



July 21, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the July 12, 2005 CPC**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, Frances Dyke, Richard Linton,
Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Michael Stamm, Greg Stripp

Guests: Paul Bloch (Computer Science), Jane Brubaker (Facilities Services),
Jim Hutchison (Chemistry), Dave Johnson (Chemistry), Roger Kerrigan (Facilities
Services), Tim King (Facilities Services), Charlene Lindsay (Facilities Services),
Andrea Mathews (Student, Architecture), Ellen McCumsey (Neuroscience),
Fred Tepfer (University Planning)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

1. ONAMI at the University of Oregon Project – Meeting One

Background: The chair and staff explained that the committee is being asked to identify key Campus Plan policies, patterns, and other appropriate campus design issues for the ONAMI at the University of Oregon Project. In addition, the committee is asked to comment on the proposed user group representation.

Rich Linton, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and user group member, described the project's purpose. The project's origin is unique and has a broader constituency than most. The 9.5 million dollar project will include about 20,000 gsf of new space and is part of a larger Oregon-wide initiative to enhance nanoscience research and development. It will free up space in existing facilities to accommodate other existing needs in the sciences.

Jim Hutchison, Chemistry Professor and user group chair, provided a history of the planning process to date. The two primary factors affecting site selection were collaboration and a vibration-free space. Collaboration is a signature of how the university does science on campus, and the project's intent is to build upon internal relations among scientists and expand relations with entities beyond campus. Establishing physical connectivity is particularly important among scientists who are not as likely to naturally interact. A vibration-free space is essential to accommodate nano-scale research.

UNIVERSITY PLANNING OFFICE

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 T (541) 346-5562 F (541) 346-6197 www.uplan.uoregon.edu

The user group considered many sites including sites in the Riverfront Research Park, main campus, and East Campus. The proposed underground site was selected because it best meets the two factors described above. It is adjacent to related science facilities and it exceeds the highest vibration-free standards. Excellent site stability means that a world-class vibration-free research facility can be built without spending millions of dollars per instrument. The stability is a result of the solid rock mass close to the surface and isolation from adjacent Franklin traffic due to an existing utility tunnel. Future stability is guaranteed because no construction is allowed above the facility, a designated open space. In addition, service needs that often cause vibrations and added cost (e.g., elevators) can be located in existing connected buildings.

The proposed site also provides an opportunity to improve the appearance and function of the shared east-facing Huestis/Streisinger entrance. The proposed aboveground portion of the project would establish a new entrance for the ONAMI facility as well as Huestis and Streisinger while preserving the Science Walk connection.

Chris Ramey, University Planning, reviewed the *Campus Plan* policies and patterns. He said all policies are relevant, but Policy 2: Open-Space Framework is particularly relevant because the project will reconstruct the Science Green and create a new aboveground building entrance on its western edge. This new entrance is directly linked to an important pathway, the Science Walk. In addition, this project may present an opportunity to improve the campus edge along Franklin Boulevard and better define the north edge of the Science Green. In accordance with Policy 2: Open-space Framework, approximately 2,000 square feet of designated open-space enhancements or creation are required.

Policy 7: Architectural Style and Historic Preservation is also relevant because the above-ground portion will have to tie into the design of Huestis and Streisinger Halls.

Chris reviewed a preliminary key pattern list and user group as described in the meeting mailing.

Discussion: A guest expressed concern about building a facility on the main campus that is connected to outside industry. Rich said research must respond and relate to cutting edge industry. Jim added that the link to industry allows the academic community to have a world-class research facility that would not otherwise be fundable.

A guest and member said it was important to ensure that future expansion would not require construction above the proposed facility within the designated open space. Jim clarified that future phases would not build above the proposed facility within the designated open space. One reason this site was selected is to ensure that future development will not occur above the facility, thus protecting the high-quality vibration-free environment. Jim said the most vibration-sensitive areas would be built underground at the southern end near 13th Avenue, the greatest distance away from the anticipated future aboveground science building at the northeast corner of the open space.

In response to a guest's question about accommodating future expansion needs of existing facilities in Huestis Hall (e.g. the zebrafish research facility), Jim said the proposed new facility would help by releasing space in Huestis Hall to accommodate existing needs. In addition, there is potential for basement-level expansion south and west of Huestis. Rich added that user group representatives from adjacent buildings have already been involved in the project and will continue to be involved to ensure that such considerations are addressed.

In response to a member's question about accommodating future expansion needs for the proposed facility, Jim said future expansion for related research is anticipated, but it would not require a vibration-sensitive environment. Therefore, related research could be housed in an adjacent aboveground facility at the northeast corner of the open space and linked underground.

Members discussed the importance of restoring the features of the Science Green. Patterns and policies addressing open-space design are important. A member emphasized the importance of retaining the art features such as the Science Walk brickwork and the sundial. Members said some changes in the open-space design would be acceptable as long as the flavor of the open space is retained; it should look like a piece of the UO campus, not an industrial zone with mechanical vent grates and equipment and large areas of concrete. The open space should have more green than paving.

Members discussed the potential for providing natural light into the basement facility and resulting skylights in the designated open space. Jim acknowledged that this will be a significant design challenge. Natural light is a detriment in critical research and equipment areas but desirable in general meeting and work areas.

Jim agreed with a guest's proposal to improve existing landscaping problems, in particular the sloping edge adjacent to the east side of Huestis. A member added that it would be advantageous to improve the Franklin edge as well, acknowledging that it may be out of the project scope.

In response to a guest's question about whether future landscaping maintenance (e.g., mowing) would cause vibration problems, Jim said likely not, but that this should be researched.

A member said the Building Maintenance and Service Policy requirements should be addressed in a way that protects the quality of the open space. Jim said the mechanical systems would be underground and an independent chiller system might be needed to meet the facility's specific temperature-control needs.

A member said policies and patterns addressing transportation are also important because off-campus users will have to access the facility. Staff added that it would also be important to accommodate service access needs. Jim and Chris said existing visitor parking will be used to accommodate off-site users. The new facility will share existing building service areas, but this has not been fully resolved. In response to a member's question, Jim said research equipment will likely be transported through Huestis Hall. He agreed that this was an important factor to address. A guest added that the underground facility will have to be designed so that the open space continues to serve as a required fire lane.

A member noted the benefit of establishing a clear building entrance for both the general public and the university community, which is currently lacking. In response to a question about security needs and whether this would affect the front-door design, Jim said security needs will be addressed as described in the user-group-generated pattern "Security Layers." The outer layer, the front door, will convey a campus image and be welcoming. As a user moves closer to sensitive research areas, security measures will be imposed. Public users will not have independent access to the facility.

Members said user group representation was appropriate. They encouraged selecting a landscape architecture faculty member for the unfilled AAA representative position. In response to a question about including a representative from outside industry, Jim said they considered this option and decided it was more appropriate to convene a focus group to gather outside industry input.

In response to a question from Jim, staff said it is possible for the project to come back for CPC review mid-way through the design process. This is quite common, and it helps verify that the design is proceeding in the right direction before committing to a final design scheme.

Action: No formal action was taken. The committee's comments will be taken into consideration as the ONAMI at the University of Oregon Project design process moves forward.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

- cc. Paul Bloch, Computer and Information Science (Deschutes Building Manager)
- Jane Brubaker, Facilities Services
- Jim Hutchison, Chemistry
- Dave Johnson, Chemistry
- Roger Kerrigan, Facilities Services
- Peter Keyes, Architecture (University Senate)
- Tim King, Facilities Services
- Charlene Lindsay, Facilities Services
- Mike Marusich Neuroscience (Streisinger Building Manager)
- Andrea Mathews, Student in Architecture
- Monte Matthews, Veterinary Services (Streisinger Building Manager)
- Ellen McCumsey, Neuroscience (Huestis Building Manager)
- Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning
- Beth Prescott, Neuroscience (Streisinger Building Manager)
- Bill Roberts, Neuroscience (Huestis Building Manager)
- George Sprague, Biology (Streisinger Building Manager)
- Fred Tepfer, University Planning
- Bill Trevarrow, Neuroscience (Huestis Building Manager)
- Bruce Wilson, Molecular Biology (Streisinger Building Manager)