PRINT DATE
3/29/2012

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT NAME:	University of Oregon EMU Expansion
CLIENT NAME:	University of Oregon
PROJECT NUMBER:	

MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING REASON:	City of Eugene Coordination Meeting
MEETING DATE:	3.23.12
MEETING LOCATION:	City of Eugene Conference Room

ATTENDEES

NO.	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	COMPANY AND ADDRESS
A	Katharine	Kappa	541.682.5309	katharine.h.kappa@ci.eugene.or.us	City of Eugene, 99 W 10 th Ave, Eugene, OR 97403
B	Louranah	Janeski	541.682.5273		City of Eugene, 99 W 10 th Ave, Eugene, OR 97403
C	Steve	McGuire	541.682.6800	steve.w.mcguire@ci.eugene.or.us	City of Eugene, 99 W 10 th Ave, Eugene, OR 97403
D	Martina	Bill	541.346.5880	mbill@uoregon.edu	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403
E	Drew	Standridge	541.346.2849	des@uoregon.edu	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403
F	Dana	Winitzky	541.346.0692	drw@uorgon.edu	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403
G	Geoff	Larsen	541.686.8478		Balzhiser&Hubbard, 100 W 13th Ave., Eugene, OR 97401
H	Eric	Philps	503.445.7332	ericp@serapdx.com	SERA Architects, 338 NW 5th Ave, Portland OR 97209
I	Nathan	Burton	503.445.7381	nathanb@serapdx.com	SERA Architects, 338 NW 5th Ave, Portland OR 97209
J	Samir	Mokashi	503.488.5651	samir.mokashi@codeul.com	Code Unlimited 12613 NW Ally Elizabeth Ct, Portland, OR 97229
K	Tom	Jaleski	503.488.5651	tom.jaleski@codeul.com	Code Unlimited 12613 NW Ally Elizabeth Ct, Portland, OR 97229

DISTRIBUTION

L	Fred	Tepfer		ftepfer@uoregon.edu	University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

MEETING NOTES

NO.	Item	DOCUMENTATION OF DECISION/DIRECTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1	Direction	Zoning - no parking needed per agreement since there are no classrooms or residences in project. New bike parking spaces exceeding existing number. Fred Tepfer to provide analysis to city.	UO
2	Direction	Public Works - Stormwater management O&M in place. Will need info on traffic control during construction. Existing plumbing fixture count completed prior to demolition to determine existing/new impact.	B&H/City
3	Direction	Public Works - Reconfiguration of loading dock might exceed substantail improvement thrshold. Provide plans and scope of work to verify impact to SWMP.	B&H/City
4	Direction	Fire - Aerial apparatus access. Loading dock is acceptable but 13' wide lane beyond is too narrow, 14' minimum required, 20' preferred minimum. Fire marshal wants one entire side of project to be accessible by aerial apparatus with required drive width and distance from building. See separate e-mail from Keith Haggas for comments.	SERA
5	Direction	Fire - FDC is preferred to be in one location. This is needed so fire knows where to go. Will discuss further with Fire. Fire hydrants are adequate per code, confirm access drives meet code requirements.	SERA
6	Direction	Building - With the provision that the concert hall is for music and spoken word performances and no overhead structures except lighting and acoustics are designed for the space, it looks as though it is a platform. Confirm heights conform to code requirements.	SERA
7	Direction	Building - Mills Center structure with retaining wall around exist. Foundation, needs engineering calculations to confirm that load transfer percentage increases comply with Chapter 34 limits.	KPFF
8	Action	Building - Shaft approach to 3 story open space, doesn't look like a shaft with open bottom etc. Concerned with open stairs and elevator, open balconies above level 2. Can submit AM&M at this time with information on other projects using similar approach, showing use of horizontal exits to compartmentalize space and how volume and fire load are a benefit.	Code Unlimited
9	Action	Building - Concert Hall main lobby. Provide narrative of UO protocol for handling crowds and events so that conformance to code is achieved. Give examples of how perimeter is set. Can submit AM&M at this time.	UO

PRINT DATE
3/29/2012

MEETING NOTES			
NO.	Item	DOCUMENTATION OF DECISION/DIRECTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
10	Action	Set meeting with Keith Haggas and Steve McGuire prior to submittal of AM&M. City will be reimbursed for review of AM&Ms.	Code Unlimited
11	Decision	Building - Posted occupant loads in existing ballroom and assembly rooms are acceptable and can continue in place.	
12	Direction	Building - Horizontal exits created in existing building and for concert hall are a valid approach and good mitigation measures for 3 story open space approach.	SERA
13	Direction	Building - City to conduct review of 100% schematic design documents. City will be reimbursed for review.	UO
14	Direction	Building - Energy code approach will be a performance model approach on the combined existing and new building.	SERA
15	Decision	Building - No seismic retrofit to existing building required per 3404.4 as 2 separate structures.	SERA
16	Direction	Building - Smaller floors are considered as stories not mezzanines for existing building and we will continue that approach.	SERA
NOTE: Please send any additions or revisions within 5 business days of receipt of meeting notes.			

Subject: EMU City meeting 3-23-12
Date: Saturday, March 24, 2012 12:55 PM
From: Drew Standridge <des@uoregon.edu>
To: Chuck Campbell <crc482@comcast.net>, Kay Coots <kcoots@uoregon.edu>

Just a reminder regarding this project. The goal is to bring the project to a 100% Schematic Design level and then put the project on the shelf until funding options are explored. I reminded the design team before the meeting began we need to keep in mind this project will most likely fall under a new code cycle and items such as Atrium spaces, "A" occupancies, horizontal exits, etc... need to be verified once the project is approved to move into the Design Development phase.

The first portion of the meeting involved public works. There was some mention of the proposed strategy for storm and sanitary requirements at the south loading dock. Ballheizer and Hubbard engineers is working on the civil components of the project that include storm water, waste water, etc... I suggested to Martina to keep Doug Brook in the loop as these types of items continue to develop.

Keith was unable to attend the meeting yesterday, but Steve McGuire provided some commentary regarding Keith's comments he provided. I anticipate an additional meeting with Steve and Keith as the Atrium design develops. Keith's comments are attached for reference, but I'll provide commentary on what was discussed at the meeting.

1. Aerial apparatus access - The proposed design of aerial apparatus access did not provide aerial access on one complete side of the building. The design team acknowledged this and is going to a backup plan that was discussed in an earlier meeting. The backup (redesign) plan will be proposed before the end of schematic design.

2. Concert Hall - discussion occurred regarding the size of the stage and some limitations were discussed in regards to "props". We had a short follow up meeting after the city officials left and I asked for clarification on the term "prop". The design team is considering a "prop" to be anything flying overhead and not a stage type prop. It was proposed that this auditorium mainly for the Bach festival, dance recitals, spoken word type shows etc... I suggest we ask for clarification regarding this proposed strategy so we can have a clearer understanding of what potential restrictions could be applied to this space. The concert hall is intended to be a 1,000 seat auditorium with a balcony.

3. Hydrant, FDC, and fire control room locations - Steve repeated more comments regarding the proposed Fire Lane access. There appear to be some issues with the current design not meeting some requirements for

fire lanes in other areas besides the proposed aerial apparatus fire lane. Existing hydrants in the area are acceptable. The proposed FDC locations (which wasn't mentioned to me until it was brought up at the city) include 2 separate FDC connections on the north side of the building and one on the south bringing the grand total to 3 different FDC locations. Steve expressed Keith may entertain two FDC locations, but three would be difficult to accept. During the follow up meeting I asked why this was proposed and the design team mentioned there were some pathway challenges. I expressed that the university will want one FDC location and pathways need to be developed to combine the fire sprinkler systems. I worked diligently with the design team during the beginning of the project to develop a small fire command room near one of the proposed main entrances and I talked about the importance of one central location for response. I was surprised to hear the proposed FDC locations. I do believe the design team understood my direction during the follow up meeting and I anticipate a proposed redesign before the end of schematic design.

4. "Central Space" (Cities interpretation = Atrium) – I expressed early on during the design phase about issues regarding smoke control systems and the long term effect for the building if a smoke control system was required. I also discussed challenges regarding smoke control systems in larger A occupancies. The design team developed a proposal using a "shaft" method that included fire barriers that create horizontal exits. While Keith's comments suggest he is viewing this as an atrium space that will need smoke control and Steve agreed; I did get the sense from Steve that he would be interested in looking at this design approach further if the design team were to define the tradeoffs we are proposing for the shaft method in an AM&M scenario. I feel they have a decent design for the shaft approach, but I see a couple of hang ups regarding exiting for the Concert Hall and the balcony of the concert hall that may prove difficult to justify with alternate means. The design team is developing an AM&M for the "shaft approach" and I expressed that we would like to review this in detail before this is moved forward with the city. I also suggested that any conversation that includes the Atrium space and design with the city include both Keith and Steve at the same time. (basically I said don't talk to Keith about the atrium without Steve present).

a. In addition to this Atrium issue there was a question from Steve regarding current event scheduling and crowd management practices within the EMU and what practices and procedures would be in place for the new building. I believe this question was driven from the proposed Horizontal Exit strategy. The proposed strategy has the 1000 seat auditorium exiting through a fire barrier into the "central (atrium) space" and I think they were thinking about the potential to have an occupied event in the atrium and the auditorium at the same time. I explained that Chuck has worked with the scheduling department to develop procedures for events in the EMU. Occupant loads are set per a setup of a room and EMU staff are trained on crowd control and management.

b. The quote I wrote down from Steve is what is triggering my concern. He said "Fire is very interested" when he referred to crowd management practices. The impression I got from Steve is we will have to submit examples of how we currently manage the EMU and what new management practices and procedures will be added for the new space. I suggested to the design team that they meet with Chuck, Jessi, Dana and myself to develop this narrative. I feel this was a fair warning by Steve and with the current uneasiness the city has with the Atrium type design and the fact we are adding A occupancies I'd like to start the dialogue now to avoid some recent struggles we've had with A occupancies.

5. During the follow up meeting I asked the design team if they have developed a phasing plan for the project. They mentioned they haven't, but portions of the building will need to remain occupied during construction. I expressed to them that this will need to be reviewed and coordinated through our office from a system and exiting standpoint.

If you haven't had a chance to review the proposed design layout of the building I'm sure we can set-up a "Go-to" meeting where the design team can share their design with us. I think this would be helpful for Chuck and Jessi so they have an understanding of the proposed A occupancies.

Drew

From: Martina Bill <mbill@uoregon.edu>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2012 15:28:06 -0700
To: Drew Standridge <des@uoregon.edu>, Janet Lobue <lobue@uoregon.edu>, Fred Tepfer <ftepfer@uoregon.edu>, Dana Winitzky <drw@uoregon.edu>
Subject: FW:COE EMU Fire comments

See below EMU fire comments from Keith Haggas.

Martina S. Bill | Planning Associate
UO Campus Planning & Real Estate
541.346.5880 | http://uplan.uoregon.edu/

------ Forwarded Message
From: MCGUIRE Steve W <Steve.W.McGuire@ci.eugene.or.us>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2012 14:07:35 -0700
To: Martina Bill <mbill@uoregon.edu>
Subject: FW: PC 12-24: EMU

Martina, I did have you e-mail, so here is your cc regarding Keith Haggas' fire comments.
Steve

From: MCGUIRE Steve W
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 12:34 PM
To: 'ericp@serapdx.com'; 'samir.mokashi@codeul.com'
Subject: FW: PC 12-24: EMU

Here are Keith's comments in electronic format. I do not have Martina's e-mail address. Could you forward this e-mail to her?
Thanks

Steve McGuire
Code Analyst
(541) 682-6800
Steve.w.mcguire@ci.eugene.or.us <mailto:Steve.w.mcguire@ci.eugene.or.us>

From: HAGGAS Keith A
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 5:09 PM
To: MCGUIRE Steve W
Subject: PC 12-24: EMU

Steve,

Here are my comments for the Project Consultation. I have provided input on the specific Fire questions (1, 5) as well as a few others that sort of cross into Fire territory (2, 7, 8, 9):

1. Confirm aerial apparatus access per attached diagram.

2. The proposal for aerial apparatus access is not acceptable. I have marked in blue on the colored site plan Sht. G110 and have the following requirements that need to be addressed:

3. The aerial access route needs to be provided parallel along one ENTIRE side of the building per OFC D105.3; the proposal is for limited access points for about a quarter of the building length.

4. The aerial access route needs to be a minimum 26' wide. This allows us to deploy the outriggers on the apparatus and have room to work around the truck. The proposed plans show a 20' wide drive and larger rectangular areas for apparatus setup; the truck is long and skinny (relatively), so having a large rectangle of space is less useful than a long, wide enough space parallel to the building.

5. The aerial access route needs to be a minimum of 15' away from the building so that the truck can be far enough away from the building to deploy the ladder at a safe angle and also not been immediately adjacent to the burning or collapsing building; the proposed plan shows the access right against the building.

6. The aerial access route can be a maximum of 30' away from the building (measured from the near edge of the access route) so that we can reach the roof of the building (or higher) at a safe angle; the proposed plan has landscaping, stairs and retaining walls in the area where the aerial access needs to be located.

1. Confirm that the concert hall performance platform does not trigger requirements for a proscenium or smoke control within the hall.

2. See OSSC 410. If the stage is more than 50' tall then it needs a Proscenium wall, Proscenium curtain, and Stage ventilation. Stage ventilation can be by roof vents (410.3.7.1) or smoke control (410.3.7.2). Also, if the stage is over 1000 sf in area (it appears to be) then stage ventilation is required, again by either roof vents or smoke control.

5. Confirm hydrant, FDC, fire control locations & access.

a. The existing hydrants around the building appear to be adequate. At fire hydrants the access road needs to be a minimum 26' wide for 20' either side of the hydrant. The proposed redesign of 13th does not appear to provide this at the existing hydrant. Keep in mind that this hydrant serves this area of campus, not just the EMU, so the 26'x40' area needs to be on the primary fire access route (not the aerial access route if it is separate).

b. The 13' Wide Optional Access Lane will not be used or counted as fire access; code requires 20' wide, 14' is the minimum width for a secondary access; can this be widened to 14'?

c. Will there be 2 fdc locations for this building when done, or will everything be reworked and a single fdc/fdcs provided at the new location? Preference is to have 1 fdc location serve the entire building; there may be separate connections for the sprinklers and standpipes depending on the system design, but grouped at 1 location.

7,8,9. This group of questions centers around whether or not the central space in the new building is an Atrium or not. Based on the proposed plans this space meets the definition of an Atrium, there are several usable areas at the 2nd and 3rd floors in this space and this is a required exit way for almost all of the building. The idea that this is somehow being treated as shafts is not accurate or appropriate. If this central space becomes just a circulation space without any seating/gathering areas and is also not used as a required exit path, then there could be some discussion about not treating it as an atrium.

The biggest issue with an atrium seems to be the need for a smoke control system. The building already requires sprinklers, fire alarm w/voice evac, and some sort of rated construction between the atrium and the adjoining spaces (although this can be avoided if accounted for in the smoke control design). It appears from the cross section provided that a passive, rather than mechanical, smoke control system may be doable by using the volume of the ceiling and skylights as a smoke reservoir. A good design would include 'relief' venting of the skylights to limit property damage and aid in putting the building back into service after an event, but it seems that avoiding smoke exhaust fans, make-up air and all the necessary automatic controls could be avoided.

Or, the central space needs to be limited to 2 stories by a complete floor separation at some level. This still creates an atrium by definition, but eliminates the need for a smoke control system.

See OSSC 404 for detailed info on code req'ts for atriums.

Keith A. Haggas
Deputy Fire Marshal
(541) 682-5261
keith.a.haggas@ci.eugene.or.us <mailto:keith.a.haggas@ci.eugene.or.us>

------ End of Forwarded Message