

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date : February 23, 2009 Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author : Becca Cavell Job No. : THA Project 0810
Re : Coordinating User Group – Programming Session 3

Present:

User Group Members

Rich Linton
Jim Hutchison (co-chair)
Mark Lonergan
Heiner Linke
Andrzej Proskurowski
Helen Neville
George Sprague
Rick Glover
Deitrich Belitz
Bruce Bowerman
Lou Moses (co-chair)
Mike Haley

UO Representatives

Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng

Consultants

Roger Snyder, HDR
Thom Hacker, THA
Chuck Cassell, HDR
Becca Cavell, THA

Summary Notes

- Rich seconded Fred's recent e-mail about the current program: the excess demand for space in LISB is a good thing – this is a very successful and ambitious group of faculty.
- Rich noted that the vision for LISB began 10 years ago and the building will reinforce the mission of the BBMI. This core group of 15 scientists is fundamental to the vision for interdisciplinary science. The imaging center and vivarium are also included.
- The federal stimulus package may offer funding opportunities beyond the project budget.
 - NIST proposal is already in line; this may fund additional Mat/Phy space and results should be known fairly soon.
 - NSF may have up to \$200m but will need to plan RFP process.
 - NIH may fund academic or vivarium space; up to \$1bn expected but process and timeline not known.
 - Other initiatives may be able to fund instrumentation, equipment, or perhaps renovations.
- LISB is in a relatively strong position to secure funding – integrative science and shovel-ready projects make it very timely.
- The building vision & process must remain flexible and not too limited, given the possible funding opportunities.
- The development opportunities for vacated buildings should be considered. For example, Straub Hall could support emergent centers, new collaborative or new hires.
- Informatics: Rich and Al Malony have agreed that NIC will remain in its current location. This may open up opportunities for computer science in LISB.
- Mark said that the building needs to embrace a research culture, and that there is now a momentum to develop the vision for shared space.
- Developing the building around student space is key.
- Mark asked that the team investigate the maximum possible size the building can be on the site, and agreed that ideally additional funds would be found to expand the project.

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.

- Mat/Phy will be flexible. It is vital that some space in LISB is available, and it will be important to make connections back to existing spaces (for example, a connection across Streisinger to Klamath).
- ISC3 becomes part of the vision for the future of Mat/Phy's space needs, and the message from UO about this future project should be clear.
- The vision of shared lab space may lead to space efficiencies that should be studied in an iterative process.
- Jim asked that as spaces are developed the team should focus on how to INTEGRATE science, not insulate it.
- Rich noted the success of the Lokey Labs. LISB should also focus on possible synergies, and the integration & connection of Mat/Phy and Neuro/Life sciences.
 - Where can we find the best opportunities?
 - Where do nano- and life- sciences come together?
 - Building to be flexible to support future change
- Building should also connect to, and integrate with, the broader UO campus. Some of its programs engage the non-science and non-UO community – for example families and children involved with Helen's research.
- Bruce noted that ISC1 supports cross-disciplinary interaction – photolithography is a good example. Proximity is important – LISB should have space to support shared scientific exploration. This could happen on an initially limited, experimental scale – substantial but perhaps not fully committed.
- The integration of cognitive neuroscience, psychology and genetics is very powerful.
- Bruce noted that everyone needs more space.
- Roger reminded the group about the timeliness of decision making and the ability to effectively impact a design process. Decisions made in the first 10% of the timeline are the most effective. Fred agreed that the building envelope has to be established by the beginning of the Design Development phase.
- The project must be developed around modularity and flexibility.
- It is not feasible to design for an unknown number of floor plates.
- A fifth floor would be very challenging for a number of reasons but shouldn't be rejected outright at this stage.
- Rich noted that maximizing ISC1 was very successful and noted that LISB should aggressively maximize its envelope.
- Thom noted that dry labs cost less to develop than wet labs, but that extremely flexible labs will increase costs. The design team has been looking at new ways to arrange program spaces on site, including locating labs on both sides of an atrium space with student areas activating the public space.
- The design team will study the program and explore various proportions and arrangements of wet and dry lab space. Flexibility is the key.
- The cost of developing the subgrade space may not be the most expensive space – will depend on geotechnical conditions.
- Richard T noted that small spaces can still result in a large presence.
- Mark said that there has to be a commitment to integrated science to justify investing in flexible space.
- Fred diagrammed different approaches to program distribution that might affect the success of an integrated approach – the “layer cake” and “vertical distribution” approaches. He also reminded the users about the idea of a “home base” for scientists, and the importance of the sociology of the space.
- Chuck showed the group the current program, and the group agreed that the Neuro/Life Science program requires approximately 36,000 net SF in LISB (of the available 55,000 nsf).
- With ~5,000 nsf allocated to miscellaneous uses, 15,000 nsf can be allocated to Mat/Phy. This group will need to consider how best to use this space; this review needs to consider complex-wide needs and will come back to the question of integration.
- Rich noted that UT Dallas has emphasized the need for a robust building management plan which should be in place before tenants move in. Ideally a science complex facility manager

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.

would oversee the day-today management of LISB, and a faculty-based space committee would guide the process of space allocation and review. Security and public safety are also significant issues.

- The group noted the difficulties associated with placing intense chemistry lab spaces above the third floor.
- Chuck and Thom explained current studies placing the vivarium on the first floor, with the atrium space focused on the second floor.
- Chuck recommended that equipment space be developed based on modular planning systems to support churn.
- Chuck showed a graduate student work station from another project, where systems furniture was used to provide 20 nsf / student. Circulation space has to be added to the model.
- Fred urged the building users to focus on NEEDS instead of WANTS. The User Groups will meet to review their program status, and future meetings will be scheduled soon.
- Meeting adjourned at noon.

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.