

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT #512
COUNTIES OF COOK, KANE, LAKE AND McHENRY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of Wednesday, August 16, 1995.

CALL TO ORDER

The Special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 512 was called to order by Chairman Moats on Wednesday, August 16, 1995 at 5:40 p.m. in the Board Room of the Administration Building, 1200 W. Algonquin Road, Palatine, Illinois.

ROLL CALL

Present: Members Barton, Born, Coste, Howard, Kolze, and Moats

Absent: Student Member Solarte

Also present: Paul Thompson, President; Ed Dolan, V.P. Academic Affairs; Bonnie Henry, V.P. Student Affairs; Vern Manke, V.P. Administrative Services; David McShane, V.P. Information Systems; Steve Catlin; Carl Dittburner; Bob Getz; Patty Roberts; Mary Jo Willis - Harper College. Guests: Burnidge, Cassell & Associates - Elgin; Legat Architects, Schaumburg; Holabird & Root, Chicago; Brian Heise; Margaret Van Duch - Pioneer Press.

Chairman Moats stated that the purpose of the meeting was to interview architectural firms for the new multipurpose facility.

Chairman Moats requested that Other Business be addressed first to consider the appointment of Brian Heise to the Board of Trustees.

Member Barton moved, Member Kolze seconded, that the agenda be revised to address Other Business before the interviews of the architects.

In a voice vote, the motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

Member Barton moved, Member Kolze seconded, that Brian Heise be appointed to the Board of Trustees to fill the vacancy due to Member Norwood's resignation.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Barton, Born, Howard, Kolze and Moats
Nays: None

Motion carried. Member Coste voted Here.

Member Heise joined Board members at the table.

INTERVIEWS OF ARCHITECTS

Burnidge, Cassell & Associates

Mr. Charles Burnidge introduced his team and explained some of the comparable work that they have been involved in. The team members from Burnidge & Cassell were Dan Atilano, who would serve as project manager, and Tom Mahaffey. Other presenters included Ron Jerit of Jerit/Boys, theater consultants; Rick Talaske from The Talaske Group, acoustician; Teresa Mesia-Rubinos, structural engineer; and Bob Hamilton from Gewalt Hamilton, civil engineers. A slide presentation was made as well.

Question Period

Member Barton asked if the location of the building on the proposal was the recommendation of his firm or that of the College. President Thompson stated that Building L was established with certain access points to a location, but no configurations were given as to the exact location of the building. Member Barton explained her question deals with the possibility of building an adjoining larger structure at a later date. Mr. Burnidge stated that this has been taken into consideration. He emphasized the importance to the public of having a canopied drop-off area with easy handicap access.

A member of the team explained the importance of "linking" in the prospectus with regard to linking the future proposals to the existing campus as well as other areas such as public circulation, educational philosophy, etc. This is developed in concert with all of the people who might impact those ideas.

Member Barton asked if the size of the wing space at the Elgin College performing arts facility was determined by the college

personnel or their architectural firm. It was explained that the space is intended to accommodate a number of different performing arts, and flexible dividers are moved to allow more wing space in a theater setting.

There was discussion regarding the location and usage of the scene shop, which is now used for a general craft area. President Thompson agreed that this will need to be addressed.

Member Barton asked if this facility would have a HVAC system separate from that of the main college. Mr. Burnidge stated that this is advisable because the facility is often used when school is not in session. In addition, the artifacts contained within the art gallery will require special temperature and humidity controls.

Member Kolze asked for information regarding the fee structure. Mr. Burnidge explained that in the Quality Based Selection Process, which is part of what is mandated in Illinois, the process is such that the Board makes a decision on the architect and then the negotiation takes place regarding fee structure with the Capital Development Board. If the fee cannot be negotiated with the architect that is chosen, then negotiation proceeds with the second architect selected. Mr. Burnidge added that he did not come prepared to address that issue because it is not allowed in projects that involve dealing with taxing and state monies.

Member Kolze asked what the firm's record is in regard to being on budget. Mr. Burnidge replied that they have a very good record in cost containment because they work with outside cost consultants from the beginning of the project. The choices made by the College regarding putting the job out for bids, working with a construction manager, etc. will also affect the project. Mr. Burnidge emphasized that their job is to bring the building in on budget.

Mr. Heise asked if the AV and electronics for the communications in the teleconferencing center are handled by the electrical consultants or the acoustical consultants. Mr. Burnidge replied that they prefer to put this in the acoustical consultant area. The best way to get the most cost effective system is to develop a contractual arrangement where the audio and AV systems are separate so that there is direct contact with the audiovisual contractor. This also eliminates the mark-ups associated with general and electrical contractors. There is also more control over the bidding process where you can define your requirements more clearly. However, there is obviously some overlap between the audio and AV contract and the electrical contract.

Vice President David McShane asked how the facility would be tied in with telecommunications and networking applications. He explained that it is expected that this facility will be tied in

with the rest of the campus network. Mr. Burnidge replied that this would be looked at very closely. The complexity of the telecommunications as well as the acoustics both need to be considered. Mr. McShane asked who will oversee the networking requirements such as Internet access. Mr. Burnidge stated that his firm would not deal with the telephones or computer networks, however, they would work with our staff to understand what is in place and what they can tie in with. It was noted that Metro is the electrical engineer and is familiar with Harper.

Member Barton noted that it was her understanding that the Elgin auditorium went significantly over budget. Mr. Burnidge stated that the project was finished within the budget amount, however, more money is needed to appoint some of the buildings.

President Thompson asked how soon preliminary drawings could be made available after the final selection and approval of an architect. Mr. Burnidge stated that the time spent programming and working with the staff is very important, and the length of time will depend in part on how much input is required from Harper staff.

Chairman Moats asked if it is possible to effectively reconcile theater use with musical use of the facility. It was noted that this is done in a variety of ways, such as moveable dividers, and has been done in even larger venues than the one being considered at Harper.

Member Born asked if there were plans to also use this proposed facility as a technology center. President Thompson stated that this is going to be a programming issue. There was some discussion regarding the public's desire for a facility of this nature and the intended use of the facility.

Chairman Moats thanked the representatives of Burnidge, Cassell & Associates for their presentation.

Member Howard moved, Member Born seconded, that the Board recess and reconvene in 15 minutes.

In a voice vote, the motion carried and the Board recessed at 6:50 PM and reconvened at 7:04 PM.

Legat & Associates

Wayne Machnich, President of Legat Architects, presented for his firm. Their team also includes HOK Architects of St. Louis. Mr. Machnich introduced the other consultants who comprise their team. He explained how HOK and Legat work together and detailed a number

of projects they completed. The team would include Dominick Demonica, project manager; Mike Haggans from HOK, who will lead the design effort; Bob Shook, theater planner; and Ed Dugger of Kirkegaard Associates, acoustic and AV documentation. The members of the team presented information and slides concerning the proposed project as well as other projects they have completed.

Question Period

Member Barton asked if the art gallery would have its own separate HVAC unit. Mr. Machnich replied that this would be advisable. She also asked if any of the four proposed designs can be added to at a later date. Mr. Haggans stated that the possibility is for additional facilities to be built to the east that would connect, depending on which design was chosen.

Member Barton asked if there was an area that is designated as a parking level. Mr. Haggans replied that the areas to the south in all of the schemes are a possibility. Pushing the parking structure further to the west would take away from the building's visibility. Mr. Machnich discussed the rationale of the relationship of the facility to the adjacent buildings, the topography and the distance from the various college entrances. There was discussion regarding the desire for parking garages and the extremely high cost of building those structures. The location of parking garages in conjunction with the various schemes was discussed.

Member Born asked the architects if they felt the primary thrust of this building was on the theater or the corporate aspect of the facility. Mr. Machnich stated that he does not know exactly what the College has in mind, but his understanding is that there are two distinctly different missions that have been combined, that of the corporate services and instructional facility, and that of the theater/art gallery. Although they are not mutually exclusive, different users would need to be served.

It was noted that the Capital Development Board (CDB) would not have a problem with two separate buildings, but there may be a problem with getting food service to the building. Mr. Machnich explained that that would be a design problem that could be addressed. He addressed the role of the CDB in terms of their purpose and what they commonly get involved with on projects of this nature.

Mr. Machnich stated their firm will work with the College to make this facility into whatever the College wants. Chairman Moats noted that this is an extremely challenging project because of the scope of the project and because they want to keep options open for the future.

The issue of making the building acoustically acceptable for both music and theater was addressed. Mr. Machnich stated that it is not as difficult in a smaller facility of this nature. He explained the various ways of achieving the different acoustics necessary.

Member Born asked if a larger theater could be built with smaller ones on each side that could then be joined into one as the need arises. Mr. Machnich stated that this could be done with the use of moveable walls. In addition, it would be difficult to use all three areas at the same time. He added that it would also be quite expensive.

President Thompson asked when preliminary drawings would be available if approval was given by CDB on October 1. Mr. Machnich stated that it would depend on how much time Harper's staff can give his firm, and how much detail they are looking for in the beginning. Realistically, he felt that they could have a plan of substance ready within three to four months.

Chairman Moats thanked the representatives of Legat Architects, Inc. for their presentation.

Member Barton moved, Member Howard seconded, that the Board recess and reconvene in 15 minutes.

In a voice vote, the motion carried. The meeting was recessed at 8:04 PM and reconvened at 8:15 PM.

Holabird & Root

Mr. Jeff Case of Holabird & Root began the presentation with a brief outline of the staff and history of his company. The team of presenters consisted of James Baird, the partner in charge of design; Dennis Vovos, project manager; Bob Piotrowski, project programming and interiors; and Don Guyton, who will be in charge of space planning, theater design and theater equipment. The presenters detailed some of the projects with which they have been involved, especially those in the university and theater community.

Member Barton asked where they see a conference center fitting in. Mr. Case stated that it will be necessary to get a better understanding of how big that conference center is, but they see a definite possibility of having an auditorium and conference center in one facility. There is a lot of flexibility with this arrangement in terms of teaching and reaching other constituents, such as with distance learning.

There was discussion regarding the use of glass on the west side of the building in terms of the recent intense summer heat. The architects offered a number of solutions and ways to work around this problem.

Member Barton asked how a larger, second facility would fit in. The architects stated that these are the types of things that need to come out in the programming process. The scheme should be designed to accommodate possible uses in the future, and balance the program with both budget and phasing.

Member Born asked how many people could be accommodated in the corporate center. The architects stated that their understanding is that two rooms will be dedicated to telecommunications and satellite network, but the sizes have not been determined. There will also be a minimum of two computer classrooms set up. There are an unnamed number of classrooms that need to have the infrastructure for conversion to either or both of those uses. It was noted that there are many things that people remember regarding conferences such as the food service, the bathrooms, the acoustics, the convenience, etc., and the planning for all of these issues need to be taken into consideration.

President Thompson asked how long it would be before preliminary drawings would be available once approval was given. The architects stated that schematics and design and development would be available in about three months time. The programming process is harder to determine because a great deal of that depends on the input from the College. The whole process is very interactive and involves careful planning from all those involved.

Chairman Moats asked how they reconcile the different acoustic requirements of theater groups versus the musical groups. Don Guyton explained the different types of adjustable acoustics that are used.

Chairman Moats thanked the representatives of Holabird & Root for their presentation.

Chairman Moats again thanked the members of the all of the architectural staffs for the work that went into their excellent presentations.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Member Barton asked if they are bound to the \$6.5 million, or if more money might be available in the future for special purchases to make the facility as nice as possible. President Thompson stated that those decisions should be made up front and built into

the bid as alternates. If it is determined that more money is needed at a later date, they can approach CDB or ICCB for permission to add local dollars. Member Howard noted that the architects had recommended taking a long-range plan and building in phases rather than cutting important things out at the beginning of the project.

Member Born suggested that the Board discuss the emphasis of the facility, as she did not recall there being a decision to have two computer rooms, teleconferencing, etc. Member Howard noted that there was confusion in the presentations regarding the different ideas for space allocation. Member Born stated that she would be uncomfortable making any kind of decision until the Board is in agreement as to what they want and how the public is going to perceive this. Member Coste suggested that a concept document would be necessary.

Chairman Moats noted that more discussion is obviously necessary, but that the purpose of this meeting was to get a feeling for what the marketplace had to offer. There was discussion involving the involvement of the Foundation and the business community. Member Barton suggested that the Board and the architectural firm of choice make a trip to Johnson County Community College to view their facility.

President Thompson stated that the theater is a key component on the list because the Board requested that the College move forward with this portion of the plan. State funding is more readily available, however, if this is a multipurpose facility rather than a theater. He stated that it will be necessary to stay within the guidelines of what was included in the ICCB RAMP document. Chairman Moats felt that the RAMP document was flexible, but President Thompson thought that there should not be more than approximately 10 percent of change. Member Born asked why this was not discussed before we were locked into the project. Other members voiced their opinions that there had been discussion regarding the wording that was needed to get state approval, as it was not possible to get those dollars for only a performing arts center. President Thompson noted that the RAMP document reflected the basic request that came before the Board for local funding for the theater itself with the additions for the corporate technology area. Chairman Moats stated that it will be necessary to review the RAMP document to clear up the confusion.

Member Barton stated her feelings that it is an embarrassment that although Harper is a leading community college in the state, they are one of the few in the area that does not have a performing arts center. Member Kolze noted that that was part of the impetus to submitting the RAMP document in order to get in line for the funding, so that there was only time for limited discussion. Other

Board members agreed that it was important to get the project started. Member Born stated that it is important to know exactly what we want to do on this project because of the other expensive projects underway, such as the technology plan.

Mary Jo Willis stated that the faculty has some very strong ideas that they need to share with Board, such as the desire for a 400 seat theater. Member Kolze noted that it would be one of the architect's functions to pull these various ideas together. There was discussion concerning the need to reach a consensus before the architects are consulted, or whether it would be advisable to come to these decisions with the help of the architects. Member Coste reiterated his feeling that a basic concept document should be presented to the architects.

Member Howard recommended that the Harper staff follow-up on the references given by the architects. It was recommended that the Board also receive input from the faculty and staff regarding their perception of the architects.

It was agreed that the ranking of the architects will be discussed and decided upon at a special Board meeting. Vice President Manke suggested that the Board decide on the ranking of the architects by August 24 in order to forward the information to CDB. He agreed with Member Coste's recommendation regarding the need for a concept document.

Member Born reiterated the need for the administration to follow-up on the references given by the architects. Chairman Moats noted that it was his understanding that the Architect Selection Committee, which recommended the three firms, was going to check the references. Mr. Manke stated that Legat Architects are well known to the administration, and that they are also familiar with a good deal of the work done by Burnidge, Cassell and Associates. They were less familiar with Holabird & Root, but they were very impressed by their credentials. Mary Jo Willis has information on all of the theater consultants. It was agreed that all of this information could be brought together for a report at the August 24 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Member Barton moved, Member Kolze seconded, that the meeting be adjourned. In a voice vote, the motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

BOARD REQUESTS

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AUGUST 16, 1995

- 1) Chairman Moats stated that it will be necessary for the Board to receive information regarding what was previously requested in the RAMP document.
- 2) Member Coste stated that a basic concept document should be presented to the architectural firm that is chosen.