

ways to create intimate spaces within larger lab environments, and to deal with energy issues also.

- NYU's biology building has a couple of recently renovated floors that have a lot of open space. Four labs are centrally located, with mini offices for students and with faculty offices located at the perimeter. Only PIs have doors. The spaces are modular but somewhat noisy.
- The Psychology Building at Dartmouth imaging facility: aesthetically successful but functional disastrous. Visitors to the center have to be escorted through the animal facility, restrooms are not available on the same floor, significant acoustical problems with MRI vibration transmitting through ductwork to adjacent spaces.
- The Beckman Institute at the University of Illinois unites people through a common atrium. Rich noted that it houses a subset of the disciplines proposed for our building.
- The Lokey Lab, modeled on the FEI showroom, works well.
- Atria in Streisinger, Willamette and Lillis on the UO campus all work well.
- Bruce suggested that the building should have aesthetically pleasing entrances to the lab components – well detailed, and noted that he liked the dynamic connections suggested by the wedge-shaped plan shown by the design team in the interview.
- The Salk Institute has areas for interaction in an exterior environment, abundant natural light in the building, and it very beautiful.
- Interior gardens could be beautiful but have to look good – U Toronto's department of medical genetics has a negative example.
- Birck at Purdue accommodates Nano and other disciplines. All space is shared, with labs dedicated to equipment as needed. Students have portable desks.
- Chuck asked about collaborative, grant-driven projects.
- The best collaborations are unanticipated – the building had to be designed to support the unexpected.
- Chuck noted that generic, prototype designs will be a goal for this project. They should be as repetitive as possible, with as much moveable parts as possible – and should be both flexible and adaptable.

1.4 Roger asked about external collaboration

- The imaging facility has many visitors – UO students, visitors from other Universities across the region and country. Also some private sector visitors.
- Some visiting faculty and researchers need lab space.
- The Lokey Lab has a fee-for-use space.

1.5 Chuck asked about incubator space

- Lokey Lab partnership labs is a form of collaboration not anticipated in the Lewis Building.
- Rich Linton: Phase 1 has a strong direct focus on economic development; Phase 2 should be open to this but is more in support of the University's scientific community. The investment in the core facilities can certainly be shared with external collaborators.

1.6 The MRI facility has many visitors including families and children, so parking and wayfinding need to be considered. Chuck noted that these will result in a less locked-down building than many science facilities.

1.7 Lab and MRI visitors will have brain injuries, cognitive impairment and perhaps mobility issues, so Universal Access and wayfinding will be design concerns.

1.8 The imaging equipment is occasionally used for animals, but the vast majority of test subjects are human.

1.9 Security – both personal and biosafety – need to be considered.

1.10 Sustainability discussion:

- The building will accommodate some green science research.
- This is a real opportunity to make a sustainable building to support this research.
- Opportunities for re-using rainwater are interesting.
- A green roof would be good (discussion of challenges and opportunities ensued)
- The oak trees are an important part of the site and should be preserved.
- Fred noted that rather than focusing immediately on solutions perhaps the group should ask itself what our environmental values are, then how they should be expressed in the building.
- Sustainable design workshops will be scheduled in the future.

NOTE: Attention Attendees! Please review these notes carefully as they will form the basis of future work on this project. If you feel that anything is incorrect or incomplete, please call the author at 503-227-1254.

- Green chemistry is a good example of how sustainable design might also make good financial sense – energy savings, etc.
 - Helium recovery should be explored: finite resource.
 - Federal funds might be available for innovative solutions.
- 1.11 Chuck presented a series of generic diagrams, each supported by a floor plan for an actual laboratory project, to illustrate various ways that typical spaces in a lab building might be laid out.
- Each diagram includes open lab space with benches, dedicated lab support space for various equipment and specialty uses such as fume hood alcoves, cold rooms etc; and office space.
 - The various buildings illustrated in the plans show many more specific spaces such as open office, shared student offices, core facilities, meeting rooms and so on.
 - The first three diagrams showed “historic” planning scenarios that are not desirable:
 - Private offices within lab spaces allow windows to serve both labs and offices but the exit path from the office passes through a more hazardous lab environment, and is no longer legal by code.
 - Offices located in the core of a building have no access to natural daylight.
 - Labs located in the center of the building also have no daylight access.
 - The subsequent diagrams showed many different approaches to the relationship between labs, support and offices. Variables include:
 - Offices located proximate or remote from the lab spaces
 - Various circulation diagrams
 - Atria
- 1.12 Bruce asked how important it is that all the floors follow the same pattern. Chuck noted that some core elements should stack – for example, bathroom, elevators and so on. Other areas can vary by floor.
- 1.13 Scott talked about the difference between bench science labs and the lab needs for other researchers who are working with human subjects.
- 1.14 Some equipment is noisy and needs careful consideration. One approach might be a service corridor such as at Lokey Labs. This may present problems for access to natural light.
- 1.15 George suggested bringing open lab elements and support lab spaces to a common corridor wall.
- 1.16 Cognitive science will have very different needs as they don’t need many lab services (once-through air, plumbing, gasses).
- 1.17 Thom Hacker presented a series of images regarding the building site and design response issues.
- 1.18 Will site access, parking and deliveries all be achieved off Franklin?
- 1.19 How will delivery and visitor parking be separated?
- 1.20 Campus planning issues will include:
 - Public perception of the UO along Franklin
 - View into campus
 - Current conflict with dedicated campus open space
- 1.21 The internal organization of the building should respect broader campus-driven issues.
- 1.22 The building will need appropriate FUTURE flexibility, and should be designed to be adaptable in order to support the future need.
- 1.23 The timeline for future change is not weekly – the true anticipated timeline for change will inform decisions about both flexibility and adaptability.
- 1.24 The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

END OF NOTES

NOTE: Attention Attendees! Please review these notes carefully as they will form the basis of future work on this project. If you feel that anything is incorrect or incomplete, please call the author at 503-227-1254.