



December 20, 2024

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the December 13, 2024, Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Bob Choquette (Chair), Eric Alexander, Deborah Butler, Emily Eng, Michael Griffel, Mike Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Norma Kehdi, Carrie McCurdy, Taylor McHolm, Janet Rose, Daniel Rosenberg, Hal Sadofsky, Amy Salmore

CPC Staff: Clare Kurth (Campus Planning)

Guests: Chris Andrejko (Rowell Brokaw), Paul Comery (Transportation Services), Becket DeChant (CPFM), Dorothy Faris (Mithun), Grace Graham (Cameron McCarthy), Lydia Fitzpatrick (Campus Planning), Luke Helm (CPFM), Eric Howald (Communications), Karen Hyatt (Board of Trustees), Harper Keeler (Landscape Architecture), Colin McArthur (Cameron McCarthy), Lynn McBride (Mithun), Lauren Meyer (CPFM), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (Communications), John Rowell (Rowell Brokaw), Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

**CPC Agenda**

**1. Proposed Amendments to the *Campus Plan* and *East Campus Area Plan* – Related to the Next Generation Housing Development Plan for the East Campus Design Area – Continued Discussion**

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to continue discussion and take action on the proposed amendments to the *Campus Plan* and *East Campus Area Plan (2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area)* related to integrating recommendations from the Next Generation Housing Development Plan.

CPC Staff reviewed project history, public engagement, project materials, and committee procedures.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the project timeline and scope of the *East Campus Area Plan* and *Campus Plan* amendments as related to the Next Generation Housing Development Plan, changes to the *East Campus Area Plan* since the previous CPC meeting and public hearing on October 29, 2024, and that potential future development projects in the east campus area will be reviewed by the committee per *Campus Plan* requirements.

Discussion:

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

Regarding changes to the allowed uses in the *East Campus Area Plan* zones:

- Member: What is the difference between the institutional and limited institutional zones? E.g., can other uses, besides residential halls, be placed in the east campus area?
  - Olsen: The limited institutional zone establishes a height limit and will not allow parking structures.
- Member: Does the residential area in the *East Campus Area Plan* relate only to the *East Campus Area Plan*, or does it also apply to City of Eugene residential zoning?
  - Olsen/Eng: The residential area in the *East Campus Area Plan* is consistent with Eugene City Code R-1 zoning.

Regarding student housing availability and quantity:

- Member: Does the proposed bed count account for existing student housing proposed for demolition, or is the count in addition to existing housing?
  - Olsen: No residence halls are proposed to be demolished or impacted in association with the Next Generation Housing Development Plan. The proposed bed count accounts for the planned demolition of Hamilton Hall, which is outside the east campus area.

Regarding the residential transition area and future proposed building heights:

- Member: What is the setback distance from Moon Lee Lane and the proposed Phase 2 residential hall, E.g., how much transition does the transition area account for?
  - Olsen: The transition area has a maximum 45-foot height limit, and the residential zoning has a maximum 37 feet height limit. The height difference between the City of Eugene R-1 zone and the East Campus transition area is minimal. There is no building setback within the transitional area, however this could be a design consideration during schematic design review of future buildings. The building setbacks will be a design consideration not a Plan policy consideration and will be partially influenced by the open space framework.
- Member: Support for the step-down and lower building height proposed for the Phase 2 residence hall, however, an 85-foot building height is too high for the limited institutional zone.
- Member: The building height step down looks nice on the diagram, however, what will this feel like in practice? E.g., is this a true transition or a transition in name only, and what will this feel like in the adjacent neighborhood?

- Eng: Acknowledge there may be an awkward period between when construction begins and when the plan is fully built out and the full extent of the transition area is realized.
- Thorstenson: The Next Generation Housing Development Plan has the goal of preserving existing tree canopy in the area, which will function as a buffer to break down the scale of future new buildings.
- Guest: If the Next Generation Housing Development Plan relies on consistency with Eugene City Code, how does this Plan address City language on livability in the neighborhood?
  - Olsen: There has been thoughtful consideration of the transition to the adjacent neighborhood and retaining the residential character.

Regarding traffic and parking:

- Member: Does not feel there is enough information on traffic displacement.
- Member (via email comment prior to meeting): Concern that the project neglects to address the members' previous concerns and lacks alignment with *Campus Plan* principles.

**Action:** With 11 in favor, 1 abstention, and 2 opposed, the committee agreed that the **Proposed Amendments to the *Campus Plan* and *East Campus Area Plan* – Related to the Next Generation Housing Development Plan for the East Campus Design Area** are consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

## **2. 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Redesign – Schematic Design Review – Continued discussion**

**Background:** The purpose of this agenda item was to continue the schematic design review for the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Redesign project.

CPC Staff reviewed the project history, meeting material resources, and procedure.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the project's schematic design and scope. Project scope review included general material selection from durability, maintenance, traffic calming (related to bikes and scooters), and placemaking perspectives, safety, circulation, landscape and tree canopy, and ecology and plant species.

Luke Helm (CPFM) reviewed the project design, programmatic needs, service vehicle access, landscape considerations, and open space transition areas.

### **Discussion:**

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

Regarding traffic flow and access:

- Guest: Is the intention to limit motor vehicle traffic to traveling westbound only, limiting vehicle access through 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue?
  - Helm: The project goal is to allow motor vehicle traffic, E.g., service, and commercial vehicles, movement from east to west through 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  - Olsen: For smaller university vehicles, E.g., service utility vehicles and micromobility vehicles (bikes and scooters), two-way travel will remain available.
  - Eng / Olsen: Traffic will be limited to authorized and service vehicles only.

Regarding fixed route shuttle services:

- Guest: Consider that Transportation Services is developing a fixed route shuttle service along 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Have locations for the shuttle service been considered?
  - Olsen: The fixed route shuttle service has been considered as part of the project analysis and was identified in the concept design documents.

Regarding pedestrian safety:

- Guest: Consider that bike parking should be usable and functional year-round. Will the proposed bike parking be covered?
  - Helm: There will be a mix of covered and uncovered bike parking.
- Member: Support for significant events on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue being considered in the design, E.g., the ASUO street fair. Were campus partners involved in these events included in the design process?
  - Helm: Campus partners were engaged and participated during the design process.
- Member: Will 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue have curbs or other separation between pedestrian and wheeled areas?
  - Helm: The design area of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue is curb-less throughout for accessibility. Pedestrian safety features have been considered and are incorporated through design strategies including changes in materials, narrowing vehicle travel lanes, and widening pedestrian areas.
    - Member: A concave gutter system will be used to collect water and transfer it to catch basins and will also separate pedestrians from vehicles.
- Members: Concern that individual electric vehicles (E.g., electric scooters), travel at relatively high speeds and may pose safety concerns to pedestrians. Further consider ways to mitigate high speeds of individual vehicle traffic. Also consider pedestrian safety at high conflict areas (E.g. Agate St and Kincaid St entrances to 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue).
  - Eng, Helm, and Olsen: Design elements such as changes in patterns and materials, narrowing of travel lanes, and rumble strips are included with the intent to slow wheeled traffic and maintain comfort for users with hard wheels, (E.g., wheelchairs and skateboards). Narrowed wheeled areas and increased enforcement will also promote safer speeds and etiquette.

Regarding existing parking lot access:

- Member: How will loading, unloading, and temporary ADA parking for large events on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and in existing parking lots? be addressed?
  - Olsen: Authorized vehicles will continue to be allowed. Operational strategies for existing parking lots and service areas will require continued consideration and planning.
- Members: Will the parking lot at Allen Hall be removed or impacted?
  - Olsen: This plan does not identify removing this parking lot only the access to the lot.

Regarding the Many Nations Oregon Tribal Flags in the EMU amphitheater:

- Member: Consider that the proposed tree plantings may interfere with visibility of the flags.
  - Helm: Specific tree species have not been selected, but this will be a consideration in final species selection.
- Member: Will the location of the flags remain or be relocated?
  - Helm: The project's intent is for the flags to remain in their existing location.

Regarding general comments:

- Member: What are the maintenance considerations for the increased landscape and planting areas?
  - Olsen: Low maintenance, native Oregon plantings are proposed. Maintenance is anticipated to be minimal once plantings are established, but the full operational details will be considered during the construction phase.
- Member: Consider that the proposed 'O' entry signage appears prominent as shown at the gateway entrance areas of Kincaid and Agate streets. Are there areas on campus where the 'O' is prominently displayed?
  - Helm: This is not the final design. Other identifying markers, E.g., the official University seal, could be considered in the final design.
- Member (via email comment prior to meeting): Concern that the project neglects to address previous member concerns and lacks alignment with *Campus Plan* principles.
- Guest: Will a copy of the design presentation be available?
  - CPFM staff note: The presentation has been made available on the project webpage at: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/13th-avenue-axis-conceptual-design> or, <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-12/13th-ave-cpc-sd-presentation-copy-reduced.pdf>

**Action:** With 12 in favor, 1 abstention, and 1 opposed, the committee agreed that the **13th Avenue Redesign Schematic Design** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following condition:

1. As the project design develops and is refined, the project will consider and return to the committee for review of the following:

- a. Covered bike parking locations
- b. Ensuring safety for all users of pedestrians and wheeled vehicles in multi-modal areas
- c. Tree placement and visual impact to the Nine Flags representing Oregon's Tribal Nations in the EMU Amphitheater
- d. Site lines and visibility around the Campus Heart, E.g., the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and University Street intersection for tabling