

Meeting Notes -

Date: March 2, 2016

Project: UO Oregon Bach Festival Job No: 01528

Author: Becca Cavell Cc: Martina Oxoby; File

Meeting: User Group DD Meeting 2

Attendees :

Janelle McCoy OBF Exec. Director
Alison Snyder, Assoc Professor, Architecture
Dave Goudy, Interim Director of Education,
OBF
Richelle Krotts, College of Education
Janet Yood, Construction Inspector, Campus
Planning, Design and Construction
Dick Romm, OBF Volunteer

Martina Oxoby, Owner's Rep, Campus
Planning, Design and Construction
Mark Butler, Lease Crutcher Lewis
Tanner Perrine, Lease Crutcher Lewis
Becca Cavell, Hacker [by phone]
Melissa Clark, Hacker [by phone]
Corey Martin, Hacker [by phone]
Lewis Williams, Hacker [by phone]

Notes:

1. Tanner updated the group on the Cost Estimate: LCL has completed its cost review and the project is over budget by approximately 5%; the main areas where scope has increased is the building interior and the site design. LCL and Hacker will meet on Thursday morning to comb through the numbers and to strategize pathways to meet the budget. Following this meeting, an updated report will be shared with the committee. Hacker will extend the meeting invitation to Larry Gilbert / Cameron McCarthy.
2. Hacker presented its basic approach to the design and finishes of the interior spaces, and responded to questions from the committee:
 - a. The ground floor lobby will have a polished concrete floor. The wood screens and stair treads, and ideally all other wood elements in the building, will be the same species. The two of most interest to the design team are cedar and white oak. Hacker would like a natural / unfinished appearance for the interior wood – a reference in part to the unfinished wood on the interior of musical instruments.
 - b. The interior finishes will be neutral – shades of white for the walls, a grey coating on windows and storefront (or possibly clear anodized for aluminum components). White ceilings – sheetrock and acoustic panels. Where carpet is required it will be an earth tone

- too, akin to the concrete. This neutral backdrop will highlight the wood and the drama of connections to the landscape and the natural environment. , and to daylight.
- c. The flooring on the second floor will be carpet, over the wood structural system.
 - d. Douglas fir was used in two recent campus projects as stair treads: the Alumni Center and the College of Health & Wellness. Both add harder inlay nosings to provide durability and contrasting nosings for visually challenged: the Alumni Center inlay is a steel nosing; the Health & Wellness project uses ipe – a very hard wood species. The Alumni Center stair is a reclaimed product; LCL is carrying a budget for new douglas fir stair treads on a steel substructure. Per LCL, white oak may be a slight uptick over fir.
 - e. The main stair was shown in a straight configuration in one of the renderings shared with the committee; all agreed this was an acceptable design approach (rather than retaining the curved stair, which was code-challenged)
 - f. While it would be more aesthetically pleasing to have butt-glazed windows, the vestibule at the rehearsal room will probably have to have mullions to control sound. Hacker is meeting with Kirkegaard soon to study building acoustics in more detail, and will report back.
3. The group reviewed interior spaces, to discuss basic approaches to finishes and uses prior to Hacker’s detailed development of the spaces. A series of upcoming Focus Groups will look at these rooms in more detail, including proposed ceiling and lighting layouts:
- a. The lounge area at the top of the stairs was shown with low furniture grouped around a circular coffee table, with a white board on the south wall. This space will be changed remove the whiteboard (this wall is a good location for art, potentially) and to furnish it with lounge furniture suitable for meetings – sofas and a rectangular table, for example – for 4-5 people It will not be used as a work space for volunteers. Janelle wonders if acoustical material might be useful to help control noise from the lobby. The floor finish will be carpet.
 - b. At the entry to the administrative suite, a full height screen and door will provide necessary security. While the door is rendered without mullions, this may not be possible in reality; the University doesn’t like floor pivots as door hardware. The team will continue to review options with the client.
 - c. The current scheme shows partial height guardrails at the second floor, overlooking the lobby. While this is a potentially affordable solution and allows the upper floor to be used as an audience location for informal lobby events, it presents acoustical challenges with sound from the lobby potentially disturbing staff working upstairs. The group discussed the pros and cons of various approaches. Hacker will study the possibility of providing sliding panels or doors for a “both/and” solution, but the group understands the budget may not support this approach, and the difficulty of achieving a full acoustical seal for any moving parts.
 - d. Some concerns persist about security in the lobby area given that no staff are routinely located on the lower level. The restrooms and the elevator need to be available during business and performance hours, so the hallway can’t be secured in any way. One advantage of retaining an acoustical connection between the two floors is the ability to monitor the lower level more easily. Janelle will talk with David Mason in more detail about this issue. The elevator is now shown tucked around the corner on the first floor; required signage for the restrooms will now be expanded to include a sign for the elevator so that building guests can navigate the building easily.

- e. Building security: autolock doors can be anticipated at the main building entries and the doors to the rehearsal rooms. Other doors requiring secure access will have keypads, including the gender neutral restroom. David and Martina noted that all pairs of doors will be required to have removable center mullions, and that horizontal mullions may be required for doors with panic hardware at a minimum.
 - f. The library / work room storage capacity will be documented and reported by Hacker for the upcoming Focus Group meetings. Additional storage is possible due to the room's height: the second floor ceiling height is 10'-0 +/- . The presence of natural light is not a concern in this space, since most materials are stored in boxes.
 - g. The building offers many possible locations for art. OBF has a collection of event posters, etc, that could be used to furnish the spaces. OBF will share electronic files or other representations of this art to Hacker so that the team can begin to place them in the project renderings. OBF posters are approximately 24x36 inches in size.
 - h. The systems furniture in the open office will be explored in more detail; Martina noted that projects pursuing LEED credits for interior spaces limit furniture partition heights to 42 inches – to maintain views to the exterior. Adjustable height desks, moveable side tables, and tuck-under mobile “sittable” file cabinets are all possible amenities that will improve flexible use of the furniture.
 - i. The Board Room will have a concrete floor. A wall of cabinets will provide storage, accommodate buffet-style food services, and includes a refrigerator and a sink. A dishwasher is NOT required. The design will be adjusted taking views from the courtyard into account. The room will include a flat screen digital display with video conference capability on its west wall, and may include a writable surface on the east wall. The narrow north walls are a good location for art. The design currently shows two pairs of doors to the courtyard – this approach will be carried into DD, but could be adjusted later. The tables in the board room will be reconfigurable – easily mobile and possibly tilt-top to support efficient storage. They will remain in the Board Room with the exception of occasional events where they could be moved to other locations in the building. Seating in this room should be comfortable, and storeable. Acoustical separation between this room and the adjacent restroom is being addressed by the design team.
4. The rehearsal room was considered in more detail, with updated renderings and recommendations from the design team:
- a. The entry vestibule has been adjusted to include a concave curve at the entry to the room. This gives Kirkegaard improved acoustical performance in the rehearsal room, and eases the appearance of the vestibule from the lobby.
 - b. Curved wood walls are located north and east. Windows are shown in the north east (low, with view to the garden) and the south (high clerestory). A skylight washes the entire east wall with natural light. An additional window would be desirable to the west.
 - c. Interior CMU walls need a more robust coating than a simple sealer, per Joseph. Also, a slightly larger area of reflective surface would be ideal. Options include paint, a plaster finish, or possibly a spray application of some kind. The budget carries an allowance for an acoustic treatment at these walls – the team's recommended design approach is pending. Martina reiterated concern about scope and budget creep.
 - d. A set of retractable absorptive banners are deployed from a shelf below the south window. These allow the room to be tuned.

- e. Additional absorptive acoustical material is required beyond that shown; the team hopes to place it in discrete locations such as lighting pockets, the top of the light shelf, etc.
 - f. Lighting will ideally be at high level; Martina noted that access for maintenance has to be considered. SOMD has a high lift for Beall Hall, but it only extends 25'. While OBF could rent equipment, this may not be acceptable. If lighting height is limited to 25' this will have a significant impact on the aesthetics of the room. Hacker will explore options and report back.
 - g. Recording session may require added lighting and/or microphones.
5. Janelle is interested in reducing the number of private offices on the second floor – if the offices remain, she plans to institute an “open door” policy. Hacker will provide drawings of an alternate arrangement of the second floor showing fewer/no private offices, and showing private meeting spaces to support an open office environment. Technology increasingly supports mobile workforces, and the ability for staff to access network-based or even desktop-based data from remote locations – this is an IT discussion for the future. OBF has a staff retreat on March 18th – Janelle will bring this discussion to that meeting. Hacker noted that per prior discussions with LCL, each office eliminated will save approximately \$10,000.
 6. Martina noted that the FF&E budget is very challenging; any construction budget savings would be diverted to re-fund this budget.
 7. Hacker will preview interior finish options with Alison prior to the next User Group meeting as she will be away that day, and the team values her opinion.

End of Meeting Notes

Next meetings:

- a. HVAC Workshop w/ Joseph – March 10th, 2 – 4pm, Go-To Mtg
- b. User Group Mtg DD-3 – March 16th 9am – noon, CAPCON
- c. City of Eugene Pre-proposal Meeting – Wednesday March 16, 2:00 - 4:00 PM
- d. CPC Subcommittee Mtg – March 17th 10 – 11am
- e. Focus Group Meetings: Wednesday April 13 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Focus Group Participants:

2nd Floor: Mike, Janelle, Sandy, Alison and David Mason

1st Floor Lobby: Mike, Janelle, Alison, and David Mason

1st Floor Rehearsal Room, Board, Room, Storage, Artistic Director/Green Room: Mike, Janelle, Alison, Dave Goudy and David Mason

Site / Landscape: Mike, Janelle, Alison, and David Mason

Sustainability & Maintenance: Janelle, David Mason, Alison, David Ward, Jeff Madsen, Janet Yood.