



June 9, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
Campus Planning and Real Estate

Subject: **Record** of the May 22, 2008 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Samantha Chirillo, Will Cooksey, Tom Driscoll, Michael Fifield, Ally Frueauf, Gregg Lobisser, Garrett McSorley, Kevin Nute, Brianna Orr, Chris Ramey, Molly Sirois, Greg Stripp, Don Swain, Rob Thallon

Staff: Christine Taylor Thompson (Campus Planning and Real Estate)

Guests: Vince Babkirk (Facilities Services), Jim Hutchison (Chemistry), Roger Kerrigan (Facilities Services), Lou Moses (Psychology), Cathy Soutar (Campus Planning and Real Estate), Fred Tepfer (Campus Planning and Real Estate)

Agenda:

- **CPC Chair Election**
- **Integrative Science Complex (ISC), Phase 2 – Meeting One**
- **2009-2015 Capital Construction Budget Request**

1. CPC Chair Election

Background: The chair asked committee members for nominations for 2008-2009 CPC chair. She nominated Gregg Lobisser.

Staff said the chair is elected annually and will begin his/her term in the fall once the 2008-2009 CPC membership has been appointed.

Action: The committee agreed unanimously to recommend to the president that Gregg Lobisser be appointed as chair of the 2008-2009 CPC.

2. Integrative Science Complex, Phase 2 (ISC2) – Meeting One

Background: Staff reviewed the purpose of the Meeting One for the ISC2 project.

Lou Moses and Jim Hutchison, project co-chairs introduced the project as described in the meeting mailing. The project will take advantage of the benefits of an interdisciplinary approach by providing science facilities designed for use by multiple disciplines. The new ISC2

CAMPUS PLANNING AND REAL ESTATE

building (about 100,000 gsf) will include shared and individual lab spaces, teaching/classroom facilities, offices, and other shared facilities (e.g., instrumentation labs).

Jim clarified that faculty moving into the new ISC facility would vacate some existing campus offices and labs. For the most part, however, adjacent occupants would fill these vacated spaces to resolve current space needs.

Fred Tepfer from Campus Planning and Real Estate discussed the proposed project site as described in the meeting mailing. Fred noted that while the proposed site is the only viable option for ISC2, a number of factors will make it a challenge due to the required floor plate width for an efficient science building, a strong desire for a programmatic connection to adjacent science buildings, and the location of two very large red maple trees. The new Lokey Lab is designed to allow for an underground connection but above ground connections to Streisinger would require construction within a designated open space. Also, it would interfere with the north/south pathway through the Science Green that continues west through the parking area along Franklin Boulevard. The two trees are important components of the primary public view of campus (along with the adjacent landscaping and main campus entry sign). It is quite possible that the building will be higher than four stories to accommodate all the site constraints as well as the desired building program.

Jim said siting options were considered very seriously during the first phase of ISC (Lokey Lab). ISC2 hopefully will create enough surge space to allow future phases (ISC3) to replace existing science buildings that do not serve the users well nor fit in with the campus character (e.g., Onyx Bridge). As campus space within the academic core becomes more valuable, it will become more important to consider ways to make better use of it.

Discussion: Members made the following comments:

- Work to improve the campus's open space framework, pathway system, and public edge while accommodating desired development.
- Ensure that the importance of the public edge along Franklin Boulevard is addressed.
- Convey to the public the importance of the university's research and academic mission through design elements (open spaces and buildings) to counterbalance the strong Athletic image that will be conveyed in the vicinity of the Arena east of Agate Street.
- Recognize the significance of the two maple trees.
- Ensure the campus edge does not become more impenetrable. Convey to the public the significance of open spaces, one of campus's predominant character defining features. The Science Green is one of the few remaining open spaces visible to the public. If an open space is removed, it likely will not be replaced.
- Pay particular attention to the importance of the pattern, Positive Outdoor Space.
- Assess and address existing and projected foot traffic in the area when considering changes to the pedestrian pathways.

In addition, committee members said that a strong effort should be made to pursue a graduate student representative for the user group.

Action: The committee, with thirteen in favor and one opposed, recommended to the president that the proposed site for the Integrative Science Complex be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. As the building's location and scale is established, it shall recognize need to balance the value of retaining open space, protecting the two significant maple trees, developing interdisciplinary facilities, enhancing the campus edge/public image, and meeting campus height restrictions.

2. The project will come back to the committee for initial review once preliminary siting and massing options have been developed.

In addition, the committee unanimously supported the identified key *Campus Plan* patterns and policies for the project with the understanding that the committee's comments also will be considered as the project moves forward.

3. 2009-2015 Capital Construction Budget Request

Background: Staff reviewed the purpose of CPC's review of the Capital Construction Budget Request as described in the meeting mailing. She reminded the committee that it will have an opportunity to review the proposed projects at a future date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are met.

Cathy Soutar from Campus Planning and Real Estate summarized the Capital Construction Budget Request process as described in the meeting mailing. She reviewed all previously approved projects for the past three biennia and introduced the new projects proposed for inclusion on the Capital Construction Budget Request list.

Discussion: In response to a member's question Cathy explained that the Innovative Learning Complex (ILC) would be divided into a series of phases. The first phase, which is on the list of proposed projects, does not include an addition to PLC. The PLC addition would be part of a later phase.

Members expressed concern and confusion about the inability to review projects for conformance with all *Campus Plan* policies and patterns at such an early stage. They said it is important to convey the fact that they did not consider all patterns and policies during this initial review. Staff suggested that it would be most appropriate and helpful for the committee to focus on the most relevant policy, "Policy 3: Densities." A member said it is important to note that a project may meet maximum density allowances, for example the proposed ILC project, but result in overall scale and massing concerns once all other *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are considered.

A member suggested involving the Environmental Issues Committee (EIC) due to the substantial scale of proposed changes. Staff said the proposed development reflects the *Campus Plan*, which had a substantial amount of public input. Typically, interested parties such as the EIC would be involved if, changes to the Campus Plan (e.g., an amendment) are proposed.

Action: The committee agreed, with 4 in favor, two against, and two abstentions, to forward the following comments to the president:

The CPC reviewed the proposed 2009-2015 Capital Construction Budget Request as required by the *Campus Plan* to determine if it is consistent with relevant *Campus Plan* policies and patterns.

This was an initial review focusing primarily on *Campus Plan* Policy 3: Densities. It is important that the CPC have an opportunity review the proposed projects at a later date to ensure that all *Campus Plan* patterns and policies are met.

Based upon this initial review, the CPC determined that:

- (1) sufficient land exists, **in aggregate**, to accommodate the **prioritized first-biennium** capital construction projects,
- (2) each capital building project proposed for funding in the **first biennium** has siting opportunities that are consistent with the *Campus Plan*, and
- (3) any of the **prioritized** capital construction projects would require plan amendments, and if so, to provide comments.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Vince Babkirk, Facilities Services
Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services
Paul Bloch, Computer and Info Science (Deschutes Building Manager)
Lisa Gardner, Eugene Planning Division
Terri Harding, Eugene Planning
Jim Hutchison, Chemistry
Roger Kerrigan, Facilities Services
Lou Moses, Psychology
Greg Rikhoff, Community Relations
Gordon Sayre, English (University Senate)
Cathy Soutar, CPRE
Fred Tepfer, CPRE
Bruce Wilson, Molecular Biology (Huestis and Streisinger Building Manager)