STUDY OBJECTIVES

Purpose
The University of Oregon Area Studies address three prospective sites on the University of Oregon Eugene campus, each for a specific use and program:

- Softball Field
- Science Building
- Residence Hall

The area studies serve to:

- Further explore each site to accommodate the proposed program and its context, and
- Identify how each site's development can best reflect current and future campus goals and, as such, contribute to the betterment of the campus’s beauty and function.

Relationship to the Campus Plan
The University of Oregon Campus Plan (completed in 2005, updated in 2011 and amended in 2014) outlines the process and policies, and sets the framework for campus development projects. The process to develop a supplementary and comprehensive Campus Physical Framework Vision has begun parallel with the site selection process for the three building projects. It will further define and expand open spaces identified in the campus plan, define activity locations, examine density and capacity, and identify new development sites.

The Campus Physical Framework Vision consultant (CPFVC) provided expert opinion on the site selection of the three building projects and conducted context studies of each site prior to the start of the broader Vision process because of the need to move the planning and design process forward on the three sites. The intent is that the three projects will enhance their broader campus areas, even if density must increase to accommodate program, and not to preclude bigger concepts and themes resulting from the upcoming vision work.

Process
The seven-week process began and ended with work sessions with the Advisory Group for the Campus Physical Framework Vision (AGCPFV). These sessions served to identify principles, unique characteristics of the campus, and overarching big-ideas to consider through the Campus Physical Framework Vision starts in 2015. By doing this, the sessions highlighted the role of each site in the larger context of a campus physical framework.

Based on the data in the just-completed site selection evaluations, the expert opinions and area studies completed by the CPFVC, and input received during the outreach program, the AGCPFV recommended a preferred site for each project to the university president. The president then asked the Space Advisory Group (SAG) and the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) for their reviews of the preferred sites for each project. Included in this document are their recommendations given to the president, who made the final decision for each site.

Outreach
As part of site selection for three building projects (i.e., a new women's softball stadium, a 100,000-gsf science research lab building, and a 500-bed residence hall), Campus Planning, Design, and Construction (CPDC) staff conducted a campus-wide outreach process. The primary objectives of the process were to:

1. Provide information on the University of Oregon Campus Physical Framework Vision Project and site selection for the three building projects;
2. Solicit feedback from on- and off-campus neighbors on the site selection process and short-listed sites for each of the three building projects; and
3. Provide an opportunity for discovery if there was information missing from the research and data collection effort conducted earlier in the site selection process.
The outreach process featured project presentations and dialogue at:
- Two open houses (one at the Lewis Integrative Science Building, and one at the Ford Alumni Center);
- Eight focus group meetings;
- Two neighborhood association board meetings;
- Two tabling sessions in the EMU lobby aimed at all students; and
- Numerous communications with individuals and representatives of key stakeholder groups via face-to-face dialogue, phone conversation, and e-mail.

**Methods of Outreach**

Methods of outreach included, but were not limited to:
- Project website (http://uplan.uoregon.edu/UOFrameworkVisionProj/UO_FVP.htm)
- Paid advertisements noticing the open houses in at least two issues of the Daily Emerald
- Article in “AroundtheO”, and follow-up e-mail “blast” by University of Oregon communications staff
- E-mail blast to the Deans & Directors distribution list
- Notification e-mails to neighborhood association leadership
- Notification of open houses and project at Campus Partners meeting.

**Interested Parties**

Interested parties notified/contacted included, but were not limited to:

**Internal**
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Campus Planning Committee
- Space Advisory Group
- Native American campus community leaders
- Child development center directors and Olum parent council
- EMU and Outdoor Program leadership
- School of A&AA faculty
- Campus Planning, Design & Construction staff
- Campus Operations staff
- UOPD chief
- Parking & Transportation director
- Project sponsors
- Law school dean/faculty and student advisory council

**External**

- Neighborhood leadership (Fairmount and South University associations)
- Business/property owners
- City staff

The Advisory Group to the Framework Vision Project received comments compiled through the outreach process.
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MISSION STATEMENT

Mission
The University of Oregon is a comprehensive public research university committed to innovative teaching, discovery, and service. We are a community of scholars dedicated to helping individuals question critically, think logically, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically.

Purpose
We pursue excellence in research, artistic expression, and the generation, dissemination, preservation, and application of knowledge. We are devoted to educating the whole person, and to creating the next generation of transformational leaders and informed participants in the global community. Through these pursuits, we enhance the social, cultural, physical, and economic well-being of Oregon, the nation, and the world.

Vision
We aspire to lead as a preeminent public residential research university encompassing the humanities and arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. We seek to enrich the human condition through collaboration, teaching, mentoring, scholarship, creative inquiry, scientific discovery, and public service.

Values
- We value the aspirations, passions, and success of all who work and learn here.
- We value the pursuit of academic freedom, creative expression, and intellectual discourse.
- We value innovation, collaboration, and experiential learning in our schools and colleges.
- We value diversity and seek to foster equity and inclusion in a welcoming, safe, and respectful community.
- We value the quality of life provided by the unique geography, history, and culture of our place in Oregon.
- We value our shared responsibility to sustainably steward our resources.

CAMPUS PHYSICAL FRAMEWORK VISION
PRELIMINARY VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

The CPFV in 2015 will use the University’s Mission Statement to identify values and principles to guide campus development. In concert with the Campus Plan, the CPFV will identify the “big ideas”—the physical elements that will frame the vision.

The following summarizes first thoughts of:
- Key words from the University’s Mission Statement
- Preliminary values/principles for the CPFV
- Preliminary campus themes that might lend themselves to forming the “bigger ideas” of the CPFV, and lastly
- Planning perspectives of the campus’s makeup and key elements.
Key Words from the University’s Mission Statement

Teaching • Research • Service • Discovery • community of scholars • innovative teaching • excellence • artistic • transformational • global community • well-being of Oregon • preeminent • collaborative • public • residential • experiential learning • sustainably steward our resources • collaboration • welcoming • safe • unique geography, history, and culture of our place in Oregon.

Preliminary Values /Principles

The University of Oregon’s campus in Eugene supports the University’s Mission Statement by:

• Being accessible, safe, welcoming, and fostering social collaboration—a shared responsibility between open space and buildings
• Enhancing identity via a high quality open space system and a distinctive heritage
• Using the open systems to encourage collaboration through social and academic interaction
• Providing a connected, human scale in support of the entire community—a second home for its students
• Integrating ecological care into all aspects of campus life, practices and operations
• Maintaining vibrant, memorable places that influence people and create good stewards

Preliminary Campus Themes

Open space framework comprised of:
• Connected series of open spaces
• Quads, courts, axes, and greens

Campus as ecosystem comprised of:
• The physical campus, practices-policies, and operations

Unique identity built upon:
• Cultural heritage
• Open space framework
• Architecture
• Unifying elements

Campus as outdoor learning environment for:
• People – social and intellectual
• Physical resources– research, models, and specimens

Campus access giving priority to:
• Pedestrians first
• Entire community

Campus linkages to:
• Research Park
• River
• Autzen
• EWEB, Downtown, Walnut Station, Glenwood

Edges that serve as:
• Transitional space between uses
• Blend the margins
• Good neighbors to adjacent uses

Loose fit—long life (Growth and Flexibility) to:
• Meet space needs
• Develop open space framework
• Allow for flexible use

Engage and celebrate the Willamette River to:
• Utilize river as educational resource
• Restore river edge
• Accommodate development opportunities—light touch

Revitalize the Millrace as a:
• Natural corridor
• Storm water system
• Living laboratory

Intersections emphasized:
• At the heart of campus
• To recognize and mark key points in the campus’s fabric.
Preliminary Planning Perspectives

The following diagrams illustrate how one might view the campus as a system of:

- Layers
- Patterns
- Flows

This will be further developed over the course of the CPFV development process.

**Layers**

**Patterns**

**Flows**

**Landmarks and monuments** for:
- Orient movement
- Announce important elements/areas

**Finer human scale** of the region and the city
- Retain
- Enhance

**Connections to outdoors** via:
- Exposure to sun
- Outdoor gathering areas in sun or rain
SITE SELECTION

Siting Studies
Prior to the expert opinions and area studies, the University hired professional consultant teams led by the consultant Cameron McCarthy to prepare site selection reports for the three projects. Each report included a concept design sufficient to determine the space needs of the project and any location related criteria. The report documented the sites under consideration and listed the following criteria from the Campus Plan, the Space Needs Plan, other studies, and project sponsors.

- Feasibility of Development
- Campus Planning Framework
- Space Needs Plan
- User Needs: Program & Facility

Each report included a matrix applying the criteria to the possible sites as determined by the Advisory Group for the Framework Vision Project (AGCPFV). The AGCPFV then selected one site for softball, one for the science building, and three for the residential hall for further study through the expert opinions, area studies, and outreach.

Expert Opinions
The Framework Vision Project consultant (CPFVC) reviewed each site and advised the AGCPFV on the near- and long-term implications of the preferred sites. The expert opinions identified issues and opportunities for near- and long-term development by focusing on the following questions:

- Are the programs and sites able to accommodate the program?
- How can each project beneficially contribute to the campus physical environment today and how might it afford planning and design opportunities in the future?

The CPFVC’s expert opinion of each project recommended to the AGCPFV one site for each project, narrowing the three short-listed sites to one for the residence hall.

AREA STUDIES

Due to the complexities of each project and the various site possibilities, the CPDC staff instructed the CPFVC to prepare studies to demonstrate how each project fits into its proposed area and to define greater campus planning and design implications and opportunities in the near- and long-term. The CPFVC worked with the projects’ sponsors, campus planning staff, and the AGCPFV to develop these area studies. The area studies were reviewed by the AGCPFV, the SAG, and the CPC. Their recommendations are contained in this document.

The studies evaluate each site within a larger context—a subarea of the campus. By applying a conceptual direction to each subarea, the Area Studies illustrate a physical framework of open space, development sites, and major circulation elements. The process tested each subarea with a series of diagrams to understand implications for open space, pedestrian circulation, vehicular circulation, service, and emergency access.

In addition, each area study analyzes the coverage (building, open space, and other) as well as floor area ratio (FAR) of the existing condition with three increments of growth that culminate in a theoretical build-out condition. The metrics can then be compared to similar metrics addressed in the University’s Campus Plan and supporting documents. The area study boundary for each site do not correspond to the Design Areas and subareas contained in the Campus Plan.

Area Study Organization
Each area study follows this organization of diagrams:

- Program
- Criteria
- Outreach

Outreach
Synopsis of public outreach findings

Planning Concept
Conceptual planning direction

Framework Plan
Planning recommendations to guide development of open spaces, building placements, and pedestrian circulation

Build-Out Illustrative
Potential full development using the overall concepts and framework as drivers to create characteristics and goals particular to the area

Systems Diagrams
Affirming each site’s ability to accommodate open space, circulation routes, emergency access, and service

Development Densities
Development densities of the existing condition, with the project, with additional development approximately equivalent to that contained in Scenario 2 of the Space Needs Plan, and build-out in comparison to the maximum allowed development densities in the Campus Plan

Framework Vision Project Advisory Group Provisions, Space Advisory Group Recommendations, and Campus Planning Committee Considerations
Provisions, recommendations, and considerations for project design and development

Metrics
Metrics applied to clarify the Advisory Group, the Space Advisory Group, and the Campus Planning Committee provisions and considerations

CPFVC Additional Recommendations
Additional consultant recommendations based on discussions with the FVPAG, SAG, and the CPC, the site expert opinions completed by the CPFVC, and analysis and planning conducted for the area studies
## Schedule:

### Campus Physical Framework Vision

**Site Selection for Three Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th><strong>Fall Term 2014</strong> (9/29 - 12/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering on potential project sites</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expert opinion on project sites</td>
<td>- Area studies on project sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Campus Physical Framework Vision**

- Space Advisory Group

**Space Needs Plan**

Prepared by Campus Planning, Design & Construction: Fall 2014
1. Research
Advisory Group reviews potential sites, data, and reports for three projects.

2. Advising
Advisory Group selects short list of sites, considers expert opinion, reviews area plans, and forwards recommendations for all three projects.

3. Feedback
Advisory Group solicits input from invested and interested groups via open houses, meetings, emails, and postings.

4. Decision
Final sites recommended to president, who confers with CPC and SAG. President makes final site selection.

Prepared by Campus Planning, Design & Construction: Fall 2014
Study Areas

- Science Building
- Softball Field
- Residence Hall

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON AREA STUDIES
Campus Plan Development Densities

The Campus Plan identifies density criteria for specific areas of the campus. This criteria includes maximum building coverage, floor area ratios (FAR) and minimum required designated open space. As a means of comparison, the table below also appears in each area study development density calculations. Note that the area study boundaries do NOT correspond to established Design Areas or subareas of the Campus Plan.

### Campus Plan Design Areas Development Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Area</th>
<th>Subareas</th>
<th>University Policies: Maximum Allowed Building Coverage</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rounded)</td>
<td>(rounded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Center and Historic Core</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Circle (Parking)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC Parking Lot (Parking)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Campus</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Campus</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Central Campus</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Campus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaqua Triangle</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>27-29, 31-32</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited High Density Residential/Limited Institutional</td>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>37-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** University of Oregon Campus Plan, Third Edition, 2014

**Notes:**
1. Coverage and FAR values. See University’s documents referenced above.
**SOFTBALL FIELD**

**Program**
- Seating for 1,500
- Indoor Practice Facility (90’x90’ minimum)
- Team Building (14,800 GSF on 2 floors)
- Two Bullpens

**Criteria**
- Compatibility / Readiness
- Support of Campus Plan
- Support of Space Needs Plan
- User Needs – Fan Experience

**Outreach**
- Academic use on/adjacent to the site favored
- Parking/neighborhood issues cited
- Alternative sites preferred by some
- Others saw remaining at Howe as building program support
- Maintaining Outdoor Program use until relocated
SOFTBALL FIELD

Planning Concept
1. Green axis—University Street
2. Open space as an organizing element
3. Re-purpose, replace, or develop academic buildings along University Street
4. Pedestrian priority
SOFTBALL FIELD

Framework
1. Green axis – University St.
2. Open space as organizing element
3. Re-purpose/replace buildings along University Street
4. Pedestrian priority
5. Create a build-to line to define University Street
6. Build underground parking
SOFTBALL FIELD

Build-Out Illustrative

- Flexibility
- Vibrant public spaces
- Maximized building area
- Future academic facility on University Street
- Development along University Street
- Structured parking

Legend
- Open Space
- New Buildings
- Existing Buildings
- Plaza
**SOFTBALL FIELD—Development Densities**

### Existing

- **Academic Center and Historic Core**: 1-9, 0.28, 0.19
- **Franklin Circle (Parking)**: 10, 0.75, 4.08
- **PLC Parking Lot (Parking)**: 11, 0.75, 4.08
- **Southwest Campus**: 12-15, 0.18, 0.08
- **North Campus**: 16-19, 0.02, 1.78
- **Northeast Campus (Academics, Research, and Support Services)**: 10-22, 0.18, 0.07
- **Northeast Central Campus (Academics, Shared Services, and Housing)**: 23-27, 0.25, 0.48
- **Southwest Campus (Academics, Athletics, and Recreation)**: 25, 0.18, 1.25
- **Jaqua Triangle**: 26, 0.18, 0.68
- **East Campus Institutional**: 27-29, 11, 0.02
- **Limited High Density Residential**: 33-35, 0.53
- **High Density Residential**: 35-36
- **Low Density Residential**: 37-41

**Note**
The area study boundaries do NOT correspond to established Design Areas or subareas of the Campus Plan.

### Project

### Scenario 2

### Build-Out

#### Area Study Development Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Building GSF</th>
<th>Open Space Coverage</th>
<th>Other Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>Build-Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>Build-Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOFTBALL**

- **Existing**: 277,600, 0, 277,600, 0.27, 454,100, 0.43, 564,900, 0.54, 202,000, 0.19
- **Current Phase**: 339,400, 29,400, 368,800, 0.35, 611,200, 0.58, 513,400, 0.49, 162,200, 0.16
- **Scenario 2**: 128,200, 198,100, 326,300, 0.31, 744,000, 0.71, 521,500, 0.50, 196,500, 0.19
- **Build-Out**: 79,700, 262,100, 341,800, 0.33, 937,400, 0.90, 508,700, 0.49, 194,000, 0.19

**Legend**

- **New Building**
- **Existing Building**
- **Open**
- **Closed**

**Legend**

- **New Building**
- **Existing Building**
- **Open**
- **Closed**
SOFTBALL FIELD

Advisory Group Provisions and Space Advisory Group Recommendations

1. Space for future academic building should be reserved along the site abutting University Street.

2. The minimum width of a future academic building is 70 feet; further study is required to establish the space reserved for this building, including the potential for vertical overlap of structures for athletic and academic use, as long as there are no blank walls along University Street.

3. Establish a build-to line along the eastern edge of University Street, based upon the current Esslinger building.

4. Designate approximately 100' of open space south of McArthur Court for a future east–west open space corridor.

5. Establish a minimum width for pedestrian corridors (e.g., 25–foot minimum width for the east–west corridor south of the indoor tennis facility and north of Howe Field, connecting University Street to the north–south pathway).

6. Amend the Campus Plan density standards to accommodate the planned softball stadium building program.
SOFTBALL FIELD

Campus Planning Committee Considerations

1. Carefully consider options for service access routes that could serve future academic buildings. Service areas for future academic buildings should not be directly on University Street. Possible alternate access points (e.g., 18th Avenue) should be considered to ensure that the Softball Project does not eliminate the potential to resolve this issue.

2. Carefully consider service access to the new softball stadium site, which is essentially landlocked. Providing service access from 18th Avenue is preferred, at least in the long term.

3. Carefully consider the design of the east/west pedestrian connection as part of the softball project to ensure it successfully connects to the north/south mid-block pathway. Make every effort to develop fully this pathway as part of the project. In addition, carefully consider the design of the north/south mid-block pathway.

4. Ensure that the project does not preclude the opportunity to refine the proposed new open space as part of the Framework Vision Project.

5. Ensure close collaboration with the Outdoor Program throughout the design process. In particular, be sure to retain the function of the turn-around space.

6. Make every effort to maximize the opportunity for a future academic building along University Street (beyond the 70-foot minimum building width requirement).

7. Pay attention to the 18th Avenue edge and make an effort to improve the university’s public face.

8. Recognize that the Howe Field gates and fence have historic significance and thoughtfully consider how they tie into the design.

9. Thoughtfully consider how to provide bike parking, including game-day parking.
SOFTBALL FIELD

Metrics
1. Minimum setback of 117 feet from face of curb to allow for a 70 foot wide future academic building. Note: Face of future academic buildings will align with a selected face of Esslinger Hall.

CPFVC Additional Recommendations
2. In order to create the same sense of place as exists in the academic center of the campus, enhance and maintain the adjacent streets with walks and trees of a scale appropriate to the campus structure and consider removing parked cars to create a significant open space along the northern half of the University Street axis. Mitigate service and back-of-house impacts through strong architectural and landscape architecture design.

3. Future new academic buildings and the renovated/replaced McArthur Court should have direct access to a shared entry plaza (coordinate with controlled access to softball field during games).

4. Retain access for service with a focus on pedestrian access.

5. Plan for media hookups along University Street and/or 18th Avenue – do not disrupt landscape. Keep media hookups (and associated trailers) out of interior pedestrian paths and plazas.

6. The future academic building design should recognize location of the southern gate to the campus at University and 18th—frame the space graciously.

7. 18th Avenue will offer the maximum street view of the field. It is appropriate to locate one of the entries to the softball complex here along with a minor plaza. Align entry with Onyx Street.

8. Due to grade changes, the controlled access parallel to the northern and eastern edges of field may need to be separated from the pedestrian corridor that extends past the Indoor Tennis building, creating an accessible path is encouraged.

9. Outdoor Program Barn remains in operation until an academic building is developed.

10. Review emergency access with Fire Marshall. Through-emergency access from East 18th Street to East 15th Street that may be needed when the recreation center expands south in the future and connects with the Student Tennis building.
SCIENCE BUILDING

Program
- 100,000 GSF
- 5 stories
- Research focus
- Offices, conference, public space

Criteria
- Compatibility / Readiness
- Support of Campus Plan
- Support of Space Needs Plan
- User Needs Program

Outreach
- Site was favored nearly universally
- Linkages to other science functions seen as key
- Potential for transformation of Franklin Boulevard corridor / academic campus gateway
- Possibility of continuing extension of science-related campus functions northward
- Consideration of design that could integrate classrooms with research
SCIENCE BUILDING
Planning Concept
- Connections
- Franklin as a seam (not a divider)
- Open Space Framework
- Millrace corridor
- Orthogonal grid
SCIENCE BUILDING

Framework
1. Gateway to University
2. Reinforce N/S pedestrian flow
3. Formal Quad
4. Engage Millrace
5. Celebrate Urban Farm
SCIENCE BUILDING

Build-Out Illustrative
- Flexibility
- Research focus
- Millrace Reserve
- Structured parking
SCIENCE BUILDING
System Diagrams

Open Space

Pedestrian Circulation

Bicycle Circulation

Vehicular Circulation

Service

Emergency Access
Campus Plan Design Area Development Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Area</th>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Existing Density</th>
<th>Project Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Center and Historic Core</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Circle (Parking)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC Parking Lot (Parking)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Campus</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Campus</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Academic, Research, and Support Services)</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Campus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Triangle</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited High Density Residential (Limited Institutional)</td>
<td>31-36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
The area study boundaries do NOT correspond to established Design Areas or subareas of the Campus Plan.

Area Study Development Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Building GSF</th>
<th>Open Space Coverage</th>
<th>Other Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Square Feet</td>
<td>New Square Feet</td>
<td>Total Square Feet</td>
<td>Coverage Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>129,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129,100</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>127,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>147,600</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>141,100</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>212,100</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-Out</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>519,000</td>
<td>539,600</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCIENCE BUILDING
Advisory Group Provisions, Space Advisory Group Recommendations, and Campus Planning Committee Considerations

1. Continue the orthogonal campus grid; establish a build-to-line for the future Science building along Franklin Boulevard.

2. Extend the designated open space along the Millrace corridor; establish pedestrian circulation/pathway north of the proposed science building along the southern edge of the Millrace corridor.

3. Extend the Gallery Walk designated open space axis through the site to Franklin Boulevard, and connect to the Millrace open space/pedestrian corridor.
SCIENCE BUILDING

Metrics
None.

CPFVC Additional Recommendations
1. Enhance and maintain a street edge with walks and trees of a scale appropriate to the campus structure and Franklin Boulevard. Mitigate service and back-of-house impacts through strong architectural and landscape architecture design.
2. Design building interiors to animate the building edge (with transparent façade) along Franklin Boulevard to announce the building being of the University.
3. Design the future sky bridge to be lighted and transparent, again to announce that the University is on both sides of Franklin Boulevard.
4. In the area study, consider plantings north and south of Franklin Boulevard that will blend the campus properties, not divide them.
5. Develop interior circulation to facilitate connections to potential future university buildings to the east and west.
6. Investigate how this building and future buildings can enhance connections to the research park.
7. Site building to keep the alignment of the current Gallery Walk (do not jog walk).
8. Improve Gallery Walk paving and lighting and study future relationship to the proposed sky bridge.
9. Study potential for shared bike and pedestrian paths back of curb, assuming roadway is not changed. And, study potential for shared bike with service road and parking in current roadway, assuming roadway width is reduced; see University and City studies:
   • http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/the_boulevard_study_gillem.pdf
10. Consider the building edge along Gallery Walk as an opportunity to expose users to the science within the building, e.g., gallery space, transparency, classrooms, and seminar rooms. Provide functional open space along the west and east building edges and along the building edge facing the Millrace.
RESIDENCE HALL

Program
• 500 beds
• 145,000 GSF
• One Entry--One Building Preferred
• Community Format--Residential/Academic

Criteria
• Compatibility / Readiness
• Support of Campus Plan
• Support of Space Needs Plan
• User Needs Program
• Respect Neighbors--Solar Access

Outreach
• Solstice view not understood previously as key siting issue
• Site appears to be able to meet residence hall program and solar access provisions
• Great potential to improve open space, integrate housing with surrounding uses
• Child development centers expressed concerns about potential impacts to their programs
• Concerns about scale/compatibility, parking, and private student housing in the neighborhoods
RESIDENCE HALL

Planning Concept

- Finer Grid
- East-West Open Space
- Diagonal Flow
- Many Nations Longhouse
RESIDENCE HALL
Framework
- Transitional Massing
- Solar Access
- Programmed Open Space
RESIDENCE HALL

Build-Out Illustrative
- Maintain Flexibility
- Building Frontage
- Respect Many Nations Longhouse
- Gracious Edge
RESIDENCE HALL
System Diagrams

Open Space

Pedestrian Circulation

Service

Bicycle Circulation

Vehicular Circulation

Emergency Access

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON AREA STUDIES
RESIDENCE HALL—Development Densities

Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Area</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics Center and Historic Core</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Circle (Parking)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC Parking Lot (Parking)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Campus</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Campus</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Central Campus</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japa Triangle</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus (Academic, Athletics, and Housing)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus (Institutional)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus (Limited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The area study boundaries do not correspond to established Design Areas or subareas of the Campus Plan.
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RESIDENCE HALL MANY NATIONS LONGHOUSE SOLAR ACCESS STUDIES

The residence hall project site (1) lies southeast of the Many Nations Longhouse (MNL) (2). In December 2010, Jones and Jones prepared a conceptual plan for the Many Nations Longhouse Expansion, Expression Place, and the Many Nations Longhouse Axis.

The report states that the intent is to provide a University of Oregon campus location where Native American culture is prominently and respectfully recognized and where cross cultural interchange, activities, celebrations, and ceremonies can take place. Intentional design relationships of cardinal directions, arbors, seating, pause spaces, patterns and the messages of Honoring along the MNL Axis will expose all students, faculty and staff to the living Native American cultural traditions of the State of Oregon.

The MNL Axis (3) and Expression Place (4) are a part of the overall designated Open-space Framework of the East Campus Open Space and will connect to the larger campus open space framework.

A significant criterion for the Expression Place is that it remains free from shadow during the majority of the day of the winter solstice, starting at sunrise and lasting through the mid-to-late afternoon. Another requirement is that the MNL Axis remains in sun throughout the day until the mid-to-late afternoon. The axis can have shadow during the morning to mid-to-late afternoon as long as it continues to sweep across the axis.

These criteria place unique restrictions on the massing of the residence hall to avoid blocking the sun. To test the criteria and the feasibility of accommodating the residence hall program, the CPFVC prepared a series of sun-shadow studies using data obtained from the University of Oregon Solar Radiation Monitoring Laboratory website. The studies determined that the program can be accomplished although it will result in a more complicated massing than originally intended.

As the design progresses, the university and the selected architect will design the residence hall to meet these solar access criteria.
RESIDENCE HALL
Advisory Group Provisions and Space Advisory Group Recommendations

1. Respect and honor Native American cultural traditions by observing solar access requirements associated with the Many Nations Longhouse:
   a. Preserve sunlight from the winter solstice onto the roughly 28’ diameter Expression Place ceremonial space.
   b. Ensure that the new building does not cast shadow onto the ceremonial center of the Expression Place at any time.
   c. Ensure that the new building does not cast shadow upon the designated Many Nations Longhouse open space axis.
   d. Building should not extend into the Columbia Street open space.
   e. Future building service areas should not face the Longhouse

2. Create a new east-west designated open space north of the residence hall and adjacent to and south of the Many Nations Longhouse Axis, with the south edge of the open space aligned with the north edge of the Vivian Olum Child Development Center.

3. Establish a build-to line for the residence hall along the south side of the new designated open space as a defining edge to the open space corridor.

4. Ensure that the residence hall building along 17th Avenue is articulated and engages the streetscape.

5. Amend the Campus Plan density standards to accommodate the planned residence hall building program.
RESIDENCE HALL

Campus Planning Committee Recommendations

The Advisory Group provisions are revised as follows:

1. Respect and honor Native American cultural traditions by observing solar access requirements associated with the Many Nations Longhouse. Specifically:
   a. Preserve sunlight from the winter solstice onto the roughly 28-foot diameter Expression Place ceremonial space planned due east of the Longhouse.
   b. Ensure that the new building(s) do not cast shadow onto the ceremonial center of the planned Expression Place at any time throughout the year.
   c. Ensure that new building(s) do not cast shadow upon the designated Many Nations Longhouse open-space axis. Ensure that the Many Nations Longhouse Axis is not in perpetual continual shadow. Shadows across the axis are permissible.
   d. Future building(s) should not extend into the Columbia Street designated open-space axis to maintain solar access onto the planned Expression Place during the equinox.
   e. Future building service areas should not be located to face the Many Nations Longhouse.

2. Create a new east-west designated open space north of the new residence hall and adjacent to and south of the Many Nations Longhouse Axis, with the south edge of the open space aligned with the north edge of the Vivian Olum Child Development Center.

3. Establish a build-to line for the residence hall along the south side of the new designated open space as a defining edge to the open-space corridor.

4. Ensure that the residence hall building along 17th Avenue is articulated and engages the streetscape.

5. Amend the Campus Plan density standards to accommodate the planned residence hall building program.

Considerations

6. Consider how the proposed residence hall development would affect the solar access of existing and future development in the surrounding area.

7. Take the opportunity to fully consider and address universal access.

8. Recognize the importance of addressing the street face. Carefully consider the building’s articulation to help improve the streetscape.
RESIDENCE HALL

CPFVC Additional Recommendations

1. Enhance and maintain the adjacent streets and open space corridors with walks and trees of a scale appropriate to the campus structure. Mitigate service and back-of-house impacts through strong architectural and landscape architecture design.

2. Prepare a plan to replace parking, and provide drop-off and parking to support the Many Nations Longhouse and Vivian Olum Child Development Center.

3. Consider how to treat the back of the residence hall as it engages the street edge and the views from the Moss Street Child Development Center.

4. Consider transitional open space between building’s main entry and the designated campus open space.

5. Study building design to allow for a mid-block north-south crossing using current alignment of Moss Alley. The reason for this is to break up the scale of the building and to avoid superblock development, offering a variety of pedestrian routes on campus. Controlled access can be accomplished by sky bridges or portions of building crossing the alley.
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