

EYP/® minutes

To:	Attendees	Date of meeting:	October 17, 2019
Project Name:	Bull Run Hall Addition	Time of meeting:	3:00-5:00
Project No.:	1019004.01	Location of meeting:	Nguyen Engineering Building, Room 5117
		Meeting Number:	SD #1

Meeting Purpose: Building Committee Meeting

Attendees:

George Mason University:

- Doug Lipscomb, Asst VP Planning & Design
- Virginia Steele, Project Manager, Facilities
- Laura Manno, Architect/Planner
- Dominique Banville, CEHD
- Ron Carmichael, Director of Admin. & Operations
- Deb Crawford, VP Research
- Liza Wilson Durant, Assoc. Dean VSE
- Colby Grant (via phone), Sci Tech Admin
- Carrie McVicker, COS
- Martha Wescoat-Andes, COS

EYP:

- Suzanne Klein, Project Director
- Melissa Burns, Academic Planner
- Rick Clarke, Lead Designer
- Rebekah Dunbar, Sr. Project Architect

Minutes:

General Comments:

1. Doug noted this is the first of three meetings during the Schematic Design phase. The goal is to review progress on site selection and development of blocking and stacking. Mason received the final programming report for review and final sign-off from EYP. This report is for the Building Addition only, not the backfill spaces.
 - a. Volume 1 – New Addition Programming Report
 - b. Volume 2 – Programming Phase meeting minutes
 - c. Volumes 3 and 4 – Forthcoming backfill programming report, split into two volumes because the projects will be funded differently.
2. Suzanne recapped what EYP has been working on since the last meeting: confirming site location with Facilities, focusing on the blocking and stacking for the building, and how the program fits horizontally and vertically on the floors.
3. **Preliminary Blocking and Stacking:** Melissa reviewed the preliminary blocking and stacking that was developed during the Programming phase. The preliminary blocking and stacking had a larger first floor to accommodate user requests. Melissa noted EYP looks at the efficiency ratio for floors with the goal to be around 65% to meet DEB requirements. EYP noted that to achieve 72% on the first floor the preliminary blocking and stacking is not realistic.
 - a. Pros: First floor user requirements are met. Force Plates at grade.

- b. Cons: Columns in BioMechanics. Added construction cost of unequal floor levels, bigger footprint on site, and view of low roof from adjacent buildings.
- 4. **Blocking and Stacking – Option 1:** Melissa noted this option provides three equal floors for efficiency in form and relationships.
 - a. Similar pros and cons to preliminary scheme.
 - b. Option 1 moves the Event Space to the 3rd floor. The disadvantage of this option is the access through the building, but the advantage is views into the adjacent tree canopy.
 - c. Dry/Wet Lab space connected to classrooms and event spaces provide good synergy.
 - d. Remainder of first floor program remains the same as the preliminary blocking and stacking.
 - e. Human Performance and Cadaver split between 1st and 2nd floors.
 - f. Melissa noted all programming is based on a 10'-6" x 10'-6" modular grid.
 - g. Additional Pros: Proximity of the Event Space to labs for use as student project space (when events not in progress).
 - h. Additional Cons: Informal Space and Conference Rooms on upper levels only, so have to travel further into the building to access.
 - i. Ron asked if having the Event Space on the upper floor changes the elevator requirements for the building. EYP will review.
- 5. **Blocking and Stacking – Option 2:**
 - a. Similar to Option 1 with three equal floor levels and locating the Event Space to the 3rd floor.
 - b. Keeps all the Cadaver spaces together on 1st floor and the 2nd floor has the all instructional labs.
 - c. All 3rd floor all Human Performance spaces are located together w/ Active Learning classrooms and the Event Space.
 - d. With Human Performance on upper floor, EYP would look at structural options to accommodate force plate design requirements. EYP noted they are looking at a concrete structure with a metal roof structure to allow for longer beam spans/column free spaces on third floor for Events, Classrooms, and Human Performance.
 - e. First floor efficiency more realistic in this option.
 - f. Force Plates would be located on an elevated slab which is concerning to Human Performance (HP). EYP noted that other projects have located force plates on upper floors. EYP suggested having an upper floor location with Nelson during programming meetings. Concerns about access for visitors/participants for H.P. on top floor.
- 6. **Massing Studies Intro:** Rick noted that EYP has been studying the building site. Key elements being reviewed:
 - a. Engage Natural Features – loop road vs. tree canopy
 - b. Create Identity – Tends to be from inside of campus on pedestrian path.
 - c. Define Entries – from loop road and internal pedestrian spine.
 - d. Locate Services- this building will have a lot of services, both public and private. Noted services are usually paired together between two buildings on this campus.
 - e. Establish Placemaking- really wants to be near IABR main entrance.
 - f. Create a new outdoor place that is engaged with adjacent building activity.

7. **Site:** Rick noted that the design should reflect the activities inside the building and outside plus plans for the future (Academic VIII). Entrances into the building will be from both loop road and main pedestrian circulation spine. The building can also activate a new outdoor place adjacent to student projects with open overhead doors. A porous building and function will add life to the site. Service will be located between the new building and the future Academic VIII with direct access to loop road.
 - a. It was asked if this project needs to replace the parking lost for the new building site. Doug noted accessible parking proximity for IABR will be an issue; however, the issue isn't "Is there is not enough parking (total count) for the campus?" as much as "Not enough parking where they want to park". Concerns noted about enough parking for Hylton Performing Center events. Doug noted GMU is currently leasing spaces to Mitre. He also noted that eventually the removal of parking will be an issue, but he doesn't want parking in the center of campus. The forthcoming Master Plan will address long-term parking solutions.
8. **Massing Studies:** Rick shared the current massing concept for a larger massing on the north side, against future Academic VIII, and a softer façade on south facing IABR to create a new outdoor space.
 - a. The taller straight bar would have a 60' bar module and the shorter angular bar would have a 40' modular w/ circulation and gathering in between to help create entrances.
 - b. Same size floor plates for all three levels and the larger straight bar would be an extra level high for mechanical penthouse/screen wall for roof mounted equipment.
 - c. Initial core layout is centrally located. Two stairs located at the ends of the circulation spine. Preliminary occupancy counts anticipate required 3rd egress stair to be located in the core. Could split the elevators to either end. EYP noted can look further at locations of elevators and stairs based on feedback.
9. **Program Potential Layout:** Student Design would be located to open out to new outdoor space, promoting visibility. Cadaver spaces on the first floor near service access. On upper floors the heart symbol equals where the heart of the building is, as open or quiet study spaces. Quiet study spaces located on the ends of the building overlooking the site. The Event Space looks out to tree canopy interior of campus. Human Performance suite could be located together on one side of the building third floor. Program spaces shown in green on the second floor are still malleable, depending on which blocking and stacking option choose.
10. **Comments:** Discussed force plate concerns. Force plate on ground level and program split between levels is current preference, but then wouldn't get column free spaces on ground floor. Suzanne requested GMU send the design criteria of force plates.
11. **Progressing the Design:** Melissa noted EYP can move forward on both Options 1 and 2 with three equal floors and Event Space located on the third floor. GMU agreed on this direction. Most attendees prefer Option 2 if the force plates can work on an elevated floor, but if that is not feasible then Option 1 would be acceptable.
12. **Follow-Up Action Items:**

EYP/® minutes

- a. EYP to send sketch of column options as backup if force plates need to be located on ground floor.
- b. GMU to provide EYP with design criteria for force plates.
- c. EYP to provide examples of force plates in concrete structure elevated floors, preferable with long term data showing the success of the design.

13. Next Steps:

- a. Agreed to move forward with both Options 1 and 2 until GMU feels confident in deciding from follow-up action items.
- b. Concerned about circulation through/ with-in the building.
- c. Confirm elevator capacity to support activities on upper floors.
- d. For the Event Space look at the locations of exterior walls vs. interior walls and impact to presentations. Like the Event Space to have nearby connectivity to classrooms. GMU wants to see classrooms utilized all the time with nearby breakout space.
- e. Building Committee Meeting #2 is scheduled for Wednesday, November 6th at 10 am.

End of Meeting

The above constitutes my understanding of the items discussed and the decisions reached. If there are any additions or corrections, please, contact the undersigned.

Signed: Rebekah Dunbar

Cc: Attendees

Date: November 4, 2019