



June 17, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the June 8, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Liska Chan, Zak Gosa-Lewis, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Terry McQuilkin, Kevin Reed, Daniel Rosenberg, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Harper Keeler (COD), Jeff Madsen (CPFM), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Carl Sherwood (Robertson Sherwood Architects), Matt Roberts (University Advancement)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Thermal Energy Storage Tank Project – Addition to the Chilled Water Plant: Schematic Design Review

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials and reviewed the relevant key Campus Plan principles and patterns applicable to the project.

The purpose of this item was to review the proposed schematic design for the Thermal Energy Storage Tank Project – Addition to the Chilled Water Plant. As described in the project description, the building square footage on campus has outpaced the assumptions of 13 years ago when the university's Chilled Water Plant was designed. As a result, the university will soon be running out of capacity to produce enough chilled water at a temperature to adequately meet cooling demands. The project proposes to address the increased demand and maintain system resiliency by adding a three million gallon thermal energy storage tank (TES) adjacent to the existing Chilled Water Plant.

The tank will be about 100 feet in diameter with a height around that of the existing Chilled Water Plant building cooling towers. The tank will be connected directly to the Chilled Water Plant with piping high above ground. The project is anticipated to be complete by Spring 2022.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning), reviewed the key Campus Planning requirements for the project and key applicable comments from the March 5, 2021 CPC meeting.

Jeff Madsen (CPFM), reviewed the project location, existing site elements, projected future views of the tank location from various different viewpoints in the surrounding area, and potential vegetative screening options. Opportunities and constraints of the tank siting, location and design were also shared.

#### Discussion:

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

- Expected lifespan of this facility; how does this fit in with the fifty year plan for this area of campus?
- How different will the views be during all seasons, especially as viewed from Franklin Blvd.?
- Support for screening with evergreen trees.
- Is burying the pipe an option to help reduce costs?
- Will mature trees be planted?
- The muted tank color makes sense, but does color selection contribute to tank heat?
- Appreciation for focus on energy savings. Purpose of the tank is to provide net energy savings; this is the goal of *Campus Plan* Principle 10.
- Appreciation for the different views and renderings.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Madsen, Eng, Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), and Carl Sherwood (Robertson Sherwood Architects), provided the following clarifications:

- This facility has a fifty year lifespan.
- Project is consistent with the fifty year plans for the area north of Franklin Blvd. Facilities functions will move west of Onyx St. to allow for future academic and research development east of Onyx St. This project does not impede future development.

- The CPFM area is more exposed during winter as leaves are lost from deciduous trees along the Millrace. There are some existing evergreen trees in the area. New plantings will add layers of vegetation and could be evergreens.
- Evergreen trees are shown in the images and would complement the final color selection of the tank. Project team will consider tree images in winter.
- Burying tank was considered, however, this would not provide gains in efficiency because it would still require pumping the water.
- Proposed trees are standard nursery stock; they will take time to reach full growth (about 5-10 years).
- Tank will be designed for 42 degree water; includes 12” thick concrete walls with insulation coating on the inside of the walls. Tank color will not affect the water temperature.

Action: With 11 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed schematic design of the **Thermal Energy Storage Tank Project – Addition to the Chilled Water Plant** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

1. When planting new trees for visual screening of the Thermal Energy Storage Tank, consider evergreen tree species.

## 2. ***Campus Plan* Amendment: Principle 1: Process and Participation, Design Advisory Board (DAB) description – Continued Final Draft Review and Action**

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The purpose of this agenda item was to continue review of the final draft *Campus Plan* Amendment to integrate the university’s Design Advisory Board (DAB) process into the *Campus Plan* based upon current practice. Staff shared that this amendment will update Campus Plan Principle 1: Process and Participation, which describes participants in the design process for construction projects. Also, staff shared information regarding an additional proposed change to the amendment regarding the DAB process. Staff summarized the previous May 28, 2021 CPC meeting member comments.

### Discussion:

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

- This amendment is directly tied to the University Architect role; please share the process from its viewpoint.
- The intent of the DAB is a robust process, in addition to the planning role of the CPC, and to provide in-depth detailed architectural review. For example, for the Thermal Energy Storage Tank Project, the DAB is reviewing color samples onsite. DAB is a group of experts that help improve projects within the constraints of existing schedules and budgets. There are no added project costs; their time is paid for by the University Architect.
- Previous DAB participants have included, for example, UO Architects from the College of Design, a University of California San Diego architect, and local Oregon architects.
- Purpose of DAB is not being questioned; however, is it necessary to memorialize this in the *Campus Plan* which results in a *Campus Plan* amendment?
- There are incongruities between added Tracks A, B, and C language and University Architect having the flexibility to decide whether a project is subject to review or not. Provide more flexible DAB language.
- Members support making the DAB description language more flexible. Reference purpose, intent and relationship to the CPC. Keep wording simple.
- If the University Architect can't be at a DAB meeting, is there someone from DAB who could speak for that board at CPC meetings or provide a report?
- If in the future DAB doesn't serve the university well, there can be an amendment; the *Campus Plan* is a working document. E.g CPFM did not exist in the *Campus Plan* up until five years ago because it didn't exist (as it does today).
- Members shared rewording iterations of the amendment language. Other members supported the iterations.
- A member suggested listing examples of the type of projects UA (University Architect) would bring in DAB to review, such as Tracks A and B. For example, during the Tykeson Hall project in the heart of campus, the UA brought in the DAB to advise regarding the construction of this important building for the campus. It is important for the UA to bring in DAB on high profile projects.
- Members do not support listing Tracks A and B as examples.
- Landscape Architecture reference is intentional.
- Would the most recent change adding the sentence regarding Track C be excluded?
- CPC typically does not advise the President on Track C.
- UA does have some input on Track C; UA chooses to engage and influence as appropriate or needed.

Action: With 12 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed ***Campus Plan Amendment: Principle 1: Process and Participation, Design Advisory Board (DAB) description*** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

1. Revise the proposed language as follows: “The purpose of the DAB is to review architectural details and offer recommendations on the building architecture and landscape architecture to the University Architect to improve the project’s design. ~~The DAB would not typically comment on the program.~~ The DAB process is established and managed by the University Architect (UA) who serves as the Board chair and determines which projects are subject to review. Membership is determined by the University Architect but must consist of University of Oregon and non-University of Oregon experts. A project is typically reviewed a number of times, during schematic design and design development at the discretion of the University Architect. ~~The DAB is Advisory to the University Architect & AVP for CPFM. This process applies to all Track A and Track B projects that are new structures, additions, or have an impact on the building exterior. A project is typically reviewed a minimum of two times (during the late Schematic Design phase and during the Design Development phase) based upon size and complexity. Membership consists of two UO faculty nominations by the Head of the School of Architecture & Environment (one architect and one landscape architect) and two external experts (practicing architect/landscape architect and member of a peer university’s design staff— active or retired). The University Architect & AVP for CPFM serves as the Board chair, and has the flexibility to determine which projects are subject to review, as well as board membership.~~”