



June 9, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

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

Subject: **Record** of the May 28, 2021 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Sonya Calendar, Claressa Davis, Zak Gosa-Lewis, Shawn Kahl, Ken Kato, Moira Kiltie, Terry McQuilkin, Eric Owens, Juliae Riva, Daniel Rosenberg, Philip Speranza, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Mandy Butler (TVA Architects), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Martina Oxoby (CPFM), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), Pam Saftler (TVA Architects), Eleanor Sandys (Oregon Arts Commission), Cami Thompson (University Advancement)

CPC Agenda

1. *Campus Plan* Amendment: Related to the area southeast of the Jaqua Triangle Design Area – Public Hearing, Final Draft Review, and Action

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials and reviewed the relevant key Campus Plan principles and patterns applicable to the project. The CPC chair reviewed a brief overview of the meeting order, noting the public hearing would occur before the presentation, with presentation and committee discussion to follow after the third agenda item for this meeting.

The purpose of this item was to hold a public hearing and review the final draft of the proposed *Campus Plan* Amendment to incorporate the university's land southeast of

the Jaqua Triangle Design Area into the *Campus Plan*. CPC staff provided a brief recap of the proposed amendment. Additionally, staff shared updated information regarding stakeholder feedback.

The proposed amendment presentation materials and meeting records are available at: <https://cpfm.uoregon.edu/campus-plan-amendment-new-design-area>

Public Hearing:

Public guests were invited to indicate if they were present in Zoom to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, opened the public hearing and invited any members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment portion of this meeting was closed.

Discussion:

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

- What feedback was received from the Fairmount Neighborhood association?
- What is the status of the Matthew Knight Arena (MKA) currently; is it included in the campus plan or considered independent?
- MKA was a Track C project; goal is to include this area in the campus context and *Plan*. This does not preclude a future proposed additional Track C project on university owned land in this area; future projects in this area will align better with campus goals.
- Did the coach's offices addition project design at MKA include CPC review?

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

- Fairmount Neighborhood Association had no questions regarding this project at their most recent meeting. Clarification was requested that this project would not affect the MKA parking committee requirements.
- The coach's offices addition to MKA looks well integrated in this area.

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

- Campus Planning did not received any feedback from the Fairmount Neighborhood Association regarding this project.
- The MKA is located on university-owned land and within the campus boundary that extends around this area.

- The CPC provided feedback on the MKA project; however, the committee did not review the project to take action because this area was not yet a part of our *Campus Plan*.

Action: With 11 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed *Campus Plan Amendment: Related to the Area Southeast of the Jaqua Triangle Design Area* is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved.

2. *Campus Plan* Amendment: Principle 1: Process and Participation, Design Advisory Board (DAB) description – Public Hearing, Final Draft Review, and Action

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 hold a public hearing and review the final 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. Also, staff shared additional history and process of the DAB, and additional clarification on how the CPC and DAB work together.

Public Hearing:

Public guests were invited to indicate if they were present in Zoom to speak during the public hearing. CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks, opened the public hearing and invited any members of the public attending to comment. After no public comment was received, the public comment portion of this meeting was closed.

Discussion:

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

- Regarding DAB composition and process, is the CPC voting to insert the DAB review process into the order of operations? Will the composition and management of the DAB be a CPFM function?
- DAB will be designated for design input (for the University Architect and CPFM). DAB review would occur before a project's CPC meeting 2. DAB input would coincide with other group input; the CPC would still make a recommendation to the President, while also considering this additional input.

- Future CPC would expect DAB input on projects once the DAB is implemented. DAB would not overrule the CPC.
- Consider the weighting of the DAB input to other group's feedback.
- What additional costs and time are added to projects when using the DAB?
- DAB has already been involved in a number of current projects.
- It is an option to hold on to these questions and discussion until the University Architect is present at the CPC meeting.
- Committee should be sensitive to its own role in the process. Consider this is an additional expert entity; ensure the CPC function remains robust.
- Adding the DAB process that has not been long standing, to the *Campus Plan* may not be a valuable addition; adds bureaucracy and process steps. The University Architect can seek expert input at any time; consider actual need for adding to the *Plan*.
- Members support waiting for University Architect presence at meeting to discuss.
- Support and value for input from various architects at different levels of the process. Opportunity for growth of campus and quality professional advice on projects; not a burden to the process.
- DAB can bring design review consistency by using the same external architects as they become familiar with our campus; also can bring additional ideas from other campuses as examples.
- While there are three people from architecture as designated members on the CPC, DAB has two internal and two external architects. Clarification needed regarding the architecture representation on DAB by the University Architect.
- DAB would not override CPC recommendations to the President.
- The *Campus Plan* is a document that informs the CPM processes as well as CPC processes; this is one reason for including DAB in the *Campus Plan*.
- As a process exists for choosing which architects are on a project, consider incorporating in that process how DAB will work with architects and what they will bring to the project.

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

- DAB is a parallel process to CPC, and can be viewed as complimentary.
- DAB is an existing process and in current practice.

Action: No formal action was requested. This discussion will be continued at the 06.08.21 CPC Meeting.

3. Huestis Hall Deferred Maintenance Project: Schematic Design Review

Background: CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials and reviewed the relevant key Campus Plan principles and patterns applicable to the project. Staff also reviewed the Campus Planning requirements applicable to the exterior improvements of this project. The purpose of this agenda item was to review the schematic design for the proposed Huestis Hall Deferred Maintenance Project and determine if it is consistent with Campus Plan principles and patterns.

As described in the project description, the purpose of the Huestis Hall Deferred Maintenance Project is to encompass a full renovation of an approximately 60,000-sf structure on 4 floors. Built in 1973, Huestis Hall is a teaching and research hub for biological sciences. It is home to the Institute of Neuroscience (ION). This project will eliminate deferred maintenance, safety and security issues, address seismic vulnerabilities, resolve accessibility limitations, and update research spaces with modern, modular research and teaching labs. Potential exterior improvements will include enhancements to bike parking and entrances, surrounding landscape areas, envelope repairs and window replacement, as well as a penthouse addition for new mechanical equipment.

Martina Oxoby (CPFM) introduced the project. She explained that this is a state funded deferred maintenance renovation project. There provides an opportunity to completely overhaul the internal infrastructure to improve flexible spaces for the labs, research, and teaching that currently exist in the building. An overview was given regarding the project scope, timing, space use coordination, construction scheduling, exterior impacts, and operations coordination.

Mandy Butler and Pam Saftler (TVA Architects), reviewed the project approach, provided a virtual site tour reviewing existing site elements, conditions and constraints, and described the proposed design.

Discussion:

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

- Why is a new elevator being added, considering that there's an existing elevator, and Klamath has use of the elevator in Willamette and/or Onyx Bridge?
- Why is the air intake on the Zebrafish facility not being moved to pair with the elevator shaft?
- What year was the original building built?
- Considering that this is a once every half-century remodel, is a better understanding of seismic bracing options needed? Why would internal bracing not be fully sufficient and a clear solution rather than adding on an additional volume?
- Appreciation for the east elevation. Consider additional screening for the existing roof utilities on the south, especially from views from the Science Green and 13th Avenue.
- What is the proposed material for the mechanical penthouse cladding and the existing fans on the roof? Consider longevity of the materials and how it will patina over time.
- Support for the proposed grey and metal exterior materials.
- Does adding lateral support to the exterior outweigh the cost of brace framing the interior? Can the Zebrafish not be disturbed in any way from construction?
- Will the elevator serve multiple buildings through pathways and multiple connections?
- The elevator addition looks like an anomaly on the side of the building.
- Preference for hardscape that provides clear and functional pathways for pedestrians and bicyclists, e.g. consider not adding green landscape areas if it results in small, ineffective paths.
- The west green space, between Willamette and Huestis, is being constricted considerably by the new bike parking area and the elevator addition; concerned this may result in a walled corridor and no longer a green area.
- There is no existing service area for Huestis; need to consider where to site service functions for a science building.
- Consider how to balance access to the bike parking areas (covered/open and secure) with the loss of landscape area. Maximize green landscape areas while at the same time providing good access; this may need further refinement.
- How will this renovation impact or support the 13th avenue corridor project; how will construction affect the area?
- Understanding for the need to not disrupt the Zebrafish operations.

- Consider opportunities to improve the surrounding area in addition to meeting functional needs.
- Appreciation for moving the existing bicycle parking located near the entrance.
- Consider ways to differentiate and enhance the visibility of the main entrance.
- Campus standard fixtures will be used.
- This project design is not complete. The transformer siting and landscape design in this area have not been fully refined; careful attention to buffering views from the Science Walk area will be needed. Existing smaller ornamental trees in the area will be affected; if possible, preserve the northern most tree and existing landscape.
- Regarding the canopy design for covered bike parking, there is an existing tree. The team will continue to work with CPFM staff and experts about this tree and ensure that this approach is best. All tree canopy that is affected will be replaced, not necessarily on site. E.g., planting a tree nearby on 13th Avenue may be considered for replacement.
- Is there a sense of urgency on this project to move forward and receive a recommendation from the committee?
- This is the right time to bring this project to the committee; consider action for the team from the committee, possibly with a few conditions based upon comments.
- Does the budget include 1% for art?
- Consider opportunities (through art) to emphasize contributions from members from underrepresented groups.

In response to questions and comments, Butler, Saftler, Oxoby, and CPC Staff provided the following clarifications:

- The North elevator between Huestis and Streisinger is undersized for equipment and has operational challenges. There's a second shaft that was included when the building was designed for possibly two future elevators; however, these shafts have been used over time for utilities. Adding the elevator includes a required seismic lateral strengthening element for the building without impacting any space inside the building. This adds benefit by providing a modern elevator that serves this building and the science complex.
- The air intake for the Zebrafish facility needs to be constantly operational and cannot be put on hold during construction. If tied into the elevator addition, the route would be challenging and not attainable, as is coordinating regulatory

compliance with the NIH. This would add additional costs to the building budget. The canopy should help hide the air intake.

- Huestis was originally built in 1973.
- Schematic design is scheduled to be completed in the middle of June. This is a deferred maintenance project; time and budget is focused on the interior. No materials samples available yet (however, could be provided).
- The roof utilities on the south stair tower are existing and part of the Zebrafish system. They are highlighted in design rendering but they are not that visible from the ground.
- The seismic bracing solution of wrapping the columns does not have a big space impact; however, it is very costly because it includes a Kevlar coat. The impact of vibration and dust creation is not ideal for the Zebrafish.
- The structural engineer thought the west elevator addition was an ideal solution, e.g. moving the lateral support to the exterior of the building. The project team feels that this is the right solution for the building because it does not take away program area and it does not disturb the Zebrafish. It has added benefit to the Science Complex because it would become the most functional elevator for the adjacent science buildings for equipment, and it meets the criteria for maintenance of the building in that it will provide roof access. It will be a heavily used elevator for the entire science complex, both the most modern and largest.
- All of the Science buildings, in particular, Huestis, Streisinger, Willamette, and Klamath are all connected. It is possible to walk from one side of the campus to the other without going outside.
- Constrained site for a construction lay-down area. Working with general contractor on scheduling timing of deliveries so there are not a lot of materials sitting around on site, and to keep as tight of a construction fence line as possible. The area directly south of Huestis and the western side of Huestis is the most likely site for construction fencing and lay down of materials storage and access locations.
- 13th Avenue enhancements include:
 - Replacing the existing open bike parking in its current location, or finding additional locations along 13th Avenue to provide open bike parking as it relates to access of other science complex buildings from a neighborhood perspective.
 - Opening up the apron (curb-cut) where the cross-walk exists from Huestis to 13th Avenue; will be properly sized to the needs of pedestrians crossing the street in this location.

- This was the most opportune time to seek CPC feedback. Acknowledge that the project is not fully complete and that design elements mentioned by CPC members will be addressed.
- This project's funding source has a strict deadline requiring the entire project to be completed by March 2024. Because of the surge and the time it takes to move people out of the building to prepare for project construction, there is pressure to complete. Reassessing, for example, seismic reinforcement, would be challenging as it would add time.
- There is a 1% for Art component and opportunities for art locations and exterior enhancement. This will come back as a separate process to the CPC from today's schematic design review.

Action: With 13 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the proposed schematic design for the **Huestis Hall Deferred Maintenance Project** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Consider opportunities to screen existing roof utilities on the south stair tower, paying particular attention to views from the Science Green and 13th Avenue Axis.
2. Consider ways to balance the need to provide clear and functional access to bike parking with the desire to minimize loss of green landscape areas.
3. Carefully consider ways to enhance the entry plaza to help clarify the main building entrance and make it more welcoming, especially in areas affected by construction. E.g. look into potentially relocating bike parking, and potential use of art.