

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date: April 3, 2009 Project: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building

Author : Becca Cavell Job No. : THA Project 0810

Re : Materials / Physical Science User Group Programming Meeting SD-1

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

- 1. Chuck outlined the meeting goal to review the bench lab prototypes that he had developed based on the information gathered to date.
- 2. Vibration requirements for this building will support optical microscopy and similar levels of sensitivity; no heroic efforts are planned for vibration control.
- The group confirmed that it hopes to utilize any basement space not dedicated to mechanical space.
- 4. Becca explained the site constraints known to date, and the anticipated extent of the basement floor plan.
- 5. The group reviewed the printed materials provided by Chuck.
- The connection to Klamath Hall is under review, and the team hopes to discuss with the Fire Marshal shortly.
- 7. Fume hood density will relate to intensity of chemical use. Storage options for chemicals include remote locations or H occupancy spaces but neither solution is optimum; preference is for local storage areas.
- 8. Mike anticipates 2 students per fume hood, and thought that the bench to hood ratio shown in the sketches is about right. After considering various scenarios the group agreed that adjacent fume hoods would be best, as these result in a less claustrophobic sense of space.
- 9. The level of subdivision of the lab modules could be at various scales; a large open lab is not desirable for environmental and acoustical reasons. Chuck suggested that the 10-bay planning scenario might work best with a single division at the 5-bay point; the group confirmed that this might work well.
- 10. Chuck sketched a planning variation where the non-hood benches are comprised of moveable tables with overhead hanging systems. The users liked the proposal, and the concept of maintaining a walk-through around this zone this improves safety and collaboration.
- 11. Mike Haley prefers two=module arrangement of modules rather than three with four (4) hoods in each 2-module lab. So this results in five (5) 2-module labs in the allocated 10-module grouping on 4th floor. We assume that this implies five (5) researchers on this floor now rather than the originally assumed three (3). Need to clarify with Users.
- 12. Students will not sit in labs, but in the support area. More than 8 students in one room is not desirable; they will have desks, not cubicles. 42 inch desks are appropriate. Desk sharing is acceptable.

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.

HOR THAARCHITECTURE

- 13. The Home Base scenario was discussed briefly. Design team to sketch out options.
- 14. Lab entry can occur through the student space; this will encourage interaction.
- 15. Opportunities for glass walls connecting lab space, support space and atrium space will be very limited but will be maximized.
- 16. Design team to review / confirm fire egress issues associated with lab space and exiting through support zone.
- 17. Don't limit lab effectiveness by having inadequate student space.
- 18. Mark outlined the concept of "Bench Level Integrative Science" or BLIS. A good planning approach to support this concept would be to dedicate the 10-bay space to three faculty, with some dedicated bench space and other flex space provided for the group.
- 19. If only three faculty have assigned bench space, the group may not need to use all the faculty offices currently programmed. These could be used for student space, meeting space, or non-hazardous uses.
- 20. The lab support zone will support many different equipment uses. This group will probably have two glove boxes. Group to get dimensions of equipment to Chuck, and he will develop equipment fit options.
- 21. The dimension of the planning module, and the reality of the structural system, will both affect layout options. Columns will have to be accommodated.
- 22. The users would like the design team to study wet lab layout options for the basement space, with fume hoods and chemical storage areas. Daylight could possibly be brought into the space.
- 23. The Lokey Lab entry and its relationship to the new building will be studied by the design team.

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.