



December 9, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Clare Kurth, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the November 26, 2024, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Deborah Butler, Ihab Elzeyadi,
Emily Eng, Jamie Dillon, Michael Griffel, Norma Kehdi,
Daniel Rosenberg, Hal Sadofsky

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: George Bleekman (CPFM), Jeff Bringenberg (Soderstrom),
Lillian Moses (University Housing), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning),
Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

CPC Agenda

1. Earl Hall Window Replacement Project – Schematic Design Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the schematic design for the Earl Hall window replacement project.

CPC Staff reviewed the relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning) reviewed the *Campus Plan* process, project site details, project phasing, adjacent designated open spaces and buildings, and building history.

Lillian Moses (University Housing) shared the project needs, feasibility, goals, scope, safety and operability improvements, phasing, and next steps.

George Bleekman (CPFM) reviewed the project constraints, including challenges with exterior building materials, and shared Design Advisory Board (DAB) feedback regarding the project.

Jeff Bringenberg (Soderstrom) reviewed the project scope, material choice and aesthetic compatibility, and budget constraints.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with clarification comments from Bringenberg, Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Moses, and Thorstenson:

Regarding materials:

- Member: Are the project materials finalized?
 - Bringenberg: The DAB will provide further guidance on the final orientation of metal paneling to ensure the configuration aligns with the existing building. The materials will not change, however the orientation may.
- Member: Support for the use of the materials, E.g., triple paned windows, however, concern regarding the quality and lifespan of pvc/vinyl windows.

Regarding material sustainability goals:

- Member: What is the R-value of the proposed window and wall assembly?
- Member: The window and wall assembly R-value should exceed the campus goal with an R-value of 40. Support for upgrading the wall assembly to improve the overall value and longevity of the project.
 - Bringenberg: The window R-values has been discussed as a part of the project. The wall assembly will not be altered due to previous issues with combining new insulated materials with existing non-insulated materials on other campus buildings.
- Member: Is the sun shading and R-value of the wall assembly not receiving additional consideration in the design process? The next opportunity for window improvements may not happen for several decades? The project is missing an opportunity for improved sustainability.

Regarding the metal paneling:

- Member: Concern that the metal panels appear to have low albedo and will not meet climate change imperatives. Consider the albedo and solar diffuse reflectivity of the metal panels in the design.
- Member: Is there a missed opportunity to add additional details to the project for solar shading on the south facade?
 - Bringenberg: The solar shading was not included in the scope of this project. There may be an opportunity to look at different glazing apertures.
 - Moses: This project goal is to solve a critical maintenance need. This project will be matching the base design on other campus residence halls. To meet budget and schedule constraints, changing the window rhythm/size or sun shading were not included in the scope of work for the project.
- Member: Concerns regarding the metal panels and impacts on the local climate of adjacent open spaces. Consider the coloring of the metal paneling and a higher albedo.
 - Bringenberg: The total surface area of metal panels on the building's façade is less than 40%; the metal paneling will not be placed on all facades, only where

the current tile material exists. Facades that do not have existing tile, only the windows will be replaced; metal panels will not be added.

Regarding the wholeness of the project:

- Member: Will the existing red paint color of the doors, storefront window trims, and architectural posts be updated to be consistent with the rest of the building and project colors?
 - Bringenberg: The project goal is to repaint these areas with the existing red color. The storefront windows will remain in place.
 - Member: The existing red doors, trim, and posts may not appear cohesive with the new window and wall paneling materials. Consider the entire project and how to holistically integrate with the existing building.

Regarding the project review process:

- Member: Consider *Campus Plan* Principles 1, 6, 7, and 10 and how the project is addressing these principles is incomplete.
 - Eng: The project's proposed material energy efficiency goals are within the *Campus Plan* guidelines. While exceeding campus standards can be encouraged, it is beyond the committee's purview. This is a maintenance project rather than a capital project, that may otherwise include a broader scope of work.
 - Thorstenson: The committee's comments will be considered as the project planning proceeds.
 - Eng: Maintenance projects are not typically brought to the committee for review; however, this project is due to the significant visual changes to the building's façade, and the project's adjacency to several designated open spaces.

Action: With 8 in favor, 1 abstention, and 1 opposed, the committee agreed that the **Earl Hall Window Replacement Project Schematic Design** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. Erb Memorial Union (EMU) – 75th Anniversary Signage Review

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review placement of 75th Anniversary signage at the EMU.

CPC Staff reviewed the project history, meeting resources and procedure, and relevant *Campus Plan* principles and patterns.

Rick Haught (EMU) reviewed the project scope, location, and details.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the Campus Outdoor Sign Plan requirements, the role of the committee, sign details, and project location.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members and guests with clarification comments from Haught and Olsen:

Regarding sign materials and durability:

- Member: Will the materials be high quality and durable?
 - Haught: High quality materials will be used to ensure the signs remain in good condition, with budget for replacement as needed.
- Members: Consider using materials durable enough for the duration of the sign placement and structural components if needed for signage to retain shape.
 - Haught/Alexander: The project will ensure durability for the lifespan of the sign placement.

Regarding sign content and graphics:

- Member: Concern regarding the sign's image content/quality.
 - Alexander (Member): The project has been working with UO Communications on the sign's content with the goal of compatibility with other signage on campus and the character of the area.

Action: With 7 in favor and 2 abstentions the committee agreed that **the Erb Memorial Union (EMU) 75th Anniversary Signage** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.