



November 3, 2022

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the November 1, 2022 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Deborah Butler, Liska Chan, Emily Eng,  
Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Cass Moseley, Eric Owens, Janet Rose,  
Daniel Rosenburg, Madison Sanders, Cathy Soutar, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Bob Choquette (PPPM),  
Lindsey Hayward (Office of the Provost), Luke Helm (CPFM),  
Carrie McCurdy (Human Physiology), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning),  
Matt Roberts (University Advancement),  
Cami Thompson (University Advancement),  
Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg (College of Design)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. Campus Planning Committee – Chair Election

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

Dean Livelybrooks nominated Ken Kato, and Cathy Soutar self-nominated, to serve as the next term's 2022-2023 chair.

Members thanked Dean Livelybrooks for his exceptional years of committee service and as chair of the Campus Planning Committee.

Action: With 9 in favor, the committee agreed to elect Ken Kato as chair of the 2022-2023 Campus Planning Committee.

## **2. Urban Farm Program Expansion – Meeting One**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to hold Meeting One for the Urban Farm Expansion Program.

As part of Meeting One (further described in the *Campus Plan* on page 27), the committee was asked to complete the following tasks:

- Site Selection – Review the proposed site and make a site recommendation.
- User Group – Review the proposed user group representation and provide comments to the CPC chair, who appoints group members (refer to page 28 of the *Campus Plan* for more information about user groups).
- Key Principles and Patterns – Identify key principles, patterns, and other relevant 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.

CPC staff reviewed details of the *Campus Plan* principles and patterns applicable to this project and the proposed user group composition.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed *Campus Plan* Principle 4, Outdoor Classrooms (refer to page 58 of the *Campus Plan* for more information about Outdoor Classrooms). In addition, the project's site selection process and criteria, key considerations for each site, including the proposed site (Site A), and Campus Planning requirements were reviewed.

### Discussion:

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

#### **Site selection**

- Which road provides access to Site A?
- Is there a Right-of-Way (ROW) or easement for the railroad? Consider railroad impacts on Site A.

- There is a distance requirement from the centerline of the railroad that applies to structures.
- Does the railroad track berm impede solar access of Site A?
- Site A aligns with the intent of the *Campus Plan* Amendment North of Franklin Boulevard and honors previous conversations and input received from that process.
- Members support Site A.
- Placing the Urban Farm Expansion at Site A is a great contribution to the riverfront.
- Member indicates locating the Urban Farm Expansion on Site B would contribute to the graceful edge of East Campus. This site should continue to be considered for Urban Farm type activities in the future.
- Urban farming typically moves; while some of the other sites (other than Site A) may not meet the current Urban Farm Program Expansion site selection criteria, these sites hold potential for future Urban Farm activities.
- Explore future possibilities for the other sites that could leverage additional programs on campus, E.g., social justice and environmental initiatives.
- Site A is three times the size of the current Urban Farm; there is benefit of additional space to the existing Urban Farm.
- Regarding allowable *Campus Plan* densities, is the entire site open for potential future development?
- Will the programming of the farm use all 64,000 square feet of Site A?

### **Proposed User Groups**

- Should a neighbor of the project, E.g., the research greenhouses, be added to the user group composition?
- Consider that the Urban Farm is a user of the greenhouses.
- Consider the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation (OVPRI) as a proposed user group neighbor representative.

The following is a summary of comments from guests:

- Given the proximity of Site A to the Willamette River, consider consulting with a Willamette River or Willamette River Natural Area representative to provide additional project feedback.
- UO Community Relations can help with reaching out to Union Pacific Railroad as needed for project input.

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

### Site selection

- Riverfront Parkway and a gravel service drive provide access to Site A.
- There are no known ROW or easements on the property of Site A (railroad is on its own property); the project will verify any easements or access requirements as design proceeds.
- The railroad is at or near grade at Site A; there is good solar access.
- The *Campus Plan* allowable densities identified for the entire Willamette Design Area includes the total design area east of Site A. There is approximately 10,000 square feet of building coverage (footprint) available for Site A.
- The programming of the Urban Farm Expansion at Site A will be studied as part of the future design process.

### Proposed User Groups

- Focus groups, E.g., with a Willamette River representative and OVPRI, will be engaged in the future as the project design and planning proceeds.

### Action:

#### Site selection

With 12 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that Site A for the Urban Farm Program Expansion is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

#### Proposed User Groups and Campus Plan Requirements

With 12 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed Urban Farm Program Project User Group and *Campus Plan* Requirements are consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that they be approved with the following condition:

- 1.) Work with the CPC chair to select a neighbor representative for the proposed User Group.