

Project Name UO Erb Memorial Union Renovation and Expansion
Project Number 110451
Purpose User Group Meeting 01
Location EMU Gumwood Conference Room

Attendees	Name	Organization
	User Group:	
	Gregg Lobisser	UO, User Group Chair
	Brian Allen	UO, Student
	Michael King	UO, Student
	Mandy Chong	UO, EMU
	Dan Geiger	UO, Outdoor & Bike Program
	Deb Morrison	UO, SOJC
	Rob Thallon	UO, AAA
	Dana Winitzky	UO, EMU Staff
	Wendy Polhemus	UO, EMU Staff
	Project Staff:	
	Fred Tepfer	UO, CPRE
	Janet Lobue	UO, Capital Construction
	Consultant Team:	
	Larry Gilbert	Cameron McCarthy, Landscape
	Matt Pearson	Lease Crutcher Lewis
	Natasha Koiv	SERA
	Eric Philips	SERA
	Walker Templeton	SERA
	Lisa Petterson	SERA
	Caity McLean	SERA

Discussion Items

1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.01 PROJECT STATUS

- Fred Tepfer mentioned that work continued despite failure of Spring 2012 referendum. Student affairs presented operational and funding budget, committee found project is fiscally sound. Robin Holmes, Vice President of Student Affairs, created advisory committee, recommended with budget changes in August. Referendum passed. President approved \$69M project and \$67M student fee.
- Gregg Lobisser explained that since last User Group meeting, Management Group has been working with the Design Team to align with new budget. Removed Concert Hall at \$35M. Michael R. Gottfredson, UO President, requested additional \$5M cut in cost. University will pursue \$5M fundraising as part of project budget, and team must consider \$5M in design alternates if the fundraising goal is not met. Also added program to original building SF. President Gottfredson recommended adding to Capital budget list for Governor, which he did. Legislature will review in this session, and they expect authorization by end of June for sale of bonds.. This is the final level of approval to keep project moving.

- The focus for this User Group meeting is in preparation of CPCs initial review of the revised project design (site improvements, designated open space, massing and elevations of building). CPC check-in in April; final review in June. Hope to begin DD in July.
- Reviewed the rest of agenda. Retained same program except Concert Hall, added 3,500SF of programs as well. Purpose of today's meeting is to have the User Group provide the Design Team with direction for the April CPC check-in.

2.0 PROJECT COST UPDATE

2.01 BUDGET REDUCTIONS

- Eric indicated the budget for construction costs has reduced from \$96M to \$68M.
- Pricing was based on a year ago which has since then escalated. The Design Team, along with Lease Crutcher Lewis (LCL), used SF to make incremental reductions.
- Only \$1M short so they will continue to look for additional reductions in construction phases to meet \$68M goal.
- In addition to the \$5M in design alternates required by President Gottfredson, program has been added, and the state requires 10% bidding alternates in order to be able to award the project and begin construction.
- There will be one cost estimate for SD in late April / early May to be reviewed by the User Group before the final CPC meeting in June.

3.0 SITE PLANS:

3.01 WHERE WE WERE

- Walker and some of the User Group members toured other student unions in 2011 for takeaways relevant to EMU. This experience inspired the big idea that a hearth was an essential necessity. The EMU is a natural hearth to the campus as it lies on the exact geographical center point.
- Historical analysis of the building indicates the EMU was the most modern building on campus at the time it was built. The new EMU design has potential to retain original design elements, such as grids and ornate angles, while pulling features from every building on campus.
- Walker pointed out that 90% of the overall program relates to student activities
- Previous 13th Avenue façade showcased student activities within. Student Blvd. starts at grade with road, most elevation change is 5ft. No more ground floor! 440+. So entrance is 5ft below grade, is this ok?

3.02 SITE PLAN OPTIONS

Walker and Larry Gilbert, Cameron McCarthy, identified various components that need to be incorporated in the site plan design. They are:

- Proposed footprint of area covered (site development SF) is 67,000SF, nearly half, due to budget.
- Universal accessibility
- Providing major outdoor programming spaces, additional opportunities for enhancing / improving site. Large portion of EMU South Lawn will impact Promenade and Emerald Axis.
- Meeting bike parking space requirements while removing bike parking in Breezeway (approximately 225 covered, 60 secure, 150 surface racks; to be confirmed by CPRE)
- Emergency vehicle access
- Mitigating impacts on designated open space around perimeter of site
- New wayfinding throughout site

- Significant designated open space that surround perimeter of EMU designated open space surrounds EMU (promenade, Emerald Axis, Onyx Axis, Straub Green)
- A new north entrance on 13th Avenue
- Bookstore elevation is 451+, 5ft higher than 100% corner. (Carving out the Mill Center to lower Bookstore elevation would require costly seismic upgrades to the entire building.) In order to provide University Street and 13th Avenue access to the Bookstore entrance at elevation, an ADA compliant ramp will need to be built to meet 5ft elevation difference.
- Need to build retaining walls along Mills Center edge

Questions the Design Team posed to the User Group for design direction were:

- Where should each of the identified component go?
- Is there an option with a central vestibule that leads to the bike program?
- Can a loading dock on the North Bar support recycling / trash functions of the current loading dock location?
- How to identify an ADA compliant way to get up entrance of Retail / Convenience Store space from 100% corner to mitigate a 5ft elevation change?
- How do we enhance designated open space beyond the project we have to build for EMU expansion? (Besides removing vehicular parking around the site.)

Walker and Larry presented two site plan options that considered the components above to the User Group for further discussion.

Option 1

- Proposes removal of the curb along the parking lot north of Straub. The cars would be removed from the parking area, parking lot striping removed, and dedicated to pedestrian traffic.
- Improvement north of Mills Center consolidate the entrance to the Bookstore and new EMU entrance.
- Provides aerial apparatus access for fire trucks.
- On grade with Student Bar along 13th Avenue. Roughly same elevation as Buzz coming down the breezeway. Creates Universal Access all around the building.
- Assumes elimination of parking meters, South Lawn extends. 15ft walkway is a direct path to the building.
- Diagram illustrates there is no backdoor of building
- Need to build retaining walls along Mills Center edge

Feedback

- Expands opportunities for green space.

Option 2

- Proposes the curb remains along the parking lot north of Straub. Retains vehicle parking
- Access to Mills Center / Bookstore remains unchanged.

Feedback

- Option 1 expands opportunities for green space
- ADA ramps need landings to be brought up to code
- It would be advantageous if secure bike parking was by the bike center
- How can we convince people to walk through Straub Green instead of parking lot? (. . . Or discourage circulation pattern through parking lot). Might be worth making improvements along parking/Straub Green edge to discourage pedestrians through parking lot.
- Adding a feature in green space would require and an amendment change to Campus Plan

- Ramps are always preferred over stairs; beyond ADA, ramps are just more functional
- Avoid bike parking by ramps, people will ride through them anyway
- Concerned that Site Plan Option 2's crescent only pathway is too indirect. Always provide secondary direct pathways. If secondary direct pathways do not already exist, Pedestrians will inevitably create one, causing permanent damage to landscape in the way.
- Would like to see more exploration of both site options, and cost implications of each, before a preference is chosen

3.03 STUDENT ACTIVITIES

- Walker referenced the previous Summary of Uses pie chart was updated with the current program, it would demonstrate that 90% of the square footage relates to student activities.
- Maintains concept from previous 13th Avenue façade of showcasing student activities within. Student boulevard starts at grade with road, most elevation change is 5ft. No more ground floor! 440+. So entrance is 5ft below grade, is this ok?
- How to connect better with rest of campus while reducing glassiness of south facing wall so remain within budget?

4.0 ELEVATIONS

4.01 DAYLIGHTING

Lisa explained her approach of looking at windows maximized for daylighting, viewing out and in, to developed 11 different scenarios that all that met the goal of no more than 30% glass. Looking at a 30'x30' bay, identified three options that performed the best, considering overall illumination (targeting 30 fc overall, but when modeled without furniture, target needs to be set higher), and also looking at contrast ratio. She noted that using illuminance as the only measurement does not give a true picture of the daylight in a space. Contrast ratios are more illuminating, as it is more accurate to human eye's perception. This analysis from the previous SD effort was used to design new North Bar.

4.02 NORTH ELEVATION OPTIONS

Walker described the concept for glass was to use 1/3, 2/3 (office space very 10 feet, 15 feet), relating back to idea of rhythm and scale of 1950's building. Walker asked the User Group for direction on entrances to programs on North Bar. He proposed a few entrances shared between 2-3 programs, one vestibule leading to all programs. Fred added that feedback from Lillis indicated a lack of vestibules.

Option 1:

- 28% glazing, linear windows

Option 2:

- 28% glass, linear and L shaped windows, let program dictate playful faced.
- L shape windows less ideal for daylighting than linear.
- Lisa suggested considering placement of windows; for instance, locating windows adjacent to walls allows walls to serve as reflectors, likely bringing daylighting deeper into the space

Feedback

- Feedback from University is that Lillis lacks necessary vestibules.
- Consolidating the North entrance to one vestibule would be a mistake, limits future development opportunities for 13th Avenue.

- Prefers aesthetics of linear windows over L shape, unless they compromise daylighting opportunities of L shape.
- Consider putting more brick to L shaped windows
- Prefers L shape windows because it is different, breaks up “big brick box” of typical campus buildings
- Consider awning as opportunity for message space (ex. First Amendment engraved in awning so as the sun shines through a message is projected onto concrete
- Consider the retaining wall / ramp wall as opportunity for message space as well

4.03 SOUTH ELEVATION OPTIONS

Design Team presented five options.

- Pushing for 50% glass for this façade only, will need to reduce glazing on other facades to achieve an overall 30% window to wall ratio.
- Option 1: most like original scheme. 78% glazing, sun shading is needed, but is not accounted for in our budget. 69% energy savings for daylighting alone. Comes at great expense from a heat gain / heat loss perspective. Overall energy savings would be less, since we would need to provide a lot of energy conservation measures just to get back to the Oregon Code baseline.
- Option 2: 65% glazing, with brick column. No sun shading shown which reduces cost compared to Option 1. Heat gain / Heat loss (especially heat loss) will be need to be accounted for. Lisa explained that even though we reduced glass area by 15%, we saw only a 1% reduction in daylighting. 68% energy savings for daylighting alone. Still concerned about heat gain / heat loss, with large amount of glass.
- Option 3: 48% glazing
- Option 4: 38% glazing needed to have skylights to achieve daylighting goals (64% energy savings). Noted that skylight area is also regulated by Oregon Code. Would need to trade off skylight area with other energy conservation measures to achieve overall energy goals.
- Option 5: best for daylighting, cost, connectivity to existing building. We will need to reduce glass on other facades to achieve overall goals. Able to achieve 67% energy savings in lighting energy, with 48% glass through the addition of a clearestory.
- Option 5: best for daylighting, cost, connectivity to existing building. We will need to reduce glass on other facades to achieve overall goals.
- Lisa reminded the User Group that metrics refer to energy that is reduction from daylighting perspective only, does not account for additional heating energy that would be needed to make up for heat gain/loss.
- Walker noted that the 2-story Atrium will be conditioned space

Feedback: (Option 1)

- Atrium’s east and south manifestation reads as more unitary piece. Likes concept of building in front of building
- (option 5, into South perspective)
- Likes east facing main entrance. Make entrance facing to cement outdoor programming of South Lawn grander so it has more prominence over other entrances.
- Explore ways to consolidate entrances
- Explore opportunities to use more horizontality beyond canopies or entries to bring continuity to South perspective
- **Option 5 unified direction to develop for CPC check-in**

5.0 FLOOR PLANS / FIGURE GROUNDS

5.01 FLOOR PLANS: CURRENT DIRECTION

Natasha distributed a schedule of conference rooms per the current configuration plans. She explained the Floor Plans incorporate feedback from the recent Management Group meeting. Details include:

- Design Team from feedback from last Management Group meeting. Maintained all student programming. Removed Concert Hall. Added program for Call Center, Veteran's & Family Services, Veteran's Recovery Center, and Dean of Students. Moved Media suite and Craft Center to new locations. Used as much of the ground floor space where Call Center is in current configuration.
- Per Management Group's request, Design Team is working on a SF comparison of existing, requested program from last year, and actual per plans. Building still a bit in flux so not ready with comparison yet.
- Now have 3,030SF combined for Bookstore and Convenience Store.
- Public Space Seating: Current configuration plans fulfill seating requirements for Food Service, Lounge, etc., Food Service seating target is 395; plan includes 402. Lounge and table seating target is 900; plan includes 899. Computer stations (outside of primary computer lab) target is 60; plan includes 57.
- Conference Rooms: Conference rooms on current configuration plans are close to program, with the exception that we are missing one Very Large room at 2,200 SF for 100 capacity.

5.03 FLOOR PLANS: DISCUSSION

Eric presented current floor plans for Ground, First, and Second Floor. Mezzanine and Second Floor were skipped due to time.

Discussion:

Ground Floor

- New stairs from First Floor to Ground Floor bring in light, making Ground Floor more inviting
- Craft Center has been relocated, 440' portion of Bookstore has been eliminated, pub and coffee have been relocated
- Acoustical issues to be studied include Craft Center, Food Service, and surrounding areas

First Floor:

- Multipurpose room and Computing Center moved to Second Floor
- South wall of Atrium has been simplified
- Food Services revised to provide space for a seventh vendor.
- Former ground floor remote storage relocated into using the food service commissary area
- A guest from the Media Suite expressed concern for 24/hr access. Gregg security as it relates to 24/hr access in general have not been discussed yet and that more design specifics will be discussed in the Design Development phase.

Feedback:

- Further develop exit and entrances from Ground Floor to Courtyard.
- Suggested asking the EMU Board if they would prefer their current location over a less traditional space in the North Bar.
- Consider moving Marketing adjacent to retail to add prominence. Fred reinforced with the notion that they both bring in revenue, directly and indirectly.
- The loading dock will not work if it is to gain function. Bringing trash and recycling from current location of dock to North Bar is too far.

5.02 FIGURE GROUNDS

Walker showed these. Illustrated massing, circulation, and internal wayfinding.

Feedback:

- Incorporation of staircase into landing is lovely, preserves emotional and historical focal point 1950's space in a way that welcomes new design, symbolic of old and new generations of students.

Wrap-Up / Next Steps

- User Group meeting 02 – TBD
- Campus Planning Committee Check-in - TBD

End Time: 4:00pm

Recorded by: Caity McLean

Date of Report: 03/20/13