

## Meeting Notes

Date: February 2, 2016

---

Project: UO Oregon Bach Festival Job No: 01528

---

Author: Becca Cavell Cc: Martina Oxoby; File

---

Meeting: User Group SD Meeting

---

### Attendees :

Michael Anderson, OBF Director of Artistic Administration ; Project Sponsor.  
Janelle McCoy OBF Exec. Director  
Alison Snyder, Assoc Professor, Architecture (by phone)  
Brad Foley, Dean, SOMD; User Group Co-Chair  
Dave Goudy, Interim Director of Education, OBF  
Sandy Cummings, Director of Finance, OBF  
Janet Yood, Construction Inspector, Campus Planning, Design and Construction

Nate Bick, Director of Development, OBF  
Dick Romm, OBF Volunteer  
Richelle Krotts, College of Education and Campus Planning Committee Representative  
Martina Oxoby, Owner's Rep, Campus Planning, Design and Construction  
Tanner Perrine, Lease Crutcher Lewis [by phone]  
Becca Cavell, Hacker  
Melissa Clark, Hacker [by phone]  
Corey Martin, Hacker [by phone]  
Lewis Williams, Hacker [by phone]

### Notes:

1. The primary purpose of this meeting is to review issues related to the upcoming CPC SD approval meeting, and to address two concerns raised during a recent informal review with CPC staff – namely the arcade and the mechanical screening.
2. With Hacker using a variety of plan drawings and an active SketchUp model, the User Group reviewed the development of the arcade design. The two specific concerns relate to the width of the piers and the depth of the walkway, and its potential undesirable uses as shelter and concealment. The arcade reflects a campus pattern, but its position at the campus perimeter raises security concerns.
  - a. After much discussion about the merits of keeping the building in its current position and moving it south to give the arcade more prominence on 18<sup>th</sup>, the committee concluded that keeping its current alignment with the SOMD is preferred.
  - b. Hacker is studying nuanced adjustments to the size of the piers, but recommends the basic approach as shown is retained; seating in the arcade will encourage its use by building

- occupants. Bike parking should be discouraged. The arcade will benefit OBF patrons, providing covered outdoor space to protect visitors from inclement weather – rain or sun.
- c. Eliminating the arcade presents myriad problems:
    - i. The first floor lacks windows; the arcade mitigates this by adding life and interest to the ground floor.
    - ii. The floor plate will increase, and so will the project costs
    - iii. If the building area grows it may trigger the requirements of the Oregon Model of Sustainable Development.
    - iv. A corresponding floor plate reduction of the upper level to maintain the overall size of the building will have a negative effect on the office layout, which is already tight.
  - d. The relationship of the arcade to the storm water planter will be refined during Design Development, but for the CPC review the design team will show a bite taken out of its rectangle at its NW corner to ease and encourage pedestrian access to the arcade.
  - e. There is natural “desire line” from the dense parking to the west and the arcade – pedestrians will use the sheltered walk naturally if it is welcoming.
  - f. While a paved area to the south of the arcade is desirable – a classic neoclassical civic design approach – there is not likely to be adequate space on the tight site to provide such space. The stormwater planter and desired trees take precedence.
  - g. Hacker will develop rendering(s) showing people occupying the arcade as part of its design efforts for the CPC presentation.
3. The north court and other site elements were reviewed. The SketchUp model has been updated to reflect the actual grading necessary to achieve Cameron McCarthy’s design. The committee confirmed that the north doors to OBF will be very active, and typically unlocked during regular school hours.
  4. Hacker discussed the required roof access to the upper roof – that of the Rehearsal Room. Its initial research shows that a vertical ladder will meet code requirements; a cage may be required for fall protection if the ladder is too close to the edge of the lower roof. While Hacker showed the ladder on the west face of the structure, Martina wondered if it would be less visible on the South. This issue will be studied in more detail and reviewed with Campus Operations.
  5. Hacker showed several options for the roof level enclosure for the mechanical equipment. Hacker recommends moving the second exit stair to the center of the building to reduce the visual impact of its enclosure at the roof level – the current design proposes the stair, and not the elevator, be extended to the roof. This reflects budget savings and has been reviewed with Facilities. If a screen is provided it will likely be a painted metal mesh or louver, as air flow is required in some areas; this can be studied in more detail, but Hacker recommends that no enclosure at all be provided for the mechanical equipment. This results in much less visible roof top components, and the stair enclosure and two simple mechanical components can be painted metal. Hacker recommends a grey paint intended to help these elements blend with an overcast sky conditions. The committee preferred the elimination of the enclosure; Hacker will bring a series of views showing this approach for the CPC meeting, and will have “with enclosure” views available for review if the discussion moves in that direction.
  6. The site-based mechanical equipment comprises two transformers to the west and one air handling unit (AHU) to the east. The AHU is below the adjacent site grades. Hacker recommends using landscape screening – a hedge of arborvitae or similar vigorous shrub – as the visual enclosure for this equipment, with a security fence – picket or other – concealed by the hedge. The committee concurred that landscape screening was the best choice. A similar approach is hoped for the west side; Hacker and

Cameron McCarthy will work with Facilities to confirm if this is allowable; Larry would like to maximize the non-paved surfaces, and provide a landscape screen at the transformers if UO permits.

7. The committee reviewed material samples shared by Hacker showing very preliminary ideas for a red brick and the wood panel. The committee responded very positively to the honey colored wood, and recommended careful review of the brick blend to work well with the wood. Larger samples will be provided for the CPC.
8. A plan review considered the new stair location; at the first floor this results in the addition of a short internal hallway that could be secured with a keyed door. The second floor plan benefits from this change with all offices now placed at the perimeter. The position of the Executive Director's office was reviewed and it will remain as shown, to the east of the library.
9. Janelle asked if the musical instrument storage room included humidity control, and Hacker replied that yes, humidity control is planned.
10. The committee will meet in the same room – Drake Conference Room – on Friday at 9 AM for a final review of materials that will be taken to the CPC for the 2/11 SD review meeting. Hacker will participate via GoToMeeting.

#### **End of Meeting Notes**

Next meetings:

- a. February 5<sup>th</sup> User Group SD Meeting 9:00am-12:00pm - approve SD design
- b. February 11<sup>th</sup> CPC Presentation / SD approval
- c. February 19<sup>th</sup> User Group Meeting 9:00-12:00 – Design Development
- d. Wednesday, 3/2 User Group 9:00am-12:00pm
- e. Wednesday, 3/16 User Group 9:00am-12:00pm
- f. Friday, 4/1 User Group 9:00am-12:00pm