



November 8, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 12, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Claessa Davis, Kassy Fisher, Michael Griffel, Michael Hardwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Kevin Reed, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Tim Allenbaugh (CPFM), Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Anna Van Asperdt (Landscape Architecture), Renee Benoit (Campus Planning), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Ignacio Lopez Buson (Landscape Architecture), Darin Dehle (CPFM), Aric Duhrkoop-Galas (Landscape Architecture), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Harper Keeler (Landscape Architecture), Gene Mowry (CPFM), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Jenna Shope (CPFM), Denise Stewart (CPFM), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), Cami Thompson (University Advancement)

## CPC Agenda

CPC staff shared an update that the CPC preferred meeting format survey, previously emailed to members, is still available and encouraged members to provide their response.

The CPC chair shared information about the CPC member experience serving as a member on a user-group.

### 1. Campus Planning Committee – Chair Election

Background: CPC staff reviewed the process for electing a new chair as described in the meeting mailing.

Ken Kato nominated Dean Livelybrooks to serve as the next term's 2021-2022 chair. Members thanked Dean for his continued service as chair for the upcoming year.

Action: With 9 in favor, the committee agreed unanimously to elect Dean Livelybrooks as chair of the 2021-2022 Campus Planning Committee.

## **2. Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact (KCASI) Phase 2 – Conceptual Design / Progress Check-in**

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item, as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns. The purpose of this agenda item was to hold a conceptual design / progress check-in regarding the Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact (KCASI) Phase 2.

As described in the project description, KCASI Phase 2 is envisioned as a research building that is approximately 175,000 GSF, standing 4 stories above grade, with a basement. The proposed 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.

The Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact is concluding the Programming and Conceptual design phase on the proposed 175,000 sf, second building associated with its build out vision. The project is bringing a design update to the Campus Planning Committee in order to help keep the committee informed of the progress and direction the project is taking. This presentation will predominately address overall site context information and the proposed building form.

Darin Dehle (CPFM) provided an overview of the project progress since the April 13, 2021 CPC meeting. This included information regarding the location, building footprint, program and form, and the proposed site development (including the future service road alignment), open space development, connections and opportunities, setbacks and infrastructure, context and constraints, design elements, and Urban Farm solar impacts.

Discussion:

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

- Could any potential bridge across the Millrace also have suspension elements, e.g. similar to the Phase 1 bridge across Franklin Blvd.?
- Support for the green open space concept in this area.
- Will the concept incorporate an east/west pedestrian connection through the building?
- Is there planning for safety regarding a potential large flooding or seismic event in the Millrace and Willamette riparian area?

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

- Guests support the concept plan.
- Concerns about solar impacts on the Urban Farm.
- Is there planning for a potential green corridor from the Millrace Green to the Willamette river?
- How will staging during construction impact the Urban Farm?
- This concept shows the Urban Farm expanding west; expanding to the west is an attractive answer to losing the Urban Farm back forty. Consider that the kiln building is shown without the Urban Farm infrastructure around it, and the Memorial Orchard is shown as removed.
- The agricultural courtyard is a powerful design pattern that defines the space. Within the typology of a productive landscape, the Millrace and Urban Farm become very valuable in terms of landscape ecological services. Celebrate this loudly and show that University of Oregon supports this concept.
- The low point landscape area shown as Urban Farm expansion has only once had water in this low spot.

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

- Design has not started on a potential Millrace bridge crossing.
- There will be impact to the Urban Farm during construction; exploring ways to minimize and mitigate impacts.
- The *Campus Plan* Amendment: North of Franklin Boulevard studied how potential future projects will impact the Urban Farm function. This area has been identified as having future denser development to accommodate growth.

- The connection from the Millrace Green to the Willamette River is the River Walk Axis, which aligns with the pedestrian underpass and the broader north/south designated open space connection in this area.
- User group conceptual design comments included generating pathways that link through the buildings.
- The Millrace Green is a designated open space where the space, feel, and character of this area remain open to possibilities.
- This site is not in a flood zone; the Millrace is a pumped waterway and is not a natural connection to the Willamette River. If the Willamette River water levels are high, it will not flow into the Millrace. The only impact to the Millrace is from stormwater, which is managed through monitoring and control at the Central Power Station. This monitoring and control was installed after the low spot west of the Urban Farm experienced a water event years ago.
- The building will be designed to meet all current seismic codes; no increased seismic concerns in this area. There is bedrock under a portion of this site; the foundation will be very stable.

Action: No action was requested.

### **3. Heritage Project – Meeting One**

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item, as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, and historic preservation information pertaining to the project. The purpose of this agenda item was to hold Meeting One for the Heritage Project.

As described in the project description, the Heritage Project will fully renovate the interiors (which have been substantially altered) and restore the exteriors of historic University Hall and Villard Hall, focusing on eliminating deferred maintenance.

University and Villard Halls are the two founding buildings of the University of Oregon (built in 1876 and 1885 respectively). Together, the buildings are designated a National Historic Landmark site. Only 17 other sites in Oregon have achieved this elevated historic status.

As part of Meeting One (further described in the *Campus Plan* on page 19), the committee was asked to complete the following tasks:

- User Group - Review the proposed user group representation and provide comments to the CPC chair, who appoints group members (refer to page 12 of the *Campus Plan* for more information about user groups).
- Key Principles and Patterns - Identify key principles, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues from the *Campus Plan*.
- Other Campus-wide Opportunities - Identify potential opportunities to address campus-wide needs within the subject area or opportunities to cooperate with other nearby development efforts.

Gene Mowry (CPFM) provided an overview of the project and the pre-design process, target project dates, the intent of the interior and exterior restoration, definition of deferred maintenance, core project issues and goals, and the intended proposed user group composition.

Christine Thompson (Campus Planning) reviewed the key Campus Planning requirements, including information that the project site is a National landmark site, the pedestrian / bike friendly goal and focus for the area between the two buildings (Villard and University Halls), and the importance of protecting historic landscapes.

#### Discussion:

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

- The Site User Group has strong representation from CAS. Consider including a neighboring building representative that expands representation beyond CAS (e.g., COD, Business, or SOJC). Is there a CPC member also from SOJC that could serve as the neighboring building representative?
- CAS, Campus Planning, and CPFM have been working collaboratively on this project.
- Support for the user group composition.
- There are substantial seismic upgrades that will impact the use of the buildings' interior space.
- There are two different program needs between the two buildings and a unique historic landscape component.
- Support for CPC members to serve on a user group.

- The intended use of the space between the two buildings is for the overall University community.
- The project will engage a broader group of individuals (e.g. focus groups) in the area to provide feedback.
- Include students and faculty in focus groups.
- Ensure Transportation Services is engaged.
- Campus Planning has initiated coordination with Transportation Services regarding this project. They will be engaged in the design process as the project progresses.
- Support for transforming the area between the two buildings.

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

- Support for reaching out to SOJC for user group representation.
- There are no current CPC members from SOJC.

Action: With 8 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the **Heritage Project** proposed Project User Group, *Campus Plan* Requirements, and other campus-wide opportunities identified are consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following condition:

1. Consider appointing a neighboring building representative that expands representation beyond CAS (e.g., COD, Business, or SOJC) as a Site User Group representative.