

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date : July 2, 2009 Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author : Laurie Canup Job No. : THA Project 0810
Re : Coordinating User Group – Schematic Design Meeting 7

Present:

User Group Members

Mark Loneragan
Bruce Bowerman
Lou Moses (co-chair)
Jim Hutchison (co-chair)
Paul Dassonville
Dietrich Belitz
Richard Taylor
Rich Linton
Corey Griffin

UO Representatives

Fred Tepfer
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart

Consultants

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

CM/GC

Matt Pearson
Mark Butler

Summary NotesIntroductions

Emily kicked the meeting off by beginning with introducing the new attendees – Paul Dassonville will be attending CUG meetings as a representative of the Cog/Psychology faculty.

Campus Character – Part II

Emily provided a re-cap from Part I and reminded the CUG that UO buildings were conceptualized to be high quality, human scaled, with careful detailing.

Thom presented the design team's response to the categories that were previously discussed reminding the CUG that we believe that buildings that engage the technology of our time can be harmonious and compatible within their surroundings. Topics included:

- Building meets sky. Transparency helps let one see the sky through the building, thereby engaging the sky. Stacks can be a way to engage the sky while representing the science in the building.
- Rhythm of windows: Tacoma is one example of a way to relate to historical façade via datum lines and proportional rhythm, but uses a more modern approach to the façade, explaining that we feel it is important for our buildings to represent the structural character and speak to how they are made.
- Bold main entrance: Recessed entrances with a porch like element can be welcoming. It is nice for the entry to be transparent as a way to see what kind of activity is happening inside. Dual scale expression (building scale / people scale) is a nice way to set the entrance apart. LISB has an opportunity to use the entrance as a way to express the science within.
- Secondary entrance: Less formal but discernable. This will apply to the Imaging Suite.
- Operable windows: This is helpful to provide human scale to the building. We will strive to provide as many operable windows as possible, given the science happening in the room.

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.

- Arcades: we'll have to decide if this is a valuable part of the project. If so, it might be at the science walk.
- Top, Middle, Bottom: One way to set the top apart is to set the top floor back. This can also help relate the scale of the building to the surroundings.
- Details: We love to incorporate artwork as detail into our buildings. Details also show the care in which the building was built, and allows light to be filtered, and can represent the human activity within.

Roger encouraged people to think about the difference between image and architecture. Architecture is experiential – perhaps walking and looking at buildings is a better way to gauge these topics.

Updates

Program:

- Fred reminded the CUG that during the last meeting we reviewed the CPC comments and the building budget. This set of images are schemes, looking from outside in. Not putting program into the building. By responding to the CPC and budget, we will inform the program. Next step will be to see how the program can layer into this.
- Chuck – once directed, we will refine blocks of space and do layouts and space planning and then recraft the program.

Schedule:

- Laurie reviewed the schedule and informed the CUG that we are currently 2+ months behind the originally proposed schedule. We will be working with the CM/GC and Campus Planning to fine tune the schedule and look for ways to make-up ground.

Up and Over:

- Laurie showed the scheme options for the connection to Streisinger.
- Elevators - the team believes that in order get CPC approval, the north-south connection must be accessible. The design team can look for ways to lessen the impact on the spaces below and will work with an EMI consultant to evaluate options.

Scheme Options

Thom reviewed the status of the plans and explained that by moving the core up into atrium, we gain future flexibility for the design. He presented 2 Schemes, what we call Pinwheel and Offices East.

Both schemes use “Up and Over” and locate the Imaging Suite, the Neville Lab, and the Animal Facility on the first floor. Both schemes show 9 wet-lab modules on each floor, which provides a total of 27 wet lab modules as compared to the 28 that are currently programmed. This most impacts the vivarium, making a smaller facility. Both schemes step back the 4th floor at the south edge, to help with building scale. This floor provides some amount of flexibility.

Comments:

- If we move mechanical up to a penthouse, we could gain that space if we get the funds.
- Roger reminded the CUG that there will be changes as we work with structural and mechanical engineers, Codes, etc.
- Bruce had some reservation about the double-loaded corridor. The design team will address this concern. One idea is to move the stair and put a window at the end of the corridor.
- Corey suggested relocating the bathroom entry so that it is more private and not in a potential interaction space.
- Offices East provides a better cluster of office space for faculty.

The CUG directed the design team to further develop “Offices East” scheme.

The next CUG meeting will be postponed one week. This will allow the design team to spend a little more time with the program fit and check in with their consultants about the development of the plans.

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.