LRDP – Eric Crispin presented an overview of the Long Range Development Plan for the group’s background and information.

**Summary:**

*UH Manoa Campus: 6 million square feet of space in 300 buildings;
* 290 academic programs/degrees offered; 20,000 students, of which 55% female;
* 2007 LRDP based on 1987/1994 plan; meant to be interim master plan;
* Goals include: making campus more pedestrian friendly; livable urban campus; outdoor spaces for living and learning;
* Projected buildings in the next 5 and 10 years; classroom building is put on hold; expansion of the parking structure and a new structure behind Kennedy Theatre; C-MORE building well underway; Law School expansion; faculty housing by Magoon research area;
* Energy plan for campus – we are our own district utility/grid, receive discounted rate from HECO, 20 cents/kwh right now (has been at 27 cents), last year 18 million $ (D. Hafner);
* Majority of buildings were built in 1960’s and 70s buildings; decades of deferred maintenance issues;
* Energy use is 121 million kWh/yr down to 95 Million kWh/yr over the past 4 or 5 years; goal 30% reduction 2012, 50% by 2015, 25% renewable by 2020 and energy and water self sufficient by 2050;
* List of current and future initiatives for energy reduction; green roofs; C-MORE will be first new building with green roof;
* Daylight harvesting; PV; Shidler has modest 4.5kw system; REIS project 10.1 kw planned with demo wind turbines;
* Initiatives from Campus Planning – Manoa Sustainability Corps meeting monthly; Malama Honua website; building design and performance sustainability guidelines in rough draft form right now and being reviewed by Facilities – intend to hire consultants to verify; design advisory panel; campus facilities planning board – a more holistic perspective; campus heritage report; new idea “enterprise zones” – how does a new building fit in with adjacent buildings, concentrate on an area, look at interstitial spaces, etc and also areas between enterprise zones; consistent signage;
Campus Heritage Report – Spencer Leineweber.

Summary:

$100 K grant funded by Getty Foundation; 12 grad assistants, 3 semesters;
* F2007-F2008; Arch and botany; SOW – archival documentation, inventory campus elements, synthesize data; address conflicts with LRDP.
* Advisory committee – facilities, planning, historic preservation, botany, TPSS; when they started they did not have an accurate map, looked at aerial and made their own map; (Eric – project to update map); field work – looked at buildings before 1967; evaluation NHPA 1966, HRS6E;
* Historic Context – early Hawaii, legends, WWII, etc; looked are aerial photos; divided map into divisions; catalogued info in divisions; old drawings and narrative descriptions; looked at how buildings were used over time; did not look at condition of building; looked at integrity of history of building; historic landscapes – significance, trees, inventoried every plant on the campus (trees and bushes), GPS points; memorial tree were planted with ceremony or were selected as an existing tree and used to honor someone – usually has a plaque.
* Exceptional trees are determined by City & County of Honolulu, not by the campus.
* Conflicts with LRDP were identified – some revisions made since; examples: LRDP called for Varney Circle proposed to be moved; Julie – do we have accurate topo? Dave H – will have a new surface map;
* The Report follows National Historic Trust Preservation guidelines the Campus Heritage Report just gives information without specific recommendations; report is on the campus planning website www.manoa.hawaii.edu/planning ;

Comments/ Questions:
*Policies in conflict should be another conversation – we need to address the approach to resolve conflict. Multiple goals are not mutually exclusive but can’t address it after the fact, it must be considered early on in the design.
* Historic preservation is a generic battle we have all the time, preservation seen as an impediment to development; specific education that needs to happen internally and how its not about saving everything that is old but what’s important; getting it on the agenda is a challenge. Develop scope of work for the master plan – what are some of the major components that should become part of that scope of work.
* We need a point of reference for making our decisions. Ecological and environmental considerations (i.e. flooding) should be taken into account.
* Drainage needs to be holistic and not just from an engineering standpoint.
* Need to consider what happens outside the boundary of the campus also.

11:10 am
Mitsunaga & Associates, Inc. (3) – Clarence T.C. Ching Athletic Complex update
Teri from UHM Athletics
Kirk Yuen, Project Manager – UHM Facilities

Program overview:
* 2 volleyball courts with bleachers and lighting have been added, options separate for budgetary concerns.
* Made the building more consolidated to fit into the site better with more space at front.
* Added external central plant (40 ton unit)
* Relocated shot put across field
* Looking at dropping curbs on stadium side, using pavers, plaza area; just finished up drawings and it is represented in the drawings.
* Handicap drop off near stadium
* Added changing area for beach volley ball
* Mechanical rooms added on either side of structure that was not shown previously
* Brown areas with not be finished, due to budget
* Massing smaller than initial building proposed
* 2 concession areas; met with food concession people; packaged foods, not cooked there
* Ticketing moved into structure; stairs were rotated and relocated
* More detail on building sides: greater setback from road
* Curtain wall with glass is changed to open grill so not air conditioned
* Question: Does the corridor face the prevailing wind and rain?
  Response – we added overhangs
* Comment: have adjacent materials be waterproof
* Women’s toilets – added more fixtures
* Concourse level – mechanical rooms; concession areas on both ends, some unfinished space could be future fitness center and computer room;
* Question on possibility of cross ventilation instead of 40 tons AC
  3* rd floor Press box naturally ventilated; 2 toilets on this level; mechanical room
* Question: for acoustics does press box need to be conditioned? Response – usually windows are open.
* Replicated arch forms (Founders Gate emulation), grillwork instead of windows,
* Cut down massing for future roof; roof might be added later; don’t have rendering yet.
* Question: Will the design of the roof hold this up?
  Comment: we don’t want to approve it piecemeal.
* Will ramp down vomitories to level of field
* Comment: open up rooms to naturally ventilate under bleachers
* Comment: people sitting facing South, ventilation could help; if we reduce AC enough can the extra structure be eliminated?
  LEED silver will be addressed later
* Comment: Slide does not show landscaping
  Question: Why arches?
  Response: Founders gate was used as a reference.
  Question: What other buildings have arched windows?
  Response: We took other architects idea and used it.
  * Discussion on color choices: question whether those colors are appropriate.
  * Discussion on LEED - 47 yes credits plus a lot of maybes and we need 50 for silver.
  * Question: Did you get a price on advanced commissioning?
  * Response: Kirk (Yuen) is working on that.
*Question: Heat island roof effect – light color bleachers, will that count a roof?
Alt transportation points, parking close; bike stalls? Yes. Where? No determined. There is existing bike parking. Will have to check if that is enough.
*Comment: We would like an improvement to what we have, number and quality, is important.
*Question: EV recharging? Considering that. Listed as a maybe.
*Question: first floor, flow of athletes vs public; Most likely entering from field since won’t have full facilities in this structure.
*Response: Classes priority, intramural, football practice; track&field events; Ching field rain tolerant;
*Question: Do we have the demand for 2500 seats? Yes, used for HS football.
*Response: Not concerned about viewing from outside fence; no plan for wind screen.
* shortage of landscaping
Overall building design: Steve M. – contextual; there are cues to take from surrounding buildings; this is more Kapolei than surrounding buildings;
*This is sort of shopping mall design
* Canopy (roof) issue is important; we need to see the whole design before we approve it piecemeal.
* First floor –at the entry, why do we funnel 2,500 people toward the bathroom and janitor doors? Is that really what we want them to see as they first walk in? Why not a trophy case (or something more memorable)?
* Mechanical rooms seem large; naturally ventilating would be very good, more indoor-outdoor connection, more porosity (transparency/ openings in the building).
* Need a sense of transition when you enter

**Overall massing – Comments:**
* Current design is an improvement over before; however, we’re still very concerned about the use of materials (EIFS, split face block), lack of precedent on campus, feels impermanent; looking for something more durable; prefer real stucco; the details are contrived, just a grill in front of nothing real; wasted use of inefficient space, doesn’t have a good feeling.
* Need to see circulation, setting, how it relates to the plaza for example.
* Some changes are not reflected in presentation
*Why not take some space from across the street; create an outdoor seating area; place for kids to wait for parents, etc.
* Recommend making a site visit
* What is the role of DAP? To respond to community reaction to the existing campus: disparate designs (being kind here), in isolation of adjacent designs; past buildings have aimed for iconic architecture and did not drive for good urban design. Good urban design transcends to architectural response; how does this design sit in context with everything around it. North facade, how do you establish a vernacular to tie in to. The entry area feels like a hard surface, not pedestrian friendly to draw people into the building. Need to go beyond the surface, to create an inviting, attractive structure.
* Yes it’s improved (from the first presentation); but we don’t think it fits with other buildings in quarry but don’t know what to say; there’s not a strong context to indicate what way to go;
* The fact that our directions/ comments to the architect were received “clear as mud” is worrying; does process allow the architect to send us interim sketches? Is it easier to do in revit? We prefer he send them sooner than next presentation. Do by email?
* Note - we need the 2 sand volleyball courts to compete in these programs.

**DAP comments / discussion after presentation:**
* Building might need to hang over (the sidewalk) a bit (due to the tight site).
* Don’t think we should be designing on behalf of Mitsunaga
* Is this Kapolei / Kama’aina style appropriate for quarry? For UHM?
* The issue is not so much what style was used but how it was carried out; someone earlier recommended a design consultant;
* Who picks the design consultant?
* We should suggest 2 or 3 acceptable design consultants and let them pick; they need help with the design.
* Adding a design consultant will require renegotiation of scope of work
* We are concerned with budget and schedule too; but building will be here for generations.
* A design consultant could make a difference by working on the project for just a few days.
* Our charge (as DAP) is to motivate and drive excellence in design.
* The project as designed is not excellent.
* It’s not a matter of the design not being excellent, it’s a matter of being really bad.
* I think the architect said he was confused; he should get a design consultant
* From the discussions, the architect is planning on re-doing it himself; we need to suggest a solution

**Motion and (unanimous) second:**
* This project does not meet our standards of design excellence and we suggest they obtain a consultant help them achieve that standard of excellence.

**Discussion:**
* We suggest they select one from the following design consultants to supplement the architect’s project:
  * WCIT
  * Group 70
  * Peter Vincent (not present today and may have to recuse himself)
  * Ferraro Choi
* They should show the canopy (proposed roof over the bleachers); If it’s not in budget, it should be designed for a later phase but they should show how it might look later; how can we design it without the canopy; should show both; structural components have to be included in it; so influential an element in the design and development of the building, it could drive the concept, including having PV panels etc

**Vote:**
* DAP votes to recommend Mitsunaga Associates hire a design expert (or set of experts) as a design consultant to, as the current design proposed does not meet necessary objectives nor the standard of excellence. Vote is unanimous in support.