March 30, 2012 VIA email

Mr. Bruce Locke
Capital Development Board
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph Street, Suite 14-600
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3283

Re: Science Building Addition and Renovation Project
College of Lake County, Grayslake, Illinois
CDB Project Number: 810-056-025
Architect's Project Number: 211001.00
Meeting Minutes

Summary of the Core Group Meeting held on Friday, March 23, 2012 at College of Lake County. These notes record our understanding of items discussed and decisions made at this meeting. Please notify us within seven (7) calendar days of any necessary additions or corrections.

PERSONS IN ATTENDENCE

Bruce Locke ..... Senior Project Manager, Capital Development Board
David Agazzi ..... Vice President Administrative Affairs, College of Lake County
Ali O'Brien ..... Assistant Vice President Educational Affairs, College of Lake County
Gary Morgan ..... Dean EMPS, College of Lake County
Ted Johnson ..... Director Facilities Administration, College of Lake County
Shane Jones ..... Instructor, Biology, College of Lake County
Tara Simmons ..... Instructor, Chemistry, College of Lake County
Robert Twardock ..... Instructor, Engineering, College of Lake County
Stephanie Martoccio ..... Architectural Student, College of Lake County
Steven Brubaker ..... Designer, Brubaker Design
Scott Foster ..... Affiliated Engineers
Jeff Sronkoski ..... Principal, Legat Architects
Scot Parker ..... Project Manager, Legat Architects
Vuk Vujovic ..... Director of Sustainable Design, Legat Architects
Burcin Moehring ..... Director of Science and Technology, Legat Architects
Scott Steingraeber ..... Project Architect, Legat Architects

ITEMS DISCUSSED

1. David Agazzi opened the meeting.

2. All attendees introduced themselves.

3. Scot Parker reviewed the agenda and reviewed the goals for the meeting.

4. Steve Brubaker reviewed the Prototypical Lab Development to date.

   a. Steve commented the typical new chemistry lab was approximately 42 ft. x 31ft.

b. Steve stated he was proposing a structural clear span from the exterior wall all the way to the atrium side of the corridor that would serve the new lab. Steve added his intent was to locate major beams and columns on a grid that did not place them below walls in which vertical runs of piping would likely be located.
c. Steve noted he was using the space between the labs and the corridor serving the labs for display cases, and mechanical ductwork & piping chases.
d. Steve reviewed the building section to the right of the plans. Steve described how the ceiling was lower over most of the room to accommodate mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems, but near the exterior wall it was as high as possible to maximize the amount of daylight entering the room. Steve added with the structure clear spanning beyond the interior wall of the lab, it was his expectation that mechanical / structural conflicts would be minimized allowing for a higher ceiling elevation overall.
e. Steve stated the ceiling was mostly acoustical ceiling panels with drywall coves and soffits around the perimeter.
f. Steve commented that suspended linear light fixtures running across the short dimension of the room perpendicular to the exterior wall were proposed as the primary light source for the room.

5. Steve Brubaker reviewed three preliminary conceptual building options.

6. Steve Brubaker mentioned that each of his conceptual building plans located the Engineering and Photonics / Laser Labs on the first floor. Most, if not all, other chemistry and microbiology labs were located on the second floor and above depending upon the option. Steve added that all of his options maintained the second floor of the new addition level with the existing building's second floor. This allowed only 14 ft between the first floor and second floor, where as the floors above were not necessarily limited in height. Steve indicated he was using a 16 foot floor to floor height for the second floor and all other floors above.

7. Steve Brubaker ran through Option A highlighting the following:

a. Option A was a five story option with occupiable space on floors 1 through 4, with a mechanical penthouse above the fourth floor. The vertical nature of the building option was compatible with the college's goal to construct more vertically in order to conserve the land available.
b. Option A had a compact footprint oriented along an East/West axis to take full advantage of the sun and to minimize the mechanical requirements and associated costs as much as possible. This will also to maximize the potential for points under the LEED system relative to MEP system efficiency.
c. Option A more centrally addressed the majority of the parking to the east, creating a more centralized south campus entrance. At five stories, the addition would also be a focal point drawing students toward the new campus entrance.
d. Option A located the new offices, and the Engineering and Photonics / Laser labs on the first floor. The Microbiology labs and their related support spaces were on the second floor. Chemistry labs with their related support spaces were on both the third and fourth floors.

8. Steve Brubaker ran through Option B highlighting the following:

a. Option B was a three story option with occupiable space on floors 1 and 2, with a mechanical penthouse above the third floor.

b. Option B had a larger footprint than Option A and was also oriented along an east / west axis for the same reasons as Option A.
c. Option B through its east/ west axis orientation also addressed the parking to the east, creating a more centralized south campus entrance similar to Option A.
d. Option B located the new offices, Engineering labs, Photonics / Laser labs, a pair of Chemistry labs and a Chemistry instrument lab on the first floor. The Microbiology labs and their related support spaces, with the remaining three chemistry labs and their related support spaces, were on the second floor.
e. The larger footprint of Option B could have an impact on any future expansion of the C-Buildings northeast wing to the east.

9. Steve Brubaker ran through Option C highlighting the following:

a. Option C had a two wing building footprint which nested up against both the east wing and the south wing of Building C. The east wing of Option C was proposed to have three occupiable floors with a mechanical penthouse above the third floor while the south wing of Option C was proposed to have two occupiable floors, with a additional mechanical penthouse above the second floor.
b. Option C had its main entrance located at the intersection of the east wing and the south wing.
c. Option C through its northwest / southeast axis orientation primarily addressed the parking to the southeast of the new addition.
d. Option C located most of the chemistry and microbiology lab support spaces internally.
e. Option C located the new offices, Engineering labs, and Photonics / Laser labs on the first floor. The Microbiology labs and their related support spaces, with three chemistry labs and their related support spaces were on the second floor. The remaining two chemistry labs, and their related support spaces were shown on the third floor of the east wing. Mechanical penthouses were located on the fourth floor of the east wing and on the third floor of the south wing.
f. Option C had a less rigid, more expressive form implied through its footprint.

10. Gary Morgan viewed the options that located multiple disciplines on the same floor as a positive.

11. Tara Simmons expressed concern with having chemistry labs and their related support areas spread over two floors. Chemicals and other materials and equipment would need to be transported both horizontally and vertically between the two floors as shown in each Option A, B, and C instead of just horizontally if all were located on one floor. Tara inquired if their might be an option to provide a more private / less public means of transporting needed items between floors.

12. Shane Jones stated he liked the smaller footprint of Option A, and how it preserved the existing glazed single loaded corridors of Building-C's south wing. Shane added there was a benefit to locating the micro-biology labs on the same floor as all of the other Biology and A & P labs.

13. Steve Brubaker presented a more refined version of Option A. It showed what the potential site development might be surrounding a new addition. Steve noted that Option A had been viewed internally by the design team as having the best potential for further development. Steve added the design team would be looking for the College's consensus opinion regarding this recommendation.

14. Scott Foster commented on the three options presented by Steve Brubaker from an MEP perspective. Scott supported the rationale stated by Steve for having an east / west axis of orientation in order to maximize mechanical system efficiency thus supporting the goal of a LEED platinum certification.

15. Bruce Locke commented that per the Architect's contract with the Capital Development Board, they were required to study and document three conceptual building options, and to provide a recommendation for which may be the most advantageous to pursue.

16. Burcin Moehring provided a brief overview of the first set of focus group meetings, along with the second engineering focus group meeting held with the Engineering department. Burcin stated the Engineering department had identified a need for larger labs than were originally programmed, along with the need for a lecture style environment adjacent to both Engineering oriented labs.

17. Scott Steingraeber noted there was some question as to whether three two-person offices would be sufficient for the new addition, and if so, to which department(s) they might belong. Scott stated the Biology department had requested, a higher level of renovation in the southernmost three biology labs than was originally programmed (new flooring, ceiling, lighting, and paint). Modest renovation of the existing microbiology lab was also requested. Renovation of the microbiology lab was not in the current program. Scott added the design team was informed that the C-Building computer labs had been renovated. The requirement for renovating these rooms in the program could be dropped. Redirection of the dollars designated for the computer lab renovations could possibly be applied to needed renovations in other areas of the project.

18. Ali O'Brien indicated she would raise the concerns identified in a meeting to be held on Monday.

19. Steve Brubaker indicated that a fourth two-person office if needed may possibly be able to be achieved through efficiencies of design.

20. Vuk Vujovic commented that CLC had met with the Illinois Clean Energy Community Foundation a day prior to the core group meeting to review availability of grant funding for this project. David Agazzi added that CLC was considering whether the science building addition could be designed as a net zero energy building. This level of sustainability would be evaluated for feasibility through the use of energy modeling software by the Design Team's engineers.

21. Scot Parker asked where CLC thought a geothermal field serving the new addition, should it be required, might be located relative to the new addition. Scot stated it had come to his attention that CLC had considered the construction of geothermal wells below the ball fields west of the pond. Vuk stated a geothermal field should be located as close to the building addition as possible on the south side of the proposed building addition to minimize possible costs. Vuk added a geothermal field constructed in this area could be tied into a larger campus-wide geothermal loop at a later date if necessary.

22. Bruce Locke stated locating the geothermal field closest to the new addition to achieve the lowest possible cost would be the best option to propose in order to get CDB approval. Bruce asked Scott Foster if there was a possible alternative to using a geothermal field. Scott indicated high efficiency chillers and condensing boilers may be potential alternatives to using a geothermal field.

23. Scot Parker stated the latest preliminary cost information received from the design teams cost consultant CCS placed the additional costs for pursuing platinum certification at approximately 1.9 to 2 million dollars.

24. Ali O'Brien asked if the new addition would have restrooms and other similar support spaces. Steve Brubaker confirmed there would be. The restroom and support areas of the program were not defined yet in the conceptual studies.

25. Jeff Sronkoski asked if there was consensus toward approval of the refined Option A or any of the other conceptual building options presented by Steve Brubaker.

26. Tara Simmons stated she still had concerns with how the chemistry labs and their related support spaces were distributed over two floors. Tara noted that there would need to be an instrument lab designated for General Chemistry on each floor along with the instrument lab designated for the Organic Chemistry lab, as the equipment for Organic Chemistry is significantly different that what is required for General Chemistry. Similarly there may be a need for a preparation space on each floor should Chemistry labs be located on two floors. Tara added she would like to discuss the ideas presented further with the rest of her department.

27. Shane Jones thought it might be possible to locate the new Micro-Biology labs on a floor other than the second floor assuming that they have their own prep room and support spaces adjacent. Shane added he too would want to discuss the ideas presented further with the rest of his department as well.

28. Next focus group meeting sessions were confirmed for April 6th.

29. Next core group meeting was confirmed for April 10th.

30. Meeting adjourned at 12:45 P.M.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Legat Architects, Inc.

Scott Steingraeber, AIA, LEED AP
Project Architect

SS/SLB

ATTACHMENTS None

CC All Attendees
Denise Anastasio, CLC
Arlene Santos-George, CLC

File: 211001.00B3

FILENAME L:\CLC\211001.00 Science Classrm Bldg_Design\B_Communications\B3_Meeting Minutes\211001Core - MM032312.docx