



May 6, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the April 30, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Sonya Calendar, Hilary Gerdes, Zak Gosa-Lewis, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Terry McQuilkin, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Cami Thompson (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

The CPC Chair reviewed the decision to shift the CPC Tuesday meeting times from mornings to afternoons, beginning Fall 2021. As presented at the previous 04.13.21 CPC meeting, this decision was based upon comparison information from the CPC Preferred Meeting Times Survey results, classroom utilization data, and historical CPC member attendance. Members were encouraged to send any additional comments or input via email to CPC staff and Chair as needed. Additional information regarding this schedule change was emailed to members prior to this meeting.

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

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The purpose of this item was to have a continued 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 a review of the primary changes to the Principles of the *Campus Plan* that will be amended. Additionally, staff shared updated information regarding the proposed Design Area densities, including proposed coverage and GSF calculations, and an

additional proposed change to the *Campus Plan* Principle 12: Design Area Special Conditions, Student Housing Design Area and New Green descriptions. An anticipated CPC Public Hearing will be on May 28, 2021.

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records 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 proposed open space connection to Villard Street is welcomed.
- Support for incorporating this new design area within the campus boundary; it will connect common uses in this area. Any new projects that come forward will be subject to a detailed CPC review.
- Design Area densities are a planning tool; they help differentiate the level of review and create an estimate for accommodating future development in this area. All *Campus Plan* Principles are considered for each new project.
- May 2021 is the 10 year anniversary of the Ford Alumni Center, which represents that this is a relatively new area of campus, as all of the buildings in this area were built within 2 years of each other. Support the proposal and including the small area inside the Jaqua Triangle; highlight possibilities for future improvements, e.g. entry signage and features.
- Is the proposed FAR of 1.20 above the existing development (three existing buildings) in this area?
- The proposed FAR allows for an approximately 14,400 sf building footprint, and a traditional 5-story building, is that correct?
- The proposal could result in allowing a smaller footprint, taller building in this area. *Note from CPC staff: There are no current proposals for any new development in the proposed design area. The proposed available gsf and footprint is not necessarily limited to a specific size or specific location within the proposed design area.*

In response to questions and comments from committee members, CPC Staff provided the following clarifications:

- The existing development has a 1.03 FAR, which includes the existing three buildings in this area. Adding the extra allowable gsf from the existing Jaqua Triangle Design Area results in the proposed 1.20 FAR.

- The extra allowable coverage from the Jaqua Triangle Design Area is approximately 14,400 sf.

Action: No formal action was requested.

2. *Campus Plan* Amendment: Principle 1: Process and Participation, Design Advisory Board (DAB) description – Introduction and Discussion

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials. The purpose of this agenda item was to have an initial discussion on the draft *Campus Plan* Amendment to integrate the university's Design Advisory Board (DAB) process into the *Campus Plan* based upon current practice. Staff shared that this amendment will update Campus Plan Principle 1: Process and Participation, which describes participants in the design process for construction projects.

Discussion:

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

- Does DAB membership constitute a broad range of representation on campus?
- The overall campus design process provides an opportunity for input from many individuals, including the CPC, focus groups, and user groups. DAB is one small piece of this larger design process.
- The intention of the DAB is to compliment CPC input on broader campus issues, e.g., architectural details, which helps advance the caliber of buildings on campus. DAB is intentionally meant to be a small, disciplined, focused group to help complement and supplement other inputs.
- Does the DAB make recommendations without taking into consideration other voices in the trades on campus who have daily experience with building maintenance?
- How will the proposed DAB operate over time in the design process, e.g., does it advise before, during, or after the CPC makes a recommendation and how does it work in terms of the CPC process? Please distribute the construction projects planning process flow-chart included in this presentation.
- Appreciation for DAB and potential for its useful advice.
- What is the history and definition of the DAB?

- When is the DAB role initiated? Is the purpose to advise on design and aesthetics? Should the user group be involved with DAB earlier in the process?
- History of the DAB:
 - Previously, there was a design review group, which developed out of criticisms that campus architecture wasn't of high caliber.
 - As the CPC and user groups don't typically have a robust architectural skill set, the DAB developed as a way to compliment the strengths of the CPC, user group, and the overall process.
 - The intent of the DAB was initially to be broader in its membership; as it has evolved as advisory to the Associate Vice President and University Architect, it has been more helpful to rely on campus representatives (landscape architect and architect), and two off campus (architect and other university architect (UCSD)).
- This process is robust and still evolving. Avoid adding another set of requirements.
- Purpose of the DAB review is for both function and aesthetics. Aware of a lifecycle cost analysis for ongoing maintenance requirements. The University Architect is also the AVP for CPFM and, therefore, motivated to not have maintenance consequences.
- Having the voice of the DAB is helpful, and CPC will receive benefit from their insight in terms of the process.
- Support both function and aesthetics, use of space and function is important.
- While not directly tied to the CPC's role, what processes exist to allow building managers to provide feedback to CPFM?
- Quarterly CPFM facilities liaison meetings is one example of opportunity for communication with building managers.
- During a new building construction and design process, when there's only architects advising, this might not include the experience of people working on the building daily. Include these inputs early in the conversation.
- There is a concentrated effort to engage CPFM staff and variety of focus groups of people who provide services to buildings.
- For example, the Knight Campus building services manager reports directly to KCASI upper management and commissioner to really understand the building. The building services manager serves as a representative on focus groups and user groups.

Action: No formal action was requested.