November 13, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Eleni Tsivitzi, Campus Planning
       Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: Record of the November 5, 2019 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), George Evans, Emily Fenster, Kassy Fisher,
           Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Shawn Kahl,
           Diana Libuda, Terry McQuilkin, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

Staff: Eleni Tsivitzi (Campus Planning)

Guests: Sam Alig, John Anderson, Jane Brubaker, Emily Eng, Luke Helm, Aaron Olsen,
        David Reesor, Matt Roberts

CPC Agenda:

1. Campus Planning Committee – New Member Welcome and Chair Election

   Background: Jaime Moffitt (Vice President of Finance and Administration) welcomed the 2019-20 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 projects 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 orientations, but staff also offered a refresher of the new member orientation for any returning members who might be interested. Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) mentioned that there will be an open house related to the Recreation Field Location Options Study (which the CPC reviewed in the 2018-19 year) on November 21, 2019 and invited all present to attend and provide their feedback.

   The CPC chair announced to the committee that CPC staff will be leaving the university and thanked her for her service. CPC staff thanked the chair and all of the committee for the work they have done together and for all of their support.

   CPC staff stated the election of a new chair was also necessary as Dean Livelybrooks has served the maximum number of consecutive terms. She thanked him for his exceptional service and reminded the committee that the chair is typically either a member who will be
serving his/her second term or a new member who has previously served on the committee.

Staff asked committee members for nominations for the 2018-19 Campus Planning Committee chair. Livelybrooks had noted that he thought Ken Kato would be a good CPC chair and Kato indicated his willingness to serve as chair for the 2019-20 year.

**Action:** The committee agreed unanimously to elect Ken Kato as chair of the 2019-20 Campus Planning Committee.

### 2. Transportation Services – Strategic Overview

**Background:** CPC staff introduced the agenda item and David Reesor (Transportation Services) gave an overview of the strategic initiatives that have been identified as a blueprint for the department’s vision and mission in the coming years (per the PowerPoint presentation).

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

- UOPD currently runs three shuttles fairly independently from one another. Consider ways to make this service more of a cohesive whole.
- The access shuttle is another very important program which enables students, faculty, and staff to get to and from campus.
- At the Knight Library, bike parking spaces are often full and people frequently lock their bikes to railings.
- What is the conduit for communication and outreach that Transportation Services will use in the future? How can communications improve?
- Ensure that the *Campus Plan* is aligned with the planning for Transportation Services.

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

- The increase in demand for parking permits for faculty, staff, and students in recent years may be related to gas and/or housing prices.
- With the development of the Romania lot, 180 parking spaces will be lost. Transportation services was able to fund two additional floors of the Millrace Drive Parking Garage to make up for some of the parking supply loss across campus.
- All available state or federal funding (which could be a way to help fund transportation improvements at the UO) flows through the Metropolitan Planning Organization. The UO does not currently have a seat at that table yet, but is making an effort to be part of the conversation.
- Compared to peer institutions, the UO is more constrained on parking.
- Parking rates at the UO are below market rates for the Eugene area.
- Both a Park and Ride and a Park and Bike have been established at Autzen Stadium. Reesor has also met with Peace Health Rides on-site to discuss adding a bike share station at that location to provide commuters with another option for biking into campus.
• Transportation Services will be making a more comprehensive study of the location and types of bike parking which are available. This will likely be a part of a future transportation master plan project.
• Transportation Services will be hosting a workshop with its counterparts at other institutions to share ideas in the near future.

Action: No formal action was requested.

3. New University Parking Lot – Site Selection

Background: CPC staff introduced the agenda item and Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) gave an overview of the site selection process and criteria for evaluating each of the three sites under consideration (per the PowerPoint presentation). This new university parking lot is a project initiated by Transportation Services to construct 75-120 new parking spaces to increase capacity for university permit holders and allow for greater flexibility. Ideally the new parking spaces will be available for use in the fall of 2020.

The recommendation was that the former ODOT site (Site A) be confirmed as the preferred site for the new university parking lot based on the evaluation of each of the sites using the stated criteria.

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:
• There was a great deal of discussion about a site mentioned in the May 31, 2019 CPC meeting about the Recreation Field Location Options Study (On-Campus Site E). Site E is near the ODOT site (which was identified as the preferred site for the new parking lot). Members expressed concern about whether the use of the ODOT site as a parking lot now might preclude the possibility of using On-Campus Site E for recreation fields in the future.
• Current planning should take into consideration projections of facilities that the university may need in the future.
• Although there has been a study of potential sites to be used for recreation fields in the future, there is not an immediate identified need, or funding available for the construction of these fields at this time.
• The Hayward Field Project will affect some of the existing fields (one field will be 10-feet narrower, the other will be 15-feet narrower). A member stated that there is some urgency to find some replacement fields. Students are currently playing in a number of different locations which are not ideal.
• There is no plan from PE/Rec to raise funds to build additional recreation fields at this time even though there is demand for recreation fields. The construction of new recreation fields is not in the university's 10-year Capital Plan.
• Constructing new recreation fields near existing fields seems to make sense. On-Campus Site E is not adjacent to existing fields.
• Consider how the City of Eugene's plans for Franklin Boulevard and the development of
the Romania property could affect the use of the ODOT site as a parking lot.

- It seems like the former ODOT site could operate as a Park and Ride, similar to the way Autzen parking is operating now.
- Are there set-backs on the 901 Franklin site related to its proximity to the Millrace?
- Is the university considering a temporary parking lot similar to a recent project undertaken by the City of Eugene?
- Could the demand for parking spaces be solved by a private public partnership in about three years?

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

- Construction of a parking structure on Site B: 901 Franklin, is limited by land use code.
- The former ODOT site seems like a low-risk investment because it is unlikely to be displaced in the short term.
- The lot at 901 Franklin is currently a surface lot being leased out to a parking management company. The spots are likely being used by contractors, residents of the nearby student housing building, and faculty members. There is a strong possibility that constructing the new parking lot on this site would generate even greater demand for UO permits. This would be compounded by the loss of parking spaces at this site during the construction of a new lot in that location due to required upgrades to meet current landscaping and stormwater standards.
- A guest has been in contact with colleagues at the city who use the temporary parking lot. They have stated that the temporary parking lot is not all it was intended to be and that the performance of the geo-textile is not as robust as was expected.

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

- There will be an open house related to the Recreation Field Location Options Study on November 21, 2019 and Olsen invited all present to attend and provide their feedback.
- Constructing a parking lot at the former ODOT site will not preclude the possibility of considering Site E for recreation fields in the future.
- It is financially infeasible for this project to fund an underground parking lot.
- An above-ground, structured parking lot would cost approximately five times as much as a surface lot.
- The temporary lot installed by the City of Eugene involved the use of a geo-textile with a life-span of three to four years at a cost of approximately $300,000. This new university parking lot is intended to have a longer period of use than this geo-textile could accommodate.
- A gravel parking lot would probably not be permitted because of air quality regulations.
- Delaying action at this meeting would delay site surveys and geotechnical reviews. This will impact the schedule for design work. This may or may not affect the completion of construction of the new parking lot in the desired timeframe.

**Action:** The committee agreed with eight members in favor and one abstention to delay action until a future meeting. At that time, the committee would like to see the parking site
selection information concurrently with any relevant information from the Recreation Field Location Options Study