**Closeout**

1. Listen to the RBA presentations
* Done!
1. Evaluate the proposed design solutions and indentify merits and possible problems.
* Both options appear to meet office requirements
* Option A is more strung out than Option B, and features a dead end on the wing that goes in front of CDF
* 8x8 cubicles are industry standard, but less space than accustomed to here.
	+ We are used 9x10 cubicles, 10x12 offices (Wilson Hall)
	+ Option A less flexible than Option B in terms of adapting
	+ Concern about underutilized space in Option A due to the shape. Could we make footprint parallelogram rather than trapezoid?
* General better communications horizontally than vertically
* Option A is less reliant on elevators to get from floor to floor – generally regarded as a positive
* Both options generally meets educational requirements
* Some feeling that it may be advantageous to have the educational function segregated as in Option B.
* Technical space needs functional definition, in both options.
	+ Note that Option B provides better opportunity to connect tech areas to CDF
	+ Suggest providing some (supervisor) office space on the same floor as the tech area – few offices
* Option A has two entrances.
	+ Extra entrance is a plus
	+ Extra road crossing is a minus.

**Recommend: Need to define the functional requirements of the lab/tech space. This will define the need for power, cooling, cryo capabililties, and the need for direct access to CDF building. Define any requirements for hazardous materials or processes. Determine any requirements for security through discussions with potential industrial occupants and/or ANL.**

**Recommend: Provide some office space on the same floor as tech areas.**

**Recommend: Define requirements for lab space associated with the educational mission, and define relationship, if any, to the tech space.**

**Recommend: Look at options for providing better connection between the Industrial Complex and the IARC building.**

1. Will the building layout function for its intended purpose?
* See above
1. Is the proposed technical space functional?
* Needs to be defined. See above discussion.
1. Will the planned technical space infrastructure ( power, water, cooling, etc) be sufficient?
* Not addressed.
* Lighting requirements for the tech spaces – make sure sufficient for any possible applications
* Need to define crane coverage requirements.
* Functional requirements needs to be better defined. Floor loading, electrical capabilities, lighting, temperature control, humidity control.
1. Is the newly constructed space well integrated with a refurbished CDF building?
* Tech space is the most relevant. Not integrated in either option, but better possibilities for option B. Need to determine if this is a requirement
* Office function is well integrated in both options.
1. Will materials, equipment, and personnel be able to move efficiently around the complex
* Need to address truck access from the west to the west CDF building.
* Issues with crossing Road D from the parking lot.
1. Are the proposed solutions for class room and office space reasonable?
* Yes, see above.
1. Are there sufficient conference rooms?
* Generally yes.
* Important to retain a central gathering point
1. Will the proposed building be visually appealing and prominent?
* Both are sufficiently visually appealing to be considered
* Feeling that Option A is more visually appealing, but not unanimous.
* Eventually choice will be up to director.
1. Can issues associated with the operation of CDF through 2011 and subsequent D&D of CDF be adequately addressed?
* West side access to CDF building is required and accommodated in both options.
1. Other Issues
* Parking – concern about access from across the street
* Concern about the location of the bike path (option A)
* Both are expandable, either to the west/east or across the street.
* Recommend: Look at solutions to these issues.
1. Provide a few page written report with your recommendations
2. Please comment on any other issues the committee feels are relevant.