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PROJECT/CONSTRUCTION UPDATES

John Gremmels informed the committee of the following:
- Johnson Hall – Going very well. Looking at substantial completion at the end of August or very early September. The project is under budget. The parking components are just starting. The construction/improvement on the streets will begin soon.
- ASMC (Ag Systems Management Center) – Design is nearly complete. It will be a data center. Half of it will be unfinished and turned over to the Ag Department as a class/laboratory. They will finish it out later.
- Valley Football Center – The scope has been hard to follow but it is more or less a complete project. Most of the football operations parts will be completed by football season. The auditorium will not be done for football season as it was a late add-on.

RESULTS OF 2015 BIKE AND VEHICLE PARKING UTILIZATION STUDIES

Sara Robertson, Associate Campus Planner at OSU presented information/results of the 2015 Bike and Vehicle Parking Utilization Studies.

Vehicle Parking Utilization
- The studies are done annually
- We do an inventory of every parking lot on campus.
- We start by doing a capacity count in September. We collect the data by lot and space type.
- We divide campus up into 4 sections.
- We do a utilization count annually on the fourth week of Fall term. This is the time of year where OSU typically has the highest enrollment on campus. The entire campus is surveyed twice. Once on a Tuesday and once on a Wednesday. Four two-person teams collect the data between 10:00 am and 2:00 pm.
- We report to the City and calculate utilization rate off of general use parking lots only.
• Methodology shifted 6 years ago when Rebecca Houghtaling took over this effort and then again last fall when OSU implemented the zonal parking system.
• This past year our utilization rate was 74%.
• In general the ADA parking utilization rate is around 30%. The purpose of ADA parking is not to be utilized all the time; in part it is not supposed to be heavily utilized so there is a space available for someone who needs it.

Bike Parking Survey
• Since 2008 these have been done every two years until last year and then we did one last year and this year.
• We divide campus into sections and send a two-person team to count the utilization of bike racks.
• This is the first year we did the bike parking utilization survey on the same day as the vehicle parking utilization study. That was intentional to try and get the best snapshot of how the systems work together.
• We count capacity as a functional bike racking space. There are locations where there may be an abandoned bike on the rack or it has been installed incorrectly and you can’t get a bike attached to the rack. Capacity is adjusted to reflect anything that might decrease the ability to use that rack.
• Current capacity is 8,855 bike parking spaces, up 674 spaces from last year.
• Utilization varies widely. The utilization rate is 55%. It varies greatly by type of rack. Utilization rates are highest in the campus core.

INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE

Sara Robertson, Associate Campus Planner at OSU presented information on the request for a revision to the OSU Sign Plan.
• Signage on campus is partially regulated by the Campus Sign Plan and partially regulated by City code standards.
• Have received many requests for interpretive signage on campus.
• Current Campus Sign Plan doesn’t have a category that covers this type of signage on campus.
• Requesting an addition for a section on interpretive signage so there are parameters to review this type of signage request.
• The process will be that University Relations and Marketing will review requests for content and University Land Use Planning will review potential locations.

Dave Dodson reminded the committee that the OSU Campus Sign Plan was approved by CPC. In order to modify the Campus Sign Plan the request must be reviewed and approved by the CPC.
• University Relations and Marketing have developed a set of templates for this type of signage. They will review content and determine whether it has appropriate content and make sure the design meets the template standards.
• University Land Use Planning will then review to determine that the location is appropriate.
Dan Edge suggested that the phrase “that is not visually evident” be removed from the end of the first sentence of the proposed Interpretive Sign language. It was agreed and will be removed.
Motion to approve the modification to the OSU Campus Sign Plan was made a seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

SCHEMATIC DESIGN APPROVAL REQUESTS

Dave Dodson explained that the Land Use Planning staff review new projects for compliance with the requirements set out in the Campus Master Plan, code regulations, etc. If the project complies then they recommend approval. There are times that not everything complies but generally speaking, the project complies and so we have to alert the CPC and the architects of imposed conditions of approval to insure that they do comply. Each of the projects today do have some conditions associated with them.

**New Peavy Hall:** 80,000 SF forest science building to be constructed where the existing Peavy Hall is right now. The arboretum that runs along 30th Street is proposed to be preserved. The new building will be 3 stories and have a partial basement. Maximum building height will be 51’. The proposed footprint is just under 25,000 SF which is smaller than the current footprint.

Libby Ramirez, Project Manager shared examples of the materials proposed for use in/on this building and a product brochure. It is a US product manufactured mainly in the northern, central US. The initiative that came from the legislature in the funding of this project was to benefit the local timber industry. The CLT panels in the structural system of the project, the heavy timber, and most of the wood products going in the building are coming from local distribution.

Dave Dodson told the committee that the Land Use Planning staff had a number of concerns with the schematic design and would like the CPC to consider 13 conditions. He outlined those conditions to the committee and then opened the floor for discussion and questions.

A committee member voiced his concern about condition 5 that requires the building to conform to the three-part massing criterion. He feels this could radically affect the look of the building. There was a short discussion regarding the look of the new building.

Based on this discussion, Dave Dodson felt that conditions 5, 10 and 11 could be removed to address the committee’s concerns. After briefly discussing condition 10, Dave suggested to the committee that instead of removing it they could add the word “durable.”

Michael Henthorne asked that it be noted in the minutes of the meeting that this is an exception to the site density that the committee is usually looking for because of the importance of the teaching arboretum.

In consideration of a possible motion, Dave restated that there was interest in removing condition 5, removing condition 11 and possibly changing condition 10 where at the end it states “elevations showing a clearly articulated durable base.”
Motion to approve with conditions as stated by Dave Dodson was made and seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

**Advanced Wood Products (AWP) Lab:** During the December 2015 meeting, the committee recommended site approval for the location of this building. The site is along Washington Way next to the Bennes Barn which is an historic building. The building will be just over 15,000 SF and house an applied research partnership with private sector manufacturers intended to drive the innovation, testing and educational programs necessary to stimulate and sustain private investment in advanced secondary wood products manufacturing.

The Land Use Planning staff proposed 7 conditions to address the criteria for this building. Dave Dodson outlined those conditions to the committee and then opened the floor for discussion and questions. There was discussion about the Bennes Barn and the manure shed, access to the AWP, and the possibility that the project may trigger required improvements to Washington Way. The committee felt that condition 5 should be altered to be consistent with condition 10 for the New Peavy Hall and strike the second sentence in the current condition 5.

Dave restated that what he heard was that the committee wants to modify condition 5 by removing the last sentence and by changing the end of the first sentence to read “review and approval elevations showing a durable base.”

One committee member was concerned about signage on the fence and about the building entrance and ground floor window requirements. Dave commented that the architect will have to respond to those concerns as conditioned.

Motion to approve with condition 5 modified as stated by Dave Dodson was made and seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

NOTE: For the record, Gabe Merrell supported all of the requests today as well. He cast his vote in favor of all three items that required action.

**APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2015 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion to approve December 2015 meeting minutes was made and seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm