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I. Introduction

The University of Oregon is seeking architectural firms and their consultants to perform design services for Additions and Alterations to the School of Music, located on its campus in Eugene. The Project Program will include approximately 15,000 gross square feet (GSF) of renovations to the existing 60,000 GSF building and 29,000 GSF of new construction. The project also will include needed utilities upgrades in the area and site development.

The School of Music is a professional school in a university setting. It began as the Department of Music in 1886, became the School of Music in 1900, and was admitted to the National Association of Schools of Music in 1928. The School is dedicated to furthering creativity, knowledge, pedagogy, and performance in music and dance and to preparing students for a variety of professions in these fields. It is the only full-range professional school of music in Oregon and one of only three public schools on the West Coast with comprehensive programs offering baccalaureate through doctoral degrees.

At present the School of Music serves 500 major and 4,000 non-major students across campus in a building constructed to accommodate fewer than 300 students. The classroom, rehearsal, studio, and practice-room spaces are strained to the bursting point. Addressing this critical need, the School of Music embarked upon a successful capital campaign to significantly expand and renovate its facility.

From February through July of 2003 BOORA Architects, together with the University of Oregon Planning Office and School of Music faculty and staff, developed the program and conceptual design direction for a proposed addition and renovation to the School’s existing facility. During those months, the BOORA Project Team conducted three multi-day work sessions involving a Project Planning Committee (with the authority to give direction to the BOORA team) and other faculty representatives of the School of Music. The study built upon previous work by the University Planning Office and BML Architects. The program and design recommendations were approved by the Project Planning Committee and presented to the School of Music faculty.
The Southwest Campus area is an interface between the residential neighborhood and the institutional uses of the university. The new facility will need to make an appropriate transition between these uses, while being sensitive to potential future changes to its context. It is also an area of potential growth for the university. The College of Education is also planning for additional facilities in this area. This area is addressed by the university's Campus Plan section on the Southwest Campus; the Southwest Campus Diagnosis; and the Southwest Campus Study Part 1.
II. Process for Consultation

Coordination with University’s Planning Processes

The university’s Campus Planning Committee chair has appointed a user group consisting of School of Music faculty, students, and staff as well as representatives from across the campus. The user group is the primary representative of the university. In keeping with the principles of *The Oregon Experiment* (Christopher Alexander, et al. New York: Oxford UP, 1975) and the university’s Campus Plan, it will be a major player in the design of the project. Unlike many user committees at other institutions, the School of Music Additions and Alterations Project user group will be involved actively in the design process, including developing organizational approaches, generating design concepts, prioritizing needs, comparing building systems, discussing cost and budget trade-offs, and so forth. In addition, the design team will work with focus groups to address specific programmatic needs. Presentations and comment sessions for the university community and the community at large will be part of the process.

The university requires that the design team establish an effective means of communicating with the project user group (both talking and listening). For most projects we have used a “pattern language” as described in *The Oregon Experiment* and as found, in an abbreviated form, in this document. While we do not insist on that particular method, if another method is substituted it must provide effective, jargon-free, two-way communications that allow the design team and users to move forward jointly with design solutions supported by all parties. Within this context of user involvement and establishing effective communications between users and architects, the user group is open to different approaches to organizing the design effort.

After the proposed schematic building design is approved by the user group, it will be reviewed by the Campus Planning Committee and by the university administration. The University Planning Office will provide staff support to the project until construction begins. At that time, responsibility will shift to Facilities Services. However, Facilities Services will participate during design to ensure that building systems meet criteria for maintainability, and University Planning will remain available to advise during construction should design issues arise.
In addition to providing traditional design services, the design team will be asked to demonstrate that the new facilities comply with state requirements and university policies for energy efficiency and sustainability. As a public building, it must perform with 20% more efficiency than energy codes require. Sustainability is a priority for the university, and designs that exceed the minimum requirements are encouraged.

We also expect the design team to present a project schedule which will be monitored during the design and construction phases. The project schedule must leave adequate time for institutional review and for design changes, should these be necessary.
Description of Work

The School of Music Additions and Alterations user group and the university are interested in retaining the services of an architectural firm to guide the project through its design and construction. The architectural firm will be expected to perform the following work in consultation with the user group:

1. Verify and change, as necessary, the space needs identified by this document and the Program and Concept Study.

2. Verify, modify, or expand the patterns of the Campus Plan and the issues identified in section IV below, as necessary.

3. Determine how the needed spaces, interior and exterior, should be organized.

4. Analyze the site and its context, and provide this information to the user group.

5. Design to allow for future expansion.

6. Analyze the monetary costs, embodied costs, and sustainability implications of various types of construction to be considered for the project.

7. Work with project energy consultant to maximize energy conservation and sustainability of design. State of Oregon requirements for public buildings mandate energy use that is 20% lower than that required by energy codes.

8. Develop a schematic design. The schematic design should (1) illustrate how the project can be expressed architecturally (including a design of any appropriate site improvements), (2) fix the scope of the project, and (3) assign costs to it to accommodate funding availability. The schematic design should be consistent with the policies of the University of Oregon’s Campus Plan.
9. Work with the user group during Design Development to ensure that finishes, cabinets and other aspects of the building meet the needs of the users.

10. Provide design and contract administration services through construction. The project will be publicly bid according to State of Oregon and Oregon University System requirements.
Description of the Program

Project Program

Based on the established project budget of $15.2 million, the Project Team developed a Project Program to address the School of Music’s highest priority needs. The approved Project Program includes the following program elements:

- A new large-ensemble rehearsal room
- Renovation of the existing choral rehearsal into a 148-seat lecture hall and performance space
- Renovation of an existing instrument rehearsal room into a new choral rehearsal room
- A new central recording room with recording capability in Beall Hall and all larger rehearsal spaces
- A new centralized score library for choral, orchestral, and band music
- Expanded practice and rehearsal spaces for the jazz and percussion programs
- Expanded lab areas for the electronic music program
- A new 80-person flat-floor classroom for large classes and recitals
- Additional small seminar rooms
- New computer lab
- New acoustically isolated faculty studios
- Expanded capacity for GTF offices in existing spaces
- Additional small practice rooms in existing spaces
- An enlarged piano classroom in renovated space
- Expanded and improved departmental administration space in renovated areas of the existing building
- Enlarged and improved Music Education spaces in renovated areas of the existing building
- A new and expanded piano tech shop.
The Project Program is summarized below. It identifies the areas inclusive to the project, either in new construction or renovated space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Moved Or Renovated</th>
<th>New Construct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Beall Recital Hall</td>
<td>12,975</td>
<td>11,820</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Rehearsal Spaces</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>11,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Instrument Stor/lib</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Athletic Bands</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Classrooms And Labs</td>
<td>13,283</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Practice Rooms</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Offices And Studios</td>
<td>16,933</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Department Admin</td>
<td>5,896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,896</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Music Education</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Com. Music Inst</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Support</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Square Feet</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,793</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,173</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected firm, working collaboratively with the project user group, will use this project description and the program and concept study document to reexamine all aspects of the project and then to create a design for the School of Music. It is important to note that although the program and concept study has established the project’s broad parameters, the design team is expected to work with the user group to reevaluate and verify the School’s space requirements as identified in the program and to create the design needed to meet these requirements within the available funding.
Site Goals

1 Visibility
Improve visibility of the School and enhance its presence to the public. Located in the southwest corner of the campus, the School has poor visibility. Reinforcing potential sightlines from Alder Street and taking advantage of the School’s exposure to 18th Avenue can enhance its public presence and improve visibility.

2 Campus Access
Invite students to the School from central campus by improving pedestrian walkways. Pedestrian access from campus is pinched by the cemetery and the western edge of campus. Improving walkways around Knight Library from the 13th Avenue commercial area and from central campus will invite students to explore this area of campus.

3 Parking
Provide convenient parking for patrons and replace all parking lost by building expansion. Proximity to parking is critical for performances in Beall. The future addition of the Concert Hall will increase demand for parking. Any parking spaces that are lost due to building construction must be replaced. A comprehensive parking solution should be developed for this part of campus.
4 Open Space
Extend the system of Campus Open Space south to 18th Avenue. The parking lots and access drives that surround the site isolate the School from the network of open spaces on the campus. The new Education building and the Music School expansion provide opportunities for site repair that establish well-defined open spaces south to 18th Avenue.

5 Bicycle Path
Create bicycle pathways that minimize conflict with pedestrian paths. Conflict between bicycles and pedestrians can be minimized by encouraging cyclists to use a pathway along the east side of the site adjacent to the cemetery.

6 Service Access
Create service access that avoids conflicts with pedestrian paths and open space. Relocating the service drive to the east will minimize conflict with pedestrians and open space. A new drive from 18th Avenue keeps service and delivery trucks to the rear of the School.
III. The Campus Plan
The Campus Plan contains a policy framework intended to provide guidance for developing properties owned by the University of Oregon that are either within and outside of the approved campus boundaries. It is a process for making development decisions on an ongoing basis rather than a static fixed-image master plan. This concept acknowledges the fact that the exact nature and magnitude of future changes cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty, and that object-oriented plans based on explicit assumptions about the future become outdated as the “future” becomes known. A copy of the Plan is available at: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~uplan/LRCDPUpdateDraft%20PlanCover.html

IV. Policies
Policies are adopted methods that describe how to apply the Campus Plan to development projects. They are expressions of the university’s requirements with respect to the physical development of university properties. Policies apply to all development within the Plan’s jurisdiction. Each policy below is elaborated in the Campus Plan.

1. Process and Participation
2. Open-space Framework
3. Densities
4. Space Use and Organization
5. Replacement of Displaced Uses
6. Maintenance and Building Service
7. Architectural Style and Historic Preservation
8. Universal Access
9. Transportation
10. Design Area Special Conditions
11. Patterns
12. Sustainable Design
V. Patterns

The Oregon Experiment premise of patterns establishes a means of articulating commonly held values as they pertain to the campus environment and design. Patterns ideally function together as words in a sentence, creating a cohesive whole built on a common design language, the “pattern language.” To achieve effective and meaningful dialog about important campus design issues, all construction projects shall consider the patterns below.

**Patterns**

Each pattern shall be considered during project design. Patterns are statements that describe and analyze design issues and suggest ways in which those issues might be resolved. The term “pattern language” is best known from the book *A Pattern Language*. Its principal author, Christopher Alexander, helped the University of Oregon develop its planning process in the early 1970s. He defines a pattern as “any general planning principle, which states a clear problem that may occur repeatedly in the environment, states the range of contexts in which this problem will occur, and gives the general features required by all buildings or plans which will solve this problem” (*The Oregon Experiment*, p. 101). These patterns ideally function together as words in a sentence, creating a cohesive whole built on a common design language, the “pattern language.”

The process and its constituent components are described more fully in the book *The Oregon Experiment*. The purpose of developing a pattern language was to provide a non-technical vocabulary of design principles that would allow building users to communicate effectively with the planners and designers of those buildings. The university must maintain a balanced perspective on the physical development of the campus. It must be able to respond quickly to opportunities for facilities improvement as they emerge; it also must employ long-range planning and emphasize the importance of long-term continuity in development decisions. The use of patterns, as opposed to a “fixed image” master plan, helps to achieve this goal. Patterns articulate long-lasting shared traditions and understandings yet adapt well to changing development needs.
Application of Patterns in the Design Process
– Project Pattern Lists

(a) All user groups shall review the following list and select patterns with issues relevant to their projects (and add new patterns as appropriate, see (c) below). At the beginning of a project’s design process the University Planning Office will work with the project sponsor to create a project pattern list selected from the list of patterns below. The Campus Planning Committee, during its review of the project’s process, will verify the appropriateness and completeness of the list of patterns selected. Every project pattern list must include those patterns highlighted in bold type in the list below.

(b) Each pattern on this list shall be considered as the project is designed. Those patterns in bold typeface are to be considered on every project. If any are not implemented, the reasons for their omission are to be reported to the Campus Planning Committee during its schematic design review.

(c) As the user group defines the project, the list may grow to include new patterns written to address certain specific issues the user group wishes the project architect to consider or to include other patterns not previously identified. The list may continue to grow during project design as the result of new or newly added patterns.

(d) In most cases literal interpretation of a pattern should be avoided. The pattern is intended to help identify the essence of an issue that needs to be considered and to suggest ways in which the issue might be resolved. In some cases it is possible that although the problem is properly identified, the solution suggested by the pattern may not be appropriate. Such cases call for an alternate means of resolving the issue.
Campus-wide Pattern List: A Pattern Language for the University of Oregon

The following list is arranged roughly from global issues to specific issues. As noted above, patterns in bold typeface must be considered for every project. The full text of each pattern can be found in the Campus Plan.

LARGE SCALE CAMPUS
This first set of patterns defines how the campus is formed at the greatest scale and looks at the composition of the entire campus.

- Universal Access
- Sustainable Development
- Open-space Framework
  - Campus Quadrangles, and the Historic Core
  - University Shape and Diameter
  - Campus Trees
  - Promenade
  - Open University
  - Main Gateways
  - Good Neighbor
  - Outdoor Classroom
  - Student Housing

TRANSPORTATION
This set of patterns defines the transportation systems (including pathways) of the entire campus.

- Local Transport Area
  - Bike Paths, Racks, and Lockers
  - Path Shape

- Paths and Goals
- Road Crossings
- Pedestrian Pathways
- Looped Local Roads
- Hierarchy of Streets
- Spillover Parking
- Shielded Parking
- Small Parking Lots in Campus Core
- Peripheral Parking

SITE ARRANGEMENT
This set of patterns informs how buildings should be arranged to become a part of the campus.

- Site Repair
- Use What We Have Wisely
- Existing Uses/Replacement
- Positive Outdoor Space
- South Facing Outdoors
- Quiet Backs
  - Water Quality
  - Accessible Green
  - Local Sports
  - Research Ties
  - Public Outdoor Room
  - Small Public Squares

Main Building Entrance
Activity Nodes

Building Complex
Connected Buildings
Family of Entrances
Tree Places
Access to Water
Seat Spots
Sitting Wall

BUILDING DESIGN
This set of patterns informs how each building should be designed.

- Four Storey Limit
- Architectural Style
  - Building Character and Campus Context
  - Arcades
- Operable Windows
  - Materials and Operations
- Flexibility and Longevity
- Future Expansion
- Wholeness of Project
- Wings of Light
  - Pools of Light
- Quality of Light
  - Public Gradient
- Organizational Clarity
  - No Signs
- Building Hearth
  - Classroom Distribution
  - Fabric of Departments
  - Faculty-Student Mix
  - Office Connections
  - Place to Wait
  - Enough Storage
Patterns Reviewed during the Program and Concept Study

Patterns
Site Repair
Four Story Limit
Quiet Backs
Accessible Green
Small Public Squares
South Facing Outdoors
Main Gateways
Positive Outdoor Space
Building Complex
University Streets
Main Entrance
Family of Entrances
Promenade
Activity Nodes
Connected Buildings
Operable Windows
Sustainable Development
VI. Campus Planning Committee Comments

In May 2005, the Campus Planning Committee identified key Campus Plan policies, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues for the School of Music Additions and Alterations project. The following is a summary of the committee’s comments.

University Planning Director identified the following as particularly relevant policies:

- Policy 7: Architectural Style and Historic Preservation because Beall Hall is historically significant.
- Policy 2: Open-space Framework. The Southwest Axis designated open space is partially undeveloped, and this project, along with the future College of Education project, provides an excellent opportunity to make improvements. At the 18th Avenue campus edge the School of Music is very visible to the general public. There is potential for a gateway where the Southwest Axis intersects with 18th Avenue.

Other members of the Campus Planning Committee identified the following issues:

- The importance of the School of Music and College of Education working together to address campus edges, both on 18th Avenue and Alder Street.
- The establishment of a main building entrance (as described in the Main Building Entrance pattern), which is currently lacking.
- The School of Music’s serious and unique security issues.
- Coordination of utility requirements with wider area needs and energy conservation. (Policy 6: Maintenance and Building Service.)
- The adjacent cemetery trees and vistas as a resource.
- Potential new traffic issues from additional auto access off of 18th Avenue and pedestrian safety concerns.
- Beall Hall’s primary auto, pedestrian and visual access from Alder Street.