University of Hawaii at Manoa  
Design Advisory Panel  
Meeting Notes  

DAP Meeting 2009.08.19  
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm  

Present:  
DAP Members present: Kirsten Faulkner, Julie Walters, Clark Llewellyn, Steve Meder, Sanford Murata, Peter Vincent.  
Brent Tokita, Richard Matsunaga & Associates, 808-591-1818  
Denise Antolini UH Law School  
Eric Crispin, UHM AVC Planning.  
Brian Minaii, UH VP/OCI, Maynard Young, UH OCI  
Janet Gillmar, UHM Office of Planning  
Caroline Berry, guest from CA.  

Agenda Item: New Classroom Building  

Project site:  
Site of existing Henke Hall, 1 story; fronting McCarthy Mall, (note ugly transformer), significant gold tree, bombax trees  

Project Background/ Status:  
- Pre-final stage of the PDR.  
- Size of classrooms based on registrar’s data; mix of sizes is desired, generous 30 sf/ student so space for breakout sessions  
- Building will act as surge space for classrooms taken down for renovations  
- Learning spaces equipped with state of the art technology; model for future development  
- Full Wi-Fi coverage to leverage the internet in lesson plans  
- 100% student laptop accommodation  
- Increased duration of and opportunities for interaction of faculty and students.  
- Provide spaces to collaborate, study, and socialize  
- Increase retention of first year undergars  
- Medium size classrooms 30-35 students – 42 of these, 12 small, and 7 large (50+)  
- Lecture Hall (210), 1 Media theatre (350), 1  
- No office spaces as sustainability measure – during holidays, shut down.  
- Gross 160,000 sq ft (7 stories above and basement )  
- Efficient AC building to reach sustainability goals; so can shut down entire building after class hours; no offices  
- Project site near Kennedy theatre, Hamilton, McCarthy Mall, push footprint to the North as much as possible to keep McCarthy Mall accessible and to save the gold tree; at end of McCarthy walkway axis  
- "I. M. Pei district"
Setback lines: Hamilton Library on south, Moore Hall on east and west, on north side no closer than 50’ from Moore Hall.

Plaza floor (EW Road level) – social areas, study areas, support spaces

Sub-plaza floor – Lecture Hall, Media Theater, instructional support, classrooms, same level as adjacent Hamilton Library and Paradise Palms cafeteria

Floors 2 to 7 - mostly classrooms featuring non-bearing walls so can be changed in future; social areas on every floor; atrium connection between floors; naturally ventilated – for fire reasons has to be sealed off, so may as well naturally ventilate;

Roof – cooling tower, air heat pump, PV possibility but maybe rolled into a large campus wide PV effort.

Lecture halls; every 4th seat has electrical outlet; projector options.

Study area configuration; ample furniture.

Corridors on upper floors wider than necessary for possible breakout session space.

Questions / Comments:
C= comment; Q=question; A= Answer

C: We appreciate the clarity of the presentation.

Q: Is entire basement below grade? What about recent flood issue?
A: Basement in partial daylight; below grade on slope; water/drainage was discussed during PDR; Facilities felt risky to have electrical on basement level so electrical and mechanical are on plaza floor/ East West Road level.

Q: Is University preparing for potential flooding; university wide ecosystem, accommodate natural resources?
A: Yes – gradual improvements are being made (see Hamilton Library); also new Master Plan will focus on utilities/ infrastructure planning.

Q: Doesn’t that area consist mostly of blue rock (basalt – therefore difficult/costly to excavate? Doesn’t basalt occur at a 20 ft depth?
A: Geolabs and structural engineers have evaluated it; we’d have to go underground to accommodate some of this program; the rock in some ways lessens cost of foundation (could have simple spread footings);

Comment: We are concerned with building’s height, but mostly with electrical and mechanical rooms on street level where people walk and its impact of “taking away the life of the city”; Why are we encouraging people to be inside, in social boxes; but we are in Hawaii – we should be encouraging integration of indoor outdoor spaces. We suggest the design needs a better connection between indoor and outdoor on the ground floor.

Comment: Shouldn’t we push plaza area up into building so it can be more integrated with the surrounding ground?
Comment: Our project goals should be more far reaching: We should be creating inspiring places for people to study; need values that go beyond the merely practical.

Comment: We end up referring to the PDR as a “bible” – in reality it should merely serve as a point of departure for the next design team; PDR should come out with directional goals – the design team can then work on specific solutions rather than taking the PDR as a “given” and merely developing that diagram into a building.

(Discussion on order of the agenda items: Q/A only or include recommendations now?)

Q/Comment: Let’s focus on social spaces and why the isolation of social spaces? For example West social space is 10’ above grade not functional, east at grade; why enclosed spaces?
A: At first we opted for open, natural ventilation then as discussions progressed with academic staff, we went to AC; desire to open building more; original intent went to open

Q: So we’re consolidating functions for energy conservation (so we can shut down this building during holidays); But we’re trying to ascertain the building envelope; it seems the “atrium” (social space) is only ventilating its own shaft…?
Comment: This building is programmed to use 600 tons of AC. - hard to reach LEED gold or even silver with that.

Comment: We need to consider the funding element of this $85-90M project. We should address budget constraints – no sense designing a building we can’t afford. Historically the UH doesn’t get $90M of funding at one time; typically $45M at most. Backlog reduction received priority in funding; It is a balancing act (between much-needed new buildings and much-needed maintenance projects).

Comment: McCarthy Mall is the most important outdoor space on the campus. George Walters designed it. We’re concerned about the 12-ft high wall imposing on McCarthy Mall; McCarthy Mall is unfinished, this is our opportunity to conclude it. McCarthy Mall is only half its width at that end and should be brought to full width.
Is there a Gateway structure being proposed?
A: At UHM’s request we added a large space – media hall- tried to put it and the lecture hall under the tower but it became expensive; we could correct the intrusion on McCarthy Mall if the media hall were removed from the program.

Comment: Building needs stronger integration at ground level with its surrounds – Paradise Palms, a hangout area, eating areas.

The PDR doesn’t address the pedestrians and their interaction at the ground floor level; we should address budget constraints – no sense designing a building we can’t afford; perhaps consider removing the basement from the plan.
Subsequent comment: Recognize and work with topography. Question the LRDP and PDR showing the main entry at a broad level plaza imposed on the sloping ground of McCarthy Mall.
Comment: At minimum all indoor gathering places should be naturally ventilated; alternating floor AC (as earlier suggested) does not make sense;

Comment: The PDR document is well put together – almost too well - it looks ready for design development (which it shouldn’t be). We hope the next stage architect take broader look than merely implementing the PDR by sending it to a structural engineer; The PDR design is trying to replicate I.M. Pei of a different generation – if IM Pei were to design this, he might address it in a more contemporary approach; Project is austere looking, not welcoming; imposing; concerned about what architect would get this PDR and actually question it or take a broader view.

Question: Does the PDR design team continue on through the Design Phase?
A: Not necessarily and not usually. Typically a new design team is assigned the design phase and yet another will follow it through Construction. Funding for design phase was released on July 1st, clock is ticking on funding.

Comment: Intent of this project is to move general classrooms here, from scattered classrooms throughout campus; those in turn can be changed into offices, allowing us to remove temporary buildings.
Question: Who is going to follow guidelines? How do we ensure they do?
Comment: The trick is to balance between providing strict guidelines and flexibility to allow imagination and excellence in design.

Comment: We should look at what we have first (in the way of our heritage), what are we losing as well as what we’re gaining. Henke Hall has history, interpretive elements; agricultural history of school. We can agree that it’s not significant, but as a process we need to make sure we check on what we’re sacrificing.

Comment: Do we understand that of 30 trees on site, we’re keeping only 10?
Comment: There’s a concern that we’re also losing trees in other projects, and historical buildings; we need to be mindful of that at the PDR stage.
Comment: Yes - completion of McCarthy Hall should be a priority.
Comment: Regarding the nearby I.M. Pei buildings we should not replicate but acknowledge, pay homage, but not imitate. Compatibility, recesses in facades.

Q: What’s shown as planned for the area between Kennedy Theatre and Henke Hall?
A: For sustainability we’re planning on water catchment; “grass pave” with parking area overflow;
Comment: We should discourage that from happening. We don’t want to use McCarthy Mall area for overflow parking.

Subsequent Comment / Question: Assuming 300 + people per floor, how do you move that many people in/out of the building at every hourly break between classes? Are the
elevators equipped to handle that volume? What about creating pleasant stairways (see Kuykendall)?

**DAP Recommendations for New Classroom Building:**

1. Revise the way the building meets the ground; integrate with its surrounding spaces and pedestrian circulation on campus.
2. PDR needs to address phasing or at least how funding would impact the project if it were to come in lumps of say $30M, $60M, and $90 M. UH has never obtained funding a $90M building at one time.
3. Address the use of A/C and heavy demand on energy use. Consider maximizing natural ventilation where possible.
4. Consolidate social spaces into areas that integrate indoors/outdoors in lieu of using wide hallways. Indoor spaces don’t seem appropriate social spaces in a tropical climate.
5. Encourage the transition between indoor/outdoor spaces, especially at ground level.
6. Project should extend and complete McCarthy Mall, not block it. McCarthy Mall should be its full width in front of New Classroom Building. Remove the 12-ft high wall facing McCarthy Mall – deleting the media theater if necessary.
7. PDR diagrams should remain conceptual – fear in having them too developed – could easily be seen by the next design team as “givens” cast in concrete to be followed, rather than allowing further design exploration.
8. Vertical circulation needs to be better addressed – how do you get 2,400 students in/out of classes within designated break time?
9. Develop a more comprehensive vision for this building and its surrounding landscape, beyond the number and sizes of classrooms, use of technology, the desire to increase student-student and student-faculty interaction, and the concept of a building that is shut down outside class hours.

**Agenda Item:**

**Law School Addition**

Present (in addition to DAP members)
Dean Avi Soifer, William S. Richardson School of Law; Denise Antolini, Professor Env. Law; Francis Oda, AIA (Group 70 Int’l) Charles Kaneshiro, AIA (Group 70 Int’l), Phil Russell, GMR LLC.

**Presentation:**

Intro: Law School dedicated to helping people of Hawaii; pro-bono work requirement; tradition of excellence; small school; swear an oath to serving others above self; students are diverse; 100 coming in; more than 10 applicants for every seat; maxed out for space; scheduling conflicts; need flexible space; use is different today than when originally
designed; a potential second floor on most of the library is part of the original construction; goal is to be a model of sustainability for the island.

**Law School Planning Process/ Principles:**
- Charettes focused on major themes: active place; image of a coral reef; environmentally responsible model for sustainability; aiming for LEED Platinum but Gold is achievable; center -of a web that connects law school to community;
- Law school becomes gateway between athletic facilities/parking and the rest of the campus; idea of mauka-makai mall, Legacy Path, etc. long part of LRDP;
- Redevelop west area as new entry; existing entry from parking not attractive or functional for people from off campus participating in clinics, may need privacy;
- Library building: Removeportion that cannot take 2nd story and make whole building 2 stories; new elements will be in contrast to original buildings; creating corridor along central axis of buildings; gathering area between them.
- Tree removal prioritized
- Comment: Question as to whether this was done with input from University; there was definitely no review or approval by the Landscape Advisory Committee

**Design description (by design team):**
- Marginal trees removed, but higher priority trees kept; integrating building with the trees;
- Propose bringing down the 140-ft gap between buildings to 60’ opening; creating café area; become a hub; Library more for meeting and collaborative learning since materials are now available digitally; space for visiting dignitaries, Supreme Court justices; rare books area & library function; access to natural light; second floor court, classrooms, landscaped gathering places, skylights. Where will students read--need quiet--at home?
- Gathering area interior: natural light, green wall, café off to side, activities, student-centered experience, draw students in to 'live there';
- Seminar/study areas; natural light; outdoor/covered area; indoor area with glass and views, seating areas.
- Model of sustainability; Rocky Mountain sustainability charrettes; rainwater harvesting and catchment, green roof, water use reduction, use of renewable energy.
- Comment: Rainwater collection centralized, share pump, as part of larger system? This long a concern at UH, part of future integrated master plan.
- Cumulative effort vs potential cost effective energy savings – spend money up front to get those savings. Law School to garner support from admin and public for this project; continues to work to get funding;
- Exploring possible design competition using Patented design competition diagram developed by firm in Portland OR.
- Construction costs have come down; separate costs between E and W wings; will do project in phases due to scarcity of funds. Library renovation, including the café, in first phase.

**Q/A:**
Q: Where is budget item for improvements in between E and W wings? Does this fall in phase 1 or phase 2?
A: It’s included in budget for the landscaping though not specifically broken down; 2% of total of direct costs of construction. Bridge is with the building. Details not yet worked out at this phase.

Comment: Too often our projects show improvements only to the building line; we need to link spaces.

Comment: Very good approach toward design: this could end up being more of a campus center than the Campus Center project; public outreach could include presentations of architects’ solutions in the Design Competition. We like the idea of a Design Competition.

Response: UH Foundation funds to be used as stipend for design competition.

Comment: Nicely done, would like to know more about design competition; be sure Hawaiian Sense of Place intent is described in case it gets bid out to a Mainland architecture firm;

Comment/ Q: Point well; taken if architect does not know much about Hawaii environment it’s important that we provide a good document for them to go on; Going back to site plan view… at the corner toward parking lot – did you think about putting a third element over parking lot and maybe over road; more horizontal than vertical;
Response: We did look at that; Law School is already strung out…. (Laughs). To have a sense of gathering place, we want to consolidate it, not spread it out further; structure over parking adds significant cost; better to clean up parking area, landscape the entry area; create a heavy emphasis in the center; keep clinic activities at periphery/separate. Controversy when Law School went in: blocking Makai view; adding a building at the corner might raise similar objections.

Comment/ Q: You’ve clearly and generously gone beyond the scope of the PDR as a programming document; unless it goes out as a parameter for the competition, it might not be included – how do we include this as a basis for the competition while still giving architects latitude in revisiting some of these ideas?

Comment: Some discretionary review has to happen, has to be built into the process.
Q: How are these thin things programmatically decided on?
Response: We spent a lot of time on space use but where it goes is still up in the air
Sanford: terrific; question – Ecology of a place… the slot, alley between the cliff the law school sits on and the parking structure – concern of stability; and aesthetics; has it been discussed?
Comment: Yes; there is a 3-phase project to harden that cliff area; stabilizing and protecting the rock face from erosion. The rock face is the exposed sides of a mass of 40 ft basalt columns, is where quarry operations stopped, an unnatural edge to a natural feature. Want erosion control ground covers with network of fine roots to help stabilize
the soil layer on top, but don’t want large roots penetrating to the rock and splitting the basalt columns off the mass of rock below.

Comment: It's an opportunity to do something with that area as well as a challenge
Comment: Let’s look at the concept of a green wall; take that concept outside on that cliff with the same attitude; what can you do to that wall as a reference point for what is going on inside the building?
Comment: Not a simple solution; requires funds and coordination but is a good idea.

Q: What about rainwater harvesting – is it centralized or disbursed? Small areas maybe not efficient with lots of small pumps. UHM needs a global approach to storm water management.
Response: We’re looking at that. One of the plans is to create an overall Master Plan that includes infrastructure, layered on other aspects of the LRDP.
Comment: This also points to a potential competition: green roof vs PVs, though Portland's new green roof handbook includes joint use of roof space;
Comment: Broader policies are needed for the Campus as a whole; UHM needs design guidelines.
Response: We’re working on them.
Q: When do they order the survey/topo?
Response: At the next (Design) phase.
Comment: The added footprint and height of the new East Wing (library) building adversely affects the canopy of trees along Dole Street.
Response: The intention is to not remove any of the trees along Dole.

Comment: This project is much more reflective of the direction in which the University is now going; [the fact that the PDR document is so well put together] says a lot about the user and the goals they articulated; there is a lot of inspiration here as well as information, which is exactly what we need.

DAP Recommendations for Law School Expansion:
- Design team has done a great job integrating the campus values of providing a sustainable design with meeting/gathering places.
- PDR appears to have gone way beyond its merely programming scope of work – to the Design team’s credit, they have done a great deal of work going into what appears to be Schematic Design.
- That said, during the Design Phase, the new architect can and should re-visit some of the assumptions; particular attention should be paid to landscaping and integrating the existing mature trees into the project. **Given the heavy foot traffic and social area demand on the space between the buildings, question reducing it from 140 ft to 60 ft.**
- A Design Competition as proposed could bring a lot of excitement not just to the Law School but to UH as a whole; public reviews would be great.
Appendix A

Notes on the DAP Meeting’s General Discussion
(for the Record)

C = comment;  Q = question;  A = Answer

New Classroom Building:
C: This is off track; further comment on paying homage [to I.M. Pei]: the building is isolated in a boxlike way, does not really reflect I.M. Pei; need to re-visit the social space, atrium, so it’s not just a self ventilating chase.
C: The [PDR] plan appears as though they took a rough original envelope from facilities and just squeezed in the program in the total square footage.
C: That’s not architecture; for $80M!
C: It’s terrible at half the price. Impact at ground level unacceptable.
C: [Providing a social ] space is not necessarily a good space; this is not architecture.
C: The law school project had better priorities; philosophy is there; classroom building does not do that.
C: Is it better to pull back and just have broad ideas at PDR stage?
C: The problem with the Classroom buildings is its goals are so shallow

C: Setting aside any philosophical goals; they are not reaching even the goals they do have; for example the plaza could be more integrated; how does it connect to the pathways to and from the building?
C: Pathways and connections are not being dealt with and should be.
C: The PDR is missing a sense of topography; Henke site has 10’ drop, sweep of space not shown in their description.
C: One area is 10’ above the surrounding grade - how do you interact?
C: They had a box and they filled it, no room for structure, for architecture.
C: Recommend reduction in program?
C: Should we pull back the scope of the PDR? Is the design too far advanced and yet not properly resolved? How do you express and explore problems and potential in the program without at least a conceptual design?

C: Is the problem a programmatic issue? The tall building reflects an urban campus. To preserve open space we need to go vertical. Doing so allows us to get rid of portables.
C: Yes, but it needs to be more appropriate. Bring podium down.
Response: We looked at putting the media theater under the building but costs went up dramatically due to the large spans. The media theater was added later as part of the program.
C: Sounds like mission creep.
C: We need to get back to the original plan; get rid of offices and media room;
C: Why design building no with no funding to build it? Isn’t that your biggest problem?
C: You should phase it.
C: We should ask ourselves what can we achieve and what should we achieve.
C: We don’t want to spend millions on plans we can’t use.
C: Is my outrage misplaced? Legislature should fund the full percentage of a few buildings, not a small percentage of a lot of buildings. Need to educate legislature.
C: Classroom building is highest priority for campus.
C: I don’t see effectively phasing a 7 story building.
C: I deal with walkways and putting all classrooms in one place can be a nightmare. It needs to be integrated into the campus.
C: We should have the PDR reflect a $30M option, a $60M option, a $90M option
C: I think it’s Okay to go vertical; we are just reacting to a poor design option; it looks too real and it looks too far along, giving the impression the design is done when it’s not.
C: Yes – it reflects some bad concepts, especially on the ground floor.
C: I’d like to see that addressed; it can be done in one tall building, but with price alternatives.
C: For one thing, put all social areas on first (ground) floor.
C: that diagram is an antithesis of what we want; this is what we don’t want.
C: Strong recommendation to PDR: extend this phase, increase porosity, more interactions on ground floor, look into mechanical design to make it more efficient, provide more flexibility.
C: There’s a danger with the tower in the park concept on urban sites where have temporary buildings: when you take away the temp building, someone looks at the area as available to reuse and we have the worst of both worlds, towers but not much park, loss of the intended open space.
C: Vertical construction can have integration at ground level. Example: Hilton’s Grand Waikikian.
C: Another example: Portland does not allow more than 50ft or 100ft of blank wall at the ground level; it kills the pedestrian experience.
C: McCarthy Mall visually ends in the East West Center banyan grove on the knoll and Thai pavilion, but McCarthy Mall needs to be completed up to East West Road, alongside the New Classroom building. While recognizing its location on East West Road, together with the East West Center open space and buildings on the other side of the road, the building should create a proper terminus for the architectural envelope of the Mall.
C: Synergy with IM Pei buildings without replicating.
C: Would like to see the building pay homage to the campus and not to I.M. Pei.
C: Keep in mind complementary uses of classrooms and Hamilton Library, the Hamilton grove area; why is there so little sense of connection to Hamilton in this project?
C: It doesn’t work; they picked the wrong stuff [priorities] to follow.
C: Trying too much to follow the little rules
C: McCarthy Mall must be extended, with an appropriate terminus, must be completed; design must be arrived at by campus concensus. Yes, all agree.
C: What I’m hearing is that a major priority is ground floor interaction and integration with the surrounding spaces.
C: Social spaces should be squeezed out of classroom floors, brought into more interior/ exterior relationship on ground floor integrated into surrounding areas. We are not talking about different landowners here – there’s no need to adhere to lot lines or property lines.
C: Yes – an articulation of setbacks rather than just building straight walls to the perceived setback lines. Use setback averaging; like the art building that is built around the baobab tree.
C: A goal in the LRPD is to not diminish tree canopy on campus. That should be one of the project goals as well.
C: I encourage the Law School to put its project out to competition!
C: Law School looked at the right issues, the diagram is seductive, but not sure about the polyp architectural expression.
C: We want PDRs to reflect a realistic level of funding coming in. for the New Classroom Building 1/3rds of the $90 Million total; they could also have 3 alternative funding options ($30,$60,$90M);
C: We’re looking for site planning that integrates campus space planning, open space and massing, includes indoor-outdoor-pedestrian relationships, never lose sight of the 3-dimensions, topography–show site sections that include adjacent buildings; realistic budgets; civil/mechanical engineering requirements; fundamentally that’s what we’re looking for in the PDR.
C: N and S side look the same but they said they’d do all this environmental stuff
C: Program what the limit is – of tonnage of HVAC. Say 400-500 sf/ ton vs. 250 sf/ ton we’re using now, operating costs unsustainable.
C: The whole thing is so old school. By the book. 1960’s standards. Like they simply brought out the Architectural Graphic Standards manual and designed it.
C: In the future, let’s cut presentation time down; bring in egg timer – 10 minutes max!
C: Need to talk among ourselves regarding the common issues; Urban design concept of the campus.
Next project?