

**MEETING NOTES**

Meeting Date : December 8, 2009                      Project : UO Lewis Integrative Science Building  
Author : Becca Cavell                                      Job No. : THA Project 0810  
Re : Coordinating User Group – Design Development Meeting 2

Present:

**User Group Members**

Helen Neville  
Rick Glover  
Lou Moses (co-chair)  
Mike Haley  
Richard Taylor  
Paul Dassonville  
Mark Lonergan  
Rich Linton

**CM/GC**

Matt Pearson, LCL  
Mark Butler, LCL

**UO Representatives**

Fred Tepfer  
Emily Eng  
Denise Stewart  
Jeff Madsen

**Consultants**

Marjorie Brown, HDR  
Chuck Cassell, HDR  
Regina Filipovich, HDR  
Kelly Knauss, HDR  
Laurie Canup, THA  
Steve Simpson, THA  
Becca Cavell, THA

**Summary Notes**

CUG Meeting Notes

1. During introductions Marjorie Brown from HDR was introduced to the committee. Marjorie replaces Roger Snyder as the Principal in Charge for the project.
2. Becca outlined the meeting agenda and noted that the committee would be asked to give clear direction of a series of issues.
3. Steve presented the design updates for the exterior of building:
  - The south elevation has been developed to show the window offsets occurring above the first floor. This achieves three goals: it represents integrative science, reinforces the base of the building, and marks the second floor atrium level.
  - The overall building height may be reduced by 8 inches at each of the two upper floors. The design team intends to study the effectiveness of various sunshade systems, ceiling heights, and other issues associated with this effort.
  - Fred noted that one option is to integrate PVs into the sunshade system.
  - Rainwater will be captured and directed into planters as part of the sustainable site strategies; on the north side a rain garden is being developed.
  - The team proposes using two blends of brick, and changes in brick plane, to articulate and modulate the design of the facades. The window heads and sills will be framed with precast concrete.
  - The bridge connection to Deschutes Hall will be as transparent as possible.
  - On the north elevation, the windows are arranged in a more uniform manner according to the rigorous lab module.

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.

- Louvers are now shown in correct locations for the fourth floor mechanical room to the east.
  - The rooftop fans will have a degree of character due to their functional requirements.
4. The committee responded:
- General consensus favored the red brick blend that was reviewed. A lighter and more contrasting panel was supported conceptually.
  - The Franklin Blvd elevation needs more work and should learn from the approach to the south façade re: organization of windows and reduction in scale. The art panels need particular consideration, and need to be coordinated with the landscaping so that any art isn't concealed.
  - Richard suggested that there may be some opportunity to soften the north façade at the west corner where large brick expanses currently dominate the building. The committee discussed the relative visibility of the building from Franklin, and Fred noted that the north side of the building will be experienced at both vehicular speed and also by people on foot and on bikes. The design should take this into consideration.
5. Steve presented the design updates for the interior public spaces of the building
- The vestibule has been expanded slightly and shifted south.
  - The entry to the Neville / Pfeiffer dry lab has been modified to provide a corner window.
  - The area adjacent to the stair up to the mezzanine could be a series of oversized steps with platforms. This would likely require two handrails. It might be possible to include both this concept AND an artwork component as discussed at the previous CUG meeting. Emily expressed concern about ADA; Fred expressed concern about maintenance.
  - The south atrium wall is made of wood, and Steve proposed a wedge-shaped component on floors three and four housing student desks and a conference room; this element includes windows looking toward the stair and trees. The wood is treated as a carved object and includes benches and a niche at the atrium level.
  - The north atrium wall is reflective and white. Steve proposed a design approach where the laboratory entrances are marked with clear glass and views into the lab spaces, while other lab spaces have high level transom windows. The wall surfaces could be made of back-painted glass with integrated art work or white boards. The committee suggested placing more controlled displays at the lower levels with perhaps some white board type surface AND art / display on the upper floors. The committee also suggested incorporating electronic media to display faculty research, citing a recent exhibition at the library as a precedent.
6. Laurie led a discussion about Sustainability Goals for the project:
- The project is being guided by 11 goals established at an early meeting of the sustainability committee. The 11<sup>th</sup> goal focused on LEED and BETC; Laurie briefed the group on what these acronyms mean with background on both issues.
  - Laurie and Fred discussed the various metrics that are used in this field. The President's Climate Commitment has been signed by UO, and focuses on carbon reduction; the LISB project goals are in line with this approach, with a 40% reduction in energy use being a prime goal.
  - The group discussed the relative merits of the LEED and DAD LEED equivalent approaches, and the various tangible and intangible benefits of committing to the LEED system.
  - Laurie showed the current conservative scorecard for LISB and noted that the project is easily at the LEED Gold level, and with some focus and investment it should be possible to achieve LEED Platinum.
  - Moving from DAS LEED to true LEED will incur some costs – both design and administrative fees. BETC credits will likely offset some of this investment.
  - Helen repeated her desire that the roof be a green roof, and noted that trees could be used to mitigate the appearance of the rooftop mechanical systems. Becca asked that the group recognize the request and return to it at a later date; the current discussion is a broader look.

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.

- Fred noted that Chris Ramey's AUA group is skeptical about LEED, and that the process can result in "point chasing" and the expenditure of construction funds to achieve points that might not make sense environmentally. An advantage of the DAS LEED system is that it allows partial points for certain approaches.
  - Mark Longeran asked the design team if the project would be different if LEED became a goal – if the design team would propose different solutions if the project weren't LEED.
  - Jeff Madsen talked about UO's recent LEED projects (the Alumni Center and the Arena for example) and the group discussed the merit of a collective body of LEED projects versus isolated examples. The marketing opportunities and actions of peer institutions were discussed.
  - The committee was asked its opinion regarding committing to LEED, and if so to what level. The committee agreed that the project should be registered for LEED, understanding that this does not represent a requirement to then proceed. The design team and UO will review the scorecard and identify possible areas where points could be gained, and working with LCL during the January costing effort the team will work to identify the additional costs the project will incur to achieve LEED Platinum. THA/HDR will also identify the costs that USGBC will bring to the project to administer and certify the project.
7. Becca reviewed the current space planning status with an emphasis on the office and meeting room areas. The committee agreed that a subcommittee should be established to guide the development of the faculty office areas.
  8. Becca showed furniture options for the public spaces.
    - The group discussed "living room" and "kitchen table" approaches to furniture, and agreed that the atrium should include social furniture organizations the support interactions between faculty members and other building users.
    - Furniture arrangements could vary vertically through the building.
    - On the atrium level the furniture could be arranged in groups around the wood bench zone rather than centrally in the space.
    - The atrium level should feel like a "living room"
    - The furniture should be mobile and re-arrangeable, and should take fire code requirements into consideration.
    - THA/HDR will bring images of furniture concept options to the next meeting for further review.
  9. Becca introduced some ideas for floor finishes.
    - Concrete is an acceptable floor finish for the public spaces. The concrete could be polished or stained and sealed; the committee understands that concrete isn't a perfect product but will crack and have variations in appearance.
    - Faculty offices should have carpet tile floors. Concrete may be acceptable in some offices. The design team will investigate acoustical implications. Linoleum might also be an option.
    - Bench labs will have concrete floors or sheet rubber.
    - Dry labs: Helen stated a preference for carpet throughout but would allow more durable products in the waiting areas and circulation spaces.
    - The design team will bring a proposal to the CUG for an approach to flooring material uses. The CUG will guide the process.
  10. Fred noted that the building users will be asked to sign off on the arrangement of their spaces soon. Becca noted that the pending drawing issue set can be used for this process. The animal facility and characterization spaces will be omitted from the approval process at present.
  11. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

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.