



PLANNING COMMITTEE REVIEW MEETING/September 12, 2008

MEETING START TIME: 1:30 p.m.
MEETING END TIME: 4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Kathleen Enz Finken Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Bob Hetzel Vice Chancellor - Administration & Finance
Matt Lewis Director of Campus Planning and Facilities Management
Ron Rada Emeritus Faculty Member
Billy Clow College of Liberal Studies – Interim Associate Dean
Karen McLean College of Science & Health – Interim Dean
Ruthann Benson College of Liberal Studies – Interim Dean
Jon Hageseth Student Development
Mary Coady Student Development
Matt Groshek Student / Environmental Council
Jennifer O’Neill Student / Environmental Council
Larry Earll DSF / Project Manager
Valentine J. Schute, Jr. River Architects
Mike Adler River Architects

MEETING NOTES:

1. The following information was distributed at the meeting for review and discussion:
 - a) Meeting Agenda
 - b) Planning Committee Meeting Notes dated August 12, 2008
 - c) 11x17 drawings of current floor plans dated September 12, 2008
2. Val Schute reviewed the meeting notes dated August 12, 2008. Notes were approved.
3. River Architects presented a three dimensional model of the courtyard design intending to help the committee visualize the space and plantings proposed by JJR at the August 12th meeting. The following comments were made regarding the courtyard design:
 - a) Will there be grating over the trenches?
 - b) What will the plants and trees look like as the seasons change?
 - c) What will the ground cover be at the planting areas? Will the plants themselves provide cover or will there be mulch or rock?
 - d) Will the sidewalks be heated? No.
 - e) The trees shown in the courtyard provide softness to the space as well as shading opportunities.
 - f) Why is there a small section of concrete sidewalk on the west side of the courtyard?
 - g) Show benches at perimeter of circular walk.

- h) Chairs were shown to illustrate how many seats could be provided for a presentation within the courtyard area. The committee noted that seating for 85+/- as shown would be nice. Larger gatherings could occur in a different location
After seeing the model, the overall feedback from the committee on the design concept was positive.
4. River Architects presented three options of the roof terrace design reflecting some of the comments made at the August 12th meeting. The following comments were made regarding the roof terrace design:
- a) Some committee members felt this would be a good space for sculpture. Val Schute noted that it may be difficult to get 360 degree viewing of items.
 - b) Matt Lewis commented that the cables and vines will only give another place for birds to perch and thus making a mess out of the areas below.
 - c) A 42" guardrail will be provided at the parapet wall from the highest point off of the floor.
 - d) Planting materials need to be easily maintained.
 - e) Bill Colclough commented that the university struggles to maintain the inner courtyard at Wimberly Hall and he's not convinced that they would be able to maintain all the rain gardens AND the roof terrace at the new building.
 - f) Larry Earll noted that the roof membrane under the pavers will need to be maintained every 20 years or so. The less built-in items on top of the pavers, the easier it will be to maintain the roof down the road.
 - g) Val Schute noted that the roof terrace will have floor drains and overflow drains.
 - h) Will lighting be provided? Val noted that there are lights in the alcoves near the vestibule and that lights could be added to the masonry piers. However, the lighting will likely not provide enough light for reading in the evening hours.
 - i) There was a tie vote between schemes A, B, and C. Committee suggested JJR take another look at the design and merge the schemes.
 - j) Committee members like plantings along the east and west walls as well as something near the parapet wall.
 - k) The overall consensus was that the roof terrace should be simple, but elegant.
 - l) River Architects and DSF proposed leaving the terrace as all pavers and using "movable" planters.
5. The current floor plans were reviewed and discussed. The College of Science & Health located on the fourth floor is being replaced with Philosophy, International Studies, and Environmental Studies.
6. Design options were presented for the Gathering space and main Lobby. The following comments were made:
- a) Committee members prefer the railing option with stainless steel horizontal bars in lieu of glass railings.

- b) The large window into the Hall of Nations was commented on as being a nice feature, but daylight needs to be controlled during presentations.
 - c) What will keep people from removing the flags?
 - d) How visible will the flags be if on a standard pole?
 - e) Are the flags a programmed element for the building?
 - f) Could the flags be circulated and not have so many on display at one time?
 - g) If flags are floor mounted vertically, the mounting should be flexible (possibly in groups) and not permanently built into the floor as proposed.
 - h) The doors located in the corners of the Hall of Nations allow people to come and go during presentations.
 - i) Can double doors be provided into the Hall of Nations in lieu of the single door?
 - j) Wood panels are nice, but will it date the building?
 - k) Will wood panels fade, get darker, or remain the same over time?
7. Design options for the classroom ceilings were presented and discussed. Structural and mechanical elements are causing the ceilings to have a multi-level design. The AE team would like to simplify the design to keep the costs under control. The Planning Committee agreed that the ceilings should be simple. Val Schute noted that the 11-4" ceiling height currently shown at the projection screens was done to allow the screens to be high enough so that the marker board could be used at the same time. The question posed was how often do the screens and marker boards get used simultaneously and is having an expensive ceiling design to accommodate this need really worth it?
8. Val Schute provided a list of possible alternate bids for the committee to consider. The items listed weren't intended to be final, but ideas to solicit committee feedback. The alternate bids will be further assessed by the AE team and brought back to the committee for input.

The ideas proposed as possible alternate bids included:

- a) Classroom Technology
- b) Five classrooms in the southwest wing of the third floor
- c) Roof terrace
- d) South courtyard
- e) Additional unfinished basement space for storage

Larry Earll noted that State projects are allowed to upgrade finishes as part of an alternate bid, but deduct alternates are not allowed. Matt Lewis expressed concern about downgrading the base finishes to meet the budget. Matt added that the State doesn't fund replacement of finishes and that UW-L is responsible for material replacement, so future maintenance costs need to be considered when deciding which material to use.

9. Matt Lewis proposed a question to the committee regarding technology in the classrooms. Should the work be spread out among the classrooms or should rooms be completed, while others have limited or no technology? River Architects presented a current list of bid

packages for the AV work as the Classroom Committee had agreed to at their September 2nd meeting. Since that meeting, discussion has taken place among Classroom Committee members that the bid packages need to be reassessed. This will occur at the next Classroom Committee meeting.

10. One to two additional Planning Committee meetings will be needed in the near future to address open items. The meeting(s) will be arranged by Matt Lewis.

Meeting Notes by: Michael J. Adler, Associate AIA

Note: This constitutes our understanding of the issues presented. Contact River Architects, Inc. via phone at (608) 785-2217, or e-mail m.adler@river-architects.com if there are any discrepancies.

- c. All in attendance
Matt Lewis/UWL
Larry Earl/DSF
Maura Donnelly/UWSA
Alex Bargout/Arnold & O'Sheridan, Inc.
Nate Novak/JJR, LLC
Mike Bohlmann/PSJ Engineering, Inc.
Ian Griffiths/Berners-Schoeber Associates, Inc.
Dennis Johnson/Ayres Associates, Inc.
Michael Thomason/Thomason Clark Corp.
Scott Leonard/Professional Audio Design
Phil Roeglin/Professional Audio Designs, Inc.