

June 11, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 29, 2020 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (chair), George Evans, Emily Fenster, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Dean Livelybrooks, Terry McQuilkin, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Phillip Carroll (CPFM), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Allen Hancock (Community Member), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Lynn Nester (PE & REC), Ivy Pitts (Campus Planning), Bitty Roy (Biology), Huntley Sims (VPFA Intern, Campus Planning)

**CPC Agenda**

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

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was 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.

CPC staff introduced the purpose of the requested action agenda item and summarized key CP principles as described in the meeting mailing.

Aaron Olsen, Campus Planning representative, described the proposed update to the Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan as described in the meeting mailing. Changes to the North Campus area will be addressed as part of the North Campus amendment process.

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

- Nighttime spillover light is a concern, for example light from structures such as the new parking garage when close to the river. Parking garages are sometimes heavily illuminated.
- Specific lighting proposals are reviewed as part of their own respective project review.
- Is the Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan text before the committee today?
- Do we address only what we know now, not anticipating future needs? (e.g. North Campus area).
- The map is intended to address current walkways and what we know now. This is a planning tool to inform future discussions and prioritize where primary walkways should be. Future walkways for land north of Franklin Boulevard will be addressed as part of the campus plan amendments for that area.
- Students are concerned for their safety after-dark on campus and would like more, rather than less, lighting on campus, especially near campus / residential edges where students live.
- Concerns for climate change and species loss. Reduce and contain lighting where possible, help mitigate, and make sure studied comprehensively.
- The lighting plan outlines requirements for prioritizing walks including providing safe paths to front doors and ensuring walks are accessible. The goal is to not overly light every part of campus, rather provide uniform levels of lighting along prioritized paths which will contribute to an increased sense of safety.
- Look at building entrances, paths and walkways – are some overly lit? Focus lighting on specific areas and be cognizant of light pollution, with safety a priority for students, faculty, staff, and community.
- Regarding the Riverfront Research Park drive area, should one side or the other be designated as a lit walk to help mitigate light pollution and direct flow of traffic? For the right-of-way influence, do we work with the City?
- Is the Knight Library to Alder walk included? There is great concern by UOPD for safety and nefarious activity in this area.
- Adding lights to the Kincaid to Alder walk is not preferred as it encourages more use in a potentially unsafe location; therefore, this route should not be added to the map.
- Is it possible to address the security issues with lighting without it being a recognized part of our pathway lighting system?
- The quality of lighting is important; avoid glare and intense lighting.

The following is a summary of comments from guests:

- Impacts to biological activity from LED lights is a concern, they are worse for birds than other lights. Alternate options in sensitive areas (e.g. motion sensors in natural area and possibly in general).
- Student perception of safety is sometimes inflated; crime statistics would be useful to have.
- Thank you for changing the lighting color/coolness along the South Bank Path for wildlife; perhaps this should be done campus-wide.
- Two members were unable to attend but sent a note indicating support for the proposed changes.

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

- This CPC action is addressing the lit walkway map contained in the Outdoor Lighting Plan and not intended to address any building or structure lighting.
- The Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan text is not the focus of CPC review today, only the map.
- The university has coordinated with the City in the past for lighting in the right of way in an effort to address off campus lighting around the university. For example, a group of university and city representatives worked together to identify opportunities to improve lighting. Specifically, street lighting exists on Riverfront Parkway, which can be further assessed as needed.
- The Outdoor Lighting Plan has current language that talks about full cutoff fixtures to minimize the light pollution into the sky and focus light downward to meet city standards for night sky and dark sky.
- Regarding the Knight Library to Alder walk, a new light was recently installed along Alder Street at two locations. The walk on the north side of Education has been identified as a concern from UOPD and adjacent sorority houses. This walk is not accessible.
- The Riverfront South Bank path lighting will install 3000K LED lights providing an on-campus test for LED lights which are more ecologically sensitive.

Action: With 11 in favor the committee agreed that the proposed Campus Outdoor Lighting Plan – Map Update is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

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

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to have continued discussion about a Campus Plan amendment, incorporating the university’s land between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River.

CPC staff introduced the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing.

Aaron Olsen, Campus Planning representative, provided a process update, an overview of land use planning history, and described the new proposed “Natural Area” language. Also presented were updates to the proposed open-space framework.

### Discussion:

#### Overview of land use planning history

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

- Thank you for the great overview.
- The Framework Vision Project (FVP) did not include any studies of a natural area north of the railroad tracks. Playing fields seem to be only briefly studied, with no mention of artificial turf.
- The FVP was based on a needs assessment as well as input from the Space Advisory Group. All space needs, including fields, were discussed as part of the FVP.
- Are the results of the playing field study available?
- There is an important need for fields, and field use would fit much better in the location than buildings.
- Further explore and discuss technological improvements with current artificial field materials, where there has been tremendous improvement, to see how we can meet the needs and address concerns of all. Artificial turf, instead of grass, reduces the amount of space needed for playing fields.
- As plans develop, there will be time for more discussion and study regarding whether the fields should be natural grass or synthetic turf. Lighting would be needed to accommodate use after dark.

The following is a summary of comments from guests:

- Representation of academic use in the area north of the tracks is important. Many students use this space as an outdoor classroom and it is important to take this function into account.

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

- The playing field study is available on the campus planning website: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/recreation-field-location-options-study>. The study identifies initial considerations for each site to accommodate recreation fields, however, it was not a site selection process.
- The Conditional Use Permit (CUP) allows for recreation fields; however, it does not specify or require a specific material. A future project will need to consider field materials and will be reviewed by the CPC.
- The land use summary and history is not necessarily comprehensive but intended to provide a better understanding of the history of this part of campus.

#### New proposed “Natural Area” and Open-space updates

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

- The idea of a fifth type of open space and the idea of Natural Areas is supported. It can work well in conjunction with an area set aside for playing fields.
- This is a great response to a prior CPC request.
- The description of the Natural Area is supported and the wording is good. This leaves open what area is considered a Natural Area. Expanding the identified Natural Area open space is supported, relying upon consultation from experts to better define the appropriate size. The university should capitalize and take advantage of such an area for research, education, outreach, and public enjoyment. This can be seen in places such as the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration: <https://www.cbber.ucsb.edu/>
- Support the proposed Natural Area language; could see this space as a programmed element.
- How many acres are designated in the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) (and this draft map) as Natural Area or open space (red lines, and including 200’ setback) and how much is either future playing fields or buildings? Could these details be provided for both north of and south of the railroad tracks?

- Be sure to consider adjacent land uses when thinking about future uses. Adjacent to North Campus, there are big changes with the EWEB site and existing large natural areas north of the river.
- Remember that rivers move around – where the river is now has changed throughout history. The area has long been disturbed, for example, with the history of gravel mining.
- There are other examples of substantially disturbed lands converted to natural areas, for example, Delta Ponds.
- Regarding the suggested word change of “should” to an absolute “will,” this can be problematic. Be careful when locking in words as you could prevent others from doing what you really want in the future, even though your intention was to try and lock it in. It can go both ways, you can experience situations where absolutes do not result in the original expectations and lead to a worse situation because it leaves no room for discussion and consideration of options.

The following is a summary of comments from guests:

- It would be good to have Natural Areas in central campus as well.
- Currently the grassy area north of the tracks is largely natural. Why are we only considering the riverfront?
- Good wording on the Natural Area.
- Regarding the request to consult with experts, Campus Planning invited UO ecologists regarding what could be done to improve ecology as part of prior efforts. For example, some suggested restoring the grassy area to oak savannah, enhancing the campus as a green campus. This grassy area (currently outside the open space boundary) should be considered.
- Consider a suggested change of the word “should” to “will”, or “will prioritize,” related to native plants and adjacent development.
- “Will be prioritized” still allows exceptions but makes a stronger stand. This also allows flexibility for other options (add examples if helpful). Allow the possibility to add specimens.
- Native plants in general should be prioritized, whether or not they are endangered or threatened.

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

- Regarding the word change from “should” to “will”, the focus on “should” was intentional for plantings. The goal is to leave open the ability to respond to planting needs when considering campus as an arboretum, for urban agriculture, and for educational needs.
- Additional project history will be posted on the project website:  
<https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment>
- CPC may need to break into a sub-committee to resolve some of the exact wording for the specific amendment language that is presented next fall.

### Timeline / Process

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

- How many meetings do we anticipate in Fall 2020?

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

- Three future CPC meetings are planned for Fall 2020 as per the mailing, with the last meeting being an action item. This is flexible and more meetings can be scheduled as needed.