

# Meeting Minutes

Casper College Gateway Building

Date: 09 November 2009

Location: Casper College

## Design Workshop #02

Conceptual Design Workshop DAY 1

Morning Session

1. Sign in and Introduction
2. Reviewed the process and results of Workshop #1. Through the collaborative Vision Session, the participants selected four images that they felt represented the important qualities of the Gateway Building. The images represent the aspirations of the group that the building serves both the student and administrative functions of Casper College. During the workshop two potential conceptual schemes for the building were presented. Scheme One was preferred due to its distribution of departmental services, access from the three primary levels to on grade entrances, and use of the site. Of high importance to the team were issues related to: entry, building siting, and site utilization, use of slope and ease of access to services. It was stressed that the primary entrance for the building would be to the east, allowing access to the second level of the building. Secondary entrances, first to the north along the walk south of Wold Science and second to the southwest at the upper parking lot level adjacent to the Business Building. A strong corner preference was noted. Visual access to and development of a pedestrian route north of the building were highlighted. The client team mentioned that the successful scheme provide access to daylighting from most fully occupied offices and work areas. Taking advantage of the slope meant utilizing the building as an internal pedestrian route to mitigate slope and provide sheltered access from upper to mid campus. The discussion then turned to the program and the cost model. CRSA has made some decisions to reduce some spaces to hit the target 76,000 sf, and that through the use of shared collaborative work spaces, the College has been able to offer some reduction. It was noted that the cost of mitigating the hill was approximately \$10 / sf and that the building program calls for 76,000 sf @ \$203 / sf for a total cost of \$15.4 million. Kathy mentioned that \$193 / sf is a challenging budget for this type of building, but some considerations could be made to reduce the cost of some spaces such as curriculum classrooms to allow a higher cost per sf for the public spaces.
3. The presentation of two new conceptual floor plans incorporated the comments from the group concerning the plans presented in Workshop #1. The two new plans respond to two basic forms, Scheme #1 is a "Pinwheel" around a central core and Scheme #2 is a "Bar" along the east road. Both schemes raise peculiar issues regarding site planning such as how users "read" the building, access to parking, site development for outdoor public spaces such as plazas and site access walks, how the building responds to surrounding buildings (Wold & Business) and how each building form allows for the occupants to have access to daylighting

and views, as well as how the building components such as roofing and stair towers impact users.

4. Scheme 1 – Revisions were made to the “Pinwheel” format from Workshop 1 responding to the need to: locate Curriculum areas within levels 1 & 2, allowing for a the proper exiting from Continuing Education on level 2, accentuating level two entry and connectivity with level three Student Services, coordinated layout of the new One Stop format, consolidation of Advising and Career Services and access to Cashiering services, the development of building support spaces including food service, copy center, and on level four the organization of executive administration offices, Board/Session Room and support space. Review comments / questions included checking how and where the site slope effects access to daylighting, the location for delivery and robotics rollout space, the building’s height and visibility, the proximity to Wold, views from the site, circulation to and through the building, and the organization of the building’s departmental functions. The client team spoke about the preference of moving executive administration to level three.

5. Scheme 2 – This layout tested a more rigid format for an administration building. The “Bar” to accommodate the program areas met the needs to be more closely tie to the street to east, takes the more prominent corner location adjacent to Wold Science, and preserves hillside between itself and the Business Building. The long building layout did stretch departmental groups along the 320’ building. The organizational structure does allow for some cost savings as the building’s footprint in this configuration requires less excavation and fewer linear feet of retaining walls. A very similar organization of departments was achieved, but the form did not allow for as many cross collaborative spaces, poorer joint services and more rigid organizational structure. Many felt that that the rigid nature of the scheme did not respond as well to the needs of being a service oriented structure, that the fun or relaxed quality of providing services was lost and that the overall flexibility over time may have been more difficult. Lessons learned were that the rigid structure allowed for a more efficiently organized layout of offices and services points.

6. The design vocabulary exercise presented a wide variety of precedent images focusing on materials and fenestration. Issues illustrated in the images included the users ability to make a distinction of open space vs. private offices based on window patterns, the combination of various materials in a variety of ways to express the nature of the building and the collegiate components within. The discussion resulted in the preference of brick, stucco and metal panels for the primary exterior materials. The group also indicated that a truly traditional or classical building would not be appropriate for this campus because of that propensity of those styles to imply an incorrect institutional age. Further discussion focused on the personal tastes of various group members, including a discussion from Mike regarding the maintenance of the materials proposed.

7. The sustainability discussion began with a brief introduction to LEED. The college has adopted a standard policy that all new construction is to be designed to be eligible for LEED Silver certification, but no documentation is to be expected. This translates into an attempt to design high-performance buildings without relying on successfully achieving specific LEED

credits. CRSA plans to meet this directive by making prudent material and systems choices early in the design phase and incorporating appropriate specifications and detailing in the construction documents to allow contractors to implement the designs. The discussion continued through a brief highlighting of various credits that are easily incorporated or require little initial investment.

## Break for Lunch

## Afternoon Session

### 8. Specific User Group Focused Discussions of Floor Plans

Executive Administration and Administrative Services (President's Office, Foundation/Alumni, College Relations, Human Resources, Accounting/Financial Management, Grants, and Board/Sessions Meeting Rooms). The client team responded to internal layouts of suites of spaces. Feedback was given regarding the location of these suites and for some their preference for locating on level three. Foundation / Alumni preferred the Administrative Assistant to have access to daylight (preferably an outside wall), plan to move Director's furniture.

College Relations: review the layout of the photo studio prior to drafting schematic design floor plans. Accounting / Financial Management: work to organize the cashiers together, allow for access to purchasing and conference room without patron having to access through Acct/Fin Mgt, place missing staff member adjacent to cashiers for backup, if continued adjacency with HR team okay with shared copy/coffee/chat room, prefer having a small shared meeting space. HR: organization works, continue to plan for both local and remote storage. Grants: two offices and support space works, storage can be remote.

Student Services / Admissions: One Stop organization needs to indicate student use spaces to better understand organization, staff need to be the first point of contact, visual access to recruiting important and "near front door", make sure VA benefits and scholarships have good public access, back-of-house administrative spaces work, check s.f. of copy/coffee/chat, look at compacted storage for records, move joint use conference room further back, plan for defining better the career / advising outreach materials and computers, indicate reception location, plan for second exit for area with counselors, push assistive services behind the scenes, plan for secondary copy/coffee/chat if career/advising is located at a distance from the rest of student services administrative core.

Academic Services / Curriculum – Leslie and Jeff Sun represented the group. Decision to delete three general use classrooms in lieu of planning for all spaces within this group to be understood as "college resources" was agreed to. Design team asked to confirm locations of storage areas. Later discussions with complete client team helped confirm adjacencies, layouts and circulation. Continued coordination with the client team is needed.

Continuing Education – Team agreed that Scheme 1 presentation of staff was preferred, but Scheme 2 classroom layout was more efficient. Space summary and drawings will now reflect a joint use conference center to accommodate 200, (6) approximately 800 s.f. classrooms, a computer lab, (2) 400 s.f. classrooms, and a teaching kitchen. Team stressed importance of chair/table storage adjacent to rooms and remote storage for materials and resources. Client group did not want to serve as gate keepers to second floor, but understood the need to allow

the second level to act autonomous from other floors in after hours or weekend situations. To do this special planning of exiting from this area will be confirmed.

#### Morning Session

9. CRSA/Amudsen conducted an on campus internal work session. Drop-in visits from curriculum and students services helped offer direction to the design team. The team crafted re-organized floor plans to meet the client comments from day one.

10. Executive Committee Work Session – CRSA presented revised floor plans for comment. Level one contents include two electrical classrooms, administrative suite for curriculum, robotics studio and fab/lab, associated storage for each, drafting studio and mechanical drafting classroom, student lounge and display area, and mechanical room. Missing: building –wide resource of remote storage and workroom. Decision: copy center will remain in the administration building.

Level two contains continuing education classrooms, computer lab, storage and conference center, electronics/motors lab, electronics/solid state lab and associated storage, GIS classroom, drafting classroom and their associated storage needs. Comments: consider secondary exit locations.

Level three contains student services, one stop, career / advising center, food service venue and seating, information kiosk, board/session room and associates catering prep and chair/table storage room, accounting / financial management, foundations / alumni, president's office, VP Administrative Services, VP Academic Services, VP Student Services, and Assoc. VP Student Services / Athletics Director. Missing: BOCES, Compass Testing, Educational Resource Coordinator (UW),  $\frac{3}{4}$  bath. Comment: indicate in more detail the core services, including janitorial service space, re-orient cashiering to face one stop, move purchasing area to south, craft secondary entry to south end of building, check s.f. in all copy/coffee/chat rooms, and consider the locations of two-story volumes (to level two and/or level four).

Level four contains Human Relations, College Relations, Grants, copy center and administrative offices for Continuing Education. Missing: Facilities Coordinator. Comments: move HR to south location, move Continuing Ed to NE location, remove copy center from this floor, check layout for photo studio, plan for growth and meeting space.

Public art: there is \$100,000 slated for public art in addition to the construction budget of \$15.4 million. Art committee will be called to participate in a one-hour meeting at the next workshop.

CRSA completed sketch revisions which were distributed to client team for further review. Review comments to be return before 13 November.

CRSA will be working on:

- 1) Taking revised floor plans and revision comments and crafting schematic level floor plans. Work to include core development, preliminary code check to confirm exiting requirements and restroom loading.
- 2) Developing exterior elevations, including studying materials, colors and roof forms. CRSA to distribute to client team the initial design ideas early next week (16 or 17 November).

- 3) Investigating landscape issues: including exterior access points to and through site, building access points, grading, and issues to convey to landscape architecture team.
- 4) 3 December President Nolte has a Legislative Breakfast, CRSA to keep client team posted o availability of renderings by this time.

## Arrin's Notes During the presentations

### Morning Session

#### Introductions

##### Review of Workshop 1

- Issues & vision exercise activity – resulting imagery – Value Tree
  - Goal & Vision Oriented
  - Fun & Student Oriented
  - Team & Sense of Community
  - Sustainability, Texture & Color

##### Space Summary & Cost Model

- Scheme 1
  - Description of site
  - Basement level @ Wold Science (Continuing Education)
  - 1st Floor @ East Entry (Curriculum)
  - 2nd Floor @ T-bird Gym (Student Services)
  - 3rd Floor (Administration)
- Scheme 2
  - 1st Floor @ East Entry (Curriculum)
  - 2nd Floor @ T-bird Gym (Continuing Education)
  - 3rd Floor (Student Services & Admin)
- SF breakdown
  - Challenges of requests & space allocations (impacts on cost model)
  - "Arm wrestling" & trimming of spaces
  - Cost Model – 15.4 M @ 76,000sf = \$203/sf
  - Collaborative sharing of spaces

##### Site Planning Overview

- Current Schemes
  - Scheme #1 - "Pinwheel"
  - Scheme #2 - "Bar"
  - Site considerations
    - Parking
    - Wold Science

- Daylighting

#### Conceptual Floor Plans

- Scheme #1
  - Entry at grade @ basement, Main & Upper Levels
  - Robotics Roll-out space
  - Bell Tower
  - Basement
    - Curriculum, Entry, Electronics & Robotics
    - Building Support Deep in Building
    - Entrance Planning is critical (dumpster, services & vehicles)
    - How get people into building – where are services?
  - Second Floor
    - Curriculum – Electronics, Drafting, GIS
    - Continuing Education (Eastern Entry Access)
      - After-hours access & security
      - Parking & Ease of Access
        - At grade with lot to east of site
        - Easy access to T-bird Gym lot
  - Third Level
    - SW Entry
    - Café, Copy Center core of services
    - Kiosk, Meeting rooms, Advising
    - Central vertical circulation components
      - Atrium Description
  - Fourth Floor
    - Administration
    - Views / Access to Valley
    - Resources scatters throughout the building
      - Forces interaction & flexibility
- Scheme #2
  - Driven by central stair tower
  - Stair is monumental element
  - Excavation & street access
  - Length of building is issue
  - Relationship to Business Building
  - Basement
    - at grade @ east street
    - Curriculum on level
      - Electronics, Robotics
  - Second Level

- Curriculum
  - General Use Classrooms
  - Continuing Education
    - Conference Center
    - Eastern Entry
    - Access & Security – After-hours
  
- Third Level
  - Services – Copy Center & Kiosk
  - Student Services
  
- Fourth Floor
  - Admin & Public Spaces
  
- Modeling Issues
  - Read building – Wayfinding
  - “Prow of ship” to draw individuals into building
  - Relationship of building to Wold
  - Access to view to east – Daylighting
  - SW “low-slung” – less intimidating
  - Components
    - Roofing pitches
    - Stair tower volumes
    - Planning into the site
      - Site beyond building
      - Outdoor spaces
  
- Questions & Discussion
  - Joanna
    - Q - Scheme #2 - Cut into more of hill?
    - A - Hill falls away, building extends out in air behind Wold
  - Randy
    - Q - Scheme #2 – Enlarge 4th floor to reduce length of building?
    - A - You tell us, can curriculum leave
  - Kathy/Randy
    - Q - Move components to other areas or floors?
    - A - Conflict with other components, daylighting, community & linger spaces, Draw people inside and outside
  - Rich
    - Q - Talk about entry & what is stair tower?
  - Darry
    - Q - Stair tower includes elevator in same location?
  - Laura
    - Q - Continuing Ed offices in back?

- A - Large rooms=doors & exiting, locating staff in core
- Jane
  - Q - Are these two designs where we are?
  - A - Results of marching orders, but can change in upcoming weeks
  - Q - How deal with winds?
  - A - It is a tough call - take advantage of site or protect from wind
- Joanna
  - Q - Scheme #2 seems stand alone, Scheme #1 reaches out to campus?
  - A - Correct - Scheme #2 = Formal Admin Box, #1 = Pedestrian alley
- Joanne
  - Q - Difficulties of Scheme #1?
  - A - Engage site, Place occupants on outside edge, readability & wayfinding
- Linda
  - Q - Parking on East lot?
  - A - Wayfinding, learn about building parking will change, 3 entries
- Joanna
  - OK to go up a level to One Stop.
- Jane
  - Q - Take Admin from top floor and place "in the mix"
  - A - Floor plate size limits or move other us - balance is key who can be where
- Laurie
  - Q - Have you seen One Stops as two floor areas
  - A - Joanna has see them as two floor - one floor is better (core vs. destination)
- Randy
  - Q - How make building not look like classroom or admin box
  - A - Architectural Vocabulary images - appearance of components

#### Design Vocabulary

- Design Components
  - Fenestration
  - Public vs. Private spaces
  - Traditional Materials & Non-Traditional
  - Windows = Permeability
  - Cost Savings - repetition of components
  - Masonry & Wood or other materials
  - Pre-cast materials - monolithic quality
  - Contemporary vs. traditional & classical
  - Roof structures can become "house-like"
  - Two-story spaces to draw eye & increase interest
- Discussions
  - Mike
    - Maintenance and materials use
    - Preference for brick, stucco & metal siding

- Departure from multi-color brick & one stucco color
- Preference for punched windows vs. large expanses of glass
  - Discussion of heat gain
- Believes the compromise (window types) is what will be decided upon
- Laura
  - Prefers Ribbon windows
  - Doesn't believe that "Classical" old campus buildings are appropriate here
- Jane
  - Anchor (Icon) building – destination building
  - Should look like educational institution
  - Shouldn't look like a dorm or manufacturing
- Kathy
  - Start of tradition of new projects
  - Steward of public dollars
  - How far afield do you want to go from what you have to what you want to be
- Joanna
  - Modern aspect, project substance & learning

#### Sustainability

- LEED introduction
- Campus standard is Silver without documentation
- How manage system
  - More than just gaining credits, but aim for high-performance buildings
    - Make good decisions regarding maintenance, materials, etc.
- Credits
  - WE Credit 1.1 – Water efficient landscaping
    - Green next to building, moving to brown away from building
  - EA Credit 3 – Enhanced Commissioning
    - Perhaps think about adding to campus
  - EQ Credit 3.1 – Construction IAQ Management
    - Cleanliness
  - EQ Credits – Low VOC's
    - Low hanging fruit
- Tough choices about infrastructure to support sustainability
- Many systems are hidden in walls and are tough to recognize benefit
- Laura
  - Q - Renewable energy components?
  - A – Renewable sources, green power or on site (PV, Solar hot water, turbine)
- Mike
  - Geothermal well field will likely go under building footprint
  - Geothermal systems conserve space within building – no mechanical systems on roof
  - LEED crafted with urban environment in mind (CC rural)
    - Can't get many credits no matter what
    - Simple planning

- Light roof, water percolation, pervious Paving
- Water efficiency credits
  - Easier to get than many others
    - Low flow fixtures
- Energy & Atmosphere
  - Renewable energy sources, lighting controls, daylighting
  - Commissioning agent
- Material & Resources
  - Regional Materials
    - Difficult in western locations
  - Recycling
    - Policies are usually the challenge
    - Recycled materials are getting better
    - Lack of documentation sometimes hobbles effort, no "teeth"
- Indoor EQ
  - Ventilation
    - Operable windows could be a good component / policies & security
  - Low emitting materials
  - Maximizing daylighting & views
    - Push staff out to exterior of building

#### Lunch

#### Discussion of Schematic Floor Plans

- Executive Administration
- Student Services
- Academic Services
- Continuing Education

Casper College Gateway Building			Date:
Meeting: <b>WORKSHOP #2</b>			Time:
Name	Dept. / Organization	Phone #	Email
KATHY WINTERDAL	CRSA	801-355-5915	kathy@crsa-us.com
ARRIN HOLT	CRSA	801-355-5915	arrine@crsa-us.com
RON SHOSH	AMUNDSEN ASSOC	307-234-9999	amundassoc@aol.com
GRADY DAVIS	AMUNDSEN ASSOC	234-9999	" "
Tim Brekel	ARC	970-421-1137	tbrekel@arcipm.com
Julie Christiansen	ARC	970-401-0411	jchristiansen@arcipm.com
RANDY STUTHEIT	CC	307-259-8361	RSTUTHEI@CasperCollege.edu
Janet Doolittle	CC	265-4741	Ladywy@MAE.com
SHARON BELL	CC	268-2634	shell@caspercollege.edu
Gale Lara	CC	268-2547	glara@caspercollege.edu
Lynnde Colling	CC	268-2232	lcolling@caspercollege.edu
David Arndt	CC	268-2521	davndt@caspercollege.edu
Joanna Anderson	CC	268-2210	janderson@ " "
ESLEY HAVEN	CC	268-2448	Haven@caspercollege.edu
Carmen Simone	CC	268-2706	csimone@caspercollege.edu
Rich Fujita	CC	268-3088	RFUJITAE " "
Katie McMillan	CC	268-2488	Kmcmillan@caspercollege.edu
Joanne Theobald	CC	268-2231	theobald@caspercollege.edu
Robyn Landen	CC	268-2362	rlanden@caspercollege.edu
BILL LANDEN	CC	268-2667	blanden@ " " "
Darryl Vogt	CC	268-2596	dvogt@caspercollege.edu
Jeff Sun	Geography/GIS	268-3560	jsun@caspercollege.edu
Lois Davis	IT/CC	268-2703	ldavis@caspercollege.edu
LINDA NICHOLS	CC	268-2220	lnichols@caspercollege.edu
Alison McNulty	Admissions/CC	268-3123	amcnulty@caspercollege.edu