1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.01 PROJECT STATUS

- Gregg reviewed the ambitious schedule for the current and upcoming design phases.
- Touched on Craft Center as first phase of the construction.
- Begin today with those outdoor items that need User Group input so that the team can go back to the CPC subcommittee for final approval.

2.0 BUILT LANDSCAPE FEATURES
2.01 SITE PLAN REVIEW
- Larry reviewed changes to the site plan on the north court and northwest pathway
- Bike shelters, bike share stations
- South lawn, captures more green space
- Paving pattern surrounding the south lawn will relate to the interior paving and structure
- Storm water opportunity along edge of 13th and at south end of building, and at south east corner
- the outdoor CC area
- Seat wall 21” at north courtyard, suggesting it with LED light cast into the seat wall but
  Fred cautioned that campus standard does not support that approach – ineffective.
- Possible green wall or green screen at the CC edge.
- Dan questioned the Straub covered bike parking being located at the south end of EMU, Fred confirmed the location as directed
- Rob noted that the seating locations are not located in sunny spots, reconsider locations for the benches.
- Materials for seating – wood that is oiled yearly to keep its tone.
- Keep trees in south lawn surround in a rectangular formation, with large trees, and then smaller areas of accent trees – mostly lawn.
- Rob said the large trees in front of Straub (sequence of Elms) is a good scale at the edge of the green and creates a nice backdrop for events.
- Teak standard benches, custom wood benches, concrete seat walls are approved for the next step to take to the CPC sub-committee. Use of the LED lighting which reads from the plaza and the building, but not from the street, is an accent that would support the space as a programmable events space.
- Rob asked about the stairs at the north court, which need to be clarified along with the seat walls.
- Question came up about whether the Sweet Gum trees are being removed or not; Larry thinks they are being removed / Fred and Gregg think we are leaving them in place.
- Martina noted that we still need to work with campus facilities on the tree plan.

3.0 CRAFT CENTER OUTDOOR SPACE
3.01 CRAFT CENTER SCREEN WALL DESIGN
- Precedent images for fences and screen walls, standing seam roofing
- Studied numerous options
- Highlight activity at the craft center, by adding a walk-way at the CC wall, with seating and screening
- Diagram showing the equipment locations with venting requirements, where the 3 flues are aligned and extend up through the roof. Locate 12’ away from the EMU building; you will see them from the River Rooms, but they will only be 2’ ht.
- Fred noted that 6” spacing is the most common fence picket spacing on campus.
- Walker showed a regular spacing option, and a “curtain scheme” with varied spacing.
- Fred asked about the possible added cost of the curtain scheme, which Walker noted would be an add’l unknown cost.
- Possibility of adding a planted green screen along the screen wall.
- Possibility of putting some of the open screening pieces in locations of the glass area for allowing views, but needs to be balanced with handling the driving rain.
- Attachment mechanisms may vary depending on whether you want to remove / add full screens over time as equipment changes.
- Fred suggested a deeper overhang to create more rain protection, but allow for the curtain scheme to be used.
- Suggestion for a gray color instead of green to coordinate with the building window frame vocabulary.
- Conclusion that the curtain scheme with varied spacing is preferred design direction, but not the solid panels around glass – want to leave some visibility to the activity. May need
to add some solid panels on the inside of the CC courtyard space – dependent on the equipment needs, but keep it flexible for future changes.

4.0 BIKE SHELTERS / BIKE PARKING

4.0 BIKE SHELTER DESIGN

- Similar fencing design to the CC but with regular spacing; Visibility IN is a security benefit. 6” inch picket spacing.
- Green color may be requested by the committee since bike shelters are farther from the building.
- Similar attention to detail as the bike shelter at Hedco.
- Gregg noted that wrapping the canopy around the corner from 13th to the east is a nice architectural treatment.
- South elevation canopy at the Straub trash enclosure would be similar to the bike enclosures, but would stop the canopy and not cover the bikes.
- Open bike shelters at the street edge would be campus standard.
- Lisa reviewed the daylighting study of the north side canopy and the impacts to the interior spaces on the north wing. The study looked at a 3’, 5’, 7’ deep canopy with transom glazing above.
- Rob raised a concern about a low panel to conceal the bikes when looking out from inside the building.
- Fred recommends a 6’ deep canopy at the north side, with the standard hoop bike racks. Dan weighed in on using the gray color, and not the green right up at the building; others felt the green color could be acceptable.
- Use campus standard for the freestanding street edge bike shelters.

5.0 PUBLIC SPACES INTERIOR DESIGN

5.01 HEARTH

- Illustrate the new building interior, historic building interior, interface between the two.
- Carissa reviewed the various types of seating/lounges/tabling/computer that has been studied along with input from the UO public spaces group; some modifications to the suggested types of areas were indicated from the UG.
- Preference exercise with preliminary precedent images for the public spaces; this will inform the further development of the design.
- UG preference for a wood structure over a concrete structure for the new student wing; warmth and color of the wood was a strong positive. Design team will move ahead with this approach for wood structure at the new wing.
- Presentation of the preliminary 3-D views of the public spaces; well received except for the large expanse of glass at the MCC front view along the boulevard.

6.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

6.01 Discussion postponed.