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1.0 PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

This was the 10th meeting of the East Campus Residence Hall (ECRH) User Group. Copies of the graphic information and agenda presented at the meeting are attached.

The purpose of the meeting was to address concerns expressed at the last meeting regarding location of some spaces within the plan, building relationship to open space, and loading dock location.

Two alternate locations for the loading dock were studied and presented.

2.0 PROJECT UPDATE FROM GREGG LOBISSER

2.1 Glumac has been selected as the energy analysis consultant for the project.

2.2 The ECO-Charrette is scheduled for August 13. Johanna Brickman and Cathy Soutar are coordinating attendees and agenda.

2.3 An Academic Linkages meeting is scheduled directly after this meeting from 3:00-5:00. This is the first meeting with the academic community and will focus on updating them with the project and getting their initial design input on classroom and other learning spaces that will make it easy for faculty to use the building.
2.4 Sean Landry was not able to attend the User Group meeting but did provide review comments on the graphic material that were issued prior to the meeting. A copy of his comments are attached.

3.0 FIRST FLOOR PLAN REVIEW

3.1 Three ground floor schemes were presented. Scheme C was preferred and approved for further development based on the following comments and discussion.

3.1.1 Scheme A: This scheme was the previous floor plan.
3.1.2 Scheme B: The scheme locates the loading dock in the center of the kitchens with access from Moss Street.
3.1.3 Scheme C: This scheme angles the south residence hall bar so that it opens up the building to the open space and conceals the loading dock at the southeast corner of the building.

3.2 Main Entrance
3.2.1 The main entrance to the building is currently off 15th Street. Alternate locations had been studied on previous designs but the 15th street entrance is the preferred location.
3.2.2 The entrance should be designed to be more visible.

3.3 Classrooms, area desk, mail room, study rooms, sustainability center, residence apartment:
3.3.1 These rooms are currently located at the north end of the building near the entrance and seem to work well. Spaces will continue to be refined as the design progresses.

3.4 Performance Center
3.4.1 Location of the performance room was discussed. The location options were either to keep it where it currently is located between the north and middle housing bars, or move it the southwest corner of the building.
3.4.2 The current location provides an easy to find location and can be monitored by the Area Desk. Service would be provided from the west side via the fire lane.
3.4.3 The southwest location would help activate the open space but only when the performance room was used, not on a constant basis. There were some concerns that some of the performances may disturb the law school. This location is also more difficult to structure since it would be located directly under the housing bar above. The current location falls between the two housing bars and can easily be structured using long span structural elements.
3.4.4 The preference was to keep the Performance Center where it is currently located near the area desk.

3.5 Loading Dock
3.5.1 Two alternate locations for the loading dock were presented.
3.5.1.1 Scheme B located the dock off Moss Street and approximately centered in the kitchens.
3.5.1.2 The center location posed kitchen layout problems. It separated the commissary and catering kitchens and did not produce an efficient work flow layout. Les Jones had prepared a schematic kitchen layout to
illustrate the potential design issues. The central loading dock, while more concealed than previous schemes, did not produce efficient kitchen layouts and therefore was not recommend.

3.5.1.3 Scheme C located the loading dock in the southeast corner but more concealed and integrated into the building design. This location will allow for the kitchen layouts to be more efficient. It also addressed the concern of concealing the loading dock and not appearing like an add-on to the building. This location was approved.

3.6 Servery and Outdoor Dining
3.6.1 The concept to locate the servery and dining so that it activates both the north and southwest courtyards still seemed appropriate.
3.6.2 The Common Grounds coffee area is proposed to be located in the southwest corner to activate the open space.

3.7 Catering Office
3.7.1 Scheme C locates the catering office along Moss Street so it can have a public entrance.

3.8 Residence Directors Apartment
3.8.1 The apartment is now located along Moss Street under the middle residence bar. This will give both the Residence Scholar and Director Apartments more private locations and easy access off Moss Street.

3.9 Trash/Recycling Areas
3.9.1 Convenient locations for the trash and recycling areas need to be identified. Possible locations could be on the west side near the entrances to the housing bars. Truck access will be needed for pick-up. Taking trash/recycling all the way to the main loading dock seemed too remote for easy student use.

3.10 Bicycle Storage
3.10.1 Secure bicycle storage areas need to be located. Possible locations are courtyards or west side near each entrance location to residence bars.

3.11 Moss Street Semi-Suites
3.11.1 Review options to provide more of these room types or pulling the rooms west into the courtyard due to large size of courtyard and preference to provide open space to east.

4.0 FINANCING AND BUDGET

4.1 Allen presented initial financing numbers for the project as they relate to cost of housing over the next few years. Projections indicate that housing costs will have to increase about 5% a year to offset the cost of the new project.

4.2 Continued concerns about cost of the project were also expressed due to the increased program. The original program was approximately 170,000 gross sq. ft. The current program is approximately 200,000 gross sq. ft. Now that the major design component locations have
been approved, the design team will focus on developing a schematic package so the estimator and CMGC can prepare a cost estimate.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

7.1 The next meeting is scheduled for August 20, 2009.

7.2 Sustainability meeting August 13, 2009.

END OF MEETING NOTES

LK/ctc

Attachments: Agenda
Graphic materials presented at meeting: open space and site diagrams, revised first floor schemes, kitchen plan.
Sean Landry comments dated August 8, 2009
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To: Gregg Lobisser, Cathy Soutar

From: Sean Landry

Date: August 8, 2009

8/6/09 User Group Meeting: Comments in response to latest ECRH drawings

Dear Gregg,

I apologize that I am unable to make this afternoons meeting, please accept the following as my comments to the latest drawings prepared by ZGF.

I would like to see the design team move away from their current ground floor. The footprint of the museum seemed to change more significantly than the Res Hall. We need to be convinced that current scheme is best and the only way to do this is to aggressively examine options and let the best ideas come forward.

The following are suggestions of what I would like to see for next time:

1. Scheme with the loading dock in an alternate location. Scheme B/D may be an improvement, but it is impossible to evaluate from the sky. What does this look like? (section / elevation?)

2. Scheme with the dining hall to the north. This could make 15th Ave. edge a café/urban-like setting w/ outdoor seating on the street (although faces N?). This would get the dining hall closer to other Res Halls and create an active St. front/ entry.

3. Scheme that creates a solid building edge to the west adjacent to the existing east campus green. This could help to define the outdoor space in a more formal way.

4. Scheme where performance hall or other significant programmatic space moves to the southwest corner. The performance hall in this location could screen the loading dock while also helping to define the outdoor space to the south and west - complimenting the Longhouse (this might help the current ECRH courtyard as well).

Thanks for your attention to this and best of luck with today’s meeting. I look forward to seeing what the design team comes up with for next time.

Kind regards,

Sean Landry