



XII. Appendix: Meeting Minutes

LORD · AECK · SARGENT

ARCHITECTURE

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER
Christopher Newport University New Science Building	26088-12

DATE OF MEETING	TIME / WEATHER
September 6, 2007	10:00

MEETING LOCATION	PURPOSE
Student Center, Harrison Room	Science Building Re-Programming

PARTICIPANTS	PRESENT
Bill Brauer- CNU	Yes
Mark Padilla- CNU	
Hunter Bristow- CNU	
Gary Whiting- CNU	
Kathleen Brunke- CNU	
Nicole Guajardo- CNU	
Andrew Velkey- CNU	
Tim Marshall- CNU	
Sherman Lee- CNU	
Jason Hart- CNU	
Jim Finch- GHA	
John Starr- LAS	
Sejal Patel- LAS	
Miriam Swift- LAS	

DISTRIBUTION	VIA
PARTICIPANTS	
Randy Holmes, GHA	
Lori Garrett- GHA	
	Copy

FILE: k:\d\prj\26088-01\cor\mna\070906_mna.doc

ITEMS BELOW THAT ARE NEW OR UPDATED ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN UNSHADED BAR IN THE LEFT HAND MARGIN. ITEMS BELOW THAT HAVE APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS BUT ARE NOT YET APPROVED OR CLOSED ARE IDENTIFIED WITH A SHADED BAR IN THE LEFT HAND MARGIN.

ISSUE NO.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
1	9/6/07	Bill Brauer stated that the University expects to be able to fund between \$75-80 million for the New Science Building and the renovation of the Existing Science Building. Gaining more funds than this would be politically difficult. Within the current budget, the funds allocated to renovate Gosnold Hall can now be used for the New Science Building and Existing Science Building renovation. Renovations to Gosnold are not part of the new program. President Tribble would like to “dress up” the courtyard entry side of the Existing Science Building as part of this new program.	

ISSUE NO.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
2		Bill Brauer stated that CNU needs the total project cost budget by October 1, so that the funding for this building can be part of the Governor's budget. The final program document can follow before the end of October. LAS/GHA to revise their schedule to meet this deadline.	LAS/GHA
3		Bill Brauer stated that while a Phase II science building is not out of the question, it is not yet part of the current planning for campus building. The three projects that currently take priority are the New Science Building, the Library Addition, and the New College Building, with the Science Building taking top priority.	
4		Mark Padilla clarified that the future building that would replace Wingfield Hall is expected to house the College of Decision Sciences, which would encompass Accounting, Economics, Leadership, Math, Business Engineering, and Computer Science. Psychology cannot be located in this building, as the program for Decision Sciences already exceeds the square footage planned for the new building. The New Science Building and Existing Science building will therefore need to house all of the Biology, Chemistry and Psychology programs.	
5		Mark Padilla suggested that Radcliffe Hall might become a classroom building when the New Science Building and McMurrin come online, relieving some of the pressure on the Science Complex to provide classroom space.	
6		John Starr and Sejal Patel reviewed the previous programming process and the current schematic design. It was stated that significant program cuts/sharing will have to take place to fit the Biology, Chemistry, and Psychology programs into the currently designed 150,000 gsf.	
7		Kathleen Brunke stated that the Biochemistry labs (termed Cell/Mole in the current program) in the Biology program could take place in the Intro Chemistry lab. Gary Whiting spoke with Lisa Webb later, however, and it was determined that these labs should remain separate. Biology will have one Cell/Mole lab instead of two.	
8		Drew Velkey stated that there may be a possibility of sharing more than just cagewash facilities between Biology and Psychology programs. He would like to work with Gary Whiting and Lisa Webb to determine possibilities for sharing, particularly regarding animal spaces.	CNU
9		Drew Velkey said that since the laundry and shop functions can (and currently do) occur off-campus, the Psychology department could lose those spaces from the program.	

ISSUE No.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
10		Mark Padilla suggested that the public spaces currently in the program could be a place to gain square footage, e.g. the auditorium. The group felt that the auditorium would be heavily used by the three departments, and should remain in the building. However, John Starr suggested that certain public spaces such as the reading room could be shared between departments to save space. Kathleen Brunke and Drew Velkey suggested that Biology's Museum Room could be replaced by display cases in the Lobby.	
11		Drew Velkey stated that the Comparative Biopsychology Lab could be combined with the Learning and Motivation Lab. He also suggested that prep and/or teaching labs could also be used for research. The prep labs should be expanded if they are also to be used for research.	
12		One possibility for expansion of the current footprint (if necessary) could be a southward expansion of the existing science building, with a corresponding extension of the New Science Building's western leg. LAS/GHA to investigate.	CNU
13		Hunter Bristow suggested reducing the size of the lobby/atrium by 5-10% to economize on space and cost.	
14		Nicole Guajardo agreed to reduce Psychology Faculty Data Rooms from 10 to 8.	
15		The group agreed that more study should take place regarding the need for classrooms in the Science Complex. Gary Whiting pointed out that many classrooms would be added when McMurrin is completed that may be used for science classes. Radcliffe may also become a classroom building. Nicole Guajardo and Gary Whiting to coordinate with CNU regarding the scheduling commitments of classrooms campus-wide to more closely identify the needs for the Science Complex. Chemistry requires that the two classrooms adjacent to their labs remain to meet ACS accreditation requirements.	CNU
16		Other revisions were discussed and incorporated into the space list. See program dated Sept. 7, 2007 distributed separately.	

REMARKS

ATTACHMENTS

PREPARED BY

DATE PREPARED

Lord, Aeck & Sargent, Inc.

THESE NOTES SUMMARIZE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS MEETING. PROJECT ACTIONS WILL BE BASED ON THESE NOTES.

PLEASE CONTACT THE WRITER IMMEDIATELY IF YOU DO NOT CONCUR.

LORD · AECK · SARGENT

ARCHITECTURE

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER
Christopher Newport University New Science Building	26088-12

DATE OF MEETING	TIME / WEATHER
September 20, 2007	11:00

MEETING LOCATION	PURPOSE
Student Center, Madison Room	Science Building Re-Programming

PARTICIPANTS	PRESENT
Bill Brauer- CNU	Yes
Mark Padilla- CNU	
Hunter Bristow- CNU	
Gary Whiting- CNU	
Nicole Guajardo- CNU	
Kelly Cartwright- CNU	
Andrew Velkey- CNU	
Tim Marshall- CNU	
Sherman Lee- CNU	
Jason Hart- CNU	
Lisa Webb- CNU	
Jim Finch- GHA	
John Starr- LAS	
Sejal Patel- LAS	
Miriam Swift- LAS	

DISTRIBUTION	VIA
PARTICIPANTS	
Randy Holmes, GHA	
Lori Garrett- GHA	
	Copy

FILE: k:\d\prj\26088-01\cor\mna\070920_mna.doc

ITEMS BELOW THAT ARE NEW OR UPDATED ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN UNSHADED BAR IN THE LEFT HAND MARGIN. ITEMS BELOW THAT HAVE APPEARED ON PREVIOUS REPORTS BUT ARE NOT YET APPROVED OR CLOSED ARE IDENTIFIED WITH A SHADED BAR IN THE LEFT HAND MARGIN.

ISSUE NO.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
1	9/20/07	LAS presented two schemes, A and B, and the corresponding program spreadsheets. Scheme A retains the same building footprint and reduces the program to fit in 150,000 gsf. Scheme B proposes a 5,600 gsf addition which would better accommodate the program requirements. This addition would add approximately \$2.7M to the construction cost. This addition would be partially offset by the \$1.8M that is being available from the funds initially budgeted for the Gosnold Renovation.	

ISSUE NO.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
2		Bill Brauer asked if LAS is still proposing a complete, gut renovation of the Existing Science Building. LAS answered that yes, they are. The existing floorplan will not easily accommodate the animal housing and Psychology research labs best located in that building.	
3		LAS stated that 1 seminar room would be shared between Biology and Psychology in both schemes (for better efficiency). Drew Velkey pointed out that the Tissue Prep/Microscopy Suite will be a support space shared with Biology.	
4		Bill Brauer would like to see both schemes in a Total Project Budget format as soon as possible. Hunter Bristow and Bill Brauer would like for the design team to re-evaluate their escalation figures, which seem excessive in light of current escalation rates. John Starr stated that LAS would get a first draft Total Project Budget to CNU the following week.	LAS/GHA
5		Bill Brauer asked the design team how long the renovation would take for the Existing Science Building. Jim Finch indicated 1 year.	
6		Jim Finch to update the schedule to include the construction/renovation of the both the New and Existing Science Buildings. He stated that the schedule would most likely be divided into two phases: the New Building construction, followed by the Existing Building Renovation, with final completion at the end of 2010. Mark Padilla and Bill Brauer stated that this schedule would need to be coordinated with the demolition of Wingfield Hall, as this building is where most of the Psychology department is currently located. John Starr pointed out that this schedule would also be affected by when funding becomes available. Jim Finch to send Bill Brauer the schedule presented.	GHA
7		Bill Brauer stated that February/March is the end of the funding cycle. The money for the science project may be available around July 8, 2008, if this project is not tied to a general bond.	
8		John Starr stated that the design team will evaluate how much of the \$1M programming and schematic design budget is left to see how long the design can continue before additional funding becomes available.	LAS/GHA
9		Bill Brauer would like for the University and design team to have a comfort level with the budget. The University does not want to be in the position of having to ask the State for more funding later.	
10		The faculty stated a preference for Scheme B. Nicole Guajardo was pleased with the number of classrooms shown. Bill Brauer thinks that this scheme is achievable within the \$80M.	

ISSUE No.	DATE	ISSUE	ACTION BY DATE DUE STATUS
11		Mark Padilla asked that it be clearly stated in the programming records that the Biology department willingly gave up their classrooms in the New Science Building. This decision was reviewed with Gary Whiting later in the meeting, who confirmed that since these spaces were generic classrooms, their function could be served in another building.	
12		Bill Brauer asked Nicole Guajardo if the Psychology program allows for faculty growth. She confirmed that it does.	
13		Drew Velkey would like to see "science on display" in this building.	
14		Bill Brauer and Hunter Bristow suggested that outdoor classrooms in the Science Quad would be desirable. LAS/GHA to keep this in mind as the design moves forward.	LAS/GHA
15		Drawings and program spreadsheets were closely reviewed with Gary Whiting, Nicole Guajardo, and Psychology faculty. It was the general consensus that with minor adjustments, Scheme B would adequately serve all three departments. LAS to revise drawings in light of user comments and provided Room Data Sheets showing room requirements in detail.	LAS
16		Nicole Guajardo would like to have sound attenuation surrounding all research labs on the second floor of the Existing Building, since most are immediately adjacent to classrooms. LAS to note this requirement in the Room Data Sheets for these spaces.	LAS
17		Hunter Bristow stated that BCOM may require every lab, including research labs, to be ADA accessible.	
18		Gary Whiting would like to see a list of buildings the users could visit to gain ideas as the design process progresses. LAS to develop list and send to Gary Whiting, Kathleen Brunke, and Nicole Guajardo for feedback.	LAS
19		LAS met with Lisa Webb, Gary Whiting, and Drew Velkey regarding animal housing requirements. LAS to revise drawings and circulate to Lisa, Gary, and Drew for review.	LAS

REMARKS

ATTACHMENTS

PREPARED BY

DATE PREPARED

September 27, 2007

Lord, Aeck & Sargent, Inc.

THESE NOTES SUMMARIZE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS MEETING. PROJECT ACTIONS WILL BE BASED ON THESE NOTES.

PLEASE CONTACT THE WRITER IMMEDIATELY IF YOU DO NOT CONCUR.