



UW-LA CROSSE ACADEMIC BUILDING
DSF #05I3O
RA #1213
August 9, 2007

PLANNING COMMITTEE CONCEPT REVIEW MEETING #2 / August 6, 2007

MEETING START TIME: 10:00 a.m.

MEETING END TIME: 12:15 p.m.

<u>PRESENT:</u> Bill Colclough	Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Ron Rada	Provost - Chancellor's Office
Matt Lewis	Campus Planning and Facilities Management
Karen McLean	College of Science & Health – Interim Dean
Jay Lokken	Office of International Education - Director
Ruthann Benson	College of Liberal Studies – Interim Dean
Chris Bakkum	Interim Registrar
Elena Bantle	Student / Environmental Council
Bjorn Bergman	Student / Environmental Council
Maura Donnelly	UW System Administration
Kate Sullivan	UW System Administration
Terri Reda	UW System Administration
Larry Earll	DSF
Bill Patek	JJR
Nate Novak	JJR
Valentine J. Schute, Jr.	River Architects
Clinton Rasmussen	River Architects
Ryan Wilkening	River Architects

MEETING NOTES:

1. The following information was distributed at the meeting for review and discussion:
 - a. Meeting Agenda
 - b. Concept Review Meeting #1 Meeting Notes (dated July 10, 2007)
 - c. Project Schedule Review (Draft 3)
 - d. Design Concept C – Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevation (11x17)
 - e. Design Concept D – Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevation (11x17)
2. Val Schute of River Architects reviewed the meeting notes from the Concept Review Meeting #1. Additions to the notes were that the gender neutral restrooms should meet universal design standards and that all entrances to the building are to be accessible. The meeting notes were approved by the Planning Committee.
3. Val Schute reviewed the project schedule and emphasized the importance of feedback from the Planning Committee in order to keep moving forward to meet the schedule. Comments should be sent directly to River Architects via email.

4. River Architects applied the comments from the last concept review meeting and further developed the two design concepts with the initial design assumptions still being utilized. Design Concept A was developed into the new Design Concept C. Design Concept B was developed into the new Design Concept D.
5. Design Concept review and discussion
 - a. General Design Concept comments:
 - The building is 4 sided and entry points into the building will need to be addressed on all 4 sides. The site plan is fluid at this point and will need to remain flexible.
 - Departmental spaces may require access to daylight 8 to 10 hours a day, which could be more important than having daylight into all of the classrooms. Daylighting should be considered for interior type spaces where people will be working for extended periods of time, i.e. reception areas and work spaces (not only offices). It should also be kept in mind that borrowed light through offices into adjacent departmental spaces is probably not preferred due to privacy concerns. The Committee should review the daylighting priorities in regards to departmental vs. classroom.
 - There may be an opportunity for providing roof monitors where possible to help get daylight into interior corridors and departmental spaces.
 - There is a potential for future expansion above the 2 and 3 story portions of the building in both Design Concepts.
 - Several departments have indicated the desire to be located on the first floor of the building rather than the fourth floor to be more visible. A question was raised about the identity of the building – does placing departments on the first floor give them more prominence / importance than the others? Will the building be identified as the Science and Health or International Education building rather than a general access classroom building?
 - Discussion about the connection / visibility of departments if they are located on the 4th floor vs. mixing classrooms and departments on all floors:
 - i. Departmental traffic is most often task oriented and a specific destination that students will seek out no matter what floor it is on because they want the services offered. Student services and their locations will be advertised.
 - ii. Traffic to the departmental spaces is more intermittent vs. the heavy traffic flow of students to classrooms between classes.
 - iii. Some students may not know where departments are located.
 - The building should be thought of with the long term ability to remodel spaces versus the current specific uses in order to function successfully over the entire life span of the building as there may be a shift in program requirement in the future. This also deals with environmental practices and need for future renovations.
 - The Committee generally agreed about the need to locate all classrooms on levels 1, 2, and 3 in order to minimize heavy vertical circulation traffic.
 - The Academic Advising Center and Career Services departments should be located directly adjacent to each other with no hallway separating them due to the potential for sharing some staff and support services.
 - The new Design Schemes moved away from a 4 story atrium to having the 1st and 2nd floors open to one another and the 3rd and 4th floors open to one another with an

enclosed stair between the 2nd and 3rd floors. This would eliminate the need for extensive smoke evacuation equipment and also helps to conserve energy because the mechanical requirements are often greater for heating and cooling an atrium.

- A question was raised about the advantage of creating an opening between the 3rd and 4th floors because it adds to the overall square footage of the building. It was stated that the opening serves as a visual connection between the 4th floor, which is primarily departmental and student services, and the 3rd floor where there will be a higher number of students.

b. Design Concept C comments:

- Hall of Nations (H.O.N.) Gathering Room was repositioned to occur on axis with the main lobby space to maximize visibility. It was also provided with a patio area to the west to allow gatherings to be expanded out to the exterior.
 - i. The centralized location of the H.O.N. Gathering Room allows the space to be used for conferences during off hours or the summer months and also relates well to all the departments on the first floor.
 - ii. The proximity of the kitchen to the service entrance facilitates the ease of deliveries for catering large gatherings.
 - iii. The ability to expand the H.O.N. to the exterior patio was well received.
- The concept works well in promoting diversity on account of the proximity of International Education and Multicultural Student Services to the main lobby space.
- The concept has the ability to compartmentalize the office / departmental area from the classroom areas on the 1st floor. It may be beneficial to separate certain areas of the building during off hours or the summer months when classrooms are being utilized less frequently. The areas could then be closed off to the general public in order to reduce the mechanical requirements (conserving energy) for those spaces.
- The location of the College of Science and Health Dean's Office is remote and does not have a connection to the main lobby area. It would be beneficial to be adjacent to a gathering space to allow people to congregate outside the department.

c. Design Concept D comments:

- Hall of Nations Gathering Room was positioned in the northeast corner of the building for its proximity to the clock tower.
- The colonnade along the east side of the building adjacent to the campus mall offers unique opportunities for creating some interesting protected exterior walkways / breakout spaces.
- The lack of a departmental office directly adjacent to / working off the main lobby area may not provide visitors' access to a receptionist for general building orientation questions. Is this a positive or a negative? Can the building signage be designed in such a way to help eliminate questions about department / classroom locations throughout the building?
- Concept shows split elevator locations, which may provide a way to limit student use by having keyed access. Also, it allows elevator access to the basement.
- Courtyard would be a very active and well used space due to its south orientation and protection on 3 sides. It also presents an interesting entry focal point on the south / public face of the building.
- The site layout / response to campus traffic patterns is very successful:

- i. Responds well to northwest and southwest corner entrances where there will be heavy traffic flow from other areas of campus.
 - ii. Creates a highly visible entry for the public (2nd front door) on the southwest side of the building where people will be approaching from the parking lot.
 - The location of the roof terrace on the 3rd floor in the northeast corner of the building may not be ideal due to the lack of direct access to sunlight.
 - i. Proximity to student study area and focus on the campus mall are benefits.
 - ii. Possibility of shifting location to the south to overlook the courtyard, which would provide direct access to sunlight.
6. River Architects will email specific questions to the Planning Committee for feedback on Design Concepts C and D. Responses to the questions should be emailed to River Architects by Tuesday, August 14, 2007.
 7. UW-L to review a method to receive feedback from faculty and students. Options presented were online discussion forums, posting the drawings on the academic building website, posting comments on an ftp site, presentation boards located at the office of campus planning with comment sheets to be filled out, etc.
 8. The possibility of scheduling 3 to 4 hour long meetings in the future was discussed to allow more time for discussion and feedback during the review meetings.
 9. The next Planning Committee review meeting is scheduled for August 27th at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting Notes by: Clinton L. Rasmussen, Associate AIA

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

- c. Matt Lewis/UWL
- Larry Earl/DSF
- Maura Donnelly/UWSA
- Val Schute/River Architects, Inc.
- Michael Adler/River Architects, Inc.
- Alex Barghout/Arnold & O'Sheridan, Inc.
- Bill Patek/JJR, LLC
- Mike Bohlmann/PSJ Engineering, Inc.
- Scott Leonard/Professional Audio Designs, Inc.
- Dennis Johnson/Ayres Associates, Inc.