



Robertson|Sherwood|Architects PC

# UO Housing Central Kitchen and Woodshop

## Project User Group Meeting #3

31 March 2014

### ATTENDEES

---

Brian, Erickson, Walter Daffe, Brian Anderson  
James Robertson, Scott Stolarczyk  
Martina Oxoby, Denise Stewart  
David Opp-Beckman, Michael Griffel, Greg Lobisser  
Allan Gidley, Tom Driscoll, Gus Lim

Chambers Construction  
Robertson|Sherwood|Architects  
UO Campus Planning, Design, & Construction  
UO University Housing

### ATTACHMENTS

---

Conceptual Site Plans, Options 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B  
Site Layout Cost Analysis

### MEETING NOTES

---

1. Brian reviewed Chambers planned steps for the existing house relocation:
  - a. Chambers will begin contacting parties that have expressed interest in the houses to determine which they want and go over questions they might have.
  - b. Chambers will offer each house separately or as an option bundling any number of house together to see what is most competitive in submitted proposals.
  - c. Since this process is being handed by the Design/Build team and not directly by the UO there is not formal advertising or bidding process that needs to be followed.
  - d. Chambers will likely run a house removal and house demolition bidding process concurrently to be sure all permits are in place prior to a Site Review package being submitted to the City.
  - e. Politically, it may be better to accept proposals for relocating houses even if that turns out to be more expensive than demolition.
  - f. Brian will bring more detail on the process to next week's meeting.
2. The UO has solicited a fee proposal from Solarc for energy modeling. That proposal is due later in the week.
3. The UO has given EWEB direction to start in on their utility design. Jeff Madsen has been in contact with EWEB on the project. The design team may contact him directly to get more information on the issues around utilities. There is a question on whether electrical service will be run overhead or underground from East 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
4. Site plan concepts were reviewed:
  - a. Options that loop delivery vehicles around the south side of the building were not desirable due to uncertainty in being able to keep drivers from just unloading and leaving their product outside, or stopping them from continuing south down the alley to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

- b. In the single building concepts with the administrative functions at the center of the building, the public entry and face feels hidden. Schemes were developed around the idea of preserving a larger existing tree but that tree may not be significant enough to be such a strong driver of the design. On the other hand, the value of this tree to the quality of the public open space (sidewalk) should also be considered.
  - c. Schemes with the administrative functions at the corner of the building present a better face to the public.
  - d. Bringing daylight and views into the kitchen work area is highly desirable.
  - e. The mechanical room size was based upon the previous design work and could get smaller due to reduced program area. The design team will also explore stacking equipment or placing equipment on mezzanine.
  - f. The two building options give some potential for the woodshop to open up before the kitchen.
  - g. Placing service vehicle parking across Moss Alley would be okay by the UO.
  - h. There is a preference to not have exterior, exposed coolers and freezer, unless there is a large cost advantage to go this direction.
  - i. Clarification is needed on what can contribute to the required Open Space Framework improvements. Could a pedestrian path and open space at the north end of the site contribute or is it only for improvements in the right-of-ways?
5. In the cost analysis, one reason for the difference between options is that the cost for the freezers and coolers is not included, which means schemes showing exterior type freezers and coolers have a smaller building area listed in the costs. So, the cost difference between interior and exterior grade coolers and freezers is needed in order to get a complete understanding of differences between the schemes. The design team will be able to bring that information to the next meeting.
6. Preferred site concepts are 1A and 2A. The design team will work on refinements and cost comparisons.

**END OF NOTES**