1. Review previous documents
   - Residential Area Conceptual Study, 2006
   - Housing Strategic Plan Phase 2, 2007
   - Oregon 202 Initiative: cultivating a Vibrant Community of Scholars
2. Annotated campus plan
3. Development Options
   - NW of Campus
   - Replace Hamilton in an early phase
   - Reinforce/enhance existing campus open space
4. Additional open space framework concepts
5. Off campus housing/swap space utilization
6. Begin consideration of
   - Housing Administration Center
   - Maintenance sand Wood Shops
   - Food Service, Commissary and Catering
7. Decisions
8. Next meeting
Summary of Key Design Assumptions and Criteria that were Considered

Key assumptions/criteria are defined in more detail on pages 34-42 of the "Residential Conceptual Study" and include the components summarized below for each key criterion:

1. **Increase Marketable Campus Housing Stock by at Least 15%**: (Includes consideration of related criteria and assumptions, in particular "Increase Room Size," "Be Competitive with Peer Institutions" and "Locate Dining Near Living.") Over the next ten years, expand on-campus housing by at least 15% equaling about 480 residents.

2. **Accommodate Other Potential Uses**: Accommodate other potential uses in and adjacent to the Study Area (e.g., the EMU expansion, Arena, Alumni Center, outdoor sports/recreation opportunities, etc.)

3. **Financially Viable Development**: (Includes consideration of related criteria and assumptions, in particular "Effective Phased Development" and "Make Residence Halls the Right Size.") University Housing is self-supporting. On-campus housing must be constructed in ways that make the management of housing and food services efficient and competitively marketable. Minimize common spaces and maximize beds by utilizing existing central services.

4. **Fix Existing Conditions**: Address existing residence halls with the worst space size and organization conditions first. Hamilton has the worst space size and configuration, but existing dining facilities work well and could accommodate proposed increases.

5. **Maintain the Campus' Scale**: Maintain the campus' scale by meeting maximum allowable densities. Keep the majority of buildings four stories or less. However, review options that might require exceptions to these density limitations while retaining a harmonious style and solar access.

6. **Provide a Main Entry/"Nerve Center":** A main entry is key to administering the building and communicating consistently with the occupants. Ideally, provide a main entry/nerve center for each group of 400-450 residents. (Additional information provided on page 8.)

7. **Create Positive Outdoor Space**: Place buildings to create usable outdoor space versus "left over" space between buildings. Define open spaces with buildings or landscape.

8. **Enhance the Existing Open-Space Framework**: Build upon and expand the interconnected open-space framework and pedestrian pathway network.

9. **Define the Right Mix of Open-space Types**: (Includes consideration of related criteria and assumptions, in particular "Explore Using Humpy Lumpy as a Building Site.") Open spaces come in different shapes and sizes depending upon the intended use. Provide the right mix of open-space types in the study area (e.g., active versus passive, public versus private, circulation versus destination). (Additional information provided on page 9.)

10. **Enhance the Promenade**: Better define the existing Promenade from the EMU across Agate Street. Use the Promenade to link main activity nodes, provide clear circulation, north/south paths.

11. **Link Main Campus and East Campus**: Preserve and strengthen the open spaces and pathways linking the Main Campus to East Campus. Recognize the Agate Street crossing and improve 15th street connections.

12. **Develop 15th Ave. as a Primary Street**: Establish 15th Avenue as a primary street for both autos and pedestrians. Define the street edge with building facades and entrances. Connect to the open space framework and respond to Powell Plaza.
### Projected Housing Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Population (Fall 2006)</th>
<th>Current Enrollment Scenario (20,388)</th>
<th>EMC Maximum Enrollment Scenario (23,000)</th>
<th>Phase II Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,874 87% of 3,298 admitted first-time FR</td>
<td>2,801 85% of 3,298 admitted first-time FR</td>
<td>2,720 85% of 3,200 admitted first-time FR</td>
<td>The Ideal Space Program has 4,799 undergrads, 534 more than required to meet this objective. The survey analysis would support either, but more beds are needed to meet the combined 85% first-time freshmen goal and 15% goal for other undergraduates (D) than are needed to meet this 25% objective. Nevertheless, the level of demand is higher than the Ideal Space Program, reflecting some conservatism and providing some flexibility in terms of providing some housing that is more appropriate for students but less in demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,895 15% of 12,633 admitted returning FR, SO, JR, &amp; SR</td>
<td>2,079 15% of 13,859 admitted returning FR, SO, JR, &amp; SR</td>
<td>2,079 beds in Ideal Space Program; supported by demand analysis. A 5% decrease in the number of first time freshmen living on campus due to a 3% decrease in enrollment under the 23,000-student scenario, with a two-point decrease in the percentage housed from today’s level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase II Recommendations

- **A. Mix of housing opportunities for all**
  - Addressed by B-I.

- **B. Majority of all students live within easy walk of campus**
  - House at least 25% of the undergraduates on campus to meet the “primarily residential” Carnegie classification. The Ideal Space Program has 4,799 undergrads, 534 more than required to meet this objective. The survey analysis would support either, but more beds are needed to meet the combined 85% first-time freshmen goal and 15% goal for other undergraduates (D) than are needed to meet this 25% objective. Nevertheless, the level of demand is higher than the Ideal Space Program, reflecting some conservatism and providing some flexibility in terms of providing some housing that is more appropriate for students but less in demand.

- **C. Strong freshman connections to campus**
  - Continue to house at least 85% of the freshmen in on-campus housing designed to strengthen their connection to the university as a top priority. (Definition: “FR” are first-time, degree-seeking freshmen only.)

- **D. Strong sophomore, junior, and senior connections to campus**
  - House at least 15% of the upperclassmen in on-campus housing that is designed to meet their needs. (Definition: “upperclassmen” include returning degree-seeking freshmen with fewer than 45 credit hours, SOs, JRs, and SRs.)

- **E. Strong graduate student connections to campus**
  - Refer to Q.

- **F. Support a diverse group of students**
  - Refer to R and S.

- **G. Support interactions outside the classroom**
  - Integrate student learning programming into housing working with student learning leadership. The Student Learning and Space Program Analysis by Dr Gene Luna (see Attachment 5) fully addresses student learning linkages and space issues. The financial plan includes Student Learning Overlays to provide the necessary space to accommodate programs to improve this area of student life in UO housing.

- **H. Integrate housing into human-scale campus design**
  - Address Campus Plan policies. Flexible financial model allows project scale to vary by site. During the design stage, new construction can made divisible by the appropriate living-groups size. A larger group size is appropriate for upper-division students, so a new hall’s intended residents’ class level should inform the living group size during programming and design.

- **I. Use housing to help link to/enhance surrounding neighborhood and campus**
  - Address UO campus edge policies, especially in East Campus. Multiple sites for needed for new housing provide several opportunities to improve the East Campus Area in keeping with the 2003 Development Policy.

- **J. Emulate the university’s character and quality**
  - Address Campus Plan policies. Financial model is flexible; character/quality can vary by site. Quality should take into account student residents’ perceptions, which may prefer “residential” quality at lower cost to “institutional” high-cost rooms.

- **K. Precedence to a strong student learning center**
  - Address Campus Plan policies. Most system growth—especially non-freshman beds—can have some additional separation from the student learning core of campus without sacrificing the accomplishment of this objective. Increased upper class retention in UO housing brings these students closer to the core than their current widespread housing.
# Housing Objectives

**University of Oregon • Housing Strategic Plan Phase 2**

## Projected Housing Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Existing Population (Fall 2006)</th>
<th>Current Enrollment Scenario (20,388)</th>
<th>EMC Maximum Enrollment Scenario (23,000)</th>
<th>Phase II Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurable Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Account for desired student population and mix</td>
<td>Plan for a student population of about 21,000 (and a max. of 23,000) when determining future housing needs on/off campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The recommended housing plan—based on the ideal program—provides a considerable increase of 1,530 beds in UO-sponsored housing. While this is not enough beds to house the entire 2,612-student enrollment increase if UO realizes the 23,000 enrollment scenario, at most, market housing would have to absorb 705 beds of additional demand. With over 50,000 rental housing units in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area, this represents less than 2% of the market, and with about 300 rental units added yearly, about two and a third years of the market’s growth at the current rate. The recommended program also increases housing opportunities with the variety of unit types, providing housing opportunities where there were none for students who prefer to live in a unit type that is not currently available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M. Flexible to changes in class enrollment levels | Make on-campus housing flexible for various housing types and uses. | | | The measurable goal for this objective is a design directive to make housing flexible by having it convertible to “various housing types and uses.” The planned housing is far more flexible than the existing traditional-style halls:  
- Single-occupancy suites—appropriate for everyone from a freshman to a graduate student—appropriately serve more user types than traditional double-occupancy rooms.  
- When projects reach the design stage, their programs may include some housing type flexibility. To the extent that designers can make new structures easy for UO to reconfigure to a different unit type as part of a life-cycle renovation after 20 or 30 years, flexibility is sensible. Shorter-term flexibility—movable walls, rough-in for future kitchens, etc.—places the cost on current residents who, not benefiting from the flexibility, see no increase in value for the additional cost. Naturally, outside funding sources could change this calculus.  
- Flexibility need not be a facility design issue. The simplest way to change the use of a building is with residence life programming, which can make a building appropriate for residents at a given class level. Sophomores are much more motivated to move off campus to avoid their perceived level of rules and regulations than they are by having to live with another person. |
| N. Competitive housing and related programs for desired non-resident freshman enrollment | House at least 85% desired non-resident freshmen enrollment on campus. Provide features and programs that are competitive with our peers. | 1,086 housed 896 85% of 1,055 723 85% of 850 (850-EMC 23,000 scenario goal) | As with students from underrepresented groups and international students, the Ideal Program class level counts subsume non-resident freshmen. For freshmen, the primary increase in appeal is not unit type, although many may be assigned semi-suites, but space, as new bedrooms will be larger and in halls with LLC-like common and academic spaces. Non-residents will be attracted to UO housing by the improved unit mix options, while more nearby non-UO housing will be made available as the UO system capacity expands. |
| O. Available housing for desired total non-resident enrollment | Facilitate housing for desired non-resident enrollment (same % as existing) on/off campus, private or university-operated. Housing features and programs should be competitive with our peers. | 6,322 enrolled 31% of 20,388 6,322 31% of 20,388 7,132 31% of 23,000 | The plan supports retention by improving academic linkages for resident students and by increasing the retention in housing, and thus exposure to such linkages, for sophomores and upper division students. |
| P. Support retention efforts | To be completed once retention goals are established. | | | |
### Measurable Goals

| Q. Competitive housing for desired graduate student enrollment | Facilitate housing for desired graduate enrollment (20% of all students) on/off campus, private or university-operated. |
| | | Existing Population (Fall 2006) | Projected Housing Needs |
| | | | Current Enrollment Scenario (20,388) | EMC Maximum Enrollment Scenario (23,000) |
| | | | 3,180 enrolled 16% of 20,388 318 live in UO housing (10% of grad) | 4,078 20% of 20,388 40B in UO housing (with same 10% of grad) | 4,600 20% of 23,000 460 in UO housing (with same 10% of grad) |
| | | Phase II Recommendations | | The ideal program includes up to 679 beds for graduate students, enough for 15% of the 4,600 enrolled under the 23,000-bed scenario. Although peers offer a variety of graduate housing options, UO houses a higher percentage of graduate students than five peers and lower than only two, both of which (UCSB and UCSD) are in costly California. Adding some new graduate housing, kept affordable with suite configurations, in housing devoted solely to graduate students, will fill a gap in what UO can offer. |

| R. Competitive on campus housing and related programs for desired enrollment diversity | Provide capacity on campus to house at least 85% of desired freshman enrollment of underrepresented groups. (scenario: students of color represent 18% of all freshmen) |
| | | Existing Population (Fall 2006) | Projected Housing Needs |
| | | | 464 housed 85% of 18% of 3,298 | 490 85% of 15% of 3,200 |
| | | Phase II Recommendations | Students from underrepresented groups prefer the same types of units—and demand it in about the same proportion—as do others. If UO housing offered a variety of unit types, students from underrepresented groups share similar unit type preferences as White non-international students. Overall, students from underrepresented groups will be attracted to UO housing by the improved unit mix options, while more nearby non-UO housing will be made available as the UO system capacity expands. Sophomores, juniors, and seniors from underrepresented groups actually show somewhat higher levels of interest than White students do in improved UO-owned unit type offerings. |

| S. Available housing for desired enrollment diversity | Facilitate housing for desired enrollment of underrepresented groups on/off campus, private or university-operated. (scenario: students of color represent 18% of all upper classmen) |
| | | Existing Population (Fall 2006) | Projected Housing Needs |
| | | | 110 housed 15% of 18% of 11,707 | 346 15% of 18% of 12,815 |
| | | Phase II Recommendations | Demand analysis showed international students have a higher interest in living on campus than average, given improved unit options. Programmatically, however, international students not interested in living in UO residence halls, unlike any other group, expressed desire for assistance in arranging housing upon their arrival in the US. International students above the freshman level expressed above-average demand for new UO housing, so the percentage housed in UO housing should improve as new units come online. Those wishing to live in off-campus housing, especially transfers for whom time tends to be limited, would benefit most from housing location assistance. |

| T. Competitive housing and related programs for desired international freshman enrollment | Provide capacity on campus to house at least 85% of the desired international freshman enrollment. (scenario: 10% of all freshmen) |
| | | Existing Population (Fall 2006) | Projected Housing Needs |
| | | | 106 housed 85% of 10% of 3,298 | 272 85% of 10% of 3,200 |
| | | Phase II Recommendations | | Demand analysis showed international students have a higher interest in living on campus than average, given improved unit options. Programmatically, however, international students not interested in living in UO residence halls, unlike any other group, expressed desire for assistance in arranging housing upon their arrival in the US. |

| U. Available housing for desired total international student enrollment | Facilitate housing for desired international enrollment (scenario: 10% of all students) on/off campus, private or university-operated |
| | | Existing Population (Fall 2006) | Projected Housing Needs |
| | | | 1,173 enrolled 6% of 20,388 10% of 20,388 | 2,300 10% of 23,000 |
| | | Phase II Recommendations | | Demand analysis showed international students have a higher interest in living on campus than average, given improved unit options. Programmatically, however, international students not interested in living in UO residence halls, unlike any other group, expressed desire for assistance in arranging housing upon their arrival in the US. |
HOUSING OBJECTIVES

PROJECTIONS OF HOUSING NEEDS

Projected Housing Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Population (Fall 2006)</th>
<th>Current Enrollment Scenario (20,388)</th>
<th>EMC Maximum Enrollment Scenario (23,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

V. A placeholder for future academic needs
Identify and purchase lands desired for future academic needs and consider using as housing until needed. While UO will later finalize specific sites for proposed housing, the plan’s flexibility allows UO to develop housing on sites that later would serve other, perhaps academic, needs. The plan, however, does not include additional costs for this objective. If housing can remain as housing for the term of its financing, these costs may be minimal, but more costly less space-efficient designs would harm financial performance.

W. Enhance campus/neighborhood transition areas
Address Campus Plan, particularly East Campus policies. The edge projects—comprising of 1,530 beds—will provide UO with the perfect opportunity to have a buffer that harmonizes with both the campus and adjacent neighborhoods. Access to neighborhood attractions may be appealing on the west side of campus, while on the east side, new housing could ease the transition between the campus and the residential area.

X. Enhance campus transportation policies
Address Campus Plan, in particular Transportation Plan policies. By drawing students to UO housing—either core or edge—the plan reduces the need for commuting from greater distances and similarly may reduce the need for parking near the core of campus.

Y. Enhance sustainability policies
Address Campus Plan, in particular Sustainable Development Plan policies. Although UO’s Sustainable Development Plan (part of the Campus Plan) may favor renovation of existing buildings over demolition and replacement with new, the Campus Plan acknowledges the need to demolish buildings that cannot adapt to programmatic change. ASL’s financial analysis of alternative approaches to realizing the desired program proved that it is not feasible for UO to renovate and reconfigure existing residence halls designed and built long before today’s Campus Plan. The housing plan uses costs of construction and design that should allow for new halls to follow precepts of sustainable design as did the LEED silver-level LLC.

Z. Available housing for visiting scholars and faculty
Facilitate housing for visiting scholars and faculty on/off campus. TBD TBD TBD Eugene does not pose the same difficulties to visiting scholars and faculty as some cities (e.g., rapidly growing California communities with high rents and low vacancy), but UO could renovate and designate some of the East Campus homes for this group. Without some special attraction, most would still likely choose a market property, but convenience may be an overarching priority for enough to make such a program worthwhile.

Post Phase I Additional Housing Objectives

AA. Affordability
The plan does not improve affordability if measured by bottom line costs. From a perspective of value, however, when they selected preferred units with proposed rates in the description, students indicated that they could afford the rates and that they perceived them to be an improved value.

AB. Students of Excellence
The survey did not capture student-of-excellence status, but the plan’s student-learning linkages would make UO housing more attractive to serious students who visit or consider UO. UO may also be able to provide more attractive housing for the Honors Hall, and help attract students of excellence to UO over other colleges and universities.