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I. Introduction

This document describes the East Campus Residence Hall project, as the University of Oregon best understands it at this time. As such it serves to inform prospective architects about the project, as well as to establish the relationship between the user group and the design team that is ultimately selected for this project. Your honest insights and suggestions are welcomed as the selection process moves forward. The following information should be a beginning rather than an end.

II. Project Overview

The University of Oregon is seeking architectural firms and their consultants to perform design services for the East Campus Residence Hall project located on its campus in Eugene, Oregon. These services will include programming, schematic design, design development, construction documents, bidding, and construction administration.

Project Goals

The East Campus Residence Hall project is currently envisioned as a major residence hall housing 400-500 students from diverse backgrounds and accommodating a variety of different student living spaces, shared and common areas, dining facilities, and academic program spaces.

Several goals are fundamental to the success of the project. These include:

- Helping to meet long-term University plans to significantly expand the overall student housing capacity; and to meet expected increases in freshman enrollment.
- Contributing to University goals to house up to 25% of undergraduates in diverse housing types that offer residents sequenced independence, and motivate them to live on campus for several years.
- Providing residence hall “surge” space to house first-year students while existing traditional-style residence halls are remodeled or replaced.
- Providing dining facility surge space in the form of a 500-seat dining hall serving several thousand students per day while existing dining halls are renovated. Post-renovation plans include retrofitting the dining facility into a catering/commissary kitchen and a much smaller scale food service ‘Grab and Go’ or eatery.
- The inclusion of a greater variety of student living spaces for a diverse population of students that still retain the current in-residence staffing model (E.g. traditional double-occupancy rooms arranged with group showers and common areas, as well as other configurations).
- Common areas and public spaces purposefully organized and designed to promote community for a wide spectrum of students, enhance the quality of the student living experience, and contribute to the residential nature of campus as a whole.
- Incorporating sustainable design and operation; and, as practical, creating opportunities for residents to engage in sustainability initiatives as a living/learning laboratory.
- Flexibility in building design and construction to allow for building use and space changes over time; and to ensure the long-term success of the residence hall.
- Academic linkages and out-of-the-classroom learning within the residence hall accomplished through the creation of tailored academic programming spaces/building components and collaborative programming.
- Providing future energy cost savings for students through the creation of an energy-efficient facility with lower operations and maintenance costs.
- Continuing the University’s commitment to notable campus architecture within the context of its needs. This entails the creation of buildings and spaces that improve the campus in durable, effective, and affordable ways that fit seamlessly into the fabric of the campus.
II. Project Overview (continued)

Campus Context

The East Campus Residence Hall site is the area to the east of the Museum of Natural and Cultural History (MNCH) bordered by East 15th and 17th Avenues and Columbia and Moss Streets in the East Campus Area.

To the north of the site across East 15th Avenue are several residence hall complexes and student pedestrian routes through a significant designated open space known as the Humpy Lumpy. To the east across Moss Street is a mix of houses used as student residences or retrofitted for office use, and a childcare facility. To the south across 17th Avenue are more houses used as student residences. Finally, to the west are institutional buildings in a wide range of sizes that include the Many Nations Longhouse, the Olum Child Care facility, the Museum of Natural and Cultural History, and the Knight Law School. Beyond these facilities lies the rest of the campus.

Site Concepts, Challenges, and Requirements

The site selected for the new residence hall offers opportunities for the realization of an array of conceptual objectives that will require further review as the project develops. At this time, these include:

- Extending the living, learning, dining and social programmatic functions of the residence hall out to the adjacent exterior spaces.
- Developing programmed exterior spaces to create flexible communal areas that act as social gathering spaces, recreational areas, and quiet places to study or visit with friends.
- Concentrating the residence hall functions along 15th Avenue and Moss Street, near to existing residential facilities, so functions can be shared by all student residents.
- Locating the project on a university street or promenade with strong connections between the building’s public functions and the pedestrian thoroughfare.
- Locating the residence hall in conjunction with neighboring buildings like the MNCH to form activity nodes; and knitting these nodes together with a network of pedestrian paths.
- Providing pedestrian pathways that connect to the campus and make the area a part of the campus. For example, building upon and extending current promenade opportunities -- in particular, the promenade that extends past the existing residence halls through the Humpy Lumpy and the Erb Memorial Union, to 13th Avenue and University Street.
- Using land wisely to ensure accommodation of future development.
II. Project Overview (continued)

While the location of the selected site offers the above possibilities, it also presents challenges and contextual issues requiring review, including:

- The location of the main entrance.
- Integration of the building rear service functions into existing conditions.
- Ensuring that the residence hall respects and responds to the variety of facilities sizes adjacent to the site and within the “super-block.”

Lastly, the project triggers University requirements to create an open-space framework plan for the East Campus Area. This will be implemented in conjunction with the East Campus Residence Hall programming and conceptual design development, and is further described on page 11.

Funding and Procurement

The total project budget is in the $55-$70 million range, which will require state legislative authorization when budget numbers are more clearly defined. Roughly two thirds of the total budget will be available for direct construction, which is roughly estimated to be sufficient to build 140,000-160,000 gross square feet.

In parallel with the architect hiring process, the UO will hire a construction manager/general contractor (CM/GC). The CM/GC will provide pre-construction services (cost estimating, analysis of proposed materials and systems and constructability reviews), and obtain subcontractor bids through the CM/GC process. The UO plans to engage the design team and the CM/GC in a value-setting discussion during the programming phase to confirm the process for cost/value decisions and set initial project expectations and goals.

Schedule

With expected continued freshman enrollment increases and higher than expected student retention numbers, there is an immediate and growing need to house more students on campus. In order to address this need, the project will be subject to a tight completion timeline.
III. Design Process / Description of Work

The selected architectural firm will be required to perform the following work in consultation with the user group. Refer to the “Architect’s Agreement for Architectural and Planning Services for East Campus Residence Hall Project” for a detailed breakdown of specific requirements.

1. Prepare a project schedule that identifies both the residence hall and open-space framework plan timelines and milestones, to be monitored and adjusted during the design and construction phases. The project schedule must leave adequate time for review and design changes, should these be necessary.

2. Monitor and change, as necessary, the space and programming needs identified in this document.

3. Review and apply the patterns of the Campus Plan and 2003 Development Policy of the East Campus Area; and verify, modify, or expand upon the project-specific patterns in this document. A copy of the Campus Plan is available at: http://uplan.uoregon.edu/plandoc/CampusPlan/CampusPlan.html. A copy of the 2003 Development Policy of the East Campus Area is available at: http://uplan.uoregon.edu/plandoc/plandoc.html

4. Determine how both the interior and exterior spaces should be organized.

5. Analyze the site and its context, examining the work contained in this document and expanding upon it as appropriate.

6. Develop an open-space framework plan for the East Campus Area. Provide for integration of the residence hall with other components of the open-space framework plan.

7. Analyze the monetary costs, embodied costs, and sustainability implications of various designs (including, but not limited to, type of construction, life cycles, air and water quality, and energy) in order to meet the requirements of the University’s Sustainable Development Plan and the Governor’s executive order on sustainability, as well as the project budget. A copy of the Sustainable Development Plan is available at: http://uplan.uoregon.edu/subjects/Sustainability/sustainable.html

8. Design for energy conservation sufficient to meet or beat the State of Oregon requirements for public buildings, which mandate energy use at a level 20% lower than that required by energy codes.

9. With the user group, develop a schematic design incorporating the patterns and issues identified, accommodating the program and space needs, meeting the budget, and allowing for flexibility to change. The schematic design should illustrate how the project can be expressed architecturally, including the design of appropriate site improvements and fixing the scope of the project. The schematic design should be consistent with the policies of the University of Oregon’s Campus Plan and the 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area, applicable codes, and state statutes and policies (including the percent-for-art program and the State Energy Efficient Design (SEED) program).

10. Work with the user group during design development to ensure that building functionality and on-going maintenance, security, furnishings and finishes, and other aspects of the building meet the needs of the users, while maintaining the schematic design of both the residence hall project and East Campus Area framework plan created during the schematic design phase.

11. Provide design and contract administration services through construction. The project will be constructed according to the State of Oregon and Oregon University System requirements.
In addition to the legal and policy mandates that apply to this project, the UO will engage the design team and CM/GC in an integrated design process to describe specific areas of environmental concern; to identify strategies to address those concerns; to set environmental impact mitigation goals; and to establish methods and metrics to measure performance relative to those goals. The UO expects to be an active participant in all phases of these discussions. It is not known at this time if this project will seek LEED certification in addition to the mandated State of Oregon DAS-LEED process, or will replace or supplement LEED with a different metric. The UO firmly endorses the principles of sustainable design and expects the design team to bring to the table an expertise in these issues that is deeper and broader than simply checking off LEED points.

IV. Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Design

The UO is comfortable with using LEED as a rating system, but prefers to make each green building decision (in conjunction with the design team and CM/GC) on its own merits relative to its environmental ethics and goals. Those goals relate to specific environmental concerns, some of which are discussed in UO policies and public statements. These decisions are most effectively started early in the design process, which allows for the early integration of solutions rather than applying them after the fact. The team selected is expected to possess the skills necessary to function as an equal partner in this process and to understand fundamental green building issues -- not simply current standard approaches to sustainability.
V. Campus Plan

The Campus Plan contains a policy framework to guide the development of the University of Oregon, including the East Campus Residence Hall project. The Plan is a process for making development decisions on an on-going basis rather than a static fixed-image master plan; given that the exact nature and magnitude of future changes cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty, and object-oriented plans based on explicit assumptions about the future become outdated as the “future” becomes known.

Policies, which apply to all projects within the Campus Plan’s jurisdiction, describe the University’s requirements with respect to physical development and the application of the Plan to projects.

Campus Plan Policies:
1. Process and Participation
2. Open-space Framework
3. Densities
4. Space Use and Organization
5. Replacement of Displaced Uses
6. Maintenance and Building Service
7. Architectural Style and Historic Preservation
8. Universal Access
9. Transportation
10. Sustainable Development
11. Patterns
12. Design Area Special Conditions

Six policies are explored more thoroughly in this document because of their relevance to this project:
   Process and Participation
   Open-space Framework
   Replacement of Displaced Uses
   Architectural Styles
   Universal Access
   Patterns

Please refer to the Campus Plan for the full text of each policy.

Process and Participation
The cornerstone of the University’s planning process is the principle of participation, which is an extension of an established tradition in Oregon generally and at the University of Oregon in particular.

The process is designed to ensure that:

- Meaningful opportunities exist for participation in the planning and design processes;
- Decisions are based upon a policy framework that preserves and enhances the essence of the campus as described in this Plan; and
- Planning decisions are coordinated and faithful to overall institutional objectives.
Participation

User Group

The user group is the primary client representative in the design process and is appointed by the Campus Planning Committee chair. Unlike user committees at many other institutions, a UO user group is actively involved as a partner in the design process. Its involvement includes: developing organizational approaches, generating design concepts, prioritizing needs, comparing building systems, and discussing cost and budget trade-offs. In addition, the user group may appoint fiduciary focus groups to address specific programmatic needs at different points in the process. Informational meetings and comment sessions for the University community and the community at large may also be instituted.

The East Campus Residence Hall project user group will serve as the primary advising body for the project on matters related to design and programming. The group will consist of faculty, student, and staff representatives from academic support units, University Housing, Student Affairs, and other units representing the broader interests of the University.

Open-space Framework Advisory Group

A unique requirement of the East Campus Residence Hall project is the requirement to develop and adopt an open-space framework plan for the East Campus Area. This is to be completed in parallel with the East Campus Residence Hall programming and schematic design development phase and be completed for CPC review spring term 2009.

An East Campus Area Open-space Framework Advisory Group has been created that will serve as an advising body to the East Campus Residence Hall User Group, architects, and planning staff on matters pertaining to the open space design and usage. Advisory Group membership includes representatives from the East Campus Residence Hall User Group, the Campus Planning Committee, AAA Faculty, and Campus Planning and Real Estate.

Additionally, the process to date has included and will continue to include ad hoc groups devoted to specific topics, such as (but not necessarily limited to) building standards and data services.

Process

The selected design team will work collaboratively with the user group(s) to program and design the building through a series of exercises, user group meetings, program investigations, and other methods. The schematic design process may also engage external groups such as the Campus Planning Committee and occupants of neighboring buildings. After the user group approves the proposed schematic design, it will be reviewed and approved by the Campus Planning Committee and the University Administration. Campus Planning and Real Estate will provide staff support in combination with Facilities Services Capital Construction throughout the design and construction processes.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Open-space Framework

The University of Oregon campus is organized as a system of quadrangles, malls, pathways, and other open spaces and landscapes. This organizational framework works well and serves as a physical representation of the University’s heritage.

The framework policy calls for the preservation, completion, and extension of the open-space framework through a series of dedicated open spaces upon which the construction of above ground buildings is prohibited. Additionally, University projects are bound by requirements outlined in the Campus Plan to enhance adjacent open spaces, or to create new open spaces.

The site selected for the new residence hall is adjacent to several designated open spaces, including the 15th and 17th Avenue Axes, the Moss and Columbia Street Axes, and the East Campus Green that connects to the Glenn Starlin Green in front of the MNCH. At a roughly estimated 140,000 – 160,000 gross square feet, the residence hall project will be required to enhance or create open space of at least 16% of the gross square footage. Compliance with this provision will be ascertained when the Campus Planning Committee reviews the schematic design for the project. (Refer to Campus Plan page 27.)

Given the above, the East Campus Residence Hall project has triggered the requirement to develop and adopt an open-space framework plan for the East Campus Area. This is to be completed in parallel with East Campus Residence Hall programming and schematic design development, and be completed for CPC review spring term 2009. The framework plan must be consistent with policies established in the Campus Plan and 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area. The East Campus Open Space Framework (2004) and relevant portions of the Residential Area Conceptual Study (2006) may serve to inform the open-space framework design.

An advisory group for the East Campus Area Open-space Framework will be charged with fulfilling the following duties:

- Developing an open-space framework plan for the East Campus Area that focuses on the ‘superblock’ (Design Area H, Sub Area’s 71, 72, and 73) as defined:
- Providing direction for siting of the East Campus Residence Hall in Design Area H, Sub Area 72;
- Providing guidance for the siting of future buildings and the expansion of existing buildings in the ‘superblock’;
- Identifying potential solutions for replacement of existing uses (i.e. basketball courts);
- Clarifying the boundaries of open spaces adjacent to the proposed residence hall;
- Defining the locations of pathways that transverse the project site (including those in the ‘superblock’) and connections to the rest of the East Campus Area;
- Demonstrate how best to expand and develop a complete East Campus open-space framework that meets the requirements described in the UO 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area (pp. 17-18). (This will likely result in a series of scenarios. The plan does not need to delineate the exact boundaries of all other East Campus Area open spaces and pathways).
Universal Access

The project must create an inclusive environment that is welcoming and accessible to all users irrespective of ability. Consideration must be given for the broadest range of physical needs of infants, the elderly, the ambulatory, the mobility impaired, the sight-impaired, and so forth -- resulting in an inclusive and welcoming environment. The entire built environment (including, but not limited to, buildings, outdoor areas, signs, furniture, amplification systems, alarms, etc.) shall be designed and constructed to achieve this goal.

Below are a few examples of accommodations needed (this is not an exhaustive list):

- Accommodations for those with autism spectrum disorders (ASD) and sensory issues, such as quiet study rooms, EMF feedback loops, special lighting and acoustical treatments, good air flows, easily readable room identifiers, easily accessible classrooms, and clear way-finding (including signage).
- Room-specific Braille labels for the vision-impaired.
- TTY or other DEAF community devices for the hearing-impaired, as well as classrooms designed with good sightlines and room for translators.

V. Campus Plan (continued)

Replacement of Displaced Uses

Given the lack of truly undeveloped real property on campus, projects that displace existing uses must replace those uses. Without direction from the University President to the contrary, funds for replacing displaced uses must be included in each project budget.

Architectural Styles

The character and architectural style of campus buildings are important in maintaining the quality of the campus environment. The cohesiveness of the campus is to be maintained by creating new buildings that are compatible and harmonious with the design, orientation, and scale of adjacent buildings -- though they need not (and in some cases should not) mimic them. In order to accomplish this, buildings are to follow the general principles found in the designs of the Ellis Lawrence buildings on the campus. Emphasis is to be placed on materials (generally brick) and compositions (clear main entrances, the scale and rhythm of openings) of the Lawrence-era buildings in order to create buildings that are human-scaled. Designs must relate to the overall campus character and, as a general rule, should avoid large, blank facades; large areas of glazing; or unbroken, horizontally oriented windows (ribbon windows).

This task is doubly challenging in the East Campus area, where the styles range from 1920’s-1940’s single family residences, to 1960s Modernism (Bean Complex); with a mix of contemporary and Northwest contemporary structures that include the Knight Law Center, Many Nations Longhouse, Vivian Olum Child Care Center, and Museum of Natural and Cultural History.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Patterns

Campus projects are held to the policy framework published in the Campus Plan. Projects sited within East Campus Design Area H must also adhere to the 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area.

One of the applicable Campus Plan policies is “Policy 11: Patterns”. Patterns suggest ways of looking at major design issues and are intended to guide the design process and elicit further input from users or stimulate designer thinking.

Definition

Patterns are statements about the built environment that describe and analyze design issues and suggest possible ways to resolve them. Articulating long-lasting, shared traditions and understandings that adapt well to development needs, patterns enable user groups to respond quickly to opportunities for facilities improvements as they emerge and, at the same time emphasize long-range planning and continuity of development decisions over time.

Each pattern, consisting of a title, identification of an issue, and a policy statement, identifies the essence of an issue and suggests ways in which to resolve it. Certain issues may involve more than one pattern. In addition, not all problems that need to be resolved are covered by patterns. Finally, the solution suggested by a pattern may not be the only resolution. In these cases, an alternative means of resolving the issue is called for.

Campus-wide Pattern List

This is a list of relevant patterns taken from the Campus Plan and 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area. As prescribed in the Campus Plan, patterns in bold typeface must be considered for every project and if not included must provide an explanation to the Campus Planning Committee at the Schematic Design review. The full text for these patterns can be found in the Campus Plan. Patterns unique to the East Campus Area are highlighted with an asterisk (*). The full text for these patterns can be found in the 2003 Development Policy for the East Campus Area. Every pattern on this list must be discussed with the user group during the process of design, and designs may be evaluated using this list as a tool.

LARGE-SCALE CAMPUS: This first set of patterns defines how the campus is formed at the greatest scale and looks at the composition of the entire campus.

- Universal Access
- Sustainable Development*
- Open-space Framework
- University Shape and Diameter*
- Campus Trees
- Open University*
- Good Neighbor
- Outdoor Classroom
- Student Housing*
- Connected, Smaller-scaled Designated Open Spaces*
- Planning Process Participation*

TRANSPORTATION: This set of patterns defines the transportation systems (including pathways) of the entire campus.

- Local Transport Area*
- Bike Paths, Racks, and Lockers
- Path Shape
- Paths and Goals
- Road Crossings
- Pedestrian Pathways*
- Shielded Parking and Service Areas
- Peripheral Parking
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Street Grid
Incentives for Alternative Modes
Balanced Parking
Displaced Parking
Collaborative Parking Solutions
Landscape Buffering

SITE ARRANGEMENT: This set of patterns informs how buildings should be arranged to become a part of the campus.

Site Repair
Use What We Have Wisely
Existing Uses/Replacement
Positive Outdoor Space
South Facing Outdoors
Wings of Light
Building Height Limit (based on Four Story Limit)
Building Complex
Sustainable Form
Visibility and Presence
Academic Linkages
Quiet Backs
Water Quality
Local Sports
Public Outdoor Room
Small Public Square
Family of Entrances
Tree Places

BUILDING DESIGN: This set of patterns informs how each building should be designed.

Architectural Style
Building Character and Campus Context
Arcades
Main Building Entrance

Connected Buildings
Transparency and Approachability
Scales of Community
Staged Independence
Sense of Publicness/Levels of Privacy (based on Degrees of Publicness)
Security Layers
Nerve Centers (Based on Building Hearth and Activity Nodes)
Preview Social Spaces
Natural Supervision
Accommodate Change
Efficient and Maintainable (replaces Materials and Operations)
Back of House Services
One Room, Many Uses
Dining Conversion
Participate in Sustainable Living
Themed Areas
A Place for Quiet
Operable Windows
Flexibility and Longevity
Future Expansion
Wholeness of Project
Pools of Light
Quality of Light
Organizational Clarity
Dining and Conversation
Resident Social Hearth (In My Pajamas) replaces Building Hearth
Group Study Alcoves
Movable, Flexible Furniture
Visible Laundry
More than a Corridor
Enough Storage
Building Maintenance
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Campus and Site Patterns

Positive Outdoor Space

Issue: In general, people don’t use outdoor spaces that are merely “left over” between buildings. This can be observed at the “dead-end canyons” formed by the wings of some of our older residence halls.

Principle: Always place buildings so that they embrace the outdoor spaces they form. Design the landscape so that some sides of the outdoor space are defined by buildings and some sides by arcades, trees, or low walls. Be sure to leave entrances to the outdoor “room” at several points so people can pass freely through the space and travel to other connecting outdoor spaces.

South Facing Outdoors

Issue: People use open space if it is sunny, and they don’t use it if it isn’t. In a residence hall, sunny outdoor spaces are natural attractors of students, interaction, and community.

Principle: 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 it serves. Take advantage of views south from the building into this sunny space and to the view of the Hendrick’s Park in the hills beyond.

Building Height Limit (based on Four Story Limit)

Issue: An important aspect of the campus’s beauty is access to sunlight, views of the sky, and human scale.

Principle: Although we keep the majority of buildings four stories high or less, residential building stories are lower than other university buildings. It is possible that this building may exceed this limit while remaining compatible with nearby academic buildings, but strong consideration must be given to the resultant scale, skyline, and shadows to ensure the beauty of the campus and the importance of the individual.

Wings of Light

Issue: Buildings are often shaped without concern for natural light and depend almost entirely on artificial light. Buildings that do not allow natural light as a source of illumination are not comfortable places to spend the entire day.

Principle: Shape buildings in ways that allow natural light to penetrate into their centers. Use ideas like light shelves to bounce daylight into the building’s spaces. Usually this means buildings have wings less than about 50 feet wide. In this residence hall, the width of each wing on upper resident room levels may be different from the building depth for ground floor public areas.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Building Complex

**Issue:** Large, monolithic buildings feel out of place in the intimate environment of our campus.

**Principle:** Build large buildings as complexes of smaller elements. Relate these smaller elements to the larger whole, but give them each their own identity. For a residence hall, ensure that these elements are interconnected to ensure effective staffing and appropriate creation of community within the complex.

Sustainable Form

**Issue:** Unless sustainability is considered in the earliest planning of a building, it can be very difficult to create successful sustainable buildings. For example, in this climate major west glass exposures create climate difficulties of excessive heat gain in warm seasons.

**Principle:** Consider sustainability issues from the beginning of the design process. Organize and orient the building to maximize daylighting potential and to conserve energy.

Visibility and Presence

**Issue:** Unless users see this new residence hall complex as an integral part of the UO campus, it will be only a partial success.

**Principle:** Design the buildings and the open spaces linking this building to its neighbors to create a new precinct that is unmistakably part of the UO campus. Ensure that this precinct becomes an identifiable place in the minds of the entire campus community.

Academic Linkages

**Issue:** Barriers between the student’s living experience and their learning experience can get in the way of engagement in the full intellectual life of the university. Creating academic linkages where faculty will interact with students in their residence creates added value for on-campus living and promotes student recruitment and retention.

**Principle:** Create academic linkages where faculty interact with students in their residence hall to add value to on-campus living and promote student retention. Multi-purpose spaces and public spaces, formal and informal, of different sizes and shapes, provide for traditional classroom use as well as resident programming and informal gathering.

Building Design

**Main Building Entrance**

**Issue:** Placing the main entrance(s) is perhaps the single most important step taken during the evolution of a building plan.

**Principle:** Place the main entrance(s) of the building at a point immediately visible from the main avenues of approach, and give it a bold shape in the front of the building. Successful entrances have the following elements: are recognizable from a distance; are recognizable all times of day and night; and are in a logical location based on site.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

**Transparency and Approachability**

**Issue:** The new residence hall needs to be visible to the campus community and welcome that community in.

**Principle:** Locate and orient the building to allow interior public activities to be seen from the exterior, give the more public program elements high visibility to the larger campus community, and build the residence in ways that maximize its presence in the minds of both residents and non-residents.

**Scales of Community**

**Issue:** It’s hard to get to know 500 people at once, but it is essential that new students get involved in the larger community they live in.

**Principle:** Build layers of community into the architecture, considering the following scales:

- Room and roommate
- Resident Hearth for about 35 to 45
- Living Room for about 100 to 135
- Various sized multi-function rooms
- Residence Hall of about 500
- Dining group seat 500 at a time and accommodate several thousand per day
- University

Ensure that the architecture encourages interaction and discourse within each group as well as developing social opportunities at the boundaries between groups.

**Staged Independence**

**Issue:** The social and housing needs of first year students differ from second year students, which differ from third, fourth, and so on. As their collegiate experience develops, students thrive on greater autonomy and independence.

**Principle:** Design and organize student living spaces to provide sequenced independence through the creation of a family of living space options. Create special communities/a unique identity for the different groups while observing need for effective and efficient supervision of residences by RAs. This will encourage and affirm increasing autonomy and individual responsibility through the duration of their experience in the residence hall, and the resulting increase in sophomores through seniors living near or among first year students will enhance the residential nature of campus.

**Sense of Publicness/Levels of Privacy**

**Issue:** The residential experience should occur in a variety of spaces with a range of levels of publicness and privacy that include living, learning, social and private spaces.

**Principle:** Arrange functions along a continuum from public to private. This may be accomplished three dimensionally though use of zone and floor level differentiation with public spaces that are centrally located or main floor spaces; and more private spaces that are remotely located or upper floor spaces.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Security Layers
**Issue:** The number and arrangement of entrances and ability to observe/supervise entrances is important for the security of both the residence community and the individuals living there.
**Principle:** Create defined layers of security through separation of building zones or floor levels (that can be flexible by the hour). For example upper floors are locked and accessible to residents only.

Nerve Centers
(Based on ‘Building Hearth’ and ‘Activity Nodes’ patterns)
**Issue:** Certain activities in a residence hall serve as social and information catalysts, bringing together people and information in a synergistic environment.
**Principle:** Create “Nerve Centers” which build on elements and services that residence halls otherwise contain: reception, communication, mail, keys, information, and so forth, combined with social elements to create vital, active areas. Nerve Center should have visible vibrancy, be a welcoming starting point, and provide information for the public, visitors and residents much like a hotel lobby. A building may have various nerve centers: classrooms, dining areas, and so forth.

Preview Social Spaces
**Issue:** Social spaces that require full engagement just to see who is there discourage casual uses and social interaction. People may or may not want to enter without knowing who is already there, triggering the “friend-or-foe” syndrome.
**Potential:** Design social spaces to provide effective preview and walk-through opportunities so that a potential user can see who is there without making a social commitment.

Natural Supervision
(Based on ‘Organizational Clarity’ pattern)
**Issue:** Resident Assistants (RAs) are the front-line service providers for Housing: they live with the student residents, advise them, monitor their safety and quality of life issues. However, if the location of the single occupant rooms that they live in doesn’t place them where they can do their jobs effectively, quality of life for all residents suffers.
**Principle:** Place the rooms for RAs where they have maximum views of corridors and room entrances. This may be at corridor intersections or at ends of corridors. Ideally, an RA can see each room door that they supervise from their own room.

Accommodate Change
**Issue:** The use of this building will change over time in unpredicted ways: day-to-day, week-to-week, year-to-year, and decade-to-decade. Classrooms will be used for social events. Lounge spaces will be used for conferences. Initially this building will primarily serve first year students, allowing the UO to replace or renovate other existing residence halls, but it will ultimately serve the full spectrum of students. By the same token, the use and character of food service areas will change over time (see Dining Conversion pattern).
**Principle:** Create a facility for a long life of changing uses. Provide building services (power, heating, fire exits) that support change gracefully, yet is affordable in the original construction. Consider key investments (pathways for conduits, pipes, ducts) to support future extensions of building services. Design spaces to allow for changes over the day, week, and year: storage, flexible furniture, and adequate lighting controls for different uses. (see One Room, Many Uses)
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Back of House Services

Issue: It is important that the operational needs of the front and back of the house are incorporated in a way which works for the different staffs that will be working within this building. If the “back” of a building complex, the areas that support the operational needs, isn’t planned carefully, expensive operational inefficiencies will result with garbage stored under people’s windows and truck deliveries waking people up early in the morning.

Principle: Provide well-designed service areas to serve the functional needs of delivery of goods, trash and recycling removal, building service and maintenance, food preparation, and so forth. Make sure that these areas are designed for staffing efficiency as well as to best support core user services such as resident rooms, food service areas, classrooms, and other sensitive areas.

One Room, Many Uses

Issue: We know that there will be a wide variety of public and semi-public activities in this building: classes, meetings, conferences, themed dinners, dances, concerts, and so forth. Any attempt to serve all needs with individualized spaces will be inefficient, indeed unaffordable.

Principle: Design all public spaces for multiple functions, based on the broadest expectations of the users, while maintaining distinct character and charm for each room. This allows flexibility and efficiency while avoiding the anonymity and ineffectiveness of, for example, a school multi-purpose cafeteria/gymnasium/auditorium, the “caforum” of the 1960s.

Dining Conversion

Issue: Rapid program change is common in residence hall food service facilities, so flexibility for current and anticipated conditions as well as unanticipated future changes is essential. We know that food service in this building will also serve nearby residence halls (Hamilton, Bean) while renovation and replacement projects are underway.

Principle: Locate cooking and dining facilities in the new building strategically to serve a student population arriving largely from the northwest. Design to anticipate conversion to planned as well as unplanned future uses to meet housing’s programmatic needs (central kitchen, catering, meeting/academic/programmed spaces).

Movable, Flexible Furniture

Issue: Rigid unchangeable furniture arrangements make life seem institutional and impersonal.

Principle: Design the rooms with a furniture and division system that allows multiple configurations. Large-scale changes (panels, for example) may have to be made by staff (and probably for a fee). Also allow for small-scale changes that the occupants can do themselves, like moving a dresser, bed, or desk to a different wall.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Participate in Sustainable Living

Issue: It’s one thing to create sustainable building designs. It’s another to create buildings that teach sustainability and encourage participation in sustainable living.

Principle: Design the building to encourage residents and staff to actively engage sustainability on a personal basis. Use technologies such as ‘dash-boarding’ and metering by floor or by wing to encourage healthy competition in responsible use of resources. Create a balance between the costs of these systems and the resulting effects: concentrate the effort in areas with real pay backs.

Themed Areas

Issue: Themed areas, halls, floors, or building zones organized around a particular subject or issue provide a commonality for students that creates communities.

Principle: Provide support for themed halls such as language halls, music halls, and areas such as hearths, academic/social rooms, community rooms, dining areas, kitchenettes, spaces suitable for informal performances, and so on.

Resident Social Hearth (In My Pajamas)

Issue: To make a place feel like home, people need social spaces where they always feel completely comfortable. Students have expressed this as “a place I’d go in my pajamas.” Yet many residence hall lounges are too remote, too impersonal, and shared with too many people to provide the comfortable informality that this principle addresses.

Principle: Provide a social space for 35 to 45 residents that is their social hearth, and which corresponds to the group assigned to each resident assistant. Place this hearth at intersections of horizontal and vertical circulation, partly open to the corridors, and near other shared facilities such as laundry. These spaces are modeled on the Carson Hall and Living Learning Center floor lounges. The social group that each hearth supports is the same community served by one resident assistant.

A Place for Quiet

Issue: Residence halls are inherently noisy (unless strict rules are agreed on and enforced), and traditional residence halls are made of hard, institutional materials. But most people need quiet at times.

Principle: Provide an acoustical environment that contains noise within noisy areas and provides individuals with opportunities to find quiet. This may require acoustical materials in social areas and attention to the location and design of room doors and wall systems.
V. Campus Plan (continued)

Group Study Alcoves (Beaux Rooms)

**Issue:** Study groups depend in part on the design of the spaces used by the group. Research indicates that students who study in groups are more successful than students who study alone.

**Principle:** UO students tell us that neither a fully private room nor a large, shared, non-articulated open space are conducive to group study. Design group study areas that are enclosed on three sides, partially or fully open to circulation on the fourth side. Place these rooms near each other, within the public realm, to ensure that all residents have convenient access to them.

Visible Laundry

**Issue:** If too many people share a large laundry facility, it becomes anonymous and unpleasant like a Laundromat and requires continuous supervision by each user.

**Principle:** Provide smaller laundries specific to the smallest social group, located near and within sight of their hearth, so that doing the laundry can be more like it is at home. Instead of having to watch the laundry continuously, students can be nearby in the hearth or in their rooms. If access and timing issues need to be worked out, they will be worked out with the same group that deals with other “family”-scale issues.

Dining and Conversation

**Issue:** Thinking about food service only in terms of efficiency misses important opportunities for integration of living and learning, of creating community, and other important aspects of life on campus.

**Principle:** Use the dining facilities for more than just eating. Design dining to be friendly and comfortable, like an attractive restaurant. Locate dining where it can host the natural extension of the classroom conversation between teacher and student or among students. Design eating areas to encourage lingering and to support uses beyond a quick meal such as spur-of-the-moment discussion, informal seminars, and even formal presentations.

Living Above Ground

**Issue:** No one wants to spend long periods of time in a basement during daylight hours.

**Principle:** Zone the building to put daylight in the most used spaces, and use the subterranean spaces that can’t be day lit for service, storage, support, and nighttime activities.

More Than a Corridor (See ‘Resident Social Hearth’ pattern)

**Issue:** A standard solution to residence hall design, a double-loaded corridor with each door facing another, feels impersonal and institutional, like a cheap motel.

**Principle:** Use the corridors as a design element and interaction space, sometimes single loaded, sometimes double loaded. Provide clear views for adequate supervision, but also avoid long, straight connections that don’t provide privacy and identity for each of the Resident Social Hearth-scale social groups.
VI. Types of Spaces

This section is being developed in parallel with the consultant selection process. A full development of the program is required as part of this project.

Elements of the space program as currently understood may include: a Nerve Center including area desk and mail services; a Complex Director’s suite and apartment, a Faculty member’s office and apartment; a University Housing staff meeting room; gathering and learning spaces; study rooms; two touchdown faculty offices; a sustainability kiosk; a 500-seat dining hall; kitchen; program-flexible spaces; residential hearth; student and building storage; and back-of-house service area(s).
VII. Campus Planning Committee Comments

**CPC Meeting 1:** In December 2008, the Campus Planning Committee identified key Campus Plan policies, patterns and other relevant campus design issues for the East Campus Residence Hall project. (Refer to pages 14-15 for the Campus-wide Pattern List.)

The following is a summary of the committee’s comments.

The committee recommended to the president that the following actions be taken:

A. Approval of the preferred site for the East Campus Residence Hall project. The preferred site is Design Area 72 in the East Campus area. Design Area 72 is the eastern portion (along Moss Street) of the large block bounded by 15th and 17th Avenues and Agate and Moss Streets. The site presents exciting opportunities; it has the potential for good solar access, beautiful hillside views, and a chance to enhance the surrounding East Campus area, in particular by instituting an open-space framework plan for this area.

B. Support of the identified Campus Plan patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the following comments will be considered as the project moves forward:
   1. Accommodate the in-progress and proposed Museum of Natural and Cultural History expansion projects.
   2. Consider the relationship of the proposed building and open-space framework plan to all adjacent uses; for example, the Knight Law Center and the Many Nations Longhouse (special indoor and outdoor needs).

C. Support of the identified user group representation for the project with the understanding that the following suggestion will be considered as the project moves forward:
   1. Ensure broader campus planning issues are addressed. Given the large impact this project has on neighbor representation (e.g., Moss Street Children’s Center, Museum of Natural and Cultural History, Knight Law Center, etc.), provide a way to allow broader, substantive campus neighbor involvement in the open-space framework planning process without burdening the user group. For example, set up a separate open-space framework group with greater neighbor representation.

The project will come back to the committee for an initial review once a draft open-space framework plan and massing design are developed.