

**MEETING NOTES**

Meeting Date : January 13, 2009                      Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building  
Author : Becca Cavell                                      Job No. : THA Project 0810  
Re : Coordinating User Group Out-briefing – End of Programming Session 1

Present:

**User Group Members**

Lou Moses, Psychology  
Bruce Bowerman, Biology  
George Sprague, Biology  
Rick Glover, Student Representative

**UO Representatives**

Fred Tepfer  
Emily Eng

**Consultants**

Chuck Cassell, HDR, lab planning principal  
Regina Filipowicz, HDR, lab planner  
Becca Cavell, THA project manager  
Laurie Canup, THA Project Architect

**Summary Notes**

- 1.1 The Design Team summarized its findings from the first set of programming meetings.
- 1.2 There doesn't appear to be adequate SF in current program to allow all Psychology faculty to move to the new building. Current travel times between offices of 7-8 minute will remain – this results in a significant loss of efficiency. Suggested that either all faculty move, or none. Sacrificing any part of BBMI would be very demoralizing.
- 1.3 Existing Psych spaces are very inefficient – the program exercise will test ways to improve this situation and get more use out of less space.
- 1.4 Bruce will be happy with smaller and more collaborative lab space.
- 1.5 One of the Onyx Bridge labs could be accommodated in renovated space.
- 1.6 Bruce noted that ISC3 could be many years away, and suggested that the Onyx offload space in Lewis should be considered as fairly permanent.
- 1.7 Becca identified a series of programmatic spaces that, while not part of the new Lewis building, will still have to be funded by the project:
  - Fit-out of Zebra Fish expansion
  - Server space
  - Renovations of existing space that are part of solution
  - Bruce: pathogen regulation = 6-rack room
- 1.8 Parking: imaging needs 3 spaces for visitor parking. Visitor parking for Cognitive Psychology needs to be quantified. – Straub appears to have 8-12 spaces currently but some of these may be for other uses. Lou will work with Helen to identify parking requirements.
- 1.9 Fred noted that the new Arena project would disrupt parking in the short term for construction, but that once built and on non-game days this project would provide additional parking in this quadrant of campus.
- 1.10 Chuck outlined the team's initial concept for the location of the MRI in the NE corner of the site, and discussed issues associated with the proposed animal facility. A significant project consideration will be a pathway from the animal facility to the imaging facility. The utility tunnel will present challenges.
- 1.11 Vehicular site challenges will include: parking; loading; trucks; deliver; coordination with existing loading docks.
- 1.12 The client noted that most deliveries take the form of standard step trucks.

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.

- 1.13 More information is required about garbage collection.
- 1.14 Homework: CUG to gather information on parking and delivery requirements.
- 1.15 Becca asked if CUG was supportive of the concept of having laboratories “on view”. The group agreed that this could occur both on the Science Walk and on the building interior.
- 1.16 Rick said that this would help foster pride in both work and work place, and would foster interconnections between disciplines.
- 1.17 Security will be a significant issue.
- 1.18 Bruce asked about the connection between Streisinger and the new building. The design team needs to explore possible options for connection in more detail. Some faculty are concerned about losing space at connection points.
- 1.19 Bruce suggested a connection through the Streisinger atrium; Fred noted that this would be challenging as presently this space is NOT considered an atrium by code. But alterations might challenge this interpretation.
- 1.20 Becca asked if there were any preconceptions about the relationship between lab space and office space. There does not appear to be a specific request from any faculty group to place faculty offices adjacent / within lab space: it is more important to group faculty offices close to one another to promote collegiality. [need to confirm for molecular biology – may be a strong tradition to co-locate labs and offices]
- 1.21 A slightly offset office cluster may address all concerns. Faculty/Faculty interactions are very important.
- 1.22 Additional fundraising would enable the project to be expanded.
- 1.23 Team committed to send a preview of program to the CUG prior to the next meeting. A draft will be sent out with two specific goals: to fix mistakes, and then to begin to address program overages.

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.