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Project Description and Background

Introduction

This study records the existing conditions of the south central region of the campus as they relate to the university’s Long Range Campus Development Plan’s (LRCDP) policies and patterns. It will aid in decisionmaking for potential development of the area, as well as help identify the need for future amendments to the LRCDP.

The principle of diagnosis is one of the six basic principles of the planning process adopted by the university in 1974, known as “The Oregon Experiment,” and elaborated upon in the Long Range Campus Development Plan:

The principle of diagnosis establishes that in order to provide a general context to direct the regenerative processes of continuous adaptation and repair, a periodic analysis of the present state of the campus is required.

(p. 12)

This diagnostic study is only one step in the planning process to guide future development. As stated by Christopher Alexander in his book The Oregon Experiment, “The diagnosis tells us what is wrong, now, in the present” (p. 157). The diagnosis is not intended to establish policies and patterns, but to determine how the established policies and patterns are working. It is not intended to present the university with specific solutions for individual projects, but to analyze the combined effect past projects have had on the university environment.

Study Area

The study area encompasses the south central portion of the campus, the historic academic core of campus. It is generally bounded by University Street on the east, Pioneer Cemetery on the south, Kincaid Street on the west (with the exception of the parking area), and 13th Avenue on the north. The area encompasses the historic academic and administrative core of campus. It is also home to the Museum of Art as well as the currently vacant Collier House. This area includes a playing field and a parking lot for several hundred cars. Future plans for development will have an impact on all portions of this study area.

Background

To be effective, a diagnosis of the overall campus should be completed in advance of capital construction projects to anticipate necessary improvements and to incorporate them into future projects. The large size of the campus, however, makes a campus-wide diagnosis impractical. Therefore, instead of an overall diagnosis, the campus has been divided into manageable sections (modified from time to time as future proposed development dictates). Every few years, a diagnosis study will be performed for a specified area until the entire campus is covered; at that time the cycle will begin again. The first diagnosis study, completed in 1999, covered the northeast central region of campus and the second diagnosis study, completed in 2000, covered the southwest region of campus.
Currently, diagnosis in the study area is achieved, in part, by coordinating development needs with the academic program planning cycle as described in the LRCDP. A biennial process identifies capital construction needs resulting in preparation of the Biennial Implementation Plan. Site diagnosis, which occurs when a construction project is ready to move forward with schematic design, also provides diagnostic opportunities. Unfortunately, by the time a project reaches the design phase, site diagnosis must be accomplished very quickly. Additionally, improvements to surrounding areas are difficult to address at that time because they may not have been anticipated, and, unless a diagnosis was conducted ahead of time, their costs are seldom included in the funding for capital construction projects.

Other studies of areas larger than a development site have occurred occasionally. Previous studies have included diagnoses of portions of the area as noted in the Past Projects and Studies Map.

Process

This study was conducted primarily by University Planning Office staff. In addition, a focus group was formed to provide input from the area’s users. Prior to engaging the focus group, applicable LRCDP patterns and policies were identified. A series of base data maps showing existing conditions related to these policies and patterns were prepared to assist in determining whether the LRCDP’s policies and patterns are effective in the study area.

The focus group provided input about the health of the study area at a work session held October 29, 2001. Prior to the meeting, focus group members were asked to take a tour of the area to acquaint themselves with, or remind themselves of, the opportunities and issues that relate it (Appendix A). Following the work session, all members were encouraged to send additional written comments, and follow-up conversations with focus group members were held as necessary. Comments from focus group members were incorporated into the series of diagnosis maps contained in this report that depict areas that need fixing and areas that work well.
Past Projects and Studies

Note: This is not intended to be a complete listing of all projects. Refer to referenced studies for detailed information.

*Parking Structure Studies:
- Parking Structure Siting Study (University Planning) - 1998
- Parking Structure Study (ZGF) - 1987
- U of O Parking Analysis and Recommendations (University Planning) - 1986
Summary of Results

This diagnosis resulted in a series of maps (and related information) that depict the University’s current Long Range Campus Development Plan’s (LRCDP) policies/patterns and existing conditions overlaid with information describing which areas need fixing in the study area. A summary map showing key areas that need fixing and areas that work well is provided on the preceding page. Maps depicting more specific information about areas that need fixing are provided in subsequent sections.

Past diagnosis studies recommended the addition of a pattern addressing large-canopy trees. The Campus Tree Plan (2001) addressed this issue and the plan’s patterns and policies are included in this diagnosis.

The patterns contained in the Sustainable Development Plan, adopted in 2000, are addressed in this diagnosis as well.

Some suggested revisions to existing LRCDP policies and patterns are identified below.

Revisions to Existing LRCDP Policies

The diagnosis maps addressing open spaces identify existing LRCDP designated open spaces and other significant open spaces. Further review of other significant open spaces may result in the desire to adopt some of them as designated open spaces.

The diagnosis map addressing density and development identifies a need to resolve technical corrections affecting allowed maximum densities. This would likely result in revisions to the LRCDP. In addition, allowing for a possible small building site on the east end of Gerlinger field, facing University Street, should be researched. Such a building would enhance the University Street axis and provide for much-needed development space in the central campus area. While the field is not a regulation-sized field, any potential development should ensure continued recreational use of the field.

Additional required revisions may be identified when determining how to address specific problems defined on the diagnosis maps.

Revisions to Existing Patterns

Some of the existing LRCDP patterns do not relate to current practice. Further review of the following patterns is recommended to determine if they should be revised or removed when addressing development in the study area and in the campus setting as a whole:

Level 1 LRCDP Patterns

Building Complex

When human organizations are housed in enormous buildings, the human scale vanishes, and people stop identifying with the staff who work there as personalities, and think only of the entire institution as an impersonal monolith, staffed with ‘personnel.’
Summary: Areas that Work Well & Areas that Need Fixing

Areas that work well

A. Pedestrian pathway network is very effective.
B. Open space is well defined by the landscape features, mature trees and historic buildings.
C. Open space (with mature trees and historic landscape features) and associated historic buildings are very attractive. Appealing pedestrian scale.
D. 13th Avenue gateway is welcoming and creates a cohesive campus design. Integrated seating ledges are well used.
E. Knight Library west gate creates an attractive entrance and provides much-needed covered bike parking.
F. Mature tree canopy creates an attractive walkway.

Areas that need fixing

Notes:

1. Lack of connection to the main campus. Unattractive parking area (potential to increase canopy coverage).
2. Building's large scale and architectural style is out of character with the area. Unwelcoming and confusing entrances.
3. Well-used campus entry needs improvement.
4. Open space character is dominated by a road that is used as a short cut/parking for autos. Problem is worsened by difficult service access and loss of big canopy trees.
5. Service area, auto parking (and meters) dominate building entrance.
6. Predominantly vacant historic building is in the heart of campus (within the 7-minute walking circles).
7. Uninviting, barren seating area and building facades.
8. Security and safety edge issues.
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Therefore: To maintain human scale in public buildings, make them small, not more than 3 to 4 storeys high; not more than 9,000 square feet in total indoor area; not more than 3,000 square feet to a story. If more than one small building is being made, to house related functions, the buildings should be conceived as a collection, connected by arcades, paths, bridges.

Level 2 Transportation Patterns

Mini-Buses (transportation pattern)
Public transportation must be able to take people from any point to any other point within the metropolitan area.

Therefore: Establish a system of small taxi-like buses, carrying up to six people each, radio-controlled, on call by telephone, able to provide point-to-point service according to the passengers' needs, and supplemented by a computer system which guarantees minimum detours and minimum waiting times. Make bus stops for the mini-buses every 600 feet in each direction, and equip these bus stops with a phone for dialing a bus.

Parking Spaces (transportation pattern)
As the university grows, there is a great danger that parking will overwhelm the university environment. But if the parking is too far away, it can easily degrade teaching and learning.

Therefore: For every building with N staff offices and M workstations, provide 0.25M metered short term spaces, 300 feet from the building, in the direction away from the university center; and N (0.67—0.57P) commuter spaces 500 feet away from the building, also in the direction away from the university center, where P is the percentage of staff who live within 15 minute walk.

Level 2 Analytical Area Patterns

The Long Range Campus Development Plan Level 2 Policies identify11 patterns in Table 2 that should be considered in specific analytical areas. In many instances, it is not clear why certain patterns are or are not applicable for certain analytical areas. For example, the "Open University" pattern, as defined, may not be applicable in analytical area 15 which abuts Kincaid Street. Also, only one pattern is considered applicable to Analytical Area 61 (Gerlinger Hall and the adjacent playing field). However, it seems that many others, such as the "Local Sports" pattern, are applicable to this area.

In addition, some of the Level 2 Analytical Area patterns overlap or conflict with Level 1 policies. For example, the Level 2 "University Shape and Diameter" pattern shown as applicable only to certain areas on campus is, in Level 1 policy 3(a), required for all areas on campus. In addition, the Level 2 "Small Student Union" pattern is not considered applicable for analytical areas 11-15 in Table 2 but it is in the Level 1 Building Space Use and Development Policies. It is recommended that Table 2 be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure that appropriate patterns are specified for all applicable analytical areas and that the table is consistent with Level 1 policies.

New Patterns

The following new pattern is recommended for further evaluation and consideration for the study area and the campus as a whole:

Future Expansion
It is inevitable that buildings change and expand over time to adapt to changing user needs.

Therefore: Consider the possibility of future expansion when designing a new building or addition.
In addition, policies in the LRCDP are applied in a manner similar to that of patterns and many are often translated into patterns by project user groups. If users find it easier to understand and apply patterns, one way to clarify the LRCDP might be to officially translate frequently referenced policies into patterns including:

- open space framework (quadrangles, axes and malls),
- compatibility with adjacent buildings,
- seven-minute walking circle,
- historic preservation,
- disabled access,
- durable construction and materials,
- landscape features,
- density,
- utility systems,
- adequate storage, and
- designated service areas.

More detailed information related to these new patterns could then be provided in the existing LRCDP.

**Revisions to Existing Level 2 Analytical Area Policies**

The South Central area of campus includes four analytical areas, area 15, 17, 24, and 61. The following changes to the Level 2 policy text applicable to these analytical areas are recommended:

**Area 17**

Fix the northern boundary of this area to accurately reflect university ownership as shown in this document.

**Area 24**

Update the policy to state that the Women’s Memorial Quadrangle and affiliated buildings are on the National Register of Historic Places. Also, clarify that the Collier House (including the site) is a City Landmark.

**Area 61**

Update the policy to state that the Women’s Memorial Quadrangle and affiliated buildings are on the National Register of Historic Places.

As mentioned earlier, allowing for a possible small building site on the east end of Gerlinger field facing University Street should be researched.
Land Development Policies

The maps in this section address Capital Construction Proposals, City of Eugene Policies and Standards and the following Long Range Campus Development Plan's patterns:

LRCDP Density Ratios

Sustainable Development Plan:
Use What We Have Wisely
New construction uses up limited land and valuable natural resources on and off campus. In addition, green open spaces, landscape features, and historic resources help define the University’s cultural character and are vital to providing a stimulating intellectual environment. Therefore: All new campus growth should promote efficient development and, whenever beneficial, make use of existing facilities to preserve valuable open space and historic resources.

Level 2 Policies:

Land Development Policies – Special Conditions:
Area 15
This area includes the Memorial Quadrangle and the buildings fronting on it. The quadrangle, the original 1935 library building, and the Museum of Art are included on the National Register of Historic Places.

The 1966 addition to the Knight Library is within the National Register boundary, but that portion of the building has been determined to be "non-contributory" to the historic designation.

1. Alteration of either the original portion of the Knight Library or the Museum of Art is subject to the provisions of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (January 1980 rev.), whether or not the proposed work is supported by federal funds. Review by the City of Eugene's Historic Review Board also is required.

2. Any new construction, repair, or replacement within or abutting the Memorial Quadrangle shall acknowledge the special significance to the University of that ensemble of buildings and open spaces. The placement and orientation of new buildings or additions to existing buildings, the general character of architectural design, and the selection of materials and accessories are to reflect the qualities of adjacent buildings or the area as a whole.

3. Proposals in this area should account for preserving and strengthening the east-west axis between Kincaid Street and the EMU and the east-west axis between the Library Gate and Straub Quadrangle. [amended 12/17/99].

Area 17
This area, located between Kincaid and Alder Streets, is currently devoted entirely to off-street parking. It occupies a strategic position as the western terminus of the east-west promenade, which is anchored at the eastern end by the Erb Memorial Union.

1. Subject to satisfaction of the Level 1 policy regarding replacement of existing uses, this area provides an opportunity for siting of a major campus building which, if constructed, should serve as an appropriate terminus of the promenade identified on Map 3.
Area 24

This area includes Johnson Hall and the Collier House, both of which have been recognized as of historic significance. A small portion of the National Historic Site associated with the Museum of Art also lies within this area. Two other buildings in the area, Susan Campbell and Hendricks Halls, were built originally as dormitories but now serve as office buildings which primarily but not exclusively house administrative functions. These buildings are included on the OSSHE list of historically significant buildings, but have not yet been designated as National Historic Places.

1. Improvements situated within the boundaries of the Johnson Hall or Museum of Art National Historic Places are subject to the provisions of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (January 1980 rev.), as they may be modified to provide for achieving accessibility in historic buildings, whether or not the proposed work is supported by federal funds. Review by the City of Eugene’s Historic Review Board also is required for these buildings.

2. Proposals for alteration to the Collier House and/or its site are subject to review by the City of Eugene under provisions of the Eugene Code relating to Historic Districts.

3. New buildings built within the area shall be designed to reinforce the east-west promenade that bisects the area and to complete development of the outdoor space framed on the south by Hendricks and Susan Campbell Halls.

4. The view corridor that exists from “The Pioneer Mother” through the Johnson Hall lobby to “The Pioneer” (located in Area 13) is to be preserved.

Area 61

This area includes Gerlinger Hall, the Gerlinger instructional field, and Gerlinger annex and performance plaza. A very small enlargement of Gerlinger Annex may be possible, but significant increases in buildings should be avoided.

1. Gerlinger Hall has been designated by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education as a building of prime historic significance. Although it is not included on the National Register of Historic Places, modifications to it are to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (January 1980 rev.).

2. The open space south of Gerlinger Hall is an important adjunct to the building and is to be preserved.

3. The east entry to Gerlinger serves as the major entry to the Gerlinger Alumni Lounge. Any improvements to the east side of the building should enhance that entryway; modifications that would diminish the importance of that entrance are to be avoided.
Analytical Areas

- The text is a summary of the LRCDP special conditions for each area. Refer to the previous pages for the complete policy text.

Designated Open Spaces

- Respect the special significance of the quadrangle.
- Respect the historic significance of the buildings & open spaces.
- Reinforce the east/west axis.
- Complete the women’s quadrangle.
- Preserve the pioneer mother/pioneer view corridor.

Patterns and Policies:

Land Development Policies - Special Conditions

Areas that need fixing

1. Mature landscaping in area would have to be removed to complete quad.
2. Does not account for a potential small building site along University Street. Analysis required.
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Not University Owned

Pioneer Cemetery

Knight Library

Education

AA 17

Possible major building site should serve as a terminus for the axis.

AA 15

Knight Library

Education

Pioneer Cemetery

Not University Owned

University Bookstore

Business Center

Fenton

Columbia

Erb Memorial Union (EMU)

East Central Campus Diagnosis
Capital Construction Proposals:
1999-01 A. Museum of Art Additions & Alterations
2001-03 B. Interml Studies & Foreign Languages Bldg
Post '03 C. Condon Hall Additions & Alterations

Patterns and Policies:
Density Ratios
Sustainable Development Plan:
Use What We Have Wisely

Analytical Area Maximum Density Ratios
Refer to the current BIP for additional information

Areas that need fixing

Notes:
OVERALL: Possible building sites are highly restricted in this very desirable area.

1. Must account for actual building site availability and for technical corrections made to building size and analytical area size in the following areas:
   Area 15: Unrealized site capacity of 9,165 sf. footprint and 223 gsf.
   Area 24: Unrealized site capacity of 27,540 sf. footprint and 2,595 gsf. according to 2001 BIP (1991 LRCDC originally allocated 40,712 sf. footprint and 122,763 gsf.)

2. Must account for technical corrections made to actual building size and analytical area size in the following areas:
   Area 61: Unrealized site capacity of 9,836 sf. footprint and 23,153 gsf. according to 2003 BIP (1991 LRCDC originally allocated 0 sf.).

3. Does not account for a small potential building site along University Street. Analysis required.
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Open Spaces

The maps in this section address the following Long Range Campus Development Plan’s patterns and policies:

Accessible Green
When people work extremely close to large open green areas, they visit them and use them often; but even a fairly short distance will discourage them.
Therefore: Provide a green outdoor park, at least 60,000 square feet in area, at least 150 feet across in the narrowest direction, within 600 feet of every building in the University.

Activity Nodes
When buildings are spread evenly across a campus, they do not generate small centers of public life around them. They do nothing to help the various ‘neighborhoods’ on the campus to coalesce.
Therefore: When locating buildings, place them in conjunction with other buildings to form small nodes of public life. Create a series of these nodes throughout the university, in contrast to the quiet, private outdoor spaces between them, and knit these nodes together with a network of pedestrian paths.

Family of Entrances
When a person arrives in a complex of offices or services or workshops, or in a group of related houses, there is a good chance he will experience confusion unless the whole collection is laid out before him, so that he can see the entrance of the place where he is going.
Therefore: Lay out the entrances to form a family. This means:
1. They form a group, are visible together, and each is visible from all the others.
2. They are all broadly similar, for instance all porches, or all gates in a wall, or all marked by a similar kind of doorway.

Local Sports
You cannot get a good education in a place which runs like a factory, with a hectic work pace, and never the chance for a relaxing physical diversion.
Therefore: Arrange sports facilities on campus, so that every point is within 400 to 500 feet of a place which is designed for sports and leisure such as a swimming pool, gym, tennis courts, etc.

Main Entrance
Placing the main entrance(s) is perhaps the single most important step you take during the evolution of a building plan.
Therefore: Place the main entrance of the building at a point where it can be seen immediately from the main avenues of approach and give it a bold, visible shape which stands out in front of the building.

Positive Outdoor Space
Outdoor spaces which are merely “left over” between buildings will, in general, not be used.
Therefore: Always place buildings, arcades, trees, and walls, so that the outdoor spaces they form are convex in plan. But never enclose an outdoor space on all sides—instead connect outdoor spaces to one another so that it is possible to see and walk from one to the next in more than one way.

Promenade
Each subculture needs a center for its public life: a place where you can go to see people, and to be seen.
Therefore: Encourage the gradual formation of a promenade at the heart of every community, linking the main activity nodes, and placed centrally, so that each point in the community is within 10 minutes’ walk of it. Put main points of attraction at the two ends, to keep a constant movement up and down.
Public Outdoor Room
There are very few spots along the streets of modern towns and neighborhoods where people can hang out, comfortably, for hours at a time.
Therefore: In every neighborhood and work community, make a piece of the common land into an outdoor room—a partly enclosed place, with some roof, columns, without walls, perhaps with a trellis; place it beside an important path and within view of many homes and workshops.

Quiet Backs
Any one who has to work in noise, in offices with people all around, needs to be able to pause and refresh himself with quiet in a more natural situation.
Therefore: Give the buildings in the busy parts of town a quiet "back" behind them and away from the noise. Build a walk along this quiet back, far enough from the building so that it gets full sunlight, but protected from noise by walls and distance and buildings. Make certain that the path is not a natural shortcut for busy foot traffic, and connect it up with other walks, to form a long ribbon of quiet alleyways which converge on the local pools and streams and the local greens.

Site Repair
Buildings must always be built on those parts of the land which are in the worst condition, not the best.
Therefore: On no account place buildings in the places which are most beautiful. In fact, do the opposite. Consider the site and its buildings as a single living eco-system. Leave those areas that are the most precious, beautiful, comfortable, and healthy as they are, and build new structures in those parts of the site which are least pleasant now.

Small Public Squares
A town needs public squares; they are the largest, most public rooms, that the town has. But when they are too large, they look and feel deserted.

Therefore: Make a public square much smaller than you would at first imagine; usually no more than 45 to 60 feet across, never more than 70 feet across. This applies only to its width in the short direction. In the long direction it can certainly be longer.

South Facing Outdoors
People use open space if it is sunny, and don’t use it if it isn’t, in all but desert climates.
Therefore: Place buildings so that the open space intended for use is on the south side of the buildings; avoid putting open space in the shadow of buildings; and never let a deep strip of shade separate a sunny area from the building which it serves.

Sustainable Development:
Connection to the Environment
When people feel connected to and are knowledgeable about their environment, they will take better care of it. The University provides an ideal setting for sharing this knowledge.
Therefore: The campus development process and resulting designs/policies will provide opportunities to educate people about the University’s cultural and environmental features.

Healthy Ecosystems
Ecologically healthy landscapes are essential to long term maintenance of local ecosystems and biodiversity. Each site consists of interconnected living systems, all linked to the environment beyond the site’s boundaries.
Areas that need fixing
Notes:
1. Well-used campus entry needs improvement.
2. Serves mainly as a road/parking area emphasizing vehicular use, not open space.
3. Lack of connection to main campus.
4. Inappropriate chain-link fence.
5. To complete quad, would require removal of mature trees.
6. Should consider enlarging or creating a designated open space.
7. Substantial slope.
8. Potential to improve landscaping.
10. Parking/service area needs to be screened better.
Potential Open Space Uses

Patterns and Policies:
- Accessible Green
- Quiet Back
- Activity Nodes

Local Sports
- South Facing Outdoors
- Promenade
- Outdoor Classroom (Campus Tree Plan)

Notes:
1. Potential for quiet back not developed. Improved landscaping would help.
2. Potential for activity node not developed.
3. Take better advantage of south-facing outdoors.
4. Heavy traffic area is not visually pleasing.
5. Feeling of "off-limits." Nice green space underused.
6. Saturated ground.
7. Uninviting entrance; needs to be opened up.
8. Too much concrete. Potential to improve landscaping.

Areas that need fixing
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Landscape Features in South Central Campus

(Numbers correspond to the Potential Open Space Uses map depicting their location)

1. Roof sculpture, bronze.
   Artist: Keith Jellum
   Date: c. 1990

2. Knight Library west gate, iron and brick.
   Artist: Jerry Deithelm
   Date: 1991

3. Sculpture, metal. "In appreciation of the English Department."
   Artist: James Lee Hansor
   Date: 1974

4. Public phone and newspaper box.

5. Campus West Gate (13th Ave.), brick.
   Artist: Cameron and McCarthy
   Date: 1988

6. Memorial Quadrangle plaques. Two metal plaques installed in sidewalk adjacent to 13th Avenue to honor the students who fought in the Spanish-American and the First World Wars. "The walks of this quadrangle are the gift of Chaplain William S. Gilbert, as a memorial to the men of the University who served their country in the time of war."

   Artist: Sidewalk design - Fred Cuthbert, landscape architecture professor
   Date: 1932

7. Memorial Quadrangle plaque. Metal plaque installed in sidewalk in the center of the quadrangle on the east side as a memorial to athletics. "Memorial to athletics, Class of '21."
   Date: ?

8. Painted metal sculpture.
   Artist: Duane Loppnow
   Date: 1974

   Date: c. 1937

10. Knight Library fountain and terrace. Two reflecting pools located at the southern end of the Memorial Quadrangle.
    Artist: Lawrence, Holford, Allyn, and Bean
    Date: c. 1937

11. Brass plaque installed on top of the cast stone fountain at the terrace level of the library. It is a dedication to the 1939 senior class president Robert Bailey, who drowned in the Millrace. The memorial includes the planting of the eight pyramidal oak trees. "Here where the living mind and step of youth retrace the ancient paths to
human wisdom's goal, the symmetry of these oaks shall keep this place for one, for all who like him thought, in soul, in body, voice, and friendship. – by Robert D. Horn. In memory of Robert Chase Bailey, class of 1939."

Date: 1939

Date: 1994

13. Sculpture commissioned by William Hazelton honoring Carl Onthank, a 1913 graduate and administrator for 30 years at the university (1909-1967 or 1957?).
   Title: Family Group
   Artist: Jon Geiss
   Date: 1975

14. Metal sculpture presented in 1958 by Gamma Phi Beta to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the campus.
   Title: Prometheus
   Artist: Ian Zaak, prior head of the Sculpture Department
   Date: 1958

15. Brick and cast stone wall and stairs between Hendricks Hall and Susan Campbell Hall. The niche was originally designed for a sculpture, but it was later decided that the Pioneer Mother should be placed nearby in the quadrangle.
   Artist: Lawrence
   Date: c. 1918-21


17. Decorative cast concrete benches (2).
   Date: ?

18. Decorative cast concrete bench.
   Date: ?

19. Decorative cast concrete bench, historic style (2).
   Date: ?

   Artist: Tom Kittle
   Date: 1991

21. Habitat Tree.

22. Street banner.
   Date: c. 1990s

23. Map station, bulletin board, and Chapman bike shelter.
   Artist: Cameron, McCarthy & Gilbert (bike shelter)
   Date: 1993 (bike shelter) and 1999 (map station\bulletin board)

24. LTD south bus station and bike shelter (Kincaid and 14th).
   Artist: WBGS (bus station), and Cameron, McCarthy & Gilbert (bike shelter)
   Date: 1992 (bus station) and 1993 (bike shelter)
Potential Positive Open Spaces & Seating

Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Seating not well used. Missing potential.
2. Public outdoor room does not function as such.
3. Minimal seating provided in busy area.
4. Need for seating in this area.
5. Acoustical problems?
6. Potential to create a positive outdoor space by completing the quadrangle. Also, seating could be better placed.
7. No rain cover or seating near building exit.

Patterns and Policies:
- Positive Outdoor Space
- Public Outdoor Rooms
- Small Public Squares
- Sunny/Shady Open Spaces (CTP)
- Site Benefits (CTP)
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Natural Features

The maps in this section address the following Long Range Campus Development Plan’s patterns and policies:

Campus Tree Plan Patterns and Policies

Landscape Policies - Plant Materials

Site Repair
Buildings must always be built on those parts of the land which are in the worst condition, not the best.
Therefore: On no account place buildings in the places which are most beautiful. In fact, do the opposite. Consider the site and its buildings as a single living eco-system. Leave those areas that are the most precious, beautiful, comfortable, and healthy as they are, and build new structures in those parts of the site which are least pleasant now.

South Facing Outdoors
People use open space if it is sunny, and don’t use it if it isn’t, in all but desert climates.
Therefore: Place buildings so that the open space intended for use is on the south side of the buildings; avoid putting open space in the shadow of buildings; and never let a deep strip of shade separate a sunny area from the building which it serves.

Sustainable Development:
Campus Trees
The University’s trees provide significant defining features on campus and are vital components of the local ecosystems.
Therefore: Development will preserve and protect existing trees to the maximum extent possible and plan for continued enhancement of the campus’ forest.

Connection to the Environment
When people feel connected to and are knowledgeable about their environment, they will take better care of it. The University provides an ideal setting for sharing this knowledge.
Therefore: The campus development process and resulting designs/policies will provide opportunities to educate people about the University’s cultural and environmental features.

Healthy Ecosystems
Ecologically healthy landscapes are essential to long term maintenance of local ecosystems and biodiversity. Each site consists of interconnected living systems, all linked to the environment beyond the site’s boundaries.
Therefore: All development will protect the existing ecosystems to the greatest extent possible.

Water
Oregon’s water is one of the state’s most precious resources.
Every building site is in a watershed connected to waterways and wetlands.
Therefore: All development will protect and augment natural drainage, and treat storm water runoff on site to the maximum extent possible.
Base Map of Tree Canopy

- Coniferous
- Deciduous
- LRCBDP Designated Open Space
- Memorial Trees
- Century Trees
- Native Species

Patterns and Policies:
- Campus Tree Plan Patterns
- Landscape - Plant Materials
- Positive Outdoor Space
- SDP - Healthy Ecosystems
- Site Benefits
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Educational Trees & Species

- Only Example of Species on Campus
- Used for Instructional Purposes
- Coniferous
- Deciduous
- Native Species

Patterns and Policies:
- Campus Tree Plan Patterns
- Landscape - Plant Materials
- Positive Outdoor Space
- SDP - Connection to the Environment
- Healthy Ecosystems

Educational Trees
A - Good mature specimen.
B - Rare species.
C - Very significant example of species.
D - Important historic use of species.
E - Mature beech specimens important - slow growing and rarely planted off-campus.
F - Good landscape design example - significant as a grouping.
G - Many species in cemetery are used for instructional purposes, including the madrones along the north edge.
H - Good examples of pyramidal form and straight variety of English oak.
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Patterns and Policies:

Landscape - Grades: Squares and courtyards should be level to the eye but sloped for drainage to equal a gradient of 1.75%-2.25%. Gradients should not exceed 20% for other lawns and 33% for planted areas.

Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Substantial slope.
2. High retaining wall creates a barrier.
Adjacent Uses/Edges and City Policies

The maps in this section address city land use policies and the following Long Range Campus Development Plan's patterns and policies:

Identifiable Neighborhood (Areas 14 & 41)
People need an identifiable spatial unit to belong to. Therefore: Help people to define the neighborhoods they live in, not more than 300 yards across, with no more than 400 or 500 inhabitants. In existing cities, encourage local groups to organize themselves to form such neighborhoods. Give the neighborhoods some degree of autonomy as far as taxes and land controls are concerned. Keep major roads outside these neighborhoods.

Main Gateways
Any part of a town—large or small—which is to be identified by its inhabitants as a precinct of some kind, will be reinforced, helped in its distinctness, marked, and made more vivid, if the paths which enter it are marked by gateways where they cross the boundary. Therefore: Mark every boundary in the city which has important human meaning—the boundary of a building cluster, a neighborhood, a precinct—by great gateways where the major entering paths cross the boundary.

Open University (Areas 13, 14, 21 & 22)
When a university is built up as a campus, separated by a hard boundary from the town, it tends to isolate its students from the townspeople, and in a subtle way takes on the character of a glorified high school. Therefore: Encourage the dissolution of the boundary between university and town. Encourage parts of the town to grow up within the university, and parts of the university to grow up within the town.
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Pathways and Transportation

The maps in this section address the following Long Range Campus Development Plan's patterns and other related policies:

Bicycle Plan Patterns and Policies

Bike Paths and Racks
Bikes are cheap, healthy, and good for the environment; but they are threatened by cars on major roads; and they threaten pedestrians on pedestrian paths.
Therefore: Build a system of paths designated as 'bike paths,' with the following properties: The bike paths are marked clearly with a special, easily recognizable surface (for example, a red asphalt surface). Bike paths always coincide either with local roads, or major pedestrian paths. Where the system coincides with a local road, its surface may simply be a part of the road and level with it. Where the system coincides with a pedestrian path, the bike path is separate from that path and a few inches below it. The system of bike paths comes within 100 feet of every building, and every building has a bike rack near its main entrance.

Disabled Access Policies

Local Transport Area
The impact of the car on social life is devastating; it keeps us off the streets and far away from each other. The first step in bringing the car under control is to stop using it for local trips.
Therefore: Embed the university in a local transport area, one to two miles in diameter. Within this area, except for very special cases, encourage local trips to be made on foot, bikes, scooters, carts, perhaps even on horseback. Adapt paths and roads to these modes of travel, and keep the streets for cars slow and circuitous. At the edge of the local transport area build high speed ring roads.

Looped Local Roads
Through traffic destroys the tranquility and the safety of pedestrian areas. This is especially true in university districts, where the creation of quiet precincts is crucial to the work.
Therefore: To bring the traffic and the pedestrian world into the right balance, make the local roads that serve the area form a system of loops or cul-de-sacs, so that through traffic is impossible.

Main Entrance
Placing the main entrance (or main entrances) is perhaps the single most important step you take during the evolution of a building plan.
Therefore: Place the main entrance of the building at a point where it can be seen immediately from the main avenues of approach and give it a bold, visible shape which stands out in front of the building.

Mini-Buses
Public transportation must be able to take people from any point to any other point within the metropolitan area.
Therefore: Establish a system of small taxi-like buses, carrying up to six people each, radio-controlled, on call by telephone, able to provide point-to-point service according to the passengers' needs, and supplemented by a computer system which guarantees minimum detours and minimum waiting times. Make bus stops for the mini-buses every 600 feet in each direction, and equip these bus stops with a phone for dialing a bus.

Parking Spaces
As the university grows, there is a great danger that parking will overwhelm the university environment. But if the parking is too far away, it can easily degrade teaching and learning.
Therefore: For every building with N staff offices and M workstations, provide 0.25M metered short term spaces, 300 feet from the building, in the direction away from the university center; and N (0.67—0.57P) commuter spaces 500 feet away from
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the building, also in the direction away from the university center, where $P$ is the percentage of staff who live within 15 minutes walk.

**Path Network**

Cars are dangerous to pedestrians; yet activities occur just where cars and pedestrians meet.

Therefore: Except where traffic densities are very high or very low, lay out pedestrian paths at right angles to roads, not along them, so that the paths gradually begin to form a second network, distinct from the road system, and orthogonal to it. This can be done quite gradually—even if you put in one path at a time, but always put them in the middle of the “block,” so that they run across the roads.

**Paths and Goals**

The layout of paths will seem right and comfortable only when it is compatible with the process of walking. And the process of walking is far more subtle than one might imagine.

Therefore: To lay out paths, first place goals at natural points of interest. Then connect the goals to one another to form the paths. The paths may be straight, or gently curving between goals; their paving should swell around the goal. The goals should never be more than a few hundred feet apart.

**Path Shape**

Streets should be for staying in, and not just for moving through, the way they are today.

Therefore: Make a bulge in the middle of a public path, and make the ends narrower, so that the path forms an enclosure which is a place to stay, not just a place to pass through.

**Promenade**

Each subculture needs a center for its public life: a place where you can go to see people, and to be seen.

Therefore: Encourage the gradual formation of a promenade at the heart of every community, linking the main activity nodes, and placed centrally, so that each point in the community is within 10 minutes’ walk of it. Put main points of attraction at the two ends, to keep a constant movement up and down.

**Road Crossings**

Where paths cross roads, the cars have power to frighten and subdue the people walking, even when the people walking have the legal right-of-way.

Therefore: At any point where a pedestrian path crosses a road that has enough traffic to create more than a two second delay to people crossing, make a “knuckle” at the crossing: narrow the road to the width of the through lanes only; continue the pedestrian path through the crossing about a foot above the roadway; put in islands between lanes; slope the road up toward the crossing (one in six is maximum); mark the path with a canopy or shelter to make it visible.

**Shielded Parking**

Large parking structures full of cars are inhuman and dead buildings—no one wants to see them or walk by them. At the same time, if you are driving, the entrance to a parking structure is essentially the main entrance to the building—and it needs to be visible.

Therefore. Put all large parking lots, or parking garages, behind some kind of natural wall, so that the cars and parking structures cannot be seen from outside. The wall which surrounds the cars may be a building, connected houses, or housing hills, earth berms, or shops. Make the entrance to the parking lot a natural gateway to the buildings which it serves, and place it so that you can easily see the main entrance to the building from the entrance to the parking.

**Small Parking Lots**

Vast parking lots wreck the land for people.

Therefore: Make parking lots small, for 8 to 12 cars; when a lot requires more parking, build it up as a collection of these 8 to 12 car lots, along a spine, each lot bounded and enclosed with wall, hedge, trees; not visible from the outside.
Sustainable Development Plan:

Car-less Commuting

Even the most energy efficient, state-of-the-art green campus will carry a significant environmental burden if people get in their cars each day to get to campus. If ways can be found to make it easier and cheaper to get around without a car, people will leave their cars at home.

Therefore: The University will provide incentives for walking, bicycling, busing, and ride sharing, will discourage the use of single-occupancy cars, and will strive to link transportation planning to land-use planning.

T Junctions

Traffic accidents are far more frequent where two roads cross than at T junctions.

Therefore: Lay out the road system so that any two roads which meet at grade, meet in three-way T junctions as near 90 degrees as possible. Avoid four-way intersections and crossing movements.

Transportation Plan Patterns and Policies

University Streets

Large agglomerations of departments and heavily centralized academic facilities kill variety, academic freedom, and student opportunities for learning.

Therefore: Concentrate the major functions of the university—the offices, labs, lecture halls, sports, student quarters—along university streets; streets that are public and essentially pedestrian, 20 to 30 feet wide, with all the university activity opening off them; always locate new buildings to amplify and extend the university streets.
Areas that need fixing

Notes:
2. Very heavy traffic (including buses).
3. Conflicts with pedestrians and bikes.
4. Partially UO-owned, narrow pathway serves as a primary pathway to the SW campus area.
5. Head-in auto parking makes it difficult for bicyclists.
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Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Worn Paths (see: **••••••**).
2. Pedestrian paths cross though parking area. Entrance is dominated by parking area.
4. Uninsightly meter boxes on parking meters restrict narrow walk.
5. Limited visual area reduces sense of safety.
6. Cemetery used as short cut - safety concerns.
7. Sidewalk too narrow to accommodate pedestrian traffic. Increased problems due to opening of Mckenzie Hall.
8. Difficult to maintain landscaping due to heavy pedestrian traffic.
10. No path to parking lot from Johnson Hall.
11. Primary barriers to accessible routes:
   A. No accessible routes connect the southern area (Knight Library and Gerlinger) with the area to the north.
   B. No accessible east/west routes in southern area.
   C. Main entrance isn't accessible & detour is long.
   D. East end of ground floor is not accessible.
   E. No accessible crossing on University Street between 13th and 15th Avenues.
Bike Paths & Racks

Bikeways: 
| Designated (includes roads) | Not permitted, but often used |

Bike Racks: 
- Covered
- Uncovered

Bike Rack Use: \( \frac{3}{20} \) number of parked bicycles** total number of spaces in area

** count conducted Thursday, April 13, 2000 at 1:00 PM.

Patterns and Policies:
- University Streets
- Bike Paths and Racks
- Sustainable Development Plan:
  - Car-less Commuting

Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Not enough bike parking.
2. Safety and visibility concerns.
3. No racks but area is used for bike parking.
4. No covered bike parking in the area.
5. Bicyclists ride on undesignated paths (see: Discussion). Areas where bikes are not allowed are not well marked.
6. Bikes heading north must ride against the auto traffic.
7. Head-in auto parking makes bike riding more difficult.
8. Bike racks create pedestrian barrier.
9. Very little secure bike parking provided throughout entire study area.
Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Very restricted parking and auto access to the entire study area.
2. Unattractive parking area.
3. Parking (and meters) dominate access to building entrance.
4. Visitors get lost when driving in this area.
5. Used as a short cut by unauthorized vehicles.
6. Parking area needs to be screened better.
Also refer to Service Areas and Access map.

Patterns and Policies:
- University Streets
- Local Transport Area
- Looped Local Roads
- Small Parking Lots
- Sustainable Development Plan:
  - Car-less Commuting
  - Parking Spaces
  - T-junctions
Buildings and Building Uses

The maps in this section address the following Long Range Campus Development Plan’s patterns and other related policies:

Arcades
Arcades—covered walkways at the edge of buildings, which are partly inside the building, partly outside—play a vital role in the way that group territory and the society-at-large interact. Therefore: Whenever paths pass beside buildings, create deep arcades over the paths, and open the group territory inside the building to these arcades. Gradually knit these arcades together until they form a covered system of paths throughout the community.

Architectural Style Policies

Building Complex
When human organizations are housed in enormous buildings, the human scale vanishes, and people stop identifying with the staff who work there as personalities, and think only of the entire institution as an impersonal monolith, staffed with ‘personnel.’ Therefore: To maintain human scale in public buildings, make them small, not more than 3 to 4 storeys high; not more than 9,000 square feet in total indoor area; not more than 3,000 square feet to a story. If more than one small building is being made, to house related functions, the buildings should be conceived as a collection, connected by arcades, paths, bridges.

Connected Buildings
Isolated buildings are symptoms of a disconnected sick society. Therefore: Connect your building up, wherever possible, to the existing buildings round about. Do not keep set backs between buildings; instead, try to form new buildings as continuations of the older buildings.

Fabric of Departments [OE 12]
Over-emphasis on the individuality of departments helps to fragment knowledge by keeping it in watertight compartments. Yet each department does require its own identity. Therefore: Give each department a clearly identified home base, but spread the parts of the department within a radius of 500 feet, so that they interlock with the parts of other departments. No one of these parts should contain less than five faculty offices.

Four Storey Limit
There is abundant evidence to show that high buildings make people crazy. Therefore: In any urban area, no matter how dense, keep the majority of buildings four storeys high or less. It is possible that certain buildings should exceed this limit, but they should never be buildings for human habitation.

Historic Preservation Policies

Operable Windows
Human beings who work in confined spaces such as offices over an eight hour or more span do not flourish in a mechanically-supported work environment. Mechanically sustained environments are sterile at best and stifling at worst. Therefore: In the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, all exterior windows of University buildings must be able to be opened wholly or in part.

Seven Minute Walk Policy
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Small Student Unions [OE 17]
When a single building on campus is designated as student territory, it raises the feeling that the rest of campus is not student territory.
Therefore: Create many small student unions across campus—one for every 500 to 1,000 students, and so placed that there are no classrooms or offices farther than two minutes from the nearest one. Give each small center at least a coffee bar and lounge/reading room, and an area of roughly 2.5 N square feet, where N is the number of people it serves.

Sustainable Development:
Site Benefits
Every site is unique and has local environmental qualities which can be used to enhance the sustainability of development.
Therefore: All new development will site and orient the building and landscape features to take advantage of site conditions and context within the parameters of the established organizational framework of the campus.

University Shape and Diameter [OE 4]
When a university is too spread out, people cannot make use of all it offers; on the other hand, a diameter for the university based strictly on the 10 minute class break is needlessly restrictive.
Therefore: Plan all classes, evenly distributed, within a circular zone not more than 3,000 feet in diameter. Place non-class activities such as athletic fields, research offices, administration within a wider circle, not more than 5,000 feet in diameter.

Level 2 Building Space Use and Development Policies:

Areas 11-16
1. Consideration should be given to developing lounge and study space, perhaps including a small coffee bar, in proximity to major classrooms and lecture halls whenever possible, as suggested by the patterns “Small Student Unions” and “Student Workplace.”

2. With respect to the ground floor and mezzanine of Chapman Hall, the policy related to location of administrative offices in central campus buildings is modified. The Level 2 policy adopted with respect to Area 24 applies to these spaces.

Area 24
In consideration of the existing and traditional use of buildings in this area for central administrative purposes, the general policy favoring use of central campus buildings for instructional or instructionally related purposes is modified. An administrative office which requires frequent face-to-face contact with the general faculty or with the President in order to satisfactorily perform the duties assigned to it would be appropriately located in this area. Consideration also shall be given to the suitability of available space, in terms of size and configuration, for both instructionally related and administrative purposes.
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Areas that need fixing

Notes:
1. Building's large scale is out of character.
2. Building's small scale is out of character and limits re-use options.
3. Isolated building or area is not part of a complex or larger grouping.
4. Two buildings form a complex but are not compatible in character.
5. Barren, uninviting facades.
6. North/South building orientation makes it difficult to take advantage of solar and airflow site conditions.
7. Building size makes it difficult to take advantage of solar and airflow site conditions.
South Central Campus Diagnosis

Facilities Used by the General Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th Avenue</td>
<td>special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier House</td>
<td>special events, food service (currently not in use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlinger Annex</td>
<td>performances, classes, sports camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlinger Athletic Field</td>
<td>pick-up games, summer sports camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlinger Hall</td>
<td>special events, exercise classes, sports camp, pool use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Hall</td>
<td>Career Center interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Hall</td>
<td>administrative meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight Library</td>
<td>research, classes, browsing, meetings, I.M.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Quadrangle</td>
<td>special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Art</td>
<td>exhibit visitors, special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC Hall</td>
<td>Humanities Center?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Campbell Hall</td>
<td>OUS-related visits and meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women's Memorial Quadrangle special events

Non-University Property:

Pioneer Cemetery burials, visitations, passive recreation
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## Departments Occupying Buildings in the South Central Area
(Sept. 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLDG NAME</th>
<th>BLD #</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>SQ FT</th>
<th>TOTAL SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPMAN HALL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT GU/ENGLISH</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>19,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT GU/HONORS COLL</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HONORS COLLEGE</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRADUATE SCHOOL</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; FAC DEVELOP</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OREGON QUARTERLY</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLlier HOUSE 81</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPACE COM ASSIGN</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>6,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERSITY HOUSING</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDON HALL 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIA SERVICES</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT GU/GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>9,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>8,886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERLINGER ANNEX 50,169</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARS</td>
<td>17,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E &amp; M SCIENCE</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>15,428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERLINGER HALL 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIA SERVICES</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT GU/EMS</td>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASIAN/PACIFIC STUDIES</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARS</td>
<td>20,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXERCISE &amp; MOVEMENT SCI</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROMANCE LANGUAGES</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDON HALL 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPACE COM ASSIGN</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT UNION</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRICKS HALL 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCHITRE &amp; ALLIED ARTS</td>
<td>8,158</td>
<td>22,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOMEN'S STUDIES</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSWS</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAREER CENTER</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON HALL 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENT'S OFFICE</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>26,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC AFFRS/PROVOST</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADMIN VP</td>
<td>992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUB AFFAIRS &amp; DEVELOP</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; FAC DEVELOP</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEWS BUREAU</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALUMNI ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS</td>
<td>611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OUS BOARD'S OFFICE</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UO FOUNDATION</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG NAME</td>
<td>BLD #</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>TOTAL SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHT LIBRARY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MEDIA SERVICES</td>
<td>16,873</td>
<td>347,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>261,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT UNION</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSEUM OF ART</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MUSEUM OF ART</td>
<td>18,479</td>
<td>24,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC HALL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GENERAL CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>93,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASIAN STUDIES</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INT'L PROGRAMS COUNCIL</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSIAN/EAST EUROPEAN</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSICS</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>15,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RELIGIOUS STUDIES</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JUDAIC STUDIES</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>6,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>5,914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAS ASSIGNABLE</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUMANITIES CENTER</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC LEARNING SVCS</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACILITIES SERVICES</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN CAMPBELL HALL</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUS BOARD'S OFFICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unaccounted for space includes building operations, circulation and restrooms.
Potential Historic Buildings and Sites

Options: A° Buildings  D° Sites (Letters refer to separate list found on the following page)

* Listed on the National Register of Historic Places or designated as a City Historic Landmark

Potential historic buildings and sites include those that are designated as a City Landmark, listed on the National Register of Historic Places or possibly eligible for listing according to a survey or OSBHE.

Areas that need fixing

Notes:
Overall: Need to maintain historic buildings and sites. Deferred maintenance should be addressed.
1. Historic building is predominantly vacant. Building was not originally designed for instructional use, which limits reuse options.
2. Building design is not compatible with the historic character of the area.
Potential Historic Buildings and Sites

Listed below are buildings and sites within the study area identified as having some level of historic significance. The numbers correspond to the area map depicting historic features.

**Buildings:**

**A. Chapman Hall – 1939**
Architect: Lawrence, Holford and Allyn
Original Use: University classrooms and store
Current Use: University classrooms and offices
Alterations/Additions: Bookstore removed, door replaced windows on north ground floor façade (1966)
Condition: good
Listings:
- University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
- Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking
- City of Eugene Historic Survey - Primary Ranked

**University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map**
- OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report
  - Primary Ranking
  - Historic Continuity
  - A Diagnosis Report (1980)

**C. Condon Hall – 1925**
Architect: Lawrence and Holford
Original Use: University classrooms and offices
Current Use: University classrooms and offices
Alterations/Additions: Large south addition (1967), west fire escape replaced with a concrete and steel stair (1975).
Condition: good
Listings:
- University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
- Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking

**B. Collier House and site – 1885-6**
Architect: Not known
Original Use: Residence
Current Use: University food service, meeting rooms
Alterations/Additions: East porch altered (c1935), large dining room addition (1963)
Condition: good
Listings:
- City of Eugene Historic Landmark
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University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking
OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Primary Ranking
Historic Continuity—A Diagnosis Report (1980)

E. Hendricks Hall – 1918
Architect: Lawrence and Holford
Original Use: Women’s dormitory
Current Use: University offices and classrooms
Alterations/Additions: Reflectory porch and cornice balustrade removed.
Condition: good
Listings:
  National Register of Historic Places (as part of the Women’s Memorial Quadrangle Ensemble)
  City of Eugene Historic Survey - Primary Ranked
  University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
  Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking
  OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Primary Ranking

F. Johnson Hall – 1915
Architect: W. C. Knighton
Original Use: University administration, theatre
Current Use: University administration
Alterations/Additions: No exterior alterations.
Condition: good
Listings:
  National Register of Historic Places
  City of Eugene Historic Landmark

University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
Lawrence Building Inventory - Secondary ranking
OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Secondary Ranking
Historic Continuity – A Diagnosis Report (1980)

G. Knight Library – 1937
Architect: Lawrence, Holford & Allyn
Original Use: University library
Current Use: University library
Alterations/Additions: Rear additions (1950 and 1966) and rear and west additions (1992)
Condition: good
Listings:
  National Register of Historic Places (as part of the University of Oregon Library and Memorial Quadrangle nomination)
  University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map
  Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking
  OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Primary Ranking
  Historic Continuity – A Diagnosis Report (1980)

H. Museum of Art – 1930
Architect: Lawrence, Holford, Allyn and Bean
Original Use: University museum
Current Use: University museum
Alterations/Additions: Rear portico entrance added (1934).
Condition: good
Listings:
  National Register of Historic Places
  City of Eugene Historic Landmark
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City of Eugene Historic Landmark  
University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map  
Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking  
OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Primary Ranking  
Historic Continuity – A Diagnosis Report (1980)

I. Susan Campbell Hall – 1921
Architect: Lawrence and Holford  
Original Use: Women’s dormitory  
Current Use: University offices  
Alterations/Additions: No exterior alterations.  
Condition: good  
Listings:  
National Register of Historic Places (as part of the Women’s Memorial Quadrangle Ensemble)  
City of Eugene Historic Survey - Primary Ranked  
University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map  
OSBHE 1974 Ad Hoc Committee Report – Primary Ranking  
Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary ranking

Sites:

J. Memorial Quadrangle – 1914–1939
Architect: Lawrence and Holford  
Original Use: quadrangle  
Current Use: quadrangle  
Alterations/Additions: ???  
Condition: good  
Listings:  
National Register of Historic Places (as part of the University of Oregon Library and Memorial Quadrangle nomination)  
University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map  
Ellis Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary significance (as primary component of the 1914 Campus Plan)  
Historic Continuity – A Diagnosis Report (1980)

K. Women’s Memorial Quadrangle – 1914-1921
Architect: Lawrence and Holford  
Original Use: quadrangle  
Current Use: quadrangle  
Alterations/Additions: ???  
Condition: good  
Listings:  
National Register of Historic Places (as part of the Women’s Memorial Quadrangle Ensemble)  
University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant Properties Map  
Ellis Lawrence Building Inventory - Primary significance (as primary component of the 1914 Campus Plan)  
Historic Continuity – A Diagnosis Report (1980)
L. Women’s Physical Education Field – 1918
Architect: Lawrence and Holford
Original Use: playing field
Current Use: playing field
Alterations/Additions:
Condition: good
Listings:
National Register of Historic Places (as part of the
Women’s Memorial Quadrangle Ensemble)
University of Oregon 1992 Historically Significant
Properties Map
Service Areas and Infrastructure

The maps in this section address the following Long Range Campus Development Plan’s patterns and other related policies:

Infrastructure Policies

Service Area Policies

Shielded Parking

Large parking structures full of cars are inhuman and dead buildings—no one wants to see them or walk by them. At the same time, if you are driving, the entrance to a parking structure is essentially the main entrance to the building—and it needs to be visible.

Therefore. Put all large parking lots, or parking garages, behind some kind of natural wall, so that the cars and parking structures cannot be seen from outside. The wall which surrounds the cars may be a building, connected houses, or housing hills, earth berms, or shops. Make the entrance to the parking lot a natural gateway to the buildings which it serves, and place it so that you can easily see the main entrance to the building from the entrance to the parking.

Small Parking Lots

Vast parking lots wreck the land for people.

Therefore: Make parking lots small, for 8 to 12 cars; when a lot requires more parking, build it up as a collection of these 8 to 12 car lots, along a spine, each lot bounded and enclosed with wall, hedge, trees; not visible from the outside.

Sustainable Development Plan:

Car-less Commuting

Even the most energy efficient, state-of-the-art green campus will carry a significant environmental burden if people get in their cars each day to get to campus. If ways can be found to make it easier and cheaper to get around without a car, people will leave their cars at home.

Therefore: The University will provide incentives for walking, bicycling, busing, and ride sharing, will discourage the use of single-occupancy cars, and will strive to link transportation planning to land-use planning.

Transportation Plan Patterns and Policies

Utility Policies
Notes:
Overall: Limited service parking and difficult service access in this predominately pedestrian area.
1. Conflicts with service vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists, especially at sidewalk ramps.
2. Difficult delivery route.
3. Dumpster/service area is not adequately buffered. Also, only ramp-in service delivery is available.
4. Service vehicles park in inappropriate area.
5. No LRCDP designated service area exists for this building.
6. Service parking spaces are not large enough.
7. Drive is used as a short cut and parking area by service vehicles. Also, used for deliveries by unauthorized vehicles.
8. Need additional service parking spaces.
Appendices
Appendix A: Focus Group Letter and Area Tour

SAMPLE LETTER

October 22, 2001

Louise Bishop
Clark Honors College

Dear Louise:

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the focus group for the South Central Campus Diagnosis. This is the third study of its kind and I appreciate your willingness to participate. Your efforts will help to preserve the character of the campus as well as facilitate future improvements.

The focus group meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 29, 2001 from 9:30 A.M. to 11:00 A.M. in Hendricks Hall, PPPM Conference Room 100 (enter through the main, east building entrance, turn right, and then left). The purpose of the meeting is to gather your input on the health of this area of campus.

Prior to the meeting, please take time to review the attached information (project description and draft sample maps) and complete the tour to acquaint yourself, or remind yourself, of the opportunities and issues that relate to this area.

I look forward to seeing you. If you have questions, please contact me at 6-5572.

Sincerely,

Christine Thompson
University Planning
University of Oregon
South Central Campus Diagnosis
October 2001

Walking Tour Guide
Tour Map

1. Numbers refer to tour description
These questions are just to get you started. Feel free to make any comments that occur to you. As you tour the area, circle areas that need fixing on your map and star the areas that you believe work well.

You may start at any point of the tour. The questions are keyed to numbered locations on the accompanying map.

*Please bring your completed tour comments to the upcoming focus group meeting.*

1. **13th Avenue at the intersection of the Memorial Quadrangle.** Is this an active or passive area? Does the quad function well as an open space? Is pedestrian circulation effective? How about 13th Avenue? Where are there conflicts with bikes, pedestrians and autos? (you can circle them on your map)

2. **13th Avenue Gateway.** Is this campus entrance adequately defined? Does the transition from City to campus work well?

3. **Kincaid Street edge.** What image does the UO project to the community? Is there adequate space for pedestrians on the sidewalk?

4. **Parking lot.** Does this area feel like part of campus? Is there a visual and pedestrian connection to the main campus? Can you imagine an academic building here?

5. **Area east of Knight Library.** Is there adequate bike parking in this area? Would you consider this a good place to have lunch? Is the lower PLC courtyard used?

6. **PLC Entrance.** How is the view looking towards PLC? What are the pedestrian and bike routes through this area? Are bikes appropriate on the quad?

7. **Women’s Memorial Quadrangle.** What are the characteristics of the landscaping and historic qualities? Can you imagine additional buildings constructed to complete this quadrangle? If so, what size would they be? (don’t forget to mark up your map)

8. **Gerlinger Annex entry court.** How is this space used? Are there adequate seating areas? Do you like the appearance?
9. **Open space between Gerlinger and the Pioneer Cemetery.** Are the pedestrian and bike routes through this area safe? Do you like the look of Gerlinger Hall? How about Gerlinger Annex?

10. **Hendricks Entrance.** Do the landscaping and drive work well as an entrance to Hendricks Hall for autos, bikes, and pedestrians?

11. **Open space in front of the Collier House.** What function does this space serve? Do you think this is an important open space to preserve?

12. Overall, where would you take a visitor if you were touring this part of campus? What areas would you avoid? Where do you spend time yourself in this part of campus? Why? (you can circle problem areas on your map and star those you like)

13. Other comments. (For example, are there places where service deliveries, parking, or landscaping is a problem? Are there areas that need more seating?)

*Questions? Call Christine Thompson at 6-5572 or e-mail cthomps@oregon.*

*Please bring your completed tour comments to the upcoming focus group meeting.*

*Thank you!*

---
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Appendix B: Building Use Categories

The following principal use codes were used to define use categories for each building:

**Administration:**
10  General Administration  
12  Non-Institutional Administration  
13  Sponsored Projects Administration  
18  Centralized Services  
19  Physical Plant  

**Auxiliaries:**
50  Health Services (student)  
51  Student Union and/or Activities  
53  Food Service  
54  Bookstore  
55  Athletics  
56  Residential  
57  Recreational  

**Instruction:**
01  General and/or Lower Division Formal Instruction  
02  Upper Division and/or Graduate Formal Instruction  
03  Physical Education Activity  
05  Formal Instructional Support  
11  Departmental Administration  
14  Museums (also may be considered research)  
20  Library Reader Space  
21  Stacks  
22  Audio-Visual Services  
23  Library Services and Administration  
24  Archives  

**Public Services:**
60  Public Services  

**Research:**
34  Federal Cooperative Extension  
35  Agriculture Experiment Station  
36  U. S. Department of Agriculture  
37  Forestry Research Laboratory  
41  Separately Organized Research  

**Student Services:**
16  Student Services
Appendix C: Automobile Parking Space Count

9/25/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Resrvd</th>
<th>University Metered</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Visitor</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff/Student Visitor</th>
<th>24 min load/unload</th>
<th>unmarked</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - East 14th/Alder/Kincaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b - Alley way behind 14th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking along 14th</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking along Kincaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>60**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - West of Johnson Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - Behind Art Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - Susan Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - Behind Gerlinger Annex</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - Hendricks Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - Front of Gerlinger Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Motorcycle Parking
** City Metered
*** State Vehicles Only
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