UH Manoa Design Advisory Panel  
May 28, 2010

Attending:  
DAP members:  
Eric Crispin  Assist. Vice Chancellor for Planning  
Kiersten Faulkner  
Steve Meder - excused  
Sanford Murata  
Peter Vincent  
Juli Walters  
Clark Llewellyn  

UHM Admin, Faculty and Staff:  
David Hafner, Assist. Vice Chancellor for Campus Services  
Eileen Ellis, UH Sea Grant  
Mark Gilbert, Space Planning, Chancellor's office  
Kirk Yuen, Facilities  

Presentation  

Proposed: 2400 seats replacing existing 2500 seat bleachers. 2 volleyball courts proposed, with bleachers.  
Driven by Title 9 for women - Track & Field, volleyball, etc.  
Handicap ramp to second floor. Met with planning dept and was approved  
New lockers, showers, toilets to meet user needs  
Administrator notes the urgency to get going to use the funding.  
3 more submittals to go  
Elevator and big ramp.  

Question: will it be standardized with campus?  
Response: Yes.  

2nd floor can be unfinished to be used later, for budget constraints  
Ground floor – concession and main entrance area.  
Question: should concessions could be closer to entrances? Need ease of getting to bathrooms and concessions from seating area.  
3rd floor – press box, restroom, seating, X boxes are for TV cameras,  
Will be able to be covered at later date.  
Locker rooms and bathrooms are exhausted, not AC; offices have AC  
Leed Silver required for the project  

Question: Is there space for long jump?  
Response: It’s 8’ from the track.
Landing pit might be in way of beach volley ball court. And shot put might have to be relocated.

Question: Lighting?
Response: 4 poles; not really shown in slide show.
Dance studio building; was located where parking is now, moved 1992; it’s a portable; Group 70 did relocation.
Questions: expected utility bills? Adequate space for janitor?
Any provision for PV?
Response: we’ll have sustainable charrette; not making Silver yet.
Question: is there a design theme to create cohesive look for the lower campus?
Inspiration from any other buildings on campus? Current proposal does not show much connection of low element and element above it.

Comment: Height seems commanded by elevator.

Comments: the lower element seems modest for an entry; can the lower portion extend up, even if it doesn’t serve a function? What if you make a larger roof, starting higher and coming out over the road? Ticketing should be moved to 2 sides so lines don’t block turnstiles. How about also moving toilets?

Question: separate secure entrances for athletes? How do they enter and are the locker rooms secure? Issue needs to be addressed – separating public access from player access.

Comment: Arch element a bit too strong; looks like a bigger building truncated and little roof put on it. Natural light element good but top beam looks too heavy.

Question: Move the stairs around to sides? Break up large flat walls on sides and narrow hallways.

Comment: Consider how athletes will enter; maybe moving stairs around could help?

Comment: Roof design and PV consideration; flat roof, facing north as an option

Question: How much PV needed to get LEED point? Also, don’t want stick-on Hawaii art.

Comment: this is visible from H1; end façades are concern; detailing looks applied rather than inherent; landscaping important.

Question: are we going to see it again?
Response: Yes, that is the recommendation.
Discussion

Consider the PDR program development report; this project skipped that. Need to do EA after design started.

Question: who will own the building? Who is running the place? How does it fit into education mission of the school?

Response: Campus Facilities Planning Board meeting next week and will discuss the matter.

Question: How does our work dovetail into that board’s work?

Response: This is advisory board but advice taken to heart and transmitted to CFPB, comparable to city planning commission. Example given that CFPB canceled classroom building project based on DAP opinions.

Question: What happened to Campus Center projects?
Response: still progressing. This is a new process and it’s hard to make radical turns. Campus Center project was too far along to change much.

Comment: we should be meeting on these projects even sooner. We need them to present soon but need something prepared to show.

Comment: choosing the right consultants from beginning is important

Question: can we advise on consultant selection?

Comment: we need some new talent, we keep picking the same people.

Response: $5M and up should warrant that review; consultant selection process, DAP invited to the presentations; not for roofing projects, road projects, but projects with design issues.

Comment: Next project will be Gartley, you should come to that. Not building classroom building, so we’re assessing space we have. Gartley was going to be air-conditioned but now changed back to natural ventilation.

Comment: Make sure consultants are knowledgeable of historic buildings. This is an important topic that needs much discussion. Also, remember the Heritage Report.

Comment: I’m okay with longer meeting for LRPD and a review of today’s project in a month.
Comment: We should have a checklist of what we expect them to present to us; shocking they didn’t have site photos before today. They acted like they had a blank piece of paper and not an actual site to work with.