

Meeting Notes

Date: February 19, 2016

Project: UO Oregon Bach Festival Job No: 01528

Author: Becca Cavell Cc: Martina Oxoby; File

Meeting: User Group DD Meeting 1

Attendees :

Michael Anderson, OBF Director of Artistic Administration ; Project Sponsor.
Janelle McCoy OBF Exec. Director
Alison Snyder, Assoc Professor, Architecture
Dave Goudy, Interim Director of Education, OBF
Sandy Cummings, Director of Finance, OBF
Janet Yood, Construction Inspector, Campus Planning, Design and Construction
Richelle Krotts, College of Education and Campus

David Mason, Director of Facilities Services, SOMD
Martina Oxoby, Owner's Rep, Campus Planning, Design and Construction
Tanner Perrine, Lease Crutcher Lewis [by phone]
Larry Gilbert, Cameron McCarthy
Becca Cavell, Hacker [by phone]
Melissa Clark, Hacker [by phone]
Corey Martin, Hacker [by phone]
Lewis Williams, Hacker [by phone]

Notes:

1. The committee quickly reviewed the presentation taken to the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) on 2/11.
2. Hacker and Larry Gilbert reported that the project had been unanimously approved by the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) and shared the CPC review comments:
 - a. Carefully consider and vet the choice of the proposed wood veneer exterior material, especially with regards to longevity.
 - b. Assess the cornice line of the building in relation to the building massing, screening of the mechanical system, and its relationship with the adjacent School of Music and Dance.
 - c. Consider extending the concrete paving across the driveway to emphasize the pedestrian experience.
 - d. Consider simplifying the route from the east, to the courtyard so that pedestrians aren't going up, down stairs unnecessarily.

- e. Attempt to maximize the effective size of the courtyard by reconsidering the position of the ramp. Take into consideration the need to move instruments through the courtyard.
 - f. Pay close attention to the quality of the pedestrian experience on the north-south pathway through the site.
 - g. Consider the use of campus standard benches in the courtyard for ease of maintenance, or carefully consider the form of the proposed benches to maximize comfort.
 - h. Continue to assess the safety of the arcade and the nature of the space as a desirable, sunny, south-facing porch.
 - i. Carefully consider how to address direct solar gain through the large, south-facing windows.
 - j. Bear in mind the on-going maintenance of the HVAC unit when selecting plants for screening.
 - k. Continue to look for ways to diminish the visual and acoustic impact of the HVAC units - for example explore alternate locations such as the basement.
3. The design team shared an updated site plan and SketchUp model showing initial responses to the CPC comments.
 4. Larry has adjusted the north stairs to eliminate one flight; the only handrails in the design are those required at the stairs – the ramps are not steep enough to require handrails.
 5. The north courtyard has been reconfigured to address the CPC comments, with more planting introduced on the west side of the rehearsal room.
 6. The arcade now sports a paved area to the south, enhancing the pedestrian experience and improving its usability. The stormwater planters have been reconfigured, and bike parking has been consolidated at the building entry. The site plan shows an updated layout for the steps to the west of the arcade – the model hasn't quite caught up.
 7. The committee discussed several possible strategies to address the CPC comment regarding the cornice. After reviewing in the active SketchUp model the group confirmed its recommendation for the project cornice to be developed as proposed. Hacker will develop a set of sketches illustrating the ideas reviewed – a 14 inch simple cornice, an expressed fascia, a brick “top” over the windows and entry opening, and an upstand/setback “hat”. Hacker and LCL confirmed that the 8” cornice as shown is constructible – with a steel design already developed to enable it to span the entry setback.
 8. Hacker reported that it continues to develop the building design with attention to detail and cost. For example, the wood louvers may, or may not, extend beyond windows, or be solid panels instead. The team also continues to investigate the proposed materials in more detail – the brick blend, and the color of the wood panel, etc.
 9. The longevity of the wood panel product (CPC comment a) is being carefully researched by Hacker. Examples of recent or pending installations are plentiful, including institutional projects such as the new Perkins + Will science building planned for the University of Washington's Seattle campus.
 10. Hacker showed variations of the design with the Rehearsal Room clad with brick in lieu of the wood panel product. Janelle strongly prefers the prior approach using the wood paneling – the concept of the Rehearsal Room as an “instrument”. The references to music, vibration and resonance are powerful; Janelle recommends continuing to work to achieve the wood paneling approach. The Committee agrees.
 11. The committee asked about the detail at the ground, where the brick and wood paneling meets grade. The wood will be held up a few inches – this detail will be developed during the next phase.

12. The CPC comment regarding the location of the mechanical equipment was discussed in some detail. Glumac has prepared a drawing showing basement and vault configurations. The drawbacks of this approach include additional space, and cost, and the effect on the building plan. Access to below grade equipment will be challenging. The condensing units need to be on grade or on the roof. Hacker will complete its research and LCL will provide pricing. The data will then be shared with Christine and Eleni for their consideration.
13. Mechanical review comments from the SD submittal include some questions about a mechanical penthouse – the design team will respond to these comments in due course. Martina requested that Hacker provide additional renderings and equipment information regarding the rooftop equipment to support its argument in favor of no screening at all at the roof. The planned paint color should be part of this information packet. Christine and Eleni will review.
14. Hacker will also report on the acoustical performance of the proposed HVAC system, as part of its response to the CPC comment regarding the impact of the HVAC unit.
15. Larry will develop a site section rendering to address the CPC concerns about the pedestrian experience along the service road
16. The committee considered the bench design question from CPC, and recommends not using the campus standard. Hacker and Cameron McCarthy will continue to study custom designs and product options for the User Group to consider during Design Development.
17. Solar shading to the south: Hacker recommends achieving shading with high performance glass, and the possible inclusion of interior light shelves and roller shades. Light shelves have the potential to drive daylight deep into the open office and reduce the need for artificial lighting. Hacker recommends against the use of exterior sun shades because of thermal bridging challenges. The team will bring product samples for review during DD, understanding that the CPC is concerned about the color of any glass used on the building – dark glass is not desirable. Martina asked the team to develop light studies during DD to demonstrate the conditions.
18. The schedule was discussed, and LCL will develop in more detail with input from multiple parties. Current plans are to bid the first of two packages in May, and to start construction immediately following commencement. The schedule review will include communication and consideration regarding vibration and noise associated with construction.
19. Martina suggested that Owner/Architect/Contractor meetings (OACs) begin to be scheduled, perhaps in lieu of the Monday management meetings. LCL would lead these meetings and issue notes.
20. Martina asked Hacker to develop a work plan for User Group involvement over the coming months. This can be discussed in more detail during the Monday morning Management phone call.

End of Meeting Notes

Next meetings:

- a. February 19th % for Art Committee Meeting – 11 AM
- b. Cost Estimate due from LCL – March 1
- c. Wednesday, 3/2 User Group Meeting 9:00am-12:00pm
- d. CPC subcommittee review – week of March 14
- e. Wednesday, 3/16 User Group 9:00am-12:00pm
- f. City of Eugene second pre-submittal meeting – tentatively scheduled for 3/17
- g. Friday, 4/1 User Group 9:00am-12:00pm