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1.0  PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

This was the 9th meeting of the East Campus Residence Hall (ECRH) User Group. The purpose of this meeting was to focus on food service design and site/parking/open space issues.

Copies of the graphic information and agenda presented at the meeting are attached.

A separate meeting that focused on the food service design was also held from 10:00 – 12:00 on the same day. Joe Shing and Les Jones attended this meeting. Separate meeting notes will be issued.

2.0  PROJECT UPDATE FROM GREGG LOBISSER

2.1 Hoffman Construction was selected as the CMGC Contractor for the project. Gregg introduced Hoffman’s team of Stephanie Coyle, Project Manager, and Jacob McKay, Construction Superintendent.

2.2 The energy analysis consultant ‘request for proposals’ will be issued this week. The goal is to select by the end of next week. The three firms being considered are:
   2.2.1 Solarc
   2.2.2 Glumac
   2.2.3 Interface
2.3 The ECO-Charrette is scheduled for August 13. Johanna Brickman and Cathy Soutar are coordinating attendees.

2.4 Gregg indicated that there were several unsettled issues that he wanted the design team and committee to address and make sure they met the project goals before the project had progressed too far.
2.4.1 The southwest courtyard did not seem to frame the open space as he felt the campus planning goals had envisioned.
2.4.2 The loading dock should be incorporated into the building as opposed to being an add-on to the building.
2.4.3 The main entrance to the building should be more visible and emphasized.
2.4.4 The massing along Moss Street should be more articulated. Scale and building openings along Moss Street should consider smaller scale neighborhood context.

3.0 PROGRAM UPDATE

3.1 U of O would like to include in the program a space called ‘Learning Commons’ at 1,000 sq. ft.. This space will be used as an academic resource center for the Campus Library and staffed by the Library staff. It is also intended to be used as a work center for students to do research and collaborate on projects.

3.2 The Resident Scholar apartment is to be increased in size to 1,500 square feet so that it can be used for entertaining and gathering of students and other faculty.

4.0 SITE PLAN/OPEN SPACE/ PARKING

4.1 The following site plans were presented, as attached:
4.1.1 Open Space plan
4.1.2 Concept plan for space between the Museum and ECRH
4.1.3 Exiting survey
4.1.4 Existing survey with building superimposed that illustrates the number of parking spaces that would be lost.

4.2 The total number of parking spaces that would be lost is 313 not counting the basketball courts. This number may increase slightly as the open space is more clearly defined.

4.3 The open space diagram illustrated the open space that the project will need to provide which is 16% of the gross floor area of the building. The current building is approximately 200,000 gsf. The total open space needed is approximately 32,000 sq. ft.

4.4 The majority of this open space, 25,000 sq. ft., can be accommodated in the 60 foot strip between the ECRH and the Museum. The remaining smaller area of 6,500 is also indicated.
4.4.1 The space between the Museum and ECRH will need to accommodate pedestrian circulation, a fire lane and potential museum parking and service so the calculable area may change as the design is developed.
4.4.2 The design of this path/roadway is to be determined.
4.5 The final survey was received a couple of weeks ago. When the building design was overlaid onto the survey, the building had to be narrowed by approximately 12’ to accommodate the 60 foot space between the Museum and ECRH.

5.0 FIRST FLOOR PLAN REVIEW

5.1 Basement: A first pass at the basement layout was shown. A basement is planned for the area under the kitchen to allow for service piping if this area is finished in a later phase. A smaller basement under the north housing unit with a connecting tunnel to the main basement was also proposed. The smaller basement was intended to allow for utilities to enter the site and for service piping extending up into the north housing unit.

5.2 Entry: The entry will be emphasized.

5.3 Sustainability Center: The actual use of this space needs to be clarified.

5.4 Director’s office: Change so it has a direct access from corridor.

5.5 Ramps and change of floor elevation: We are proposing changing floor elevation of the first floor to accommodate the natural slope of the site. The entry and north area would be about three feet lower than the dining and kitchens. The difference would be made up by two ramps along the performance room.

5.6 Elevator: Move elevator away from resident scholar apartment.

5.7 Communal kitchen: Move next lounge.

5.8 Performance room: There are likely to be entrances from the open space to the west. These should be covered.

5.9 Performance room: The stage height needs to be confirmed. Discussed approximately 18”-24”. Must accommodate handicap accessibility from main floor elevation.

5.10 The south Jack and Jill rooms should be deleted. There are not enough rooms to form a community and are too remote for monitoring.

6.0 KITCHEN SERVERY PLAN

6.1 A more detailed kitchen server plan was presented. The servery and dining areas were laid out at an angle that would allow both courtyards to be visually connected and used for seating.

6.2 This visual connection and the location of the main dining seating in the center of the building seemed to be appropriate and well received. The layout of the supporting kitchen and dock will change based on comments we received from Tom Driscoll in the morning meeting.
6.3 If the loading dock is changed to the center of the building then the kitchen(s) will need to be tested to see if they will fit the revised layout.

7.0 UNSETTLED ISSUES

7.1 Entry: Mark indicated the main entry will be emphasized. The design has not progressed far enough to focus on massing but the entry will be addressed when the plan settles down.

7.2 Loading dock: Gregg suggested moving the loading dock to the center of the building, but still coming off Moss Street. The loading area would be at the same level as the first floor (with a 24” dock) and would be covered with the second floor structure. By moving the loading to the center of the building it would allow the south face of the building to be unencumbered as it meets the open space. The design team will explore this option as well as look at how the existing location in the southeast corner may be more integrated.

7.3 Moss Street articulation: Due to the length of the building along Moss Street the building form will need to be articulated to breakdown the scale along this street. This will be addressed as massing studies are developed.

7.4 Open space: The design team will revisit the goals of the open space. Some of the above changes may result in accomplishing these goals as well.

8.0 ACTION ITEMS

7.1 The next meeting is scheduled for August 6, 2009. The design team to focus efforts on options to address the unsettled issues.

7.2 Sustainability meeting August 13, 2009.

7.3 Facilities Services to complete Energy Modeler selection.

END OF MEETING NOTES
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Attachments: Agenda
Graphic materials presented at meeting: open space and site diagrams, basement, first floor, kitchen plans and residence room plans.