June 15, 2022

MEMORANDUM

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

Subject: Record of the June 7, 2022 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Ann Brown, Liska Chan, Kassy Fisher, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Eric Owens, Stephanie Prentiss, Kevin Reed, Janet Rose, Madison Sanders, Cathy Soutar, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Kyle Trefny, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Darin Dehle (CPFM), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Luda Isakharov (Student), Harper Keeler (Landscape Architecture), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Jenna Shope (CPFM), Cassie Taylor (Campus Planning), Lewis Taylor (Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact) Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg (College of Design)

CPC Agenda

CPC staff reviewed the current meeting outline.

1. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the Framework Vision Project and Southeast Campus Design Area – Public Hearing

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold a public hearing for the proposed amendment to the Campus Plan related to integrating Framework Vision Project recommendations into the Southeast Campus Design Area and incorporate changes from the recently completed Hayward Field.
CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, explained that a public hearing is a formal step to open the agenda item to the public for comments.

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records are available at: [https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area](https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area)

**Public Hearing:**
Public guests were invited to indicate if they were present in Zoom to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, opened the public hearing and invited any members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment portion of this meeting was closed. The committee will review the final draft of proposed amendments and take action at a future meeting.

**Action:** No formal action was requested.

### 2. Campus Plan Amendment Related to the area southeast of the Franklin Circle Design Area – Public Hearing

**Background:** The purpose of this agenda item was to hold a public hearing for the proposed amendment to the Campus Plan to incorporate the university's land southeast of the Franklin Circle Design Area into the Campus Plan to guide future campus development based on Campus Plan principles and to integrate Framework Vision project recommendations.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, explained that a public hearing is a formal step to open the agenda item to the public for comments.

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records are available at: [https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area](https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendments-related-framework-vision-project-and-southeast-campus-design-area-and-area)

**Public Hearing:**
Public guests were invited to indicate if they were present in Zoom to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, opened the public hearing and invited any members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment
portion of this meeting was closed. The committee will review the final draft of proposed amendments and take action at a future meeting.

**Action:** No formal action was requested.

### 3. Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 - Continued Schematic Design Review

**Background:** The purpose of this agenda item was to continue review of 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 the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, including past meeting date information.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) provided a re-cap 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. 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 additional information pertaining to the last 05/27/22 CPC meeting, regarding the question of engagement the project had with the College of Design (COD) over the course of the project. The project has been and will continue to be significantly engaged with COD over the course of the project. Engagement has included:
Meeting #1 with COD: February, 2021
COD user group member: Attendee at 15+ various user group meetings associated with the design.
Since project design start, July, 2021: 16 different meetings with COD leadership and staff regarding different aspects of various buildings in the project area and impacts, as well as the Urban Farm.

Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg (COD) reviewed the process moving forward with the Urban Farm, the history of stakeholder engagement, and discussions regarding construction staging areas. Additional items shared in the background and history information were that the current COD Dean, Adrian Parr, started Spring quarter, 2021, and Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg became interim Associate Dean of Facilities in January, 2022, and is now no longer interim. First meetings he had as interim included the Knight Campus Phase 2 project and the potential implications/impacts to the COD footprint north of Franklin Boulevard (there is substantial COD footprint North of Franklin Boulevard, including Art and Design, multiple studios and maker spaces, the Urban Farm, and the Urban Farm program more broadly). He shared that many stakeholders were passionate and interested in carefully addressing the proposed utility tunnel and the Knight Campus Phase 2 project throughout the duration of the project.

In March 2022, COD held a large Urban Farm stakeholders meeting where participants from across campus were invited; approximately 70 students attended.

After the March meeting, two processes were identified as needing management by COD, including:
1. Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 project impacts, mitigation, and displacement, and
2. Defining additional Urban Farming areas to accommodate future needs

Recognizing that these are two separate processes that frequently overlap, COD Dean Parr, launched the Urban Farm visioning process as a first step to defining the future of the Urban Farm. Input from faculty within the Department of Landscape Architecture was solicited for student representatives that might be a good fit for that visioning process; three students were identified.

On May 11th, 2022, a kick-off meeting was held in which Dean Parr gave three charge areas. The meeting was attended by faculty and the three student representatives. Since then, there have been weekly or bi-weekly meetings, Landscape Architecture faculty
meetings, and 12+ individual meetings focused on this topic with Landscape Architecture Program Head, Renee Irvin, incoming Landscape Architecture Program Head, Liska Chan, and Urban Farm Director, Harper Keeler.

The three charge areas from Dean Parr include:

1. Development of selection criteria and programmatic needs for additional Urban Farming cultivatable area,
2. Looking for ways to enhance the student experience, increasing access to the Urban Farm programming and activities, and
3. Looking for ways to integrate research experiences into the curriculum and significantly expand research opportunities within the Urban Farming program.

The goal is to complete this visioning process by June 15th to move quickly and give Dean Parr, and potentially the Provost, information on how to expand, as well as define the criteria under which COD hopes to expand the Urban Farming program, in order to officially launch a project through CPFM this summer or next fall.

Discussion:

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

- Appreciate the additional information regarding project coordination and input, as well as clarification about the COD process.
- The project has already put significant resources toward lessening the impact on the Urban Farm during construction, E.g. shoring during excavation and tree transplanting.
- Support for the project. The decision of funding and support put toward mitigating impacts on the Urban Farm should be balanced against its impact on the building program ultimately. Impacting the Urban Farm could be a 2-3-year impact during construction, after which functions return, whereas decisions that reduce programming of the Knight Campus Phase 2 building itself could have a multi-decadal impact on the institution.
- What is the role of the CPC and who else is involved in defining the impacts and the level of mitigation, especially during construction, but also long term because there are future changes that will impact the Urban Farm?
- Within the purview and focus of this committee are the permanent design elements of the project; there are some permanent changes of great concern that shouldn’t be ignored. However, how those changes affect the Urban Farm
program is a COD academic program question that has been and continues to be discussed within the COD.

- The CPC can help verify that programmatic needs identified by the COD are being met, for example, by recommending that the project team continue to work with the COD to refine the site design along the western edge, address Urban Farm activities affected by construction impacts, continue to make efforts to minimize impacts, and define replacement and siting opportunities for potentially displaced Urban Farm activities.

- If a new project related to the Urban Farm moves forward, it will return to the committee for review.

- Support for the university reaching out to community groups to bridge some of the knowledge gap that has been happening with this project. This won't be solved unless a communication effort is made.

- Have the design-specific concerns been addressed? Building design concerns include:
  
  o Sustainable design, especially for the south facade (solar gain). Vertical protection is not effective when south facing; have awareness to the west too.
  
  o Building massing, especially whether massing could be pushed toward the north over the loading areas to lessen impact on the Urban Farm.
  
  o South facing plaza design, in particular ground floor connectivity to this new campus area. The east façade has only one entry and is very inactive. Engaging the south plaza area with something like pedagogical elements of the Urban Farm could create integration between teaching, education, and research.
  
  o Further minimizing impact on the Urban Farm, especially in the area where the utility tunnel connects.

- Would it be appropriate to recommend enhanced communication with the Urban Farm (Harper Keeler) and students that are concerned about this project, especially that the project is working on mitigating impacts? Students are not hearing all items the committee is hearing.

- Important that the students and staff who care for the land are in communication.

- Who will be the people communicating between the two groups of CPFM and COD?
• Will the three student representatives working on the COD Urban Farming visioning process be involved with coordinating or collaborating with this project?
• CPC member, Madison Sanders, is one student that is in the Urban Farm visioning process group, and will continue to work on both projects to ensure communication with both groups and the students.
• Clarify if other student organizing committees (outside of COD) have a representation in moving forward with decision making. As the three student representatives are faculty appointed students, is there space for a student appointed representative, in addition to the faculty appointed students, to also be involved in COD conversations? E.g. One idea is some of these student organizing groups, who are voicing significant interest in this project, could also nominate a student representative.
• Anything CPC is advising the COD to do regarding the Urban Farm project is outside of the CPC purview of this decision. However, Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg can take suggestions into consideration and talk to Dean Parr about additional engagement opportunities with students after their visioning process is complete.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:
• Please add the row of Asian Pear trees, that run along the Fine Arts Studios Metalsmithing and Jewelry building to the list of possible trees to save, they are very significant.
• Harper Keeler, COD, Landscape Architecture, Urban Farm Director, is available to work with the design team.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Dehle and Van Den Wymelenberg provided the following clarifications:
• CPFM (Darin Dehle) is available to meet and answer CPC member’s (Philip Speranza) building design questions. Potential site design solutions are still developing as the team is looking forward to future landscape-focused meetings.
• This webpage is available and could be updated as Construction Project and Urban Farm visioning Project progresses: https://urbanfarm.uoregon.edu/about/urban-farm-faq/
• Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg (COD) will serve as liaison with the design team and work to bring in COD departmental leadership. This will include Liska Chan
(incoming Landscape Department head) and Harper Keeler (Urban Farm Director).

- The two projects will continue to overlap:
  - Knight Campus Phase 2 potential mitigation associated with the Urban Farm and other COD activities, and the
  - Urban Farming Future Needs Project, the goal of which is to establish additional outdoor area or additional Urban Farming activity area.

They are separate processes on separate timelines, but overlap and have implications with one another. Goal is to get the Urban Farming visioning process moving as quickly as possible to create the best synergy when those overlaps do happen.

- The three student representatives selected for the COD Urban Farm visioning process was with the June 15th timeline for Dean Parr in mind.

- Initially, new and shifting leadership within COD created a communication gap. However, CPFm and the design team now has very consistent communication with COD moving forward. Meetings are scheduled with COD for landscape design related items, walking the site with contractors to work through solutions that reduce impact to the “Back 40” area, and opportunities to relocate some orchard trees. If by the time construction starts, potential future places for Urban Farm development are identified and located, there is opportunity to be opportunistic for future Urban Farm development. Meetings with Campus Planning, the Knight Campus team, including the design team and contractors, are scheduled to engage with COD and the Urban Farm to work through design elements associated with the various landscape items and construction impacts.

- The line of Asian Pear trees will be added to the list of possible trees to save.

- 7-10 students were nominated by faculty for the Urban Farming visioning process group; final selection includes 3 students.

- Regarding the Urban Farm visioning process, the goal is to submit a proposal to Dean Parr by June 15th. Adding a student to the visioning group now could be poorly timed. However, adding another student after that process as the Urban Farm project progresses could be another opportunity.

**Action:** With 16 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention, the committee agreed that the **Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact Phase 2 Schematic Design** is consistent with the Campus Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following conditions:
1. Work with Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM) to refine the site design, including:
   a. the south plaza design with site furnishings (E.g., for lighting, bike parking, emergency phones, etc.),
   b. the western edge College of Design (COD) coordination with the Kiln Shed and Urban Farm,
   c. the north edge screening of the loading dock location, and
   d. the eastern roadway (Riverfront Parkway) review of vehicular drop off / pick up.

2. Continue working with the College of Design (COD) to:
   a. refine the site design along the western edge,
   b. address Urban Farm activities affected by construction impacts,
   c. continue to make efforts to minimize impacts to the Urban Farm, and
   d. define replacement and siting opportunities for potentially displaced Urban Farm activities in conjunction with the COD Urban Farm process.