

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date : February 5, 2009 Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author : Becca Cavell Job No. : THA Project 0810
Re : Materials / Physical Science User Group Programming Meeting 2

Present:

User Group Members

Mike Haley - Chemistry
Mark Lonergan – Chemistry
Dave Johnson – Chemistry
Steve Kevan - Physics

UO Representatives

Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng

Consultants

Chuck Cassell, HDR, lab planning principal
Becca Cavell, THA project manager

Summary Notes

Program Discussion:

- 2.1 The first round on the program has resulted in a building that is significantly larger than the target 100,000 GSF. Challenging site constraints may limit the building size and the budget has not been tested yet.
- 2.2 Chuck reviewed his approach to planning the program in a modular manner to support flexibility along with rational bench modules, along with trying to efficiently consolidate spaces with similar environmental requirements.
- 2.3 Much of Mat/Phy's shared equipment will ideally be located in the basement, but the expanded animal facility would also benefit from a basement location and there may not be enough SF for all the competing program elements. The existing utility tunnel complicates the situation, as to the existing data cables and vault.
- 2.4 The characterization equipment, deposition and measurement equipment identified in a recent spreadsheet would all be good on the same floor as, and close to, the Lokey Lab. A strong visual connection to the Lokey Lab is important.
- 2.5 There was a suggestion that the basement could be larger than the building above. Becca noted that the trees may be a significant constraint.
- 2.6 Mark noted general concern about the 8'-0 hood vs. bench space ratio, and the 28'-0 dimension. All major equipment will likely want to populate the space coded blue in Chuck's diagrams.
- 2.7 The design team has the most recent notes from Mat/Phy on both program revisions and equipment inventories/requirements. More detailed review will be required to finalize the second draft of the program. [a subsequent phone discussion with Mark clarified these points].

Lab Diagram Discussion:

- 2.8 Dave challenged the proposed modular layout, advocating strongly for a horseshoe plan arrangement, noting the success of Willamette Hall and failure of linear organizations in recent buildings that he has visited.
- 2.9 Fred noted that the sociology of the building will depend in part on the corridor/student/lab organization.
- 2.10 Chuck sketched a diagram of a possible solution that places labs opposite one another across a narrow atrium space.

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.

- 2.11 Dave suggested densely packing faculty lab space and creating a surge space to promote change and interaction. Relationship between Mat/Phy and Neuro/Life labs was discussed, including the possibility that all disciplines could be stacked / intermingled.
- 2.12 Chuck asked if the flex space could happen on another floor, and the group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of intermingling wet/dry labs and issues of service. Several diagrams were considered.

Concepts for Integration:

- 2.13 Discussed power of working together – and the need to design spaces that can be reorganized for new research initiatives.
- 2.14 Dave described bringing three different business partners to the Lokey Lab and each visitor perceiving the space as “theirs” – analogous to a rotating advertisement that changes regularly. A series of centers can share a single space and each can be perceived as the tenant.
- 2.15 Each PI may still want some “identity” with overall goal one of shared ownership.
- 2.16 Academic settings historically identify space as “mine” and “ours”. How do you both maintain space and allow change?
- 2.17 Building should facilitate gradual change and support new/ entrepreneurial ideas.
- 2.18 Shared space vs. shared equipment vs. “owned” equipment – and the challenge of who is responsible for maintenance. Chuck offered “core” as a possible solution for “shared” , but Fred indicated that at the UO these boundaries tend to blur and that “shared” works well.
- 2.19 Graduate student space: structured to allow easy reassignment and to reduce tendency toward ownership. 4’0” desks with some type of separation and mobile storage units.

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.