**Environmental Issues Committee Meeting Minutes**

Jan 21, 2015, 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm

Umpqua Room, EMU

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Faculty/Staff:

Erin Moore—Architecture (Chair)

Shabnam Akhtari—Math

Ron Lovinger – Landscape Architecture
Marie Swarringim - Planning, Design, and Construction

Student:

Erin Walker, Student Sustainability Coalition Board

Ex-Officio

Eric Beeler—Student Sustainability Coalition
Steve Mital—Office of Sustainability

Christine Thompson – Campus Planning, Design, and Construction

Blair Hinton - Athletics

Other Attendees

Phil Farrington – Campus Planning, Design and Construction

**WELCOME AND MINUTES**

Erin welcomed the committee, and committee members and guests introduced themselves. Ron Lovinger moved to approve the November minutes and Shabnam seconded the motion. By a voice vote, the minutes were unanimously approved.

**CAMPUS PHYSICAL FRAMEWORK VISION PROJECT**

Phil Farrington, UO planner, introduced the Campus Physical Framework Vision Project (CPFVP). It is a year-long process, launched in late summer 2014. It is different from the Campus plan and other policies guiding growth and development though supplements them. The CPFVP focuses on campus landscapes and open spaces.

The project is guided by a 14-member advisory panel who selected a team of nationally known consultants. Already, a draft list of important values relative to landscapes and open spaces (examples include human-scale and pedestrians first) has been developed. The campus community can help prioritize these and provide additional feedback at several upcoming open houses and via an online survey soon to be released.

The consultants will develop draft recommendations in the Spring/Summer 2015 that will eventually be translated into updated campus-wide design guidelines and possibly changes to the campus plan and density standards. Key items from the discussion included:

* Clarification whether or not this project includes a focus on building exteriors (“Are we going to stick with brick?). Phil said it will not focus on building materials and other aesthetic concerns.
* UO has been through 3-4 distinct planning eras that have had lasting impact on the look and feel of campus. It’s been a while since the last comprehensive review, so this is a rare opportunity and may also have lasting impact.
* Ron Lovinger said it’s important to identify “sacred spaces” like the Willamette River in this process. Problem areas like Franklin Blvd, the relationship between some campus edges and adjacent neighborhoods, and connections between Athletics complex and main campus, should also receive attention. “Healing derelict landscapes is what the 21st Century is all about.”
* Lots of interest expressed around improving the river edges and make them more usable for teaching, research, and enjoyment. Marie mentioned that Springfield has done good work rehabilitating its river edge.
* Steve asked if there appears to be widespread support to maintain existing open space ratios or is there increasing pressure to increase densities. Phil said there’s support to maintain the sense of place we have and not become an “urban campus.”

**CARBON TAX ON TRAVEL PROPOSAL**

Steve mentioned that Analinda Camacho had to postpone at the last minute. She plans to come and speak about rules governing federally funded travel at our next meeting. Steve then gave an update on his one-on-one meetings with key campus leaders

* Global engagement is an important institutional value. We want to support and even increase it.
* Sustainability and responding to Climate Change is also important.
* So a price on carbon designed to change behavior ($30 ton) may not be in line with institutional goal. Some said it’s essentially a non-starter for them. But the market price, at $10ish per ton, may be possible
* Units with particularly high travel budgets want to keep some of the tax to fund projects of value to them and that are linked to emissions reductions.
* This proposal represents a transfer from the institutional travel budget to the institutional operations budget. What do we gain from that? What specific projects will be funded. How will it further institutional goals.