



June 9, 2022

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 27, 2022 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Ann Brown, Liska Chan, Claressa Davis, Stephen Duff, Kassy Fisher, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Savannah Olsen, Eric Owens, Stephanie Prentiss, Kevin Reed, Janet Rose, Madison Sanders, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Zack Barnett (University Communications), Kaleb Beavers (Student), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Ignacio Lopez Buson (Landscape Architecture), Bryce Cumpston (Community Member), Darin Dehle (CPFM), Eric DeCassiono (Community Member), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Save the Urban Farm Coalition (Community Member), Sydney Gastman (Community Member), Brad Hutchings (University Communications), Parker Jung (Student), Harper Keeler (Landscape Architecture), KH (UO Parent), Libby Mackin (Student), Hannah McIntyre (Student), Ethan Moser (Community Member), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Michael Pluth (Chemistry & Biology), Jenna Shope (CPFM), Nick Sloss (CPFM), Denise Stewart (CPFM), Cassie Taylor (Campus Planning), Cami Thompson (University Advancement), Tressa (Community Member), Jason Wade (UOPD), Jenna Witzleben (Community Member), Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg (Architecture), Grace Youngblood (Student)

CPC Agenda

CPC staff reviewed the current meeting procedure and order of discussion. The CPC chair reviewed CPC role, purpose, and options for types of committee recommendations.

1. Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed schematic design for the Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 and determine whether the design is consistent with *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

The Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 is envisioned as a research building that is approximately 175,000 GSF, standing 4 stories above grade, with a basement. The site is west of Riverfront Parkway between the Millrace to the south and Millrace Drive to the North. This second building in the Knight Campus complex will further bioengineering and applied science research activity with the goal of supporting at least another 15-20 individual research programs and shared research equipment and service facilities.

CPC staff reviewed prior CPC meeting history for this agenda item and highlighted key topics from past meeting discussions. The project's user group composition, relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, and types of committee action were also reviewed.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) provided a review of the key campus planning requirements diagram as well as a brief overview of how the Framework Vision Project (FVP) identified this part of campus to accommodate future growth and anticipated needs for expanded uses related to science and research in the area. The *Campus Plan* amendment process for the Area North of Franklin Boulevard, and the *Campus Plan* descriptions for the area, including the Millrace Green and Urban Farm, and future service route were also reviewed.

Darin Dehle (CPFM) reviewed the project schematic design and progress since the October 12, 2021 CPC check-in meeting. This included information regarding building design, solar studies, site development, design, and circulation, campus safety, and impacts to the neighboring area.

Discussion:

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

- Is there space allocated for passenger loading along Riverfront Parkway?
Providing temporary drop-off is often important for modern functions such as Uber and food delivery; otherwise, these functions will use the bike lane.
- Support the presentation and the work involved.
- Comments/questions related to impacts to the Urban Farm:
 - Provide a more detailed understanding of the farm, such as a site plan.
 - How can impacts to the farm be minimized during the construction phase of the project?
 - Consider ways to ameliorate displaced uses, especially the Urban Farm, by working together with those who are being displaced. What's been done so far to communicate?
 - Are there portions of the farm where construction impacts could be further evaluated, such as the central area over the future utility tunnel and vault connection at the west side of the building?
 - What areas will be undisturbed and protected?
- Comments/questions related to construction and construction staging:
 - Explain excavation rationale.
 - Can the area to the north be used for staging?
 - What's necessary for foundation work and staging?
 - What is the construction type and why does it require a 30' building setback?
- Comments related to building design:
 - Building massing
 - Was consideration given to reducing solar impacts by building higher to the north? Could massing be pushed over the loading area?
 - Appreciation for the south plaza space; consider pulling back the building more on the south.
 - Explain solar shading, especially on the west façade. Why are vertical fins located on the south façade and not the west? Why isn't south solar shading horizontal instead of vertical?
 - Please provide a physical model or a digital walk through.
 - Can the building be smaller?

- Provide information about impacts to the larger campus; E.g. ecological systems, habitat, pollinators, vegetation, cultural uses, and heritage.
- Concern about limited time for design review.
- What are the impacts during construction on access from main campus to Autzen stadium, particularly on football game days?
- Comments/questions related to process:
 - The committee has seen the project proposal at past CPC meetings, and reviewed the general siting and the general massing of the building, to ensure that these align with the *Campus Plan*.
 - If there is a future proposal for a portion of the Urban Farm to be relocated, it would go through a standard site selection process and come back to the committee for review.
 - The appointed building project user group has had input and is active with regular meetings. Members include CPC chair Dean Livelybrooks and Rob Thallon, former CPC chair, and emeritus professor of Architecture, College of Design (COD).
 - How has the design team been working with COD; who is working on that team?
 - The design team includes professional landscape architects, who have education in ecology and design. The user group has had discussions regarding native plants and ecology.
 - If design review discussion is continued at the next scheduled CPC meeting, what are the impacts to the design process moving forward?
 - This meeting is the time for member review and input; acknowledging the challenge of wanting to know all the nuances and details. It's been years leading up to this point in terms of how the siting, development, and design of the building have developed; Unable to share that level of information at this meeting as it would take even more time.
 - The project team will continue to work with COD to accommodate temporarily displaced uses. While it's not appropriate for the committee to define that process, it could add a reminder to the recommendation to emphasize the importance of this step. Also, the committee could consider adding a condition that emphasizes the importance of the project team's ongoing work with COD to refine the site along the western edge.
 - Look for ways to provide a potential pathway for community concerns to be addressed, possibly a forum where affected groups could engage more effectively with the appropriate campus entity.

- Additional conversation as described will be useful.
- Request for a copy of the presentation, and to also hear from ZGF (project architect) about campus planning issues.
- Support for design team explanation of the processes to reduce construction impact, and the committee's work to reduce impacts to the Urban Farm.
- Suggestions for potential conditions of approval:
 - While not the CPC's purview to address how to accommodate uses temporarily displaced by construction, it is important.
 - Continue discussions with the COD, especially to:
 - address Urban Farm activities that are affected by construction impacts and continue to make efforts to minimize impacts,
 - define replacement and siting opportunities for potentially displaced Urban Farm activities, and
 - refine the western edge to minimize long term impacts on the urban farm.
 - Work with Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM) to refine the site design.
 - Continue to evaluate drop-off and pick-up location.
 - Consider making a separate, friendly recommendation to the president to form a group that involves COD and members of the construction design team to meet regularly to talk about measures to minimize construction impact on the Urban Farm, and create ways of broadcasting information and communicating with the community.
- Comments/questions related to voting:
 - Request for more information about the project design is not just about nuances, they are related to design elements that are part of the planning process, and CPC is a part of the planning process. Consider deferring a decision for further review and conversation.
 - What additional information would be needed before making a vote?
 - What would determine what ends the defer to vote?
 - Suggestion to approve the schematic design of the building, with the understanding that the landscape design of specific elements, E.g. the south plaza, west side, and loading dock could come back to the CPC for future review.
 - Would pausing for consideration for landscape design include the "Back 40" location?

- Suggestion to reach out to Darin Dehle for detailed answers to specific design questions.
- Suggestion to design team to formalize their relationship with the COD regarding mitigating, to a practicable extent, the impacts on the Urban Farm and opening lines of communication for comments.

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

- Will the Kiln Shed and the Kiln Shed court be inside the fenced area shown on the plans during construction? These are important to the Urban Farm.
- There is interest from the Landscape Architecture department to use the repair of the kiln shed as a possible design build project with students.
- Thanks to members speaking to some of the concerns of the students (as a student, guest has great appreciation for the Urban Farm) and providing clarity for reasoning of the staging area placement, such as the basement excavation aspects, as that information has not been available to students. However, concerns regarding the topic was quickly brushed over, and having a conversation about it was not an agenda item, when that is why students were attending the meeting. Concerned students want the staging area moved, which was said that was not an option because it would cost a million dollars. However, concerns that funding is available from student tuition and philanthropic gifts, and that UO is one of the wealthiest institutions in the region, and this project is one of the costliest public funded development projects in recent local history. Why isn't this a conversation that other people can participate in? Concerns that conversations about relocating cultivated soil and trees shows that nobody in these conversations has any knowledge of ecology or sustainable agriculture.
- Appreciation for efforts being taken to mitigate damage to the Urban Farm. Important to note that this outdoor classroom represents an incredibly unique and interdisciplinary space. The intersection of ecological systems, educational programming, and community building that takes place in this location is irreplaceable. Concern over replacement of 100-year-old heritage walnut trees and a 25-year-old orchard. What is the timeline for tree removal?
- Support for guest comments. This design disrupts an unnecessary amount of Urban Farm space. Important to remember that it's not just land and activities, this is life that is being disturbed and hundreds of humans' life affirming experiences. Support for working with those being displaced, and more

conversations with stakeholders, both relating to the people using the Urban Farm space, and with the people who will be using the science complex. Important to think about who the design is for and include everyone.

- Regarding the “Back 40” and construction staging area, it’s been said the cost of moving the construction staging area somewhere else exceeds one million dollars. Have the costs of moving trees and soil and potentially developing new Urban Farm space not only for just the staging area being impacted but for all areas impacted been considered? This is a potentially expensive process especially with all the design, planning, logistics, and staffing.
- Why can’t staging go elsewhere? The community is outraged.

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

- From a functional and operational perspective, a need for pick-up / drop-off has not been identified. The Millrace parking garage is located across the street, which provides a place to park and walk across the street to the building.
- During construction, access to Autzen Stadium will be a challenge as the sidewalks on the west side of Riverfront Parkway will be closed completely. There will be signage that directs pedestrians to the sidewalks on the east side of Riverfront Parkway as an accessway. Also, there is a route through the Riverwalk access and underpass that goes under and over to Autzen, which is another major pathway to campus that will remain open.
- COD staff and the design team have participated in tours of the Urban Farm to understand the aspects of how it works and what elements are there, and have been involved in early conversations about possibilities for the proposed building design and possible impacts. Landscape design conversations have not progressed as much yet. The project team is communicating with COD representatives and setting up more meetings to facilitate continued engagement. Also, Rob Thallon, COD representative has provided valuable input as a part of the user group.
- Several efforts have been made to mitigate impacts to adjacent functions. For example, the project decided to shore the entire west (and east) sides of the excavation to limit construction impacts. This still requires a 30’ offset from the building for equipment to operate around the building safely, but the standard process of laying back excavation would have impacted a much larger area. Construction methods in an urban setting are very different (and they might also take out a sidewalk and a lane of traffic to accomplish this). This project is not

considered to be in an urban setting, and the contractors in our area are not familiar with this kind of approach. If a more urban approach were proposed, it would result in a notable obstacle when hiring contractors.

- The tunnel is essential from a utility corridor perspective, and is a significant undertaking; the project plans to use shoring at the edges to keep excavation as narrow as possible. There will also need to be a vault connection at the (west) face of the building to accommodate the utility transition from the tunnel to the building, which is what causes more impact on the west side. There is no way to avoid excavation in this location, as utility expansion joints are required at the ends of the utility runs.
- The area that is impacted is located where the trees are shown as removed. Areas outside the proposed fenced area would not be impacted, such as the Memorial Orchard and Kiln Shed (aside from planned improvements to the shed).
- The building's programmatic requirements are very rigid and associated with a research facility design. The east side of the building drives the proportion of the building; it houses research pods that are sized to accommodate research groups identified for this building. The west side of the building houses corresponding offices and write-up spaces for those researchers; proximity is important to the function of the building. The building program was revised as much as possible in an effort to reduce impact on the west side. For example, the initial west façade concept was a straight line; it now undulates and is pulled back in sections in response to the Urban Farm and open space. Reducing the entire west bar would negatively impact the building program and function. This limits the potential to further reduce and/or shift building massing to the north.
- The south façade has significant horizontal overhangs in certain places; the vertical fins are keeping an architectural consistency to the massing of the building. The vertical fins are not as frequent as other facades around the building and are not serving the same function. The design team is considering further refinement of solar shading.
- The current project presentation (and level of detail) was prepared to address *Campus Plan* requirements and project design development.
- Construction will begin at the beginning of 2023.
- The project has been working to reduce impacts as much as possible around the building, recognizing the constrained fit. The project team understands and recognizes the perspective of the Urban Farm and those associated with it.

While it is known that the project will impact adjacent uses, it has and will continue to actively work out ways to reduce them.

- This project is not funded by student tuition funds; the project is funded through a philanthropic gift.
- The project has taken into consideration impacts and already incorporated the cost of moving trees and soil as well as other mitigation items. Taking a different approach to staging would add additional costs.
- The design phase is progressing forward; continuing the design discussion with CPC until the next meeting would not currently impact design progress.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to delay action until a further meeting, however, with 6 in favor, 7 opposed, and 4 abstentions, the committee did not agree to delay action for the **Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 Schematic Design** until a further meeting. The meeting ended before further action was taken as the scheduled time had been reached. The schematic design review will continue at the next meeting.