

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date : February 25, 2009 Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building

Author : Becca Cavell Job No. : THA Project 0810

Re : Neuroscience / Life Science User Group Programming Meeting 3

Present:

User Group Members

Lou Moses, Psychology
Ed Awh, Psychology
Paul Dasonville, Psychology
Helen Neville, Psychology
Bruce Bowerman, Biology
Monte Matthews, OVSAC
Mike Wehr, Psychology/ ION
Ulrich Mayr, Psychology
Scott Frey, LCNI / Psychology
Karen Guillemin, Biology / IMB

Terry Takahashi / Biology
Cliff Kentros / Psychology
Margaret Sereno / Psychology

UO Representatives

Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng

Consultants

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

Summary Notes

- 3.1 After introductions Lou asked the group to focus on finding efficiencies in the program areas, and not to assume that they should try to find ways to fill 36,000 nsf of area. Also, the building area has not yet been tested against the budget.
- 3.2 The design team is beginning to acquire data on the existing site conditions and will begin to study more informed layout options.
- 3.3 Chuck received more information from the user group on Monday regarding student space requirements, and has updated the program to reflect this. Otherwise, the program is the same as the most recently distributed document.
- 3.4 The group confirmed Chuck's basic approach for Cognitive Neuroscience, with three clusters of dry lab space each associated with 3 PIs. The group reviewed Chuck's space diagrams, understanding that they are not intended to convey proposed layouts at this point.
- 3.5 In Cog-Neuro the student space allocation should be:
 - Graduate and undergraduate students to have cubicle space in open offices
 - Post docs to share offices with 2 to 3 students per office
 - Graduate students can share small meeting rooms, scheduling them for office hours. Fred and Becca strongly suggest keeping these offices small (less than 100 nsf) and windowless, so that they are not easily converted into other uses.
 - Helen noted that some students need quiet space to write. This could be achieved in scheduled meeting rooms or flexible office space.
- 3.6 Becca noted that individuals have widely varying styles of study / work, and that a variety of spaces might support this. Also each cluster could have a different space configuration or proportional arrangement of offices and open space.
- 3.7 Chuck showed a systems furniture approach, with each cubicle measuring just 4'-0 x 5'-0. The cubicles had glass panels, and the open office borrowed light from adjacent spaces through high glass windows. Becca noted that this might result in a space allocation per student of 35 nsf, and noted that 35 nsf works well as a multiplier for space allocation.

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.

- 3.8 Finding the right balance of meeting space to office space is essential – the design team will study a variety of options.
- 3.9 Chuck asked about flexible office space, and the group agreed that 2 per floor would work, Bruce suggested that shared / schedulable offices could be located in the public spaces and that this would limit the chance that they be re-purposed. They could be scheduled for student's office hours. They should have glass walls and doors.
- 3.10 Chuck noted that a series of shared meeting rooms are already programmed for the building.
- 3.11 Fred noted that an earlier conference call with UT Dallas had informed the team on the importance of establishing a clear building management plan PRIOR to tenant move in, and ideally hiring a building manager.
- 3.12 Chuck focused on the program and space layouts for the Neuroscience bench labs. Student spaces were discussed. Terry would like all his students to be in private offices but understands that this would limit equipment space. Also all enclosed offices have to be located outside of any lab space. Terry also has some particular concerns about the sound isolation requirements for the anechoic chambers that he uses, air management, and other issues.
- 3.13 For Molecular Biology the preferred model is for all students to be seated inside the lab, ideally not side by side. Post doc students could be located at the window wall. Per Bruce, each PI has 10-12 students; 1 or 2 flexible rooms in addition would work well; Cliff does have one post doctorate student that he'd like to have an office for; this could be one of the flexible spaces.
- 3.14 Fred reminded the group of the "Home Base" pattern, and noted that Klamath 249 has a very successful small kitchen / lab hearth space. He suggested a similar approach for LISB – perhaps locating the flex offices adjacent to these home bases, along a public circulation space.
- 3.15 Fred and Becca described the tiny meeting rooms planned for the College of Education.
- 3.16 Chuck explained the need for a rigorous planning module approach for the bench labs, and the desire to develop flexible, adaptable and modular spaces that minimize future retrofit costs.
- 3.17 Cliff reminded the group about his lab's combined need for electro-physiology bench space and conventional mo-bio bench space. While these could be split, ideally they'd be in one space.
- 3.18 Chuck shared some recent sketch plans and Becca noted that the design team is just beginning to consider how the program might be laid out on site.
- 3.19 The group discussed how best to locate dry labs and bench space, and possible locations for various program areas including office space. Office space relationships to labs were discussed at length, and opportunities for vertical connections were explored.
- 3.20 Chuck showed a plan idea that places the vivarium on the first floor, adjacent to and connected with Streisinger.
- 3.21 The group noted that connections to existing buildings from LISB on levels 2 and 3 would be important for Neuro/Life, and for Mat/Phy the connections would be at level 4.
- 3.22 Chuck discussed next steps, and Lou asked about future meetings. Emily is working to schedule upcoming sessions.
- 3.23 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.