



April 22, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the April 16, 2019 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (CPC chair), Mark Donofrio, George Evans, Emily Fenster, Kassy Fisher, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Krista McGuire, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Charles Brucker, Emily Eng, Allen Hancock, Brent Harrison, Lindsey Hayward, Josh Kashinsky, Jeanie Lai, Chesley Lindsey, Bill Madden, Gene Mowery, Aaron Olsen, Ben Prah, Matt Roberts, Bitty Roy, Sterling Rung

CPC Agenda:

1. Classroom and Office Building Project - Check-in Meeting

Background: CPC staff introduced the project and reminded the committee that they discussed this project at their January 8, 2019 meeting. She reviewed the Campus Planning Requirements diagram as well as conditions of approval and comments from previous meetings.

Jeanie Lai (Bora Architects), Sterling Rung (Place Landscape Architects) and Charles Brucker (Place Landscape Architects) described the progress of the project to date (as presented), which is approximately 50% through Schematic Design.

Building design options are currently being explored for providing additional egress (and potentially access) along the western facade of the building. These options include:

- Aligning the full western facade with Friendly Hall;
- Aligning most of the western facade with Friendly, but providing a pedestrian path to Johnson Lane axis underneath the upper floors; or

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

- Aligning the upper floors with Friendly Hall, but recessing the entire ground floor on the western facade to provide pedestrian access along the full length of the building on that side.

There is an ongoing effort to preserve trees on the site. However, the Sitka Spruce on the north edge of the site, which had been identified as the top priority for preservation was recently discovered to have extensive internal decay. This makes it an unsuitable candidate for preservation. As a result, the design team will be shifting the focus of tree preservation to other significant trees on the site and will be investigating ways to adjust the building location on the site to achieve this goal.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- The treatment of the porch is very important. The idea of the upper and lower porch is strong and works well with the 13th Avenue Study's ideas.
- There is a high volume of pedestrian traffic moving diagonally across the northeast corner of the site from the EMU. Consider ways to accommodate this desire line.
- Consider planting native species, particularly because of the presence of the Environmental Studies program in the building.
- Seating walls or other functional landscape elements should also be used to protect trees and landscaped areas.
- Carefully assess the amount of seating provided so that this project adds to the amenities at the EMU but does not detract or duplicate what is provided.
- Define the location of utilities, transformers, trash enclosures and other service functions. Ensure that these elements are considered as essential programmatic elements and are sited appropriately.
- The building is very close to University Street. Consider appropriate ways to border on the street.
- There is an opportunity to engage the students in research and experimental learning in the landscape around the building. Perhaps engage with a faculty subcommittee to help inform the plant palette. Also consider a green roof.
- Fully assess the safety of large volumes of pedestrians exiting the building on the west, particularly when considering cars entering and exiting the parking lot on that side of the building.

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

- The timeline for this building is at least partially dependent on demand related to increased enrollment and fundraising. The project will go through schematic design and the team will generate some renderings that will be used to help raise philanthropic donations.
- The goal is to make all entries to the building fully accessible if at all possible.

- The design team is thinking about ways to help direct pedestrian traffic with landscaped elements.

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. PeaceHealth Bike Share - Additional Bike Station Request

Background: Josh Kashinsky (Transportation Services) stated that bike share is doing very well and has added a number of stations around Eugene to meet demonstrated demand. Data shows the area north of the railroad tracks is a place where people park bike share bikes currently, but there are no racks. The area proposed for the new station is already paved and the access road is oversized for the occasional service or police vehicle that comes through. This proposal would put the bike rack in the same area as the existing median, in a paved area that would not disrupt existing uses. It would bring an element of alternative modes of transportation to an environment originally designed for cars. The bike rack and signage would be the same as other areas of campus.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- Consider adding a UO standard bike rack in the area as well.

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

- Traffic on the street is infrequent and very light (occasional service/police vehicle)
- The Recreation Field Location Options Study must be completed (per President Schill's letter in response to the Senate Resolution) before the Campus Plan amendment incorporating the North Campus area into the Campus Plan can begin.

Action: The CPC agreed unanimously that the additional bike share station location is appropriate and recommended to the president that it be accepted as proposed.

3. Recreation Field Location Options Study - Update

Background: Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) gave some background information on this agenda item and reminded the committee that a CPC sub-group has been appointed and has already met to review the information presented at this meeting. Topics covered included the evaluation of sites for recreation fields based on Level One Criteria, confirmation of which sites merit further study, and review of proposed Level Two Criteria (as presented). Feedback from the sub-group was incorporated into this presentation.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- Field 1 and 2 will shrink in size after the Hayward Field Project is completed. This may affect their ability to accommodate certain activities and those functions may need to be hosted at a different location (note: for club sports, this need existed prior to the initiation of the Hayward Field project).
- A member stated that it seems there is a need for fields currently, given the limited functions of the existing fields and the maintenance challenges of the natural turf fields.
- A guest from PE/Rec stated that with the current enrollment (which is lower than it has been in recent years) the basic needs of Intramural Sports and Recreation are being met. The available facilities are not meeting the needs of Club Sports, which has to go off-campus to accommodate the current demand for particular functions.
- The Autzen parking lot and tennis court locations do not seem to warrant further study because there are current, necessary functions that use the space.

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

- This study is not assessing the need to provide new fields now. It is assessing how a future need might be accommodated.
- The size of the fields being used to do this Level One analysis is equivalent to Field 2 because that allows for a reasonable range of uses.
- In the Glenwood area, it seems very unlikely that rezoning would be possible, given that the Glenwood Refinement Plan has only recently been completed. In addition, the Metro Plan is in alignment with the Glenwood Refinement Plan, so that makes a successful rezoning application even less likely. This will be verified.
- It is not recommended that the Romania site be studied any further because of the trajectory of the current development proposal. However, a note will be included in the final report of this study, indicating that this site was eliminated from further consideration because of this development proposal.
- Level One Criteria are a baseline set of evaluations designed to balance the need to keep location options open, while not expending resources studying unrealistic sites.
- No project involving the placement of recreation fields in North Campus could begin until the Campus Plan is amended to incorporate that area.
- It is unrealistic to include Hayward Field in this study as a potential location for recreation fields. There is no space to accommodate the fields at this site.
- Level Two Criteria will examine existing uses (including environmental functions), whether those uses could be displaced, and high-level implications of those displacements.
- The goal is to complete this study to the degree possible before the end of the spring term in order to accommodate the schedules of faculty and students who may not be on campus during the summer.

Action: No formal action was requested.