



May 29, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Eleni Tsivitz, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the April 17, 2018 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Greg Bryant, George Evans, Hilary Gerdes, Alicia Going, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Kevin Reed, Christine Thompson,

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Krista Dillon, Clark Hansen, Aaron Olsen, Kay Porter, Becca Puleo, Matt Roberts, James Stegall, Roger Thompson, Michael Tobin, James Wooten

CPC Agenda:

1. Emergency Phone - New Campus Standard

Background: Staff introduced the purpose of this agenda item and reviewed related information from the Campus Plan. Krista Dillon (Safety and Risk Services) presented the reason that the new campus standard emergency phone (e-phone) is being proposed. The current campus standard e-phone (+/- 64 existing fixtures on campus) is composed of parts that are manufactured and purchased from a number of different sources. As a result, there is no warranty associated with these fixtures and maintenance is costly.

The new proposed fixture is a standard package, with lower initial costs, better warranty opportunities, simplified maintenance of existing fixtures, and more intuitive operation. In addition, there is the opportunity to incorporate analog, voice-over IP, and a camera. The new proposed campus standard fixture is the same yellow color as the existing campus standard fixture but is seven feet tall as opposed to four feet. There are some examples currently on campus of fixtures which are similar to what is being proposed. Unlike the proposed new campus standard, however, these fixtures include a goose-neck camera. If that type of camera mount were deemed necessary in particular locations, those would come to the CPC for approval. The blue light in the proposed new standard would be on all the time but would flash when engaged. The current fixtures display the word "EMERGENCY" on them. The new fixtures could substitute that word for "ASSISTANCE" so

that passers-by could use the e-phones to ask for general assistance as well as in emergency situations.

Dillon showed how the new proposed fixture would look in a number of campus locations.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- The focus of these fixtures should probably be on emergencies because other landscape features exist to provide information e.g. campus standard signage and map stations.
- If e-phones were used to respond to general questions as well as emergencies, the blue flashing lights might cause concern at first, but in the long-term could result in passers-by ignoring an emergency situation.
- The new proposed standard is taller and more visible than the existing standard. Therefore consider reducing the total number of e-phones on campus.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, the project team provided the following clarifications:

- E-phones have been installed on campus for a number of years. The primary goal is to make them visible so that they can be easily located.
- The new proposed design is an industry standard. Multiple companies provide similar fixtures so this does not commit the UO to a single manufacturer.
- Some standard models have an information button as well as an emergency button.
- The placement of these fixtures will be approached in a more strategic manner than the old fixtures which had to be co-located with campus utility tunnels.
- It is difficult (and not necessarily desirable) to hold people accountable for misuse of the e-phones.
- The blue flashing light will turn off automatically after the call has been answered.
- Pan, tilt, zoom (PTZ) cameras are usually installed on the side of a building and have a "home" view, but can be repositioned to look at different views within in an area.
- New e-phones would be installed in one of the following three scenarios:
 1. Replacement of an existing fixture (no CPC review required)
 2. Placement as part of a project (location reviewed by project team and Campus Planning and Facilities Management)
 3. New e-phone location not as part of a development project (CPC review of location may be required depending on the impact from a campus-wide perspective).

Action: The committee agreed unanimously that the proposed new campus standard emergency phone is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

- Carefully assess the number and location of these units in the implementation process.

2. Campus Planning Updates

a) Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) Amendment

Background: Staff explained that the CPC has discussed a proposed amendment to the

OMSD in previous meetings and will continue to do so leading up to a public hearing and CPC action on the proposed amendment in June. She described the current requirements under the OMSD - in particular, the four goals related to development projects - the Energy, Water, and People Goals (internal to the University of Oregon) and the LEED Gold Goal (a third party certification). The criteria that require projects to meet these goals is currently the same for each of the four goals. This has proved problematic in execution because the US Green Building Council has established its own criteria that projects must meet in order to fit into one of the pre-defined LEED project types. The criteria under the OMSD do not work well in concert with the LEED criteria, and staff described how this has been demonstrated by a number of recent projects. Therefore one of the proposed amendments is to separate out the criteria that require projects to meet the Energy, Water and People Goals from those that trigger the LEED Gold Goal and to tie the latter much more closely to the USGBC's requirements. Projects that are not required to meet LEED would still be required to address the Energy, Water, and People Goals.

The University of Oregon has certified and continues to certify many high-achieving LEED projects. It also monitors building performance over time, and therefore has the advantage of understanding the real value of a variety of sustainable design strategies and when it makes sense to employ each one of them. As a result of this, combined with the institution's commitment to sustainability, and the fact that saving energy and water and educating building users and operators on how to help the building operate most efficiently, the UO will continue to implement these strategies whether or not a particular building project is required to meet the LEED certification goal.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- Consider ways to demonstrate that other aspects covered by the LEED certification process (besides energy, water, and people-related strategies) are being addressed whether or not a development project is required to go through the formal LEED certification.

Action: No formal action was requested.

b) Tykeson Hall - Schematic Design Review Conditions of Approval - Follow-up

Background: CPC staff reminded the committee of the conditions that were required as part of the Tykeson Hall Project at schematic design approval. She relayed the Tykeson Hall design team's responses which demonstrate how they had addressed each of the conditions:

1. Reconsider the color palette of the terracotta and consider comments provided by CPC members.

The design team shared renderings and photographs of physical mock-ups that they used to help the project team explore a range of color palettes.

2. Explore ways to emphasize the main building entrance and make it more inviting, for example through landscape or architectural design.

The main building entry has been emphasized architecturally through the creation of the loggia along 13th Avenue and a high degree of transparency at the ground level of the building. The door location is emphasized with its alignment below the large two-story window opening in the brick above.

Landscape elements that reinforce the building entry and invite people to enter include a generously wide walkway and gentle steps leading up to the loggia. Landscape seat walls, planting and trees to either side of the steps reinforce the approach to the building. These elements combine in a composition to create an entry character that relates clearly to the other neighboring buildings with a primary entry on 13th Ave.

3. Carefully consider the roofing materials, particularly thinking of the view of the roof from above.

The 3rd and 4th floor roofs are higher than the windows of the adjacent buildings (Johnson, Chapman, Fenton), and won't be seen from surrounding buildings. The 3rd floor Terrace is visible from Chapman and has vegetation and pavers. The north portion of the lower roof will be visible from a limited number of rooms at the 4th Floor of Tykeson Hall. The roof has a clean layout with no equipment and minimal penetrations. The color is gray in order to minimize glare, hide dirt better, and appear neutral in color. The material is single-ply to meet durability, maintenance and budget requirements for the project.

Action: No formal action was requested.

c) Housing - Hamilton/Walton Projects - Introduction

Background: Staff introduced this agenda item and gave some background information from a Campus Planning perspective. The project to replace Hamilton and Walton, Halls and build some additional capacity is not yet funded, but when or if it is, the project will come back to the CPC and be reviewed as part of the standard process. This project could potentially involve building on the Humpy Lumpy designated open space and creating a new designated open space (similar to what was proposed in the Framework Vision Project (FVP)) that would replace the functions of Humpy Lumpy and improve the connection from the Promenade on the west, across Agate Street to Matt Knight Arena on the east.

Roger Thompson (VP for Student Services) explained that Hamilton and Walton in particular do not offer facilities that are relevant for current or prospective students. UO Housing has toured residence halls at peer institutions and has come to the conclusion that replacing those two facilities could be transformational - for that area of campus, for enrollment, for housing, and for enhancing the shape and function of nearby open spaces.

The buildings that would replace Hamilton and Walton would increase the number of beds. The left-over spaces between the wings of the existing residence halls are not useful or beautiful. More recent residence halls have created better positively-shaped, beautiful outdoor spaces, reinforced by building facades. If replaced, Hamilton could include a visitors center which would accommodate a full theater for presentations to prospective students. Also, it could improve the appearance of the service area on Columbia Street as viewed from 13th Avenue.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- A member expressed excitement about the possibility of achieving the improved pedestrian connection across Agate Street that was suggested in the FVP.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, Thompson provided the following clarifications:

- It would be ideal to phase the projects so that the first new building could house 800 students. That way the first of the existing buildings could be demolished.
- The new buildings would probably increase the number of beds by increasing the height of the buildings rather than increasing the size of the building footprints (compared to what is existing).
- Some dining services need to be provided. The hope is to expand food services (compared to what is currently offered at Hamilton) such that it could serve as a spill-over after events at the Matt Knight Arena and serve faculty or even community needs.
- Integrating classroom space with residence halls is part of the vision which UO Housing has already been pursuing.
- Through these projects, we could improve the culture of the university and provide living spaces that would attract sophomores and juniors.
- Building new residence halls would result in an increase in the cost of the new rooms compared to the existing facilities. Existing residence halls include high-end facilities (Living Learning Center, Kalapuya Ilihi, etc.) - these buildings would provide a mid-range option that is important, but currently missing.
- There will be a lot of construction sites in that area of campus aiming for a positive transformation by 2021. While preferable, it may not be possible to complete the entire project by 2021.

Action: No formal action was requested.

Please contact this office if you have questions.