



November 11, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 30, 2020 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Diana Libuda, Joshua Skov, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), George Bleekman (CPFM), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Tim Gallagher (Gallagher Designs), Brent Harrison (PE & Rec), Jen Miley (Housing), Lorri Nelson (Rowel Brokaw), Jamie Moffitt (Fin & Admin), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Greg Ottoman (Housing), Jim Petsche (Hoffman Construction), Ben Prahl (EMU), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), John Rowell (Rowell Brokaw), Devon Shea (Athletics), Carlo Yozzo (Housing)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Campus Planning Committee – New Member Welcome

Background: Jamie Moffitt (Vice President of Finance and Administration) welcomed the 2020-2021 committee members and gave a brief overview of the importance of the work done by the CPC. For the benefit of new members, staff reviewed project highlights that the CPC has seen in the past year and projected potential future projects that the CPC may review in the coming year. New members have received their CPC orientations individually prior to this meeting. Staff also reviewed the CPC meeting scheduling for 2020-2021 and the Construction Projects Planning Process Flow Chart for projects in Tracks A, B, and C (page 17 of the *Campus Plan*).

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

- Track A projects that are very minor (very limited public view or change) do not require CPC review. However, staff helps facilitate these changes and all changes are subject to the *Campus Plan*.
- There are essentially four types of projects: 1.) Track A, which are relatively small, for example, campus standard trash can design; 2. & 3.) Track B, which includes major remodel projects, such as Huestis Hall, or new buildings; and 4.) Track C projects, such as Hayward Field. More time is typically spent reviewing new buildings than remodels, and Track B requires more review time than Track A projects. During Track C review, feedback is given to the UO President, however the CPC takes no action. Many recommendations are to approve, approve with conditions, do not approve, or wait until later. The final decision resides with the UO President.
- The CPC approves campus standard designs for landscape fixtures such as lighting and trash cans. Subsequent installations do not have to be reviewed by the CPC, unless there is a proposal for a change that is not standard.
- The CPC has the opportunity to contribute to innovate work, for example, *Campus Plan* Principle 10: Sustainable Development. The work that has been completed in defining this principle is nationally recognized as being innovative and forward thinking.

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

## **2. Campus Plan Amendment: Sub-area 36 of the East Campus Design Area – Public Hearing and Action**

**Background:** CPC staff introduced the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing. Staff noted that committee action would occur after the third agenda item.

Campus Planning Senior Planner, Emily Eng, reviewed the proposed amendment to the *Campus Plan* to increase the allowed density in sub-area 36 of the East Campus Design Area and to allow for construction of the Housing Storage Facility. Materials were presented as described in the meeting mailing and in the Summary of the Proposed *Campus Plan* Amendment. Eng clarified that this portion of the presentation and discussion did not pertain to the design of the Housing Storage Facility and the public hearing was to begin immediately following the presentation.

Eng also noted that this amendment proposes an incremental solution to allow the Housing Storage Facility to be built, including a possible small improvement to the Central Kitchen, which would enclose of the Central Kitchen loading dock. The entire East Campus Design Area will be reassessed as a whole in the future, and would require a City of Eugene code amendment.

**Public Hearing:**

Public guests were invited to write their name in the chat or raise their virtual hand 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.

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

- Given the challenges of storage needs campus wide and the uncertain future and timeline of the Romania Warehouse project, are we missing an opportunity to accommodate a larger need with this project's limited scope?
- This project site was chosen at the previous CPC Meeting 1. It is located interior to the block and out of public view, is an appropriate place to put this sort of facility, and the alley adjacent to the Central Kitchen and this site helps concentrate truck traffic in the area.
- The need for a larger UO general storage facility is acknowledged. This is not a standard storage facility, as it is associated with the specific and immediate needs of Housing. The analysis of how to accommodate this need was conducted during the site selection process.
- Transitioning to the third agenda item, schematic design review for this project, will help answer questions regarding how the proposed density change would physically appear.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Jen Miley, Director of Housing Capital Construction, provided the following clarifications:

- There is a need for storage in close proximity to adjacent properties and the ability to access storage on a daily basis. The Romania location would add increased costs to Housing's operations if extra time is spent traveling back and forth to retrieve equipment out of storage. This was considered during the site selection process.

- The adjacency is not just required for storage functions, but also for grounds and shop functions to support the adjacent properties.

**Action:** With 11 in favor the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed *Campus Plan Amendment: Sub-area 36 of the East Campus Design Area* is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

### 3. Housing Storage Building Project – Schematic Design Review

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

Campus Planning Senior Planner, Emily Eng, reviewed the key campus planning requirements diagram and CPC considerations from Meeting 1 for this project. Eng noted, regarding the consideration for the user group COD representative, it was determined that a COD representative would not be pursued because of the small scale of the project.

Jen Miley, Director of Housing Capital Construction, gave a brief overview of the project purpose.

Chis Andrejko, Architect with Rowell Brokaw, presented the project schematic design as described in the meeting mailing materials. He shared an updated site plan and building elevations, fencing type considerations, and addressed considerations from CPC meeting 1.

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

- If fencing is needed, consider the campus standard first, with some kind of screening material if needed.
- If lighting is needed, carefully address any glare or spill especially towards the adjacent residential uses.
- As this site is seen as a transition area, are there any other areas on campus similar to this project that could serve as examples, to understand how to treat this space?

- The Central Kitchen site is an example of a similar transition area. However, the Housing Storage site is not adjacent to a lower density residential zone like the Central Kitchen project. The UO owns all adjacent residential lots 1-3, as well as the entire block further east. In the future, any need to transition to lower density residential zoning would occur a block east of this site.
- The neighbor to the north of this site is supportive of UO development.
- Additional examples of density transition areas are the Moss Street Children's Center, and the Graduate Village area.
- The goal is to place this small scale single story structure in a location that is not going to immediately impede larger scale institutional development.
- There is support for the building design. It will function operationally and transition nicely with minimal impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.
- Has there been a study about how this will impact catering and conference services and their operations in the Central Kitchen? Regarding truck traffic and the amount of parking in that area, could there be future conflicts of operations?
- Catering and conference services would find this project neutral to helpful. There are times when additional storage is needed for overflow space and this project will provide that. There is no impediment or concerns related to Central Kitchen staff.
- There is one neighbor to the south of the site that may require additional communication.
- Is there a rendering or explanation of the metal finish material regarding color, reflectivity, profile and durability?
- The use of proposed different materials and allowing for interior natural lighting is encouraging.
- Would adding to an existing structure, rather than building a new small service building, be a more appropriate use of campus land? Has an addition to the Central Kitchen been considered? [*Note: Sent in advance of the meeting by an absent member*]
- There were many considerations during the site selection process, which can be provided as additional background information if needed.
- Carefully consider the color and finish of materials to minimize visual impact.
- What is the sustainable design perspective? Any consideration for both campus wide sustainable wide goals and community interest? Has there been any discussion of a living or green roof on this structure?
- Where does the policy for making the building solar ready reside?

- The Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) is the overarching principle addressing sustainability. There is no specific policy that requires solar; the requirement is to meet the OMSD energy efficiency standard. It is not likely feasible for this project to incorporate solar due to its small scale. Also, the site is potentially a future development site.

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

- Which direction does the building roof slope?
- The color and non-reflective materials is important. For example, consider black with cedar wood around doors to compliment the facility. There is support for siting most of the building activity on the north portion of the site.
- Regarding the neighbor to the south, Matt Roberts will reach out and ensure they've been notified regarding this construction project. Previously, increased activity at the SW corner of the site has raised the neighbor's concern.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Andrejko, Eng, and Miley provided the following clarifications:

- The project team has discussed building color and material options. A simple, vertical, metal panel profile, with a neutral color is being considered. These materials will be selected with samples during design development. Efficient use of materials will allow differentiation in the facade and provide natural light into the exterior storage space areas.
- The roof rises toward the alley side of the building (west).
- The neighbor to the south (across the alley) has not yet been contacted.
- There is no space available near the Central Kitchen to locate this size of a project without losing the drive access, which is part of the truck circulation route to the north.
- A site immediately to the north of the Central Kitchen was considered during the site selection process, however, it was not a large enough site to accommodate the storage building. The building would have to be separated into two smaller buildings on either side of the alley to fit that location.
- A green roof on the structure was not considered, primarily, as that would put this into a different building code class of buildings. Part of sustainability is keeping operations tight and minimizing travel around, or to, campus to perform the operations out of this building.

- Storm water will be treated on-site as an opportunity to showcase sustainability. There are also opportunities for daylighting part of the project's interior space. The use of the existing truck pull through and loading zone avoids creating additional hardscape areas to accommodate that function. Additionally, this type of building is a low energy use type of building.

**Action:** With 11 in favor the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed **Housing Storage Building Project Schematic Design** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. If fencing is needed, first consider using campus standard fencing.
2. If lighting is needed, carefully address any glare or spillover light, especially towards the adjacent residential uses.
3. Engage and communicate project information with the neighbor and/or renters to the south of the property area.

#### **4. Hayward Field Renovation Project “O” Sculpture Schematic Design – Track C Review and Comment**

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

Michael Harwood, Assoc. Vice President of CPFM and University Architect, presented the proposed project schematic design materials.

Tim Gallagher, project designer from Gallagher Designs, described specific details of the sculpture's function and the artistic reasoning guiding the design.

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

- There is enthusiasm for this design and it will be an attractive addition to campus.
- Will this design be compatible with future events in the area?
- This project provides the benefit of reclaiming the hillside location that has been previously neglected and unmaintained. It is an opportunity to give a focus and

purpose to the area and will also serve as a great backdrop for events in the area. It does not impact the sidewalk, fire lane, or recreational field operations.

- Regarding universal access, please carefully consider the protrusion hazard of the sculpture by including tactile markings on the ground, or some kind of physical change, for those who are visually impaired.
- There is support for the sculpture; it looks attractive, and will be an attractive space for people to gather.
- The CPC reviewed the earlier designs of Hayward and provided input and the design team responded to CPC comments. As a Tract C project, the final design was not formally reviewed.
- It is recognized that this location is a potential future expansion area for the Indoor Student Tennis Center to the west. In the future, if that project moves forward, it could affect this site and require a relocation of the sculpture.
- The sculpture is designed to be low maintenance and difficult to climb. UOPD will frequent the area as needed. Annual maintenance responsibilities are being considered by CPFM and Athletics. Longer term maintenance issues that come forward will be managed by Athletics.
- There is support for the sculpture and it will be a nice addition to the area.

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

- Is this the only occasion on which the CPC has been asked to comment on the Hayward Field project since its inception? There is support for the CPC to provide comments on this project during all stages.
- The sculpture is beautiful and will provide photo opportunities.
- What department will manage maintenance of the structure and lighting control? If a problem with vandalism develops, who will manage safety and maintenance in this area?
- Please communicate with PE & Rec the construction timing and how that might affect daily programming in the area.

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

- The walkway will remain accessible during events. If the sculpture becomes popular during events, additional designated space may be needed. On a daily basis, this will be a useful space.

- There has been discussion and consideration for providing physical markers required to ensure universal access.

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

Please contact this office if you have questions.