rush to a conclusion, that we will have the number of meetings necessary.
- Staff noted that one of the past resolutions was opposed to development except for open space and recreations fields, and asked if there is no longer support for recreation fields whatsoever. A member responded that there are probably varying opinions and guessed that the past support for recreation fields was for natural grass, not artificial turf.
- A member who worked closely with the Senate in the past guessed that the statement referencing 35 years of opposition was not a continuous statement, and reminded the committee that the Senate didn't open up a campus conversation at the time of the most recent resolution. Students as a whole didn't weigh in. The member noted that the president responded and gave direction. The member was not opposed to the idea of expanding the green boundary (Willamette River Green) but wanted to know how far it could be extended without precluding something else. Olsen explained that, through the input received, the CUP process already reduced the number of fields to increase the conservation area. The member noted (when voting in favor of the CUP) he never said yes to artificial turf, but yes to fields, and suggested opening up the option of expanding the green boundary.
- A guest noted that just because it's in the CUP doesn't mean you need to do it. The guest noted that during the CUP process, faculty experts who were engaged asked for a "no fields option," but that it was never provided. At that point, the faculty did not want to be associated with the project.

#### Millrace Design Area

- A guest noted that the Millrace Design Area drawings don't acknowledge the full size of the Urban Farm, which is not officially assigned. A member suggested looking into the possibility of making the Urban Farm an intentional part of a new designated open space.
- A guest asked how the North Green connects to other open spaces. Olsen noted that that is an area that staff is still grappling with, regarding how it fits with the open space and circulation system.
- A member noted the importance of addressing safety especially Franklin Blvd pedestrian crossings, which will become more active.
- A guest noted that future phases of Knight Campus will change the landscape, form, and movement in this area of campus, and the dynamics along the Millrace.



- A member asked to consider not establishing too many restrictions. There are a lot of other processes that will be required that are not mutually exclusive, such as permitting at various levels and complying with environmental laws.
- Olsen concluded with informing the committee about the projects in the area that are already underway, such as the Zebrafish International Resource Center expansion and a thermal storage tank for the Chiller Plant. In addition, there are projects that are anticipated (Knight Campus phases 2 and 3) or identified as a need (beach volleyball courts, emergency supply storage) that the *Campus Plan* would need to accommodate.

Previous CPC Meetings 1 & 2 presentation materials are available at:

<https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment>. Also, please review relevant Campus

Plan principles and patterns, in particular:

- Principle 2: Open-space Framework
- Principle 3: Densities
- Principle 10: Sustainable Development
- Principle 12: Design Area Special Conditions

Action: No formal action is requested.

Please contact this office if you have questions.