MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: September 29, 2009	Project	: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Laurie Canup	Job No.	: THA Project 0810
Re	: MEP SD Review Mtg 1 9:30am – 12:30pm		

Present:

UO Representatives
Larry Stromberg
Del McGee
Jeff Madsen
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart
Doug Gorner
Ernie Svensson
Kevin Bloom
Larry Pederson
Steve Stuckmeyer
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Architect
Bruce Johnson, HDR, Mechanical
Karl Sutton, HDR, Mechanical
Dave Knighton, BHE Mechanical
Merv Caldera, BHE Electrical
Jose Guerrero, BHE Electrical
Kelly Knauss, HDR
Mark Butler, LCL

Summary Notes

1. Laurie began with project overview for new representatives
2. Comment: The door of the transformer room is to swing out. Design team to update accordingly.
3. There is a conflict on the south wall of the electrical vault. Access to the vault to come from the east side. Design team to coordinate during DD.
4. Dell McGee said we should use campus compressed air and avoid a new compressor in LISB (called for in the Narrative). Provide a filter and drier in the campus air service to LISB due to dirty lines. New compressors are screw type. Campus pressure is 110 psig. Ernie requested also having a small compressor in LISB as backup to campus air if it fails. UO to run this approach by CPS to verify approved. Upon approval design team will proceed accordingly during DD's.
5. Bruce reviewed the mechanical systems proposed for the building.
6. Bruce reviewed the Interstitial Space walkway/overhead duct clearances above the Vivarium. Dell asked if electrical panels will also be included in the walkway. Merv pointed out that ducts cannot be above panels. More discussion on location of the panels followed. Close coordination between HVAC and electrical will follow in the DD phase.
7. Steve asked why eyewash stations were not included in the tempered water proposal listed in the SD Narrative. Requirement by EHS is to provide tempered water for both eyewash and emergency showers. More discussion followed on whether we should provide a central tempered water systemor consider the use of mixing valves at each device, as well as, the possibility of limiting the amount of tempered water. Limiting the tempered water would be achieved by providing tempered water to all showers but only to a single or few eyewash units within a Lab suite. Design team needs additional direction from UO regarding tempered water at the completion of the SD phase.
8. Doug Gorder requested a separate high temperature (180+ deg F) heating water heat exchanger system for pre-heat coils to prevent coil freezing. The system should be able to shut off in the warm months of the year. The design team will proceed with this during DD.

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.

9. Doug Gorder said they're changing from 20# to 60# steam in the tunnels so there should be more heat. He said to take warm tunnel air and pull this through the building for heating. Bruce explained we're proposing to use an air to water heat pump. Del said that the tunnels see around 80 deg F in the summer when steam load is lowest.
10. There is no space in the tunnels for new heat reclaim equipment. The new heat pump will need to go in the LISB mechanical room and duct through the wall. The team discussed how to make sure there is no short-circuit to the air flow. Jeff Madsen: New tunnel ventilation is currently being planned and UO wants to coordinate location of tunnel exhaust fans with LISB heat reclaim system. If the heat is extracted at the western end of the tunnel and cooler air is ducted to the east, the tunnel pressurization should ensure no short circuit is created, or efficiencies lost to the heat recovery effort. The design team to coordinate tunnel penetrations with UO during DD.
11. Discussion followed about where to use reclaimed heat: Plumbing or HVAC heating. The decision now is to use reclaimed heat for HVAC system and not domestic water. (This is a change from SD Narrative). Fred noted there is not much heat needed on the plumbing side.
12. Ernie wanted to know if the project is providing a new R.O. system large enough to replace the one in Klamath and serve campus. Fred noted there is another R.O. system in Huestis. DWK said the decision to provide a R.O. system serving campus lies with the budget. Laurie asked Fred to address this question. Fred will set up an in-house meeting to discuss. Decision may not be for a week or two per Fred. DWK noted that a recirculating R.O. system gets complicated when we back feed to Klamath. Ernie/Jeff -there will not be space to run R.O. in the tunnel after upgrades are complete. They suggested running a new R.O. water line over the Streisinger roof (in the walkway) to Klamath. Fred noted that this would add cost to the project and other funds would need to be made available. UO to advise design team of RO scope at the commencement of the DD phase.
13. DWK asked about the nitrogen storage tank capacity and Process Cooling Water to be taken from Huestis/Willamette: Fred will set up an in-house meeting to make this decision. UO to advise design team of nitrogen requirements during DD.
14. Del requested separating distribution panels from the TER room. This will be evaluated with the users. (Note that in a later meeting Dale Smith approved the combination of TER with Electrical Panels.) Branch circuit panels to be located within user spaces in shallow closets.
15. With 277 volt lighting you can have fewer branch circuits. Flexibility and controllability can occur with switch legs.
16. Mechanical and Electrical room lighting to be on standby power.
17. Air change rates in the wet labs were discussed. Laurie suggested hiring a CFD consultant to verify effective air flow design and look for ways to reduce fan loads on the building while in operation. DWK noted that the minimum ventilation rate required by ASHRAE is 1 cfm/sq ft. Steve Stuckmeyer also confirmed 1 cfm/sq ft or 6 air changes per hour is what EHS requires. The basis of design for the system will be ASHRAE. This issue to be further studied during the DD phase.
18. Sash positions are generally 16" high at UO, with some exceptions in Mat Phy. Steve has a concern about the dependency of auto sash positioners. Fisher Hamilton (reputable company) has come out with integral sash positioners with their fume hoods. This will be mocked-up for EHS / User 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.

HDR THA ARCHITECTURE

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: September 29, 2009	Project	: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Laurie Canup	Job No.	: THA Project 0810
Re	: CPS SD Review Mtg 1 1:00 pm – 2:30pm		

Present:

UO Representatives
Jeff Madsen
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Architect
Bruce Johnson, HDR, Mechanical
Karl Sutton, HDR, Mechanical
Dave Knighton, BHE Mechanical
Merv Caldera, BHE Electrical
Kelly Knauss, HDR
Mark Butler, LCL

Summary Notes

Please note that most of the requested UO Central Plant Services team did not attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict. Jeff Madsen showed up around 2:00. The meeting was informal.

1. A number of strategies were discussed about how to route the Sanitary Sewer line on the site. This is an 18" line that serves existing builings which needs to gravity flow to Franklin though a maze of obstacles. 4 options were reviewed with the team leaning toward routing the pipe through the tunnel if possible. Jeff thinks that there might be room if the pipe runs low across the tunnel. Jeff is to follow up and send CD's of the tunnel. At the time the notes were written, drawings had been submitted to the design team. The design team requests additional discussions with Jeff Madsen to coordinate the penetration of the tunnel.

2. DWK asked Fred if we need to install the heat recovery units inside a penthouse as indicated by the UO Standards. Fred said no this can go on top of the Penthouse (as shown on HDR plans). The design team will follow up with a substitution request.

3. Additional tunnel ventilation discussion. Jeff Madsen: Replacement of tunnel chilled and steam piping will start at the CPS around Feb 2010 and should be at LISB soon thereafter. DWK requested they provide stubs for LISB but said we won't know the final flows and pipe size for a few more months. Jeff said they might just add branch tees if the flows are not known at that time they need to order materials. The design team will work to determine t-sizes / flow rates.

4. Neutralization tank for Lab waste: Fred confirmed that the team is to provide a pass through tank for now (same as ISC phase 1).

5. DWK asked about the neutralization tank mentioned in the UO standard for dumping cage wash discharge to sanitary system. Discussion followed. Decision was that it has not been an issue in the past and should not be now. DWK pointed to the UO standard where a range of allowable PH levels are outlined for sanitary discharge. Based on discussions, the group thinks the discharge will be well within the stated PH levels.

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.

6. DWK asked Fred if we can proceed with the Huestis study. Laurie said HDR/THA are still working on the fee proposal. Fred will review the fee first and then decide if we should proceed now or wait and see if the Zebrafish grant can pay for some of the design work. UO will hear about the grant in January. THA/HDR will submit a minimum exploratory fee in the next few weeks.

7. DWK asked about status of Atrium and smoke removal required. It was noted that there currently isn't adequate air-in / openings for a smoke evacuation system. Laurie mentioned that there is a project in California that uses passive smoke removal for their atrium smoke evacuation system. This was approved with the local Fire Marshall with the use of CFD modeling. Fred is interested in the idea and will review it with his contacts with the city. If it seems like a viable option, the team will evaluate during the DD phase.

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.

HDR THA ARCHITECTURE

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: September 29, 2009	Project	: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Laurie Canup	Job No.	: THA Project 0810
Re	: Tel/Data AV SD Review Mtg 1 2:30 pm – 4:00 pm		

Present:

UO Representatives
Eric Fullar
Jeff Hite
Dale Smith
Andrew Bonamici
Jeff Madsen
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Architect
Bruce Johnson, HDR, Mechanical
Karl Sutton, HDR, Mechanical
Dave Knighton, BHE Mechanical
Merv Caldera, BHE Electrical
Kelly Knauss, HDR
Mark Butler, LCL

Summary Notes

1. Telephone closets will be located on each floor. (TR's) The servers for the building will be located elsewhere. UPS systems will be located in the TR rooms. Merv suggested a central UPS. These rooms to have high temperature sprinkler heads.
2. The TER and TR rooms are to be 65-75 degrees and 30-55% relative humitidy. Fred asked if we can use outside air to cool these rooms instead of cooling units. DWK explained that high efficiency filters will likely be needed for this cooling. It may be possible to supply air from room air if the loads are light and exhaust to outside. Provide chilled water stubs in case this is not enough cooling or they add more equipment later. Merv received load information on the closets and basement from Dale to assist with the cooling design. During DD, the design team will evaluate the need for filters and the possibility of locating the TR rooms on an outside wall.
3. UO will provide data to the site and equipment but are not pulling wire in the building. The CM/GC should assume a similar scope of work to electrical.
4. The large meeting rooms should support video conferencing.
5. Standard data boxes will be at bench labs. The current density of data boxes will likely reduce. Surface mounted raceway might be advantageous in the data labs, however the design team will investigate with the users. Data boxes at 6' oc might be more cost effective in the long run.
6. Floor boxes are to be avoided even if it means power poles or pony walls.
7. A cell phone relay system will eventually be installed.
8. The design team was asked to carefully evaluate the sanitary line's proposed relation to the existing duct banks. Pot holing will take place to gain a better understanding of these constraints.

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.

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: September 30, 2009	Project	: UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Laurie Canup	Job No.	: THA Project 0810
Re	: Site, Landscape, Public Safety SD Review 9:00 am – 11:00 am		

Present:

UO Representatives
Herb Horner
Connie Ekstrom
Jane Brubaker
Roger Kerrigan
Vince Babkirk
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Architect
Oliver Kuehne, HDR, Landscape
Geoff Larsen, BHE, Civil
Larry Gilbert, CMGS, Landscape
Mark Butler, LCL

Summary Notes

1. Agate parking lot: Facilities staff expressed the desire to protect the existing False Beech in front of Oregon Hall where the additional parking spaces are shown. To save the tree the redesign should accommodate standard parking spaces to the west and east of the tree, with handicapped spaces (if required by the city) replacing the northernmost existing parking spaces. The existing Tulip tree at the Agate Street edge may be removed if necessary. Screen the lot where possible.
2. Agate Entrance Green: Show expected future condition in the plan, rather than existing conditions. Identify the Agate Entrance Green area as a separate project by others through a dashed outline or similar. The area should show:
    - The existing U of O sign and associated landscaping.
    - The estimated configuration of the right turn lane which protects the oaks.
    - A widened path to match the bike/ped path shown in the limit-of-work.
    - Removal of the Chestnut tree at the Franklin/Agate corner to allow for sufficient sidewalk width and ramps
3. Bike/ped path:
    - Preferred width is 12 feet.
    - Increase the radius of the meander at the building corners and straighten path enough to mitigate blind spots as bikes round corners. The team discussed the option to put the path on pin piles within the drip line of the tree. This is acceptable to facilities as long as the team works closely with the arborist to develop a foundation for the walkway that will not harm the trees.
    - Remove diagonal path through Agate Green and enhance the sense of green space. The desire line can be addressed by softening the existing north south path east of the U of O sign to provide a more direct connection to the Science Walk. This area will need to be included into the limit-of-work
    - Look into creating a more direct connection from the pathway between Deschutes and Oregon Halls to the north-south path along LISB's eastern edge.

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.

4. Plant material: Team to specify planting that meets U of O campus standards.
5. Fire lane: discussion about the need for red flush curbs delineating the fire lane. How does the fire lane cross the bike/ped path? Fred raised concerns about anything that might pose a hazard to peds or bikes, and thinks that painted stripes would be too maintenance intensive. The design team will work with the city to provide visible parameters for the trucks without visually obstructing the pedestrian pathways.
6. North entry: landscaping should retain views into the building entry and the glass atrium while screening service and parking areas. (2) proposed trees to be eliminated to better allow views into the site. Careful placement of low plantings will be provided for screening.
7. Stormwater planters: Geoff reiterated the stormwater concept was based on 2 collection points, one located just to the southwest of the grand oaks, the other being located within the planter area north of the science walk near the northwest corner of Deschutes. There was a discussion about THA's desire to have 6 to 8 inch "curbs" surrounding the planter beds, which facilities staff liked for fear of a tunnel effect. However, the drop in grade to the east, and the need to drain to the west for a portion of the length makes this difficult. Larry Gilbert suggested a step down approach to minimize wall heights. Planter walls and stromwater filtration will be studied with UO's concerns in mind during DD.
8. Pavers in Science Walk: Larry expressed concerns about protecting the pavers in the Science Walk during construction. He has doubts they can be protected in place as currently planned and believes they should be salvaged, cataloged, and reinstalled. It is LCL's intent to protect the pavers in place. This will continue to be evaluated.
9. Roof runoff from Streisinger: Geoff stated that it may be introduced into the stormwater planter along the LISB north edge if there is enough capacity, or directly drained into the existing collection point. Subsequent to this meeting, BHE reviewed this with the City of Eugene who stated that this roof water does not need to be treated even though there is a new covered pedestrian connection at the roof of Streisinger.

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.

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date	: September 30, 2009	Project	:	UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author	: Regina Filipowicz/ Laurie Canup	Job No.	:	THA Project 0810
Re	: Environmental Health & Safety SD Review Meeting 11:00 am – 1:00 pm			

Present:

UO Representatives
Kay Coots
Emily Eng
Dana Peterson
Drew Standridge
Denise Stewart
Steve Stuckmeyer
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Manager
Regina Filipowicz, HDR, Lab Planner
Katie Soulé, HDR
Matt Person, LCL

Summary Notes

1. Laurie began with project overview for new representatives
2. Laurie mentioned that we need to add a restroom to the basement, Fred believes that the fixture count may negate this need. This will be reviewed with the users.
3. Main building air intake is from the Penthouse level, Heustis's air quality needs to be fixed before the building can be safely occupied.
4. In the Animal Facility the door at the East end of the Corridor in the vestibule will be revised to swing out.
5. The sprinkler room is subject to change, but currently can be accessed from outdoors.
6. The Animal Facility is entered on the North end at one door and includes a connection to Streisinger.
7. Kay asked if Monte has discussed a need for a BSL2 facility. Kay thinks this might be necessary. The design team will review these needs with UO and address with Monte.
8. Above the corridor of the Animal Facility runs a catwalk that extends 11 ft in both the north and south direction. This can be accessed from the up and over connection so maintenance can access without gowning up. Currently facilities go through clearance to access maintenance items in the Animal Facility, thus the catwalk access will be helpful. The catwalk will be provided with sprinklers above and below catwalk space
9. Washing changing facilities are all duplicated between the old and new facility. How is the corridor staying clean with the north entry? Is bedding being carried through the clean hallway? The bedding will not be carried through here but will be pumped out. The design team was asked to consider what happens if the pump fails.
10. Laurie mentioned that the Code Path of the new facility is to combine LISB with Streisinger and consider as one building. The rated separations would then be at Klamath, Deschutes, ISC 1, and Heustis. The atrium will be rated 1 hour. Generally speaking, the city is on board with this approach but will need time to more carefully review the documents at later phases.
11. Currently the 4th floor is being shelled out, but it is likely that budget will be found to build this out by the completion of the project. The 4th floor is divided into two control areas with the high

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.

density fume hood labs. Steve noted that the narrative only specified 1 hour ratings on the 4th floor. This will be modified to 2-hours in the DD phase.

12. In the event of the roof connection being deleted a new stair will be added in the location of the northwest shaft, the current shaft will move north. Laurie is concerned about horizontal travel distances to stairs and believes an additional stair may be needed to ease vertical communication. In the event a stair is added, Drew said that his sprinkler room can be relocated but the room must be easily accessible at all times. UO to advise on how the design team is to proceed.
13. There are exiting concerns for the wet labs on the 4th floor due to exiting through the PD/GS offices with chairs. Regina suggested that we swap out an instrument space into the unassigned location to provide exiting.
14. A misprint in the narrative needs to read only vertical rising sashes on fume hoods, currently labeled as horizontal and vertical.
15. Fred suggested we switch TR and Chemical library to provide access through the lab to the Chemical library.
16. Chemical library could be an H occupancy as narrative is written which doesn't require a separate suppression system, not sure which H occupancy this is.
17. Drew asked Fred if the project really needs to be one building with Streisinger as separate buildings allow for greater flexibility for control areas. This would require a 2-hour separation at the Streisinger connection. Firelight could be used to make windows 2hr rated on Streisinger, this runs about $100/sf. Could also use a physical shutter system, but this is often unattractive.
18. Steve asked if horizontal connection goes away does the chemical library even make sense in this location. The design team will keep this in mind as they consider future flexibility; however Matt thinks we're okay with the budget as long as the economy doesn't improve too much, so the need for this flexibility may not be there.
19. An atrium smoke evacuation system will be required. The team needs a consultant for this work. Laurie mentioned that it may be possible to use a natural ventilation strategy for the smoke evacuation. Drew mentioned that modeling which shows heat spread/smoke spread helps with the city's approval.
20. Dana asked about fall protection strategies. The majority if the project will cover this with parapet walls at guardrail heights. Tie-offs may be needed on the roof of the penthouse and in the event tie-offs are needed the design team requests a review by OSHA be coordinated by UO. Tie-offs on the parapet walls is ideal where possible.
21. Drew asked if their were any other confined spaces, Regina mentioned one under washer in Animal Facility
22. Animal Facility is planning for 10 air changes/hr, the air change is to the space and will be HEPA filtered to the rack. Laurie proposed direct connecting air to the rack and taking a reduction on the room air changes. Fred proposed a system that monitors the ammonia in the space and when needed, the system picks up air change rates to accommodate the air quality. Kay questioned who will respond when the air quality monitors go into alarm. This system would support the health and safety of the animals. Kay is hesitant of using the ammonia detector unless the users take responsibility for responding to alarms. Laurie thinks the University should try to find a way to use the system if maintenance issues can be resolved as this would help save energy. Research needs to be done on how facilities will respond to a system like this.
23. Steve asked what the air changes in the dry lab spaces are. Most dry labs are similar to office space. Conference rooms are tied to air handlers. A fan assisted natural ventilation strategy with supplemental radiant heating and cooling is being implemented for offices and allowable dry lab spaces
24. Steve asked about the air change rates in the wet labs. The minimum air changes are 6/hr by code. 6-8 air changes/hour range was proposed by Bruce yesterday. Laurie suggested that high air change rates don't necessarily provide good ventilation. Effective ventilation design is tied to air flow direction, diffuser type, and rates. The most important factor is the air quality at the human occupied zone. Flex lab spaces may interfere with air flow so it can be hard to predict. Denise stated that these labs aren't going to be as flexible as at first understood. These labs are likely to be long-term arrangements.

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.

25. Laurie asked about UO policy on chemical use outside of the hood. Steve indicated that it is nearly impossible to manage and chemicals are often used on the bench. As a result, EHS is concerned about air quality in the labs.
26. Light and occupancy sensors can be tied to air changes when unoccupied. Kay asked about how to handle the transition from “unoccupied” to “occupied” modes in the system. Fred indicated that a regular hourly or every other hour flush of rooms seems to be the best way to manage this issue since hours of operation are hard to pin down.
27. Kay mentioned that the Animal Facility currently has problems with Isoflurane being used without a fume hood or snorkel. We need to find out where the anesthesia will be used and plan for snorkels or hoods in those locations. The design team will work closely on this with the users.
28. Eyewash/Safety showers will be located in the cage wash area and safety showers will be added in labs between every 2nd/3rd module as well as in the handicap stall of the toilet rooms.
29. Steve mentioned that the 4th floor doors are opening onto the atrium, so home base is serving as the anteroom to mitigate pressure changes. All doors will be on closers between offices and wet labs.
30. A visual connection is needed on home base doors to help keep them closed. Film could be used on the glazing if required by the users to mitigate security issues.
31. Drew discussed the smoke control system and mentioned that doors opening for makeup air will not be acceptable. Make-up air for the atrium smoke evacuation system will be evaluated further in DD. Drew asked if alarm went off would smoke be pulled into the atrium. The design of the system will implement door closers and door seals to maintain pressurization without pulling smoke into the atrium.
32. The sprinkler control room needs to be accessed to shut off on each floor. It is planned to run up the shaft but then it cannot be accessed and will need to be relocated.
33. Drew mentioned that the current fire panel in Streisinger might work and we would not need to purchase a new one. Horns and Strobes would need to match the Streisinger system.
34. Laurie suggested that the 4th floor could be enclosed with glazing to create 2 atmospheres; this would remove the need for a smoke evacuation system, removes the need for louvers, and saves money. Fred is not confident that the city will accept this approach. Fred will investigate options with his city contacts.

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.

HDR THA ARCHITECTURE

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date :	September 30, 2009	Project :	UO Lewis Integrative Science Building
Author :	Regina Filipowicz and Laurie Canup	Job No. :	THA Project 0810
Re :	Lockshop / Security / Alarm 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm		

Present:

UO Representatives
Bill Anderson
Emily Eng
Denise Stewart
Ken Straw
Fred Tepfer

Consultants
Laurie Canup, THA, Project Manager
Regina Filipowicz, HDR, Lab Planner
Katie Soulé, HDR
Merv Caldera, BHE
Matt Person, LCL

Summary Notes

1. Laurie began with project overview for new representatives.
2. DPS's role is to maintain card and alarm systems on campus.
3. Ken shared that users have difficulties using current security system in Animal Facility.
4. Ken suggested controlling the perimeter of the lab, 3-4 biometric readers are needed at $20k each, and then prox readers can be used just within the lab. Both Biometrics and prox readers with pin numbers would provide the needed security at the animal facility.
5. There is a design issue with entering the Animal facility into a dirty area and being able to directly enter Streisinger's clean area. The design team will study these relationships in DD.
6. Current security in Animal Facility is CCTV, Security system with alarms, and access control system (prox reader and pin for after hours)
7. Ken will be providing whole package including cards and electrified hardware. UO has a contract with Ingersoll Rand who writes the specs and Ken supplies the hardware.
8. Laurie mentioned that sound seals or acoustical doors may be needed in Cog Neuro run rooms. The design team will work with the users to evaluate acoustical requirements. Fred suggested a tour of their existing rooms and an evaluation of acceptability – this can be a "measuring stick" for what needs to be done in the new facility.
9. Animal Facility currently has old DVR system; NVR would be preferred for the facility. Currently they have 8-9 cameras. Ken suggested one camera at primary entrances of departments if they request it. He estimates that the new facility would need no more than 12 cameras. Ken mentioned that cameras might be needed in stairwells and the connections between Deschutes and Streisinger.
10. Kens rough calculation based on square footage and building type is $675k for whole package. This includes windows, doors, and motion all being monitored at the animal facility.
11. Ken suggested that alarms are not needed for data analysis rooms because they are within a suite.
12. The chemical room should be equipped with a prox reader; MRI currently has a proxy reader as well.
13. Suite security will be dealt with one card reader entry, one keyed entry.
14. LCL has budgeted for 33 prox readers.

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.

15. Team needs to sit down with Animal Facility to go through access points. Fred suggested that this should happen with all users when the plans are frozen at the end of DD. Ken will attend user meetings to discuss access points.

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.