



October 16, 2017

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 10, 2017 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Jane Brubaker, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel,
Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Peter Keyes, Diana Libuda, Josh McCoy,
Kevin Reed, Bitty Roy, Cathy Soutar, Rob Thallon, Christine Thompson,
Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Emily Eng, Clark Hansen, Harper Keeler, Jeff Madsen, Martina Oxoby

CPC Agenda:

1. Knight Campus - Update

Background: Mike Harwood updated the Campus Planning Committee on the progress of the Knight Campus Project since the last meeting. Schematic design is wrapping up and cost estimates are being generated and vetted.

The Knight Campus project team has partnered with the College of Design on a landscape architecture studio focusing on the Millrace and on an architecture studio studying a proposed academic building between the Onyx Street crossing and the Knight Campus site.

Rob Thallon praised the process being followed for this project. He credited a strong user group and an excellent design team with the success of the project thus far.

More visual materials will be available to share with the CPC in the near future.

Action: No action was requested.

2. Tykeson Hall - Oregon Model for Sustainable Development Adjustment

Background: Staff provided background information on adjustments from the Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) which are allowed per the *Campus Plan*. Martina Oxoby (CPFM) described the project's efforts to achieve the goals of the OMSD as well as the challenges in meeting the Advanced Energy Threshold because of a series of upgrades to the Oregon Energy Code.

The project team has explored many avenues to increase energy efficiency to meet the AETs, but reaching the prescribed 35% improvement over the current energy code would require the project to make costly design decisions that would not have significant impacts on the energy performance of the building. Currently, the energy model shows that the building is performing 34% better than the 2014 Oregon Energy Code. This is approximately 45% better than the 2010 Oregon Energy Code.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee and guests. These were addressed by the project team and discussed through the course of the meeting:

- The Oregon Energy Code changes fairly often. Does it make sense to require 35% better performance than a moving target?
- The Oregon Energy Code will be updated again in 2017. There will be more and more challenges in meeting the 35% threshold required by the AET particularly because the energy efficiency of building technologies is not advancing at the same rate. We could not predict that when this principle was drafted.
- There are plans for the committee to have a more robust and informed conversation about amending the AET after this project's adjustment request is reviewed.
- Once the major energy strategies have been included in the project, pursuing the energy-saving strategies that have lower overall impacts are disproportionately expensive.
- What is the cost/benefit of achieving an arbitrary percentage better than code? We need to rethink our goal language.
- When the OMSD was drafted, there were many 50-60 energy-saving measures available which would improve energy savings above code requirements. Now, about 50 of these measures are included in projects to meet code and the remaining 10 only improve the building performance fractions of a percent.
- If an amendment is proposed in the future the language should be clear and easily comprehensible to the general public.

Action: The committee agreed with twelve members in favor and one abstention that the proposed **Tykeson Hall - Oregon Model for Sustainable Development Adjustment** is acceptable per the allowances of the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that

it be approved as an AET adjustment of up to 2%. This is with the understanding that the design team has and will continue to make every reasonable effort to maximize energy savings for Tykeson Hall. Also with the understanding that the CPC will have a discussion about the OMSD language in the future.

3. North Campus - Conditional Use Permit - Overview and Discussion

Background: Staff gave a brief recap of the parallel tracks for the North Campus - a Conditional Use Permit being submitted to the City of Eugene for review and the North Campus *Campus Plan* Amendment which follows the standard *Campus Plan* amendment process. The latter will delve into greater specificity and have many opportunities for gathering feedback in the future.

Emily Eng explained the purpose, scope, and timeline of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process. She noted the uniqueness of the site, which includes the Franklin Boulevard edge, the Millrace, the railroad tracks, and the Willamette River, and described the history of the site (sand and gravel mining and industrial plants on the land north of the tracks and agriculture and industry south of the tracks).

Eng discussed five draft scenarios that had been developed showing a range of possible options to accommodate the university's needs for development within the boundary, shared the plans to further refine two of the options, which will take into consideration feedback thus far. The project team will meet with the city in the near future to ask questions and share progress.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee and guests. These were addressed by the project team and discussed through the course of the meeting:

- Where would the bike path be in relation to the river?
- Is there a contour map that shows the fill depth? That would be important information to know for building development because fill is not structurally sound.
- The 100' setback from the river is an absolute minimum required by code. A 200' setback would be ideal.
- Do we know what the City of Eugene is planning at the EWEB site? Will there be a synergy between the two sites?
- Has there been any consideration to putting fields south of the tracks and buildings north of the tracks?
- No option is shown without fields.
- Why are we devoting space to rugby fields when we are such a track and bike-oriented university?
- PE Rec fields are very important for attracting students.

- It is extremely challenging to find a place on campus for fields that have such defined dimensions.
- The space needs of the university (used in this study as well as many others) are determined by gathering feedback from all academic departments.
- It is incumbent on Campus Planning and Facilities Management to gather data. The best solution to this planning project would be a plan that would allow for the most opportunities.
- The Provost's Office is gathering space needs data. This enables them to understand what the university's needs really are.
- A member expressed support for the idea of looking at data to determine what needs should be accommodated in the area. He also stated that overall, we would like to get different kinds of students in the north campus area. Accommodating different uses and activities would be a good way of achieving that goal.
- The land adjacent to the river is one of the most unique resources of any university.
- The first point of discussion in this project was the Willamette River and the incredible opportunity that exists to reconnect the university to the river.
- This project is necessary because the expired CUP in North Campus does not allow any development in the area currently. This will put undue pressure on the rest of campus to accommodate development that might not be ideal.
- A member observed that the options presented at this meeting are so much more restrictive for the university than what was proposed in the Riverfront Research Park Master Plan. He suggested keeping our options open as a university so that we allow ourselves to have enough freedom to make the right decisions in the future.
- Another member from CPFM agreed that the master site plan that is submitted to the city should give us the maximum amount of flexibility to facilitate our internal decision-making process. The broad, campus-wide conversation about this area of campus should not end when we submit the plan to the city.

Action: No action was requested. The committee's comments will be considered as the planning project continues.

Please contact this office if you have questions.



November 22, 2017

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the October 27, 2017 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Jane Brubaker, Hilary Gerdes, Alicia Going,
Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Peter Keyes, Daniel Rosenberg,
Shannon Sardell, Rob Thallon, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Emily Eng, Cimmeron Gillespie, Allen Hancock

CPC Agenda:

1. Knight Campus - Update

Background: Mike Harwood updated the Campus Planning Committee on the progress of the Knight Campus Project since the last meeting. Members from the project team are engaged with students in two studios from the College of Design. Mark Eisheid's landscape architecture studio is focused on studying the Millrace and Rob Thallon's studio is working on designs for an academic building on the western portion of the Knight Campus site.

Action: No action was requested.

2. Campus Planning Committee - Chair Election

Background: Staff explained that the committee chair is elected annually. Typically, the chair is either a member who will be serving his/her second term or a new member who has previously served on the committee.

Discussion: Staff asked committee members for nominations for the 2017-18 Campus Planning Committee chair. A member nominated Dean Livelybrooks and staff mentioned that Dean had indicated his willingness to serve as chair.

Action: The committee agreed with 9 in favor and 1 abstaining, to elect Dean Livelybrooks as

chair of the 2017-18 Campus Planning Committee.

3. North Campus - Conditional Use Permit - Overview and Discussion

Background: Staff gave a brief recap of the parallel tracks for North Campus - a Conditional Use Permit being submitted to the City of Eugene for review and the North Campus *Campus Plan* Amendment which follows the standard *Campus Plan* amendment process. The latter will delve into greater specificity and have many opportunities for gathering feedback in the future.

Emily Eng reviewed the feedback that has been received so far from the stakeholder groups (that have been consulted throughout the course of the project) and described the draft Master Site Plan Diagram. She showed a diagram with the larger context around the North Campus site. This context includes the EWEB Riverfront Master Plan area (with a height limit ranging from 35 to 120 feet) and the new student housing complex on the former Louis Restaurant site (with a height limit of 120 feet). The proposed height limit on the north campus site south of the tracks is a maximum of 75 feet (with an additional 15 feet of screened mechanical area allowed). North of the tracks, the proposed height limit is a maximum of 45 feet (with an additional 15 feet of screened mechanical area allowed) in the east and west development sites and 15 feet in the central development area. Two potential concepts exploring the type of development that could occur within the restrictions of the draft Master Site Plan were also presented and discussed.

In addition, Eng described a number of questions that have been raised regarding the recreation fields. She detailed the additional work that has been done to confirm and substantiate the demand, the associated space that is required (and potential alternative locations for that space), to assess the existing facilities, and to study the best way to accommodate necessary new facilities.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee and guests. These were addressed by the project team and discussed through the course of the meeting:

- Does the Draft Master Site Plan reflect the same coverage proposed in the text?
- The proposed new large field would be ideal for academic activities that require large open spaces. A member from the Physics Department cited one example - an appropriate space for launching rockets.
- The existing PE/Rec fields on campus are heavily used well into the night.
- Would the proposed fields be fenced to prevent accidents involving the adjacent railway tracks?
- Will the proposed bike path be lit for safety purposes?
- The alignment of the bike path that is shown closer to the fields is better from a safety

perspective because light from the fields would add to the lighting provided along the path and there would be more people nearby. This alignment seems to be better from an ecological perspective as well, although proximity some cyclists might prefer an alignment of the bike path closer to the river's edge.

- What is the duration of a typical Conditional Use Permit?
- It is difficult to differentiate between the processes that are internal to the university and the submission of the Master Site Plan to the city. In the materials submitted to the city it would be wise to leave more flexibility available so that the UO has the ability to make the right decision later. For example, where the land within the boundary narrows to the east, a decision might have to be made about either saving significant historic trees or keeping the bike path completely out of the 100-foot riparian buffer. The Master Site Plan should allow the UO the flexibility to analyze those types of situations internally instead of being forced to go back to the city to ask for adjustments.
- Laying back the banks allows the river to access the floodplains. This would slow the river down in the case of a flood. A member of the CPC (and CPFM) advocated for a commitment to laying back the bank despite the fact that funds are not yet in place for that project. The UO should seek partnerships to pursue those efforts.
- If no independent parking structure is allowed in Area 5, where would the users of the building park?
- Is there access to the land north of the tracks from the west?
- The scenarios shown have done a "pretty good job" compromising on the size of the fields.
- The architecture studio studying the academic building on the west of the Knight Campus site has discovered that the existing bridge across the Millrace at Onyx is constrained. The existing connection may not be wide enough to accommodate the university's long term needs. This is the main connection point and must be wide enough in the future to help the campus function as a single, unified whole. The existing alignment may need to be corrected as well.
- In Area 7, what is the thinking behind the 30% coverage number and the 37-foot height limit? If a lower height were later deemed more appropriate would consideration be given to increasing the coverage number?
- Where is the remnant Oak Savanna? How does it affect the coverage number in that area? Does the City of Eugene suggest preservation of the Oak Savanna?
- Should the project specify a ratio of hardscape to softscape for the purposes of managing runoff?
- There are many uses and a large number of UO staff currently occupying the land south of the tracks.

Action: No action was requested. The committee's comments will be considered as the planning project continues.

Please contact this office if you have questions.



December 8, 2017

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the November 28, 2017 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Hilary Gerdes, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Peter Keyes, Diana Libuda, Daniel Rosenberg, Bitty Roy, Rob Thallon, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Phil Carroll, Emily Eng, Amanda Deml, Brent Harrison, Saul Hubbard, Kay Porter, Colin McArthur, David Sonnichsen

CPC Agenda:

1. Knight Campus - Update

Background: Mike Harwood updated the Campus Planning Committee on the progress of the Knight Campus Project since the last meeting. The project team is working with users of the existing buildings to ensure that they are successfully and satisfactorily relocated. They are also making progress towards filing demolition permits. Abatement will start in January and February is targeted as the beginning of demolition. The next package will address grading and utilities. In a topic related to the Knight Campus Project, the City Council recently voted to sell the property known as Lot 4 or the Coke Lot.

Members from the project team are engaged with students in two studios from the College of Design. Mark Eisheid's landscape architecture studio is focused on studying the Millrace. Rob Thallon's studio is working on designs for an academic building on the western portion of the Knight Campus site. The time and location of both final review sessions was shared and visitors were welcomed to attend. There is an opportunity to synthesize some of the students' work and thoughts into the Knight Campus Project.

In response to a member's question Harwood stated that there is no direct connection between the student housing project (at the former Louie's site) and the Knight Campus.

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

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

According to the recent newspaper article, the building that is proposed will be much taller than the Knight Campus buildings. Christine Thompson (Campus Planning) added that the UO has been engaged with the City of Eugene because large numbers of UO students are likely to be living there and will need to cross Franklin Boulevard to get to the university. The city will also be undertaking a study of Franklin Boulevard and the university will be involved in that process as well.

Action: No action was requested.

2. North Campus - Conditional Use Permit - Master Site Plan Review

Background: Staff and other members of CPM described this project as the first of a series of processes which would occur before any physical development occurs in this area of campus. This initial step will result in a master site plan that will be submitted to the city for review. The second step is a university process which will go into much greater detail and will result in an amendment to the Campus Plan. This amendment will include a description of the character of each individual designated open space, existing landscape features of significance, suggestions for appropriate uses of development sites, and opportunities and constraints that exist in each area. The third step would take place when/if development projects are proposed for this area. These projects will be brought before the committee a number of times before the design is finalized. Therefore, it is beneficial for this first step to result in a master site plan that retains enough flexibility to allow the University of Oregon to make the best possible decisions in the future when we have more information about what is possible. For example, what if the UO could build a net zero ecological design building along the Willamette River as a showcase? The Master Site Plan should allow for that possibility, understanding that there are many more opportunities for engagement and feedback in the future.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) reviewed information about the history of the riverfront area, the process for the master site plan to date, and information previously presented (including feedback from outreach efforts) that has informed the development of the master site plan.

Colin McArthur (Cameron McCarthy Landscape Architects) reviewed previous drawings that have been presented throughout the course of this study. He described the proposed Master Site Plan, clarifying that it is more restrictive than what code currently allows. It works within the standards/confines of an existing city land use code which was adopted in the 1980s. That already described allowable limits for a number of factors including lot coverage and building setbacks. This master site plan defines conservation areas, development areas, and appropriate uses. It balances flexibility to respond to future university needs with a certainty of what kind of development can occur.

The master site plan sets aside a total of about 19 acres of land for conservation out of a total of almost 76 acres within the master site plan boundary. In those areas, development is restricted to uses that are allowed by Eugene code, for example: pervious surface trails, bike paths, and restoration.

Where development is proposed in the master site plan, the code does not currently have any limitations on building heights. This plan specifies allowable heights for each development area and places additional limits on building coverage north of the tracks (as presented). McArthur showed a building and open space scenario diagram to demonstrate how the plan requirements could be met. This diagram also demonstrates a key change that was made since the previous CPC meeting - limiting the size of buildings and recreation fields (in collaboration with PE/Rec) so that development is set back further from the river and does not encroach beyond a 200-foot setback from the river in most areas.

McArthur also described a circulation diagram which showed the primary directions of necessary connections including future desired connections across the Millrace, Franklin Boulevard, and the railway tracks, as well as two potential alignments of the bike path along the river.

He described the context of the plan including the EWEB site. Allowable uses in that area include residential, commercial, retail, and restaurant uses with much higher allowable densities than the maximum density proposed in this master site plan.

In response to a member's question, project team members described how buildings came to be included in the master site plan. The FVP was used as a starting point for the study. However, a project with as broad a scope as the Framework Vision Project cannot consider all aspects of the university in great detail and sometimes, upon further scrutiny, not all the FVP recommendations are possible in reality. One example of this was placing five fields in the area north of the railroad tracks as proposed in the FVP was not ideal for a number of reasons. When the number of fields were reduced, buildings were considered as a trade-off for the develop-able area. Feedback from the various stakeholder groups consulted during the project outreach also indicated that a limited number of buildings with imposed height limits could be appropriate north of the tracks.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee and guests. These were addressed by the project team and discussed through the course of the meeting:

- A member expressed support for increasing the size of the conservation area to 200 feet but advocated for keeping the bike path out of the setback.
- A member did not support artificial turf fields as an appropriate use near the river. She cautioned that lighting the recreation fields would be destructive for bird migration

patterns. If lighting would be required, she requested that it be turned off by 9pm or 10pm.

- The existing bike path predates current code and is not lit. If the bike path were to be realigned, code would require that it be lit. However, a portion of the bike path across the river is deliberately not lit because it is within a natural area.
- Another member voiced support for the alignment of the bike path away from the conservation setback. Proposals for trails to the look-out points and personal paddle craft launch area should extend to this alignment of the bike path as well.
- A member was concerned about the proposed density on the east parcel north of the tracks. This was particularly in relation to the entry sequence to that area as one passes under the railway tracks. He would advocate for a direct visual connection to the river at that threshold.
- It is helpful to think about the proposal for this area in relation to the context of adjacent developments.
- It would also be helpful to show what was proposed in the former Riverfront Research Park Master Site Plan and to highlight the major shift in the vision for that area of the riverfront. There is a significant reduction in the proposed density and development north of the tracks in this master site plan.
- A member of CPFM described a number of alternatives for artificial turf fields. These options include organic infill or no infill (with sand ballast) as opposed to rubber infill fields. Alternative options for pads include systems that have been certified by Cradle-to-Cradle as opposed to older systems which utilize crumb rubber and polyurethane underlayments.
- If the fields were natural turf instead of artificial, there is concern about fertilizers washing off into the river.
- A guest stated that they would not support any uses other than athletic fields in the area north of the tracks. The guest also asked how the existing uses south of the tracks would be accommodated in the future and whether environmental remediation would be necessary in that area prior to future development.
- The chair and other members voiced support for retaining flexibility in the master site plan, because restrictions imposed now cannot be reversed in future steps. The chair expressed confidence in the CPC to do a good job helping to guide future processes that involve this area of campus.
- A member asked for clarification about the steps involved in the city review and approval process.
- The CPC chair regards this as an opportunity to expand the community that has a connection to the river and to activate the area.
- A guest from the community did not support the placement of artificial turf fields near the river and had concerns about the height of the lights needed for the fields.
- A guest from PE/Rec stated that the lights would not be on throughout the night and

that the fields are intended to be a safe, secure space. No vehicles would be allowed on the fields and tailgating would not be accommodated. Recreation fields have been present near the river for at least a few decades. These fields have provided the opportunity for recreation alongside the river for hundreds of students. This proposal would accommodate unmet needs that exist now as well as future needs.

Action: With the understanding that a *Campus Plan* amendment for this area of campus will come back to the CPC for further discussion, the committee agreed with ten members in favor and one opposed to recommend to the president the **North Campus - Conditional Use Permit** be approved.

Please contact this office if you have questions.