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Attendees :

Janelle McCoy OBF Exec. Director

Michael Anderson, OBF Director of Artistic Administration; Project Sponsor.

Sandy Cummings, Director of Finance, OBF

Jeff Madsen, Energy Project Manager

David Mason, Director of Facilities Services, SOMD

Dave Goudy, Interim Director of Education, OBF

Janet Yood, Construction Inspector, Campus Planning, Design and Construction

Dick Romm, OBF Volunteer

Chris Meade, Campus Operations

Martina Oxoby, Owner’s Rep, Campus Planning, Design and Construction

Mark Butler, Lease Crutcher Lewis

Tanner Perrine, Lease Crutcher Lewis [by phone]

Becca Cavell,

Melissa Clark, Hacker

Jennie Fowler, Hacker

Corey Martin, Hacker [by phone]

Lewis Williams, Hacker [by phone]

**Notes:**

1. Mark updated the committee on the Budget status:
   1. The SD estimate check identified construction costs at $6.6M, compared to the $6.2 budget. Various strategies that are invisible to the User Group have helped bring this number down, and Larry Gilbert(Landscape) and Tina Guard(Civil) have worked hard to find $100K in the site work. Currently there is a disconnect of $100K between the estimate and the budget. Tanner and Hacker have another strategy meeting scheduled, to continue to review issues including items such as wood louvers, interior wood systems, and other items. Hacker is also asking Lewis to confirm that its estimate includes various acoustically essential items.
   2. Lewis is carrying a design and estimating contingency of 8% and a $200K escalation factor for bidding; these numbers will continue to come down as the design is refined and bid dates get closer.
   3. The team is required to identify bid alternates; UO often allows this to apply per bid package, which eases the pressure on the design team to identify and document large amounts of alternates. Mark and Martina will meet to confirm strategy.
2. Acoustical design: Melissa reported on recent meetings involving Kirkegaard, Mechanical, Structural and UO representatives.
   1. The low velocity displacement ventilation system has now been accepted by UO.
   2. Joseph briefed Janelle and Mike on the history of the design development and the anticipated performance of the spaces as currently designed, including the issue of the office space being open to the lobby below.
   3. The structural design has been scrutinized for vibration transmission
   4. The team is beginning to update the design and this room will be the focus of the April 1st meeting.
3. CPC Subcommittee meeting: Melissa reported on the site design development:
   1. Larry and Tina’s recent work has resulted in a new strategy for storm water management, with two structured planters to the north, and no planters at the south. The storm water will be treated and then retained below the north courtyard before being conveyed to the city sewer system, to avoid inundating the city’s storm system. The ground conditions – bedrock – make infiltration very challenging.
   2. The team assured SOMD that this design approach shouldn’t adversely affect the west wing of SOMD, which experiences water infiltration on occasion.
   3. A new lawn area along 18th Avenue continues the existing campus design into the OBF site.
   4. The 18th Avenue crosswalk will be discussed at the City of Eugene meeting in the afternoon – the team is hopeful that it can leverage City funding as a plan is in place to improve the Harris Street crosswalk, and bring these savings to the project. The current design does not include lighted signals.
   5. Becca noted that while Ron Lovinger is unable to attend the CPC meeting the following day, he has responded very positively to the changes in the site plan.
4. The Hacker team presented the current interior plan configuration and a set of three configurations for the second floor, exploring open office concepts.
   1. The original layout shows 6 open office workstations, 1 receptionist position, and 7 enclosed private offices/conference rooms including the executive director’s office for a total of 14 positions.
   2. The first option shows 13 workstations and 2 private office/ conference rooms (a gain of one space) and the addition of a workroom space to the NW. This scheme includes a meeting/lounge area in the middle of the open office area.
   3. The second option shows 15 workstations, and one large private office/ conference room and two small “phone rooms” – very small meeting rooms or individual work spaces. A workroom space is also shown.
   4. The third option eliminates the workroom and show a total of 15 workstations, and two large private office/ conference rooms. An informal lounge area and a more central coffee/copy point complete the scheme.

The savings for each eliminated office may be in the region of $7.5-$10K, but this money could be redirected to ensure good furniture is provided, in lieu of reducing the total project cost.

1. The committee compared and commented:
   1. The open office concept has a lot of potential for future expansion of workstations and reconfiguration.
   2. The systems furniture – the workstations – could look cluttered. How can people personalize them? Will it look like an IBM farm?. Hacker response: the furniture is important; the height of any partitions and storage components is very flexible. Two products – Steelcase and Knoll – have been shared with Janelle ahead of the staff retreat that is planned for Friday.
   3. Staff have a variety of working and communication styles. There are acoustical solutions – white noise systems – that can help alleviate this, and Joseph is advising the team as it refines the design. The small meeting rooms are intended to support private phone calls, etc. IT systems should enable staff to move fluidly between spaces with remote desktop access.
   4. An open office allows a more simple HVAC system.
   5. Private offices can perhaps offer more opportunity for personalization, and for clutter.
   6. Can a viewing window be added to the rehearsal room from the former director’s office? Hacker: yes, cost-depending.
   7. Preferred workroom configuration is with a wall to the south, and with a plumbing wall to the north. This is more flexible than any shown.
2. Skylights: a series of renderings showing skylight options at the rehearsal room were considered. The design team will continue to include a long skylight, understanding that it could be bid as an alternate and/or be reduced in size in the future.
3. Finishes: Jennie presented a set of three interior finish palettes, named “*pure*”, “*tranquility*” and “*myrtlewood*”. These had been previewed with Alison Synder, who was unable to attend this meeting. The current thinking is that while the wood represents the INTERIOR of an instrument, rather than its lacquered exterior – a more raw look.
   1. “*Pure*” uses a white oak with a finish that mimics unfinished wood.
   2. “*Tranquility*” uses white oak with a simple finish, and appears more brown , with more pronounced grain.
   3. “*Mytlewood*” is almost bleached; Jennie cautioned that this wood sample may not represent the full nature of this species, which has a lot of natural character. Significant selection may be needed to achieve the bleached appearance.

Jennie introduced other materials – three carpets, Board Room materials for the casework and countertops, and three options for bathroom finishes. The bathrooms and boardroom are intended to have concrete floor.

* 1. The *Tandus* carpet has more pattern and was the committee’s preferred choice. Hacker will review colors (a darker combination is shown in the rendering) and will review layout. Hacker recommends NOT creating a “rug” at the informal meeting area at the top of the stairs, but rather to keep the carpet tile configuration consistent in this area. The tile could turn a quarter turn at the threshold to the open office area – this is shown in the renderings.
  2. The wood discussion was inconclusive. Janelle’s preference of all the samples shared was the textured plastic laminate partner for the “*Tranquility”* option because it is a little warmer. Janelle found Corey’s description of the rehearsal room as a “sound box” inspirational, and while she appreciates the story of the wood as the INTERIOR of the instrument she is less drawn to the coloration. She very much liked the way the building could be read as an instrument in earlier renderings. Hacker explained the difficulty it is encountering as it tries to find a warm wood finish that complements the red brick exterior. The team will continue to study and refine its recommendation for wood species and finishes, interior and exterior.
  3. Regarding concrete, Mark Butler noted that Eugene’s concrete tends to be a quite warm tone because of the color of the local sand. Hacker noted that it actively seeks this product in its residential work because of its color properties.

1. The group reviewed the finishes and the meeting ended informally without adjournment or summation.

**End of Meeting Notes**

Next meetings:

* 1. City of Eugene Pre-proposal Meeting – Wednesday March 16, 2:00 - 4:00 PM
  2. CPC Subcommittee Mtg – March 17th 10 – 11am
  3. User Group Meeting: April 1 (Rehearsal Room focus] 9 AM - noon
  4. 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.