

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date: May 26, 2009 Project: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building

Author : Becca Cavell Job No. : THA Project 0810

Re : Coordinating User Group – Schematic Design Meeting 4

Present:

User Group Members

Helen Neville
John Conery
Mark Lonergan
Bruce Bowerman
Rick Glover
Deitrich Belitz
Lou Moses (co-chair)
Mike Haley
Richard Taylor

Corey Griffin Mike Jefferis Rich Linton **UO Representatives**

Fred Tepfer Emily Eng

Consultants

Roger Snyder, HDR Thom Hacker, THA Regina Filipowicz, HDR Steve Simpson, THA Laurie Canup, THA Becca Cavell, THA

Summary Notes

- 1. After introductions, Becca outlined the agenda and noted that the project faces two challenges: it is over budget, and the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) has questioned the proposed building organization.
- 2. The construction budget is \$43M, and the current estimate is just under \$50M. A combination of four strategies will likely bring the project scope within the budget:
 - Current grant-writing proposals
 - · Exploring more efficient building organizations
 - Program reduction
 - Shell space
- 3. Fred outlined the decision making process for LISB. Lou noted that decisions will ideally be finalized within the CUG, and not taken outside the control of that group.
- 4. Thom updated the group on the outcomes of the CPC Meeting. CPC members still have concerns about the lack of perceived openness between Streisinger and LISB. Two alternate approaches could address this issue one diagram shows an "up & over" link with a reduced height, the other shows a "straight-shot" open connection.
- 5. Other concerns from CPC members:
 - The perceived bulk of the building, can it be reduced? A 5-story building might improve the situation.
 - Can LISB showcase the academic pursuits of UO in this critical location?
- 6. Lou asked how high the "Up & Over" solution was; the Animal Facility would have 8' ceilings in this zone, for an overall structure of 9'-6. The grade change to Franklin is approximately 4'-0, for an overall height of over 12'-0 as perceived from the highway.
- 7. Thom showed a diagram which studies relocating a portion of the utility tunnel that bisects the project site. Two routes have been studied. Route 1 to the north appears to be the preferred route. The design team will work with the cost estimator and UO's utility upgrade contractor to better understand the costs of such an approach. If the tunnel can be moved, a larger basement

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.

- may be possible. Possible uses may include additional Mat/Phy space, shell space, or the Animal Facility.
- 8. The design team showed three alternative plan arrangements. Each CUG member was given a list of pros and cons for each scheme, and encouraged to add further comments. Becca noted that the position of the MRI magnet is one of the key challenges faced by each scheme.
- 9. Option 1A "Pinwheel Offices / Up & Over":
 - Elevator location not ideal for Mat/Phy basement space.
 - Fred noted that the elevator's relationship to the building entry depends on the elevator being visible from the stair. The space in front of the office area would have to be very low, or the elevator relocated to meet this requirement.
 - Helen suggested placing the café in this location.
- 10. Option 2A "5-Story / Up & Over":
 - Richard Taylor suggested that taller buildings can establish presence of UO.
 - Maximizes size of Agate Green and may allow views into campus at Deschutes/Oregon Hall open space.
- 11. Option 3A "Smaller Animal Facility / Straight Shot":
 - Allows route through building on grade at Science Green but doesn't allow space to be opened to view through.
- 12. Helen noted that Franklin is not a desirable location for her lab cluster and would prefer it be located on the second floor, south side rather than north edge on any floor.
- 13. Lou asked how "Up & Over" approach affects Animal Facility. Thom reported that this approach does not affect the functional use of the facility per Chuck.
- 14. Comparing all three plans for the first floor, the effect of the Animal Facility is clear. In 1A, the first floor is blank both on Franklin and within the building. In 2A, the Franklin edge is blank but the interior space limits blank walls. In 3A, the Animal Facility is significantly minimized and the building is more active at the ground floor.
- 15. Animal Facility location and size:
 - Located on first floor and directly connected to Streisinger, size retained to meet or close to meet program request.
 - Located in basement, connected to Streisinger via elevator;
 - Located on first floor, directly connected to Streisinger, very reduced in size to allow route through at Science Green

Bruce said that a much smaller Animal Facility would be disastrous to functionality, and would limit UO's ability to recruit mouse geneticists. The basement location is not desirable but could be considered; the connections to the first floor would have to be very effective.

- 16. Option 3B studies locating 2 mo-bio mouse scientists on the first floor alongside the Animal Facility. Per Bruce, this is not ideal as the scientists become isolated. Bruce proposed keeping the two mo-bio mouse geneticists in Streisinger. Some lab renovations may be needed. Helen agreed, based on the understanding that Cliff Kentros, Mike Wehr and Phil would remain in LISB.
- 17. The five story / reduced footprint scheme (2A) is generally appealing. However, the bench lab arrangement results in 9 rather than 10 bays, and may affect the social dynamics of the building differently than in a 4-story.
- 18. It's possible to support Informatics primarily in meeting spaces. John Conery noted that Option 2A is more attractive because the link to Deschutes occurs at an office area instead of a lab location; this seems to offer more interaction opportunities.
- 19. The design team will take schemes to CPC that illustrate the Animal Facility in the basement and on the first floor. The CUG preference is for the First Floor. Disadvantages of the basement location include:
 - · Additional excavation costs
 - Additional costs to relocate the utility tunnel
 - Negative for Mat/Phy science goals
 - Additional operational costs for Animal Facility
 - Principal goal of opening views from Franklin to campus is achieved but fundamentally questionable – less than 1 second.

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.

- 20. Fred noted that the CPC needs to be reminded how the size and position of the new building, and the desire for views into Science Green threaten the survival of the mature oak trees.
- 21. Fred noted that this project can improve the Franklin edge for pedestrians and cyclists. The blank façade caused by the animal facility can be mitigated by other program components that can activate the edge and bring visual interest. For example, the office component can be expressed vertically.
- 22. John noted that from his observation in Deschutes there is significant foot traffic across Franklin. Attractions include espresso, parking, and the football stadium.
- 23. Agate Green is important and could become more so. Richard noted that Agate Green made a strong impression on him when he first visited UO. The bus stop, the campus sign, and the gateway nature of the site can all be supported by enhancing this area.
- 24. Mark asked about chemical loads in a five story building. Laurie's research shows that fifth floor constraints are identical to the fourth floor requirements. Laurie elaborated on various code issues including building separation strategies.
- 25. Mark asked if the Streisinger rooftop connection to Klamath is included in the cost estimate. Becca said that it was, to the tune of \$1.12M. The group discussed opportunities and constraints associated with the link, and the possibility that offices or other spaces be added to this area.
- 26. The group discussed how program distribution might occur in a five story scheme.
 - Helen stated a desire for BBMI to be located on contiguous floors.
 - Mat/Phy and BBMI can share a floor if necessary
 - Mat/Phy's fourth floor location and connection to Klamath remain important. The basement characterization space remains important.
 - It is important that no scientist is isolated as a result of this project.
- 27. Mark questioned the importance of the Animal Facility and asked for clarity about the history of decision making that led to the current program distribution.
- 28. CPC will be shown options 1A and 2A, but not 3A. The basement Animal Facility option will also be shown.
- 29. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

END OF NOTES

HOR THAARCHITECTURE



Option 1A Pinwheel Offices / Up & Over

Option 2A 5-Story / Up & Over

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.