



June 30, 2014

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson  
Campus Planning, Design & Construction (CPDC)

Subject: **Record** of the June 10, 2014 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Fritz Gearhart, Alicia Going, George Hecht, Katy Lenn, Gregg Lobisser, Ron Lovinger, Chris Ramey, Ed Teague

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (CPDC)

Guests: Steve Asbury (Fairmount Neighbors), Margaret Bean (UO Libraries), David Opp-Beckman (Housing), Tom Driscoll (Housing), Don Dumond (Neighbor), Carol Dumond (Neighbor), Larry Gilbert (Cameron McCarthy), Michael Griffel (Housing), Casey Hagerman (CPDC Student), Jim Kalvelage (Opsis Architecture), Karen Hyatt (Government Community Relations), Garrick Mishaga (Campus Operations), Gene Mowery (CPDC), Martina Oxoby (CPDC), Ann Phillips (CPDC Student), Zach Rix (Cameron McCarthy), James Robertson (Robertson Sherwood), Matt Scheibe (Cameron McCarthy), Denise Stewart (CPDC), Scott Stolarczyk (Robertson Sherwood), Fred Tepfer (CPDC), Mark Watson (UO Libraries)

**Agenda:**

**Chair Thank You** – Carole Daly, CPC chair announced her retirement indicating that this would be her last CPC meeting. Staff expressed great appreciation for Carole’s many years of service a chair. She will be greatly missed. All other members agreed, sharing their praise and well wishes.

**1. Allan Price Science Commons & Research Library Remodel & Addition Project – Schematic Design**

Background: Staff reviewed applicable *Campus Plan* policies and patterns and prior CPC comments as described in the meeting mailing.

Gene Mowery, project planner, introduced the project. Jim Kalvelage from Opsis Architecture reviewed the proposed schematic design as described in the meeting mailing and PowerPoint presentation. He reminded the committee about key project goals and challenges noting that they have resolved concerns identified by members.

Jim said that generally, the User Group liked the proposed curved plaza planters but it was not clear if funding would be available to include them in the project. Their design is still being refined. For example, the north edge would likely be shortened and the space between the planter and the courtyard edge would be enlarged to provide more room for

**CAMPUS PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION**

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 [www.uoregon.edu/~uplan](http://www.uoregon.edu/~uplan)

*An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act*

pedestrians and those wishing to sit on the seating wall. The planter is contoured so that it is lower along the pathway and higher along the east side for seating.

Jim said the design team assessed ways to open up north/south views through the Onyx Axis open space. They considered removing the hedge along the upper edge of the Willamette amphitheater but safety concerns have caused them to look into other less intensive changes (such as trimming the hedge). Also, Franklin edge enhancements were considered. While Franklin edge enhancements are not part of the current project scope, understanding potential future improvements ensures that the project design would not limit future improvements.

Jim said primary building materials would be glass and brick. Sunscreen design options for the west wall – fixed or operable – are under consideration. Metal mesh is the current material choice but fritted glass and other options are being considered as well. Sunscreens would cover only the upper portion of the glazing (above 8 feet) to preserve transparency and views in/out. Shade from adjacent buildings helps to reduce heat gain and glare; however, some interior shading would be needed to supplement the exterior shading devices.

The design team explored options to place the building closer to Klamath Hall. However, more Klamath Hall windows would be blocked and usable square footage would be smaller adding greater complexity and cost.

Jim explained that the lower courtyard is designed primarily as a viewing garden. It will include a small seating area, however, as well as an integrate rainwater feature.

Discussion: A member shared Campus Operations Exterior Team's concerns about maintaining the lower courtyard landscape design and plantings. Campus Operations Exterior Team staff should be consulted as the design is refined. Larry Gilbert from Cameron McCarthy assured the committee that the design team would work with Exterior Team staff as plant materials are selected. The overall design goal is to minimize plantings to create a fairly open courtyard that one can see through. Plantings that tolerate shade and relate to areas of study are under consideration. Native materials – plants and stone – are likely candidates.

In response to a member's question about the curved plaza planters design, Larry said the goal was to soften the harsh plaza landscape. Also, the curved shapes accommodate soil volume required for healthy trees better than the originally proposed rectilinear planters. He clarified that the pointed corners would not as severe as shown in the drawings – they would be about 2-3 feet wide at the point. Other members supported the curved shape, noting how it relates to the design of the nearby Onyx Axis landscaped area. Members suggested adding a finished cap to better relate the design to the overall campus character and integrating design elements that would deter skateboarders. Also, a member suggested better connecting the design of the courtyard wall to the curved shape of the planter. The rectilinear shape of the courtyard edge seems disconnected from the serpentine shape of the planter. Jim said it is possible to look at ways to introduce curved elements to the courtyard edge; however, the plaza's waffle slab construction limits options.

A member expressed support for the overall design but had some hesitation about the setback from Klamath Hall, because it has the potential to become a dead zone. Jim acknowledged that this area was challenging to address but there is ample width for a walkway and planters to enhance the space. Ultimately, the setback seemed most appropriate due to the strong desire to preserve views from Klamath Hall.

A member said the exterior shading devices are a notable design element; therefore, they should come back to the committee for review.

In response to a member's question, Jim confirmed that no HVAC units would be mounted on the roof. Operable clerestory windows on the east side would enhance ventilation. Also, higher windows facing the courtyard would be on activators.

In response to a member's question, Gene said the shape of the curved planters would not impinge on the bike path. The edge of the planters follows the current path of travel (identified by the existing patterned concrete path).

A member asked about the project's open space enhancement requirements. Gene said the curved planters address the project's requirements; however, the planters are an alternate item due to budget limitations. Other members expressed concern stating that the planters were an integral part of the project – they should be a required element. Members discussed possible cost saving design options.

A member noted that the context of the project is huge. Its impact extends from 13th Avenue to Franklin Boulevard. Now is the time to make related improvements. The chair noted that she sent a request for funds to Jamie Moffitt to enhance 13th Avenue a number of months ago. This was at the request of the CPC following approval of the EMU schematic design. While the desire to improve the broader campus context is shared by many on the committee, one cannot expect individual projects to take on the full burden. The larger landscape needs a champion.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to recommend to the president that the Schematic Design for the Allan Price Science Commons & Research Library Remodel & Addition Project be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Include the curved plaza planters in the project.
2. Ensure the lower landscape courtyard design and plantings are maintainable. Consult with Campus Operations Exterior Team staff as the design is refined.
3. Consider incorporating a finished cap on the plaza planter to better relate to the greater campus character.
4. Carefully consider ways to deter skateboarders as the landscape design is refined.
5. Assess ways to better relate the plaza's landscape design to the courtyard design. For example, consider ways to integrate the curved shape of the planters into the courtyard design.
6. Refine the exterior shading devices design and bring it back for Design Review Subcommittee for review.
7. Refine the landscape design, taking committee comments into consideration, and bring it back for Design Review Subcommittee review.

## **2. University Housing Central Kitchen and Woodshop Project – Schematic Design**

Background: The chair shared recent university senate activity related to the project. A resolution was presented at the final spring term special senate meeting. The purpose of the resolution was to halt the Central Kitchen project until a full east campus master plan could be completed to further assess appropriate sites. Senate action was deferred until fall term due to time constraints. A guest added that the senate president expressed a commitment to have a dialogue with the project sponsor and other interested parties prior to further senate discussion since no dialogue took place prior to submittal of the resolution. The chair said senate activity did not preclude moving forward with the in-progress planning and public input process that began 1.5 years ago when the CPC approved the site. The next step is CPC review the proposed schematic design.

Staff reviewed the steps in the planning process, in particular those related to the site selection process (outlined in a handout provided at the meeting). She reviewed applicable East Campus Development policies and prior CPC comments as described in the meeting mailing.

Michael Griffel, User Group Chair and Director of Housing introduced the project. He said the design team made a sincere effort to respond to comments and concerns shared by the CPC, neighbors, and others during the two-year process.

Scott Stolarczyk from Robertson Sherwood Architects reviewed the proposed schematic design as described in the meeting mailing and PowerPoint presentation. He compared existing kitchen facility traffic routes to proposed traffic routes noting that most large truck deliveries would be completed by 8:30am. The goal is to guide trucks to Agate Street via 17th Avenue versus through the adjacent single-family neighborhood.

Scott said numerous options to create a mid-block pedestrian alley crossing were considered. A route along the northern edge of the site was selected because it provides the best separation from the truck traffic and allows ways to connect to future open spaces to the west and east.

Scott said the intent of the overall building design is to relate to the low-density neighborhood scale as well as to future larger campus development. The design team continues to assess ways to screen and break up the massing of the freezer units. The landscape design, which is being refined, will include rain gardens and other planting areas to buffer parking areas.

#### Discussion:

**Siting:** A member said he appreciated the design team's effort to integrate prior CPC suggestions into the revised design. However, his bigger concern is the proposed site. This concern is shared by Michael Fifield, architecture professor, who presented the related university senate resolution. Constructing the central kitchen project on the proposed site would pre-empt thoughtful development of the area. It is inappropriate to ruin this area's potential when another site - the old DMV location - is available.

Staff noted that the *Campus Plan* site approval process was completed over a year ago.

The chair asked the committee if they would like to reopen the discussion about the site selection process or proceed with schematic design review. A member questioned the ability to revisit a previous decision that was based upon the university's site selection process. The project design process has proceeded, following all review requirements. A number of other members noted that this decision is far-reaching and important enough to reconsider. They noted that the project design team did a commendable job with the design given the site. One member suggested tabling schematic design review until the senate makes a decision about the site.

Michael Griffel explained that current kitchen facilities are dysfunctional. The project design process has already taken longer than expected and stopping until the senate takes action and then reevaluates proposed sites would result in a lengthy delay. This would be very challenging and expensive.

A member who represents the senate clarified that he did not sponsor the senate resolution. While he understands the sentiments of other CPC members, it seems that the project is too far along. It is important to trust the judgment of prior CPC members.

A member noted that the senate motion would not stop the review process. The senate does not have purview over capital project siting and design decisions.

The chair reminded the committee that this has been a several year process. The committee cannot take lightly the proposal to overturn a prior committee action. If it does so, every decision is left open for reevaluation, which would make it very challenging to proceed with a project.

In response to a question, Chris Ramey, member and University Architect, summarized the site selection process that began several years ago. Four or five sites were considered. A number of criteria including distance from sites being served, service golf carts paths of travel (on/off public streets), distance from Franklin Boulevard, and strategic placement in reference to long-term campus planning were considered. If the committee does not support the prior decision, it implies that the committee does not accept the East Campus Plan's premise that this part of campus is not needed for academic uses. It is not identified for academic use because it too far from the academic center and projected increases in student population (up to 35,000) do not anticipate a need for more academic uses in this area. Rather, there is a much greater need for support services, especially student housing. Also, projections have never included plans for the UO to expand beyond its boundaries into the low-scale residential neighborhoods to the south and east. For this reason, the proposed site is identified as a transition area in the East Campus Plan; it is reserved for institutional uses that are not large scale and not connected to the 50-minute class schedule. The open-space framework in this area intentionally transitions to the street grid system to connect with the neighborhood character. It is possible that the campus could grow beyond any expected projections in the next 50 years making long-term plans for this area no longer valid. Still, this project would not preclude future development and change because, as with the current kitchen facilities, it likely would be time to rebuild them; they could be relocated to a more appropriate location.

A member noted the importance of the site. It is key to the character of the overall campus. The proposed project would affect all future development; it does not conform to future academic uses. Also, the open-space framework is nothing like the campus will need in the future. This central location is of paramount importance. Another member noted that the proposed industrial use is not appropriate; it does not align with the residential character of the area.

The chair contemplated how the committee could withdraw its support of the site yet adhere to the *Campus Plan* site selection and design process. The committee could proceed with schematic design review and vote to deny it because it is not an acceptable use and design for the site.

Staff explained that a vote to re-evaluate the site would also be a vote against existing UO policies established to guide campus development in this area, in particular the Development Policy for the East Campus Area. The proposed site and use conforms with the policies in this plan, which was developed by means of a significant public planning process that involved the CPC, campus community, neighbors, and city. Before taking action it is very important for members to understand the underlying policies.

A member moved to postpone approval of the Central Kitchen project in anticipation of an East Campus open space framework plan to determine if the site is acceptable. No second was made.

Schematic Design:

A member expressed concern about the cluttered appearance of numerous rooftop HVAC units proposed in multiple locations. She suggested shielding them and integrating them into the design (and possibly cluster them together if helpful). Scott noted some limitations due to service clearance and air intake requirements.

In response to a member's question, Scott said freezer unit locations are reliant on internal connections. West-facing locations should be fine because they are heavily insulated.

A guest representing the Fairmount Neighborhood Board said neighbors still had substantial concerns about locating such an industrial facility in a residential neighborhood. It doesn't feel very compatible despite efforts to mitigate negative impacts. Tom Driscoll from Housing noted that the proposed uses already exist on campus. They are being consolidated to one site. Michael added that planned campus growth for the area includes larger buildings for housing and support services. This was considered when determining whether the site and design were compatible. The guest representing the Fairmount Neighborhood Board clarified that neighbors are not opposed to campus expansion; it is the industrial nature of the building that concerns them.

A member noted that it seems particularly important to ensure trucks follow the expected path of travel with the goal of preventing truck travel through the adjacent single-family neighborhood. Another member thought the design team addressed compatibility issues as best as possible given the industrial nature of the building on the selected site. He said truck traffic is impossible to address adequately and the buffer area between adjacent uses is not large enough. Another member agreed noting that the use seemed wrong in such a residential location.

A guest noted that he has lived adjacent to the project site for 52 years. He purchased the house originally with short-term occupancy in mind. He chose the location because he was told the university was going to expand soon so he hoped it would be willing to purchase his house. The university has since purchased almost every other property but it has taken much longer to expand into the area. But it is no surprise that expansion is happening. It does not make sense to worry whether the proposed kitchen facility fits into the existing character of this remnant area since it is going to change. The university has taken its commitment to create a transition area very seriously as demonstrated in the East Campus Plan. Careful consideration has been given. This is very different from prior efforts decades ago when the UO would not have consulted with the neighbors. If no action is taken today because it may not align with plans 50 years from now, nothing will ever happen. Even best efforts to plan for the future don't always turn out because needs change. For example, the Museum of Natural and Cultural History was told that it needed to face west to accommodate a larger courtyard. Then the Knight Law School parking lot was built instead. You do your best.

The committee took action (see below).

The chair suggested that the committee consider a motion at a future meeting to prohibit additional development in the east campus area until an open space plan is developed.

Action: The committee agreed, with six in favor, one against, and two abstentions, to recommend to the president that the schematic design for the University Housing Central Kitchen and Woodshop Project be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Look for ways to decrease the cluttered and unappealing appearance of the numerous rooftop HVAC units. For example, improve shielding and better integrate them into the overall building design.

2. Work diligently to ensure trucks follow the expected path of travel. The goal is to guide trucks back to Agate Street via 17th Avenue versus through the adjacent single-family neighborhood.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Vicki Arbeiter, Geology(Cascade and Volcanology Building Manager)  
Steven Asbury, Fairmount Neighbors  
Camilla Bayliss, Fairmount Neighbors  
Margaret Bean, UO Libraries  
Gwen Bolden, Parking and Transportation  
Andrew Bonamici, UO Libraries  
Jane Brubaker, Campus Ops  
Bruce Budzik, Campus Operations  
Carolyn Burke, Eugene Planning  
Darin Dehle, CPDC  
Sam Dotters-Katz, ASUO  
Tom Driscoll, Housing  
Don Dumond, Neighbor  
Brian Erickson, Chambers Construction  
Larry Gilbert, Cameron McCarthy  
Dan Graham, Molecular Biology (Klamath and Onyx Building Manager)  
Michael Griffel, Housing  
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning  
Lucia Hardy, Fairmount Neighbors  
Randall Heeb, Opsi Architecture  
Dave Hubin, President's Office  
Karen Hyatt, Community Relations  
Carolyn Jacobs, South University Neighbors  
Robert Kyr, University Senate  
Pete Knox, West University Neighbors  
Gus Lim, Housing  
Carolyn McDermid, UOPD  
Lisa Mick Shimizu, University Senate Executive Coordinator  
Garrick Mishaga, Campus Operations  
Gene Mowery, CPDC  
Lara Nesselroad, UO Libraries (Klamath Building Manager)  
David Opp-Beckman, Housing  
Martina Oxoby, CPDC  
Margie Paris, University Senate  
Matt Scheibe, Cameron McCarthy Landscape Architects and Planning  
Patty Smith, Physics (Willamette Building Manager)  
David Sonnichsen, Fairmount Neighbors  
Denise Stewart, CPDC  
Scott Stolarczyk, Robertson Sherwood  
Fred Tepfer, CPDC  
Patty Valenzuela, Physics (Willamette Building Manager)  
Mark Watson, UO Libraries