



April 23, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning  
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the April 13, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Liska Chan, Claressa Davis, Hilary Gerdes,  
Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie,  
Kevin Reed, Daniel Rosenberg, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Darin Dehle (CPFM),  
Emily Eng (Campus Planning), George Evans (Economics),  
Kyle Harshbarger (COD), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning),  
Matt Roberts (University Advancement), Ethan Shafer (EMU),  
Makaal Williams (VPFA Internship Program)

## CPC Agenda

### 1. CPC Updates – CPC Preferred Meeting Times Survey Results

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to give a brief update regarding results from the CPC Preferred Meeting Times Survey, comparison information from the classroom utilization data, and historical CPC member attendance.

The CPC chair requested members share any additional insights regarding preferred meeting times. Following the discussion, members were encouraged to send comments and additional input via email to CPC staff and Chair if interested. The Chair, with CPC staff's assistance, will consider all information and feedback to establish meeting times for next Fall.

#### Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Why consider College of Design (COD) studio times?

- COD studio class times are considered because students and faculty from the COD are especially interested in the CPC, they regularly serve as members. The goal is to avoid creating conflicting times.
- The Friday morning meeting time, from 10am - 12pm, seems to work, having the least conflicts.
- Two suggestions are: 1.) have all CPC meetings on Fridays, and/or 2.) have a shorter, hour long meeting on Tuesday afternoons at 4pm.
- The Tuesday at 4pm meeting time could work, and is preferred over Tuesday morning when the majority of faculty and students are in class. This could be a hardship, however, for some members if the meeting time runs past 5pm.
- If meetings are held Tuesdays at 4pm, possibly adjust the agenda items accordingly to fit within that time.
- Many of the larger, more important agenda items and larger presentations, such as public hearings, might be more challenging to accommodate in shorter meeting times.
- If regularly alternating meetings on Tuesdays and Fridays, then longer topics could be held on the Friday meetings.
- CPC meetings could take place only on Fridays.

Action: No formal action was requested.

## **2. Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact (KCASI) Phase 2 – Meeting One**

Background: CPC staff introduced the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The purpose of this agenda item was to hold Meeting One for the Phil and Penny Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact (KCASI) Phase 2.

As part of Meeting One (further described in the *Campus Plan* on page 19), the committee was asked to complete the following tasks:

- User Group - Review the proposed user group representation and provide comments to the CPC chair, who appoints group members (refer to page 12 of the *Campus Plan* for more information about user groups).

- Key Principles and Patterns - Identify key principles, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues from the *Campus Plan*. Review the proposed addition location.
- Other Campus-wide Opportunities - Identify potential opportunities to address campus-wide needs within the subject area or opportunities to cooperate with other nearby development efforts.

The CPC chair explained that this agenda item does not include site selection because it already took place prior to the Phase 1 portion of this project for Knight Campus.

Moira Kiltie (KCASI), gave an overview of the project as described in the CPC mailing, and provided additional information regarding the project background and history. She described the project concept and user needs. Site history information was also shared regarding how Phase 2 builds upon the KCASI Phase 1 building design and intent. The process of continuing neighbor outreach was explained.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), reviewed the suggested user group, proposed key campus planning requirements, and key *Campus Plan* principles and patterns, including specific details regarding Millrace Design Area Special Conditions.

#### Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Consider potential shading of the Urban Farm.
- This project will come back to the committee for further review.  
How does this project plan to coordinate with the city's Franklin Blvd. Transformation Project? It is important to communicate with the city regarding Franklin Blvd.
- The *Campus Plan* principles are aligned with the city's Franklin Blvd. plans.
- What will vehicle traffic be like on the proposed service route? Vehicular traffic currently goes east/west near the greenhouses; is there an intention to pave that area?
- This area of campus feels isolated with differing levels of safety; carefully consider safety in the design project area to ensure the area feels more welcoming.
- How will engineers, as a building user, impact the design?
- There are many challenging considerations as the design moves forward, including the Urban Farm.
- Important to be considerate of the Urban Farm; this is a highly desired class by students.
- How will the design team work with Campus Planning?

- The designated open spaces, Wood Shop, Millrace Studios, etc., will probably have to change significantly as development occurs in the area.
- What is the timeline for the open space planning?
- Is the first project in this process the KCASI lab building?
- The goal of Meeting One is to capture key considerations, policies, and patterns and have the committee bring additional comments. As the project progresses, questions about adjacencies and occupants will be easier to discuss and understand.
- The project will follow the standard Track B review process, not Track C. The committee will review the schematic design and make a recommendation (advisory role) to the UO president, who then makes a final decision.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

- Will the proposed building occupy current Urban Farm land use?
- How often will this project return to CPC for review; is it a Track C project?

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Dehle (CPFM), Kiltie, and Olsen provided the following clarifications:

- Impacts to the Urban Farm have been and will continue to be studied. These impacts were studied for the KCASI Phase 1 building.
- The design considerations will be shared with the design team.
- The building is not intended to occupy the space of the Urban Farm.
- KCASI has, and will continue to, work with the City to accommodate the Franklin Blvd. Transformation Project.
- The proposed service route is intended to be where it's shown on the campus planning requirements diagram. The timing of relocating the service route is to be determined.
- The KCASI Phase 2 project does not include relocating the service route; however, the project will carefully respond to this concept, for example when siting the building and designing the service area.
- Safety is a top priority for this project and area of campus.
- Engineering uses will only impact the interior spaces of the building (e.g. sound control, lighting, etc.), not the exterior of the building.
- Flexibility and access to utilities is important to support the types of uses by engineers and scientists. Multi-use spaces are key.
- As the design is further refined, exact impacts to surrounding uses will be further defined.

- The schedule is to complete and occupy the building by summer 2025.
- There is no timeline for redeveloping the North Campus area. It will be driven by new opportunities and projects as they arise. The first project in this process is the KCASI Phase 2 lab building.
- This is a Track B project. There will be Meeting 2 – Schematic Design review - along with additional check in meetings as needed.

Action: With 11 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the Project User Group and *Campus Plan* Requirements are consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that they be approved. (1 committee member in favor stated a connection with the project.)

### **3. *Campus Plan* Amendment: Related to the area southeast of the Jaqua Triangle Design Area – Introduction and Discussion**

Background: CPC staff introduced the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The purpose of this item was to have an initial discussion on the draft *Campus Plan* Amendment to incorporate the university's land southeast of the Jaqua Triangle Design Area into the *Campus Plan*. CPC staff reviewed the purpose and process of the proposed amendment, and provided an overview of the primary changes to the Principles of the *Campus Plan* that will be amended. Additionally, staff shared information regarding the proposed Design Area densities, including proposed coverage and GSF calculations, and key proposed changes to the *Campus Plan* Principle 12: Design Area Special Conditions. Additional CPC meetings will be as needed, with an anticipated CPC Public Hearing on May 28, 2021.

Presentation materials are available at: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment-new-design-area>

#### Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- The Jaqua Triangle Design Area includes the parking lot located near the Jaqua Center on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Is there a small area being added to the Jaqua Triangle that was not previously university property? If including this in the campus boundary, will there be opportunity to improve the area?

- The proposed wording about this part of the Jaqua Triangle aligns with the existing wording in the opportunities and constraints section of the *Campus Plan*, Principle 12. It emphasizes an opportunity to enhance the entrance to campus. Also, it references proposed improvements and changes to Franklin Blvd., which could potentially impact and improve this area.
- Was this area (including the Jaqua Center) previously a Track C project that CPC was not closely involved with, and not a part of the *Campus Plan*?
- All existing development in the proposed amendment area was a Track C project. The proposed amendments are trying to bring the area into the *Campus Plan*, to help guide future changes and improve ties to campus.
- Looking forward, how are increased densities in adjacent areas already planned for (e.g. Student Housing area) and reflective of the densities being proposed in this area? Is there room for growth?
- Should the buildable lot (at the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St.) be included in this new design area boundary? If so, how would this contribute to the overall density of the area?
- If the proposed building (at the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St.) is not reserved for housing development, perhaps it should not be in the Student Housing Design Area.
- The future building use is not yet determined.
- There is additional density provided in the Student Housing Design Area for the development of the site (at the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St.); it is not defined as housing.
- In the written description of the previous amendments for the Student Housing Design Area, it calls out the function of the building (at the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St.) to connect and activate the space, and is likely not housing.
- Is the proposed 1.03 FAR density, as shown, restricting growth?
- The current proposal shows densities as if the current area were completely built-out. There may be room for small minor additions in the area to consider.
- How is the gross square footage (GSF) calculation for the Matthew Knight Arena calculated? The large floor-to-ceiling heights are not similar to other campus buildings, which may skew the proposed FAR.
- Changing the shape and the boundary of this area makes sense; it aligns with the campus pattern. How we manage densities as things change is significant. There is the possibility of needing to reconsider the area in the future through another amendment.

- Supportive of what is proposed, keeping in mind that things will change when Hamilton is removed and we're planning for the future site closest to 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The FAR and densities ratios vocabulary is somewhat limiting and are an imprecise tool. However, they help represent the intent. For example, the North Campus area is a very low density that we cannot sustain; the use of FARs helps provide direction for future development while respecting all of the things we love about campus. Recognize that change is constant and we may have to discuss more in the future, however for now we can place a marker for this area and revisit later if needed.
- Northeast campus (Jaqua Triangle, Student Housing, and East Campus Design Areas) are a variety of mixed uses on campus. Difficult to predict now the use of the site at on 13<sup>th</sup> avenue across from the Jaqua Center.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, CPC Staff and Emily Eng (Campus Planning) provided the following clarifications:

- The area to the southeast of the Jaqua Triangle is UO owned land and included in the current campus boundary. There is opportunity to improve the area.
- We are learning more about potential needs for growth in this area.
- The area of the Housing Transformation Project Phase 3 (at the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Agate St.) is included in the existing Student Housing Design Area. The proposed design area of this amendment would not affect the densities in the Student Housing Design Area and does not include this site.
- The arena is a very unique building type on campus and has large volumes; the 1.03 FAR is not the same as a 1.03 perhaps somewhere else. A similar volume applied to a typical campus building, for example a 4 story building, would have more GSF (resulting in a higher FAR).

Action: No formal action was requested.