MEETING MINUTES

Date: June 18, 2012, 4:30 p.m.
Location: MSU CoB Reid Hall, Room 402
Subject: MSU-College of Business Building – SD Work Session 2 Public Open House
Attendees: Susan Dana, MSU CoB Interim Dean, sdana@montana.edu
        Audrey Lee, audrey.lee@montana.edu
        Terry Beaubois, MSU CAA, terry.beaubois@msu.montana.edu
        Katherine Zimmerman, MSU – AIRO, katherine.zimmerman@montana.edu
        Collen Davoe, Integrated Design Lab Architecture Student, colleen.devoe@msu.montana.edu
        Bill Zanoni, Integrated Design Lab Architecture Student, billzanoni@gmail.com
        E.J. Hook, edward.hook1@montana.edu
        Tom Wood, MSU Integrated Design Lab, twood@montana.edu
        Dan Stevenson, daniel.stevenson1@montana.edu
        Derek Didriksen, Dick Anderson Const., derek@daconst.com
        Tim Eddy, Hennebery Eddy, Teddy@henneberyeddy.com
        Jon McGrew, Hennebery Eddy, JMcgrew@henneberyeddy.com
        Robert Krotser, Hennebery Eddy, RKrotser@henneberyeddy.com
        Ben Lloyd, Comma-Q Architecture, ben@commaq.com

Submitted: Kim Everts

The following items were discussed at the MSU College of Business project Public Open House meeting:

Introductions:

Tim went over where we are in the process – prepared 3 preliminary concept plans for the schematic design to receive feedback from the committees and work groups. From these 3 schemes and the feedback of them, the team will design a final schematic design scheme to be presented the end of July. Tim reviewed the schemes:

Option 1 - North South:
1. Concept – oriented in a mirror image of the Bio Chem Bldg across the main axis from Alumni Plaza. The footprint on the site creates an edge to the main axis,
2. On the interior it is similar to the EW scheme, enter on a landing level with the café, down to the forum, with M Lab, Student Services and computer labs on this level with connection to future Auditorium.
3. Coming in a half level up, then move either up or down to the level desired, the main stair traverses up through the building similar to the EW Scheme.
4. Forum is linear.
5. As the floor progress up have a consistent layout of faculty offices at south east side, classrooms on the northwest side, all wrapping around the open space. Have an opportunity for a terrace on the 3rd floor facing southwest.

Option 2 – Shift or Split:
1. Is a modification of the NS scheme with the two building bars that are broken into two halves – Classroom Wing & the Office Wing and then linked together with the Forum Circulation, coming into the building to the lowest level on the south side, with a south facing entry (sun catcher concept) with regard to the trees, will be able to save some of the trees – both the firs and the street trees, service is off the parking lot to the north, see expansion to the north, similar to 1st option,
2. Auditorium location entry could be the computer lab – so that if not in this phase, the space can be used in the mean time as another function,
3. (2) 50 seat classrooms have the sliding doors between to open up to the forum for a really large open gathering space, Forum has a prominent hearth –(fireplace).
4. M-Lab – how is it going to be used? Maybe not on the main drag if there are items that need more privacy? Ideally we would have the M-Lab on the opposite side of the 2 50 classrooms
5. Student services have frontage on the forum. The Forum is more open, central space – gets smaller as it goes up through the building, in an oval shape, with some cost premium.
6. Working up through the building, similar to the other schemes. Heard was nice to have the smaller classrooms on upper levels, and larger at the lower levels.
Option 3 – East-West:

1. The building maintains the regulating lines, mirrored on the Alumni Plaza axis, the site steps down to the entry point on the south west corner. This will for the most part maintain the street trees but the grove of firs is gone.
2. Service is off the east end with a retaining wall in a depressed service well. This scheme does not impact parking as shown, but may need to supplement the service access from the parking lot.
3. Enter the building off main axis – at a landing level with the café, then dropping down into the Forum on the ground floor, with Student Services on the north, and the (2) 50 classrooms on the south.
4. Similar access to the auditorium with the computer lab, etc. at the north.
5. The forum / connecting stair has a similar experience to the stair at the NS scheme. This layout is very readable at the entry landing.
6. This has the best solar exposure for sustainability and night flush cooling. The next floors have the classrooms at the south side and offices at the north side (with north light and views).
7. There are breakout rooms at the top of the Forum that look down over it.
8. The Auditorium will displace some of the Street Trees and some of the Parking when added in the future.

Comments / Questions from the Attendees:

Katherine – concerned the number of trees that are going to be taken out. The NS looks like it allows the fir trees to remain.
Tim – yes in the short term, but in the long term will need to remove when the building is expanded. One way to address that is to set up a replacement of in kind caliper per new trees in an area

Katherine - Will it have operable windows? Tim – during the Sustainable Design Charrette operable windows were high on the list of goals, and to reduce the need to cool the building if possible.

Katherine - Will the skylights allow for adjustment in the summer to reduce the heat gain? Yes, we will analyze the daylighting further as we move into the details of the design.

Katherine - Who makes the final decision on the three design? Tim – the Building Committee will make the decisions that set up the next design option at an exit meeting tomorrow afternoon, after we meet with the other groups.

Katherine – I understand that some of the buildings need to be removed, but if the grove of firs saved they can provide shade and a nice shading area for the outdoor space or a view from the glass wall of the buildings. If the trees must come out can we replace them with decent sized trees unlike the BioChem Building that took out 100 trees and replaced them with little trees. Tim – we will be working with MSU and Comma-Q on the design of the landscape.

Laura – can you explain the solar orientation of the Shift scheme? Tim – will review all the schemes from the solar orientation standpoint. The EW scheme is the ideal orientation for solar, the NS is the least. The Shift scheme an experiment of the NS scheme by opening up the forum space to the south to create a welcoming entry sequence. In doing so, this sites the large glass wall to the south with is easier to shade the south facing glass.

Katherine – do you have to cut away a lot of the slope? Tim – we are trying to fit them into the site as best we can, but the buildings set into the slope.

Terry – you mentioned the M Lab, Bracken Center and Jabs Center discussion on moving to the 2nd floor. Tim – Originally had all these items are vying for space on the Forum. Today we discussed that the Jabs Center and the M-Lab might work better together and may want to consider moving them up to a prominent point on the 2nd level.

Tom – 1st impression is a mix between the Shift and EW. Like the central core meeting area is really nice. Also like entry on grade, don’t like the split entry. But also have the daylight bias on EW. And with the offices on the north with the view. Would eliminate the floating offices to the north, and get more to the exterior wall. The NS reminds me too much of Reid Hall, since it doesn’t have the strong central heart like the Shift scheme.

Katherine – someday the parking garage will go up, so will it cause problems for this building? Yes but the parking garage will most likely go on the Residence Hall side of Harrison, however the master plan shows another building just to the north of this building, so someday will have.

The above represents the Architect’s understanding of the discussions and decisions communicated during the meeting. Please bring any revisions or additions to the Architect’s attention within five (5) business days of receipt of these meeting minutes. Thank you.