

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date : June 17, 2009 Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author : Laurie Canup Job No. : THA Project 0810
Re : Coordinating User Group – Schematic Design Meeting 6

Present:

User Group Members

Helen Neville
John Conery
Mark Lonergan
Bruce Bowerman
Rick Glover
Ed Vogel
Lou Moses (co-chair)
Mike Jefferis
Richard Taylor
Corey Griffin
Rich Linton

UO Representatives

Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng

Consultants

Roger Snyder, HDR
Thom Hacker, THA
Chuck Cassell, HDR
Laurie Canup, THA

CM/GC

Matt Pearson
Mark Butler

Summary Notes

Introductions

Fred kicked the meeting off by beginning with introducing the Lease Crutcher Lewis(LCL) CM/GC team. As CM (Construction Manager), LCL will help the team make cost/value decisions, and as GC (General Contractor), they will build the building.

Fred outlined the goals for the meeting:

- CUG to provide guidance to the design team about how to respond to CPC comments.
- CUG to provide direction about how to deal with initial cost estimate which is about \$7M high.
- CUG to develop strategies to meet the gap.

Baseline Program Review

- Chuck explained how we got to Program V7 and also explained that the main component areas or the “big numbers” are the most important and that the estimated scheme reasonably delivers these numbers.
- Fred explained that the program doesn’t always map perfectly to a building design. The building is a way to solve needs that the program defines.
- Chuck responded to Lou’s question about meeting the needs, explaining that the plans deliver the spirit of the program.
- Mark stated a concern about whether or not he CUG’s needs will be met once the cuts have been made to move things forward.
- Bruce stated that the baseline program should include the space lost due to LISB connections to Streisinger.

Estimated Scheme Analysis

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.

- Thom reviewed the drawings that the estimate is based on. This is what can begin to establish a budget benchmark. Generally, the large space blocks align with the program. The design team will begin to look for efficiencies to minimize usable space loss.
- Thom stated that our recent studies show more fourth floor SF when compressing the building from the east. This new area on the 4th floor is not programmatically Mat Phi Space, but is BBMI space.

Update from Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

- Fred –provided an update on CPC meeting and said that we are planning to create a “Gateway” condition with a large Agate Green as a trade-off for the large green space between Streisinger and LISB. We also plan to provide a better pedestrian / bike pathway along the Franklin edge and between Deschutes and Oregon Hall. We heard mixed messages from the CPC regarding “Up and Over”, thus having the animal facility connected to Streisinger on the first floor. The design team has been directed to proceed with this approach which must feel open and be easily accessible by the public. Additionally, we’ll need to look at the whole Franklin edge to improve the experience and image of the University to the public. The building itself will be a representation of the campus. Appearance of this edge and how people move through the space will be critical in gaining CPC approval.
- An enhanced Agate Green will require that the eastern edge of the building shift west. Chuck said that this proposes a few challenges, namely relative to how the Imaging Center relates to this Agate Green and the Magnet’s relationship to the tunnel and the main power feeders on the site. We’ll be working with an EM/RFI consultant to help us work through these issues.
- Jim reminded everyone that it is critical to think about the performance of the Imaging Center, which takes priority over the CPC’s larger Agate Green. High quality science space is our first concern.

Cost Saving Ideas

Make building more efficient
Building Shell
Delay the purchase of equipment and/or furniture
Possible program reduction

- Fred outlined what shell means. Typically it provides services to accommodate future build out, but doesn’t distribute the services or finish the space. Depending on the type and amount of space, this strategy might save upwards to \$2.5M per floor.
- Jim reminded everyone that we’ll have a lead time to deal with shelling space. Fred and Chuck said that typically the money shows up to enable in-sequence build-out.
- Rich strongly supports the idea of shelling.
- Mat Phi stated that they are willing to shell the fourth floor but are unwilling to loose the bridge connection to Klamath.
- Rich reminded the CUG that the fundamental element, with exception of mouse genetics on 3rd floor, is that we need to be committed to the full programmatic build-out of BBMI.
- Jim asked if the animal facility is “right-sized” and Chuck responded that for the work that is proposed to be done, yes. If the proposed work changes, then the size can change.
- The CUG agreed that they are ok with one floor of mixed BBMI / Mat Phi use.

Baseline Program Summary

- Chuck suggested reducing programmed instrumentation space to match available basement and set that as baseline.
- Fred reminded the design team to add back the space lost for the Streisinger connection into the baseline.
- Chuck will issue Program V8 based on input from the CUG and Fred / Emily will distribute for CUG approval.

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.