



MEETING MINUTES

Project Name: UW La Crosse 2008 Residence Hall
DSF No. 08B3M
EUA Project Number: 708190-01
Meeting Date: August 26, 2008 at Clearly Hall – 10:00 a.m.

Recorded By: Bob Cooper

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Fax Number or Email Address</u>
Matt Lewis	UW La Crosse	lewis.matt@uwlax.edu
Amy Ableidinger	UW La Crosse	ableidin.amy@students.uwlax.edu
James Bushman	UW La Crosse	bushman.jame@students.uwlax.edu
Nick Nicklaus	UW La Crosse	Nicklaus.harr@uwlax.edu
Bob Hetzel	UW La Crosse	hetzel.robe@uwlax.edu
Paula Knudson	UW La Crosse	knudson.paul@uwlax.edu
Daryl Lawrence	UW La Crosse	lawrence.dary@students.uwlax.edu
Doug Kuenn	UW La Crosse	kuenn.dough@uwlax.edu
Larry Earll	DSF	larry.earll@wisconsin.gov
Sharon Blattner Held	DSF	Sharon.Blattner@doa.state.wi.us
Maura Donnelly	UW System	mduffy@uwsa.edu
Jonathan Parker	EUA	jonathanp@eua.com
Bob Cooper	EUA	bobc@eua.com

1. Larry Earll presented an overview of the project.
2. Intent of this meeting is to begin the programming phase for the project.
3. Meeting attendees introduced themselves (Maura Donnelly via telephone)
4. Meeting is a workshop and open participation is desired
5. We really need to hear what the students want to say. Student input is valued
6. The Programming work will:
 - a. Determine the buildings functional components, their size, and how they fit into the whole
 - b. Address maintenance concerns
 - c. Conform with the campus master plan
 - d. Conform with the budget
 1. First cost
 2. Cost over time
 3. Functionality and cost
 - e. Programming phase is scheduled to be complete in November 2008
7. Campus' Guiding Principles were discussed:
 - a. The 12 principles were developed by a residence life committee.

333 E. Chicago St.
Milwaukee, WI 53202
414 271 5350 : main
414 271 7794 : fax

222 W. Washington Ave.
Suite 650
Madison, WI 53703
608 442 5350 : main
608 442 6680 : fax

- b. Recent RA's meeting echoed concern about being land locked if the hall or a phase of the hall was located on the Drake Field site. For this reason, they preferred Coate Field as the best location
- c. Matt Lewis gave an overview of buildings to be developed under the master plan:
 1. Stadium is under construction
 2. New academic building to be built where residence halls are being removed
 3. Addition to Cowley Hall.
 4. Future move of Cartwright Hall functions closer to La Crosse Street
 5. Development of north and south/east and west pedestrian malls
 6. Future parking structure south of La Crosse Street, east of the Coate Hall site
 7. Additions to Center for the Arts and Mitchell Hall
8. Paula Knudson said that she likes having a central site (Drake Field) because of its location close to existing residence halls and the academic center of the campus but she understands the reasoning for moving to the north (Coate Field) site.
9. Nick Nicklaus expressed concern about maintaining green space. He asked students how to define green space. More discussion is needed to get a clearer understanding of what campus wants for "green space".
10. Part of the programming effort is to study the pros and cons of one site or two. The team needs to defer the decision on one or two building scenarios until after programming is done.
11. The use of either location or both is consistent with the master plan
12. As we move forward there is a need to factor campus utilities into the evaluation. The team needs to understand the impact of the utilities on building location and cost. Avoid utility corridors in building placement. Respect utility corridors unless there is a strong overriding reason for building in the location of existing underground utilities. Sanitary and water is currently located in Farwell Street. Utilities are generally laid out on a city street grid (since campus streets used to be city streets).
13. Vehicle and pedestrian access was discussed:
 - a. Currently vehicular access to buildings located in the interior of the campus is restricted, especially to buildings centrally located on the campus. The campus is planning on having more streets converted to pedestrian only in the future.
 - b. Pedestrian/bike access to the building is a high priority
 - c. The Drake Field site is more problematic for vehicular access, particularly for the public. Public access to Residential Life Office is important.
 - d. UW-L needs to determine and designate future access to/from La Crosse Street
 - e. The campus master plan expected three exits off of La Crosse Street. Need to discuss main entrance to the campus – is the current Cleary Hall location the right location?

- f. Master plan shows access to the future parking ramp from Farwell Street.
 - g. Campus would like to discourage access of private vehicles to the pedestrian malls.
 - h. Pedestrian Malls would be used for emergency vehicles
14. Guiding Principle No. 11 – refers to respecting surrounding views to the bluffs, etc.
15. Campus would like the new residence hall(s) to provide a sense of welcome to the campus, something human scale.
16. Principles affecting design were discussed
- a. The new residence hall should express a sense of community (towers work against this). Layout depends on students being served (class, age, etc.) Space needs to be provided for interacting with people on the floor. A larger space for an all-hall meeting on the first floor would be good. A place on each floor for students to gather would be welcome.
 - b. Current common spaces on floors in existing residence halls have been lost which has forced gatherings to basement areas. As a result the basement areas are well used. Campus would prefer gathering spaces on each floor, not in basements.
 - c. Campus wants the design of this hall thoroughly studied, with consideration of the latest trends. Campus would like this hall to serve as a model for university housing.
 - d. Special gathering spaces and study spaces on each floor are desired. A floor is considered to be one of the tiers of community
 - e. Campus felt that a kitchen is needed on floors for international students, for use over the holidays, and summers when campus food service may not be available. The facility will be also be used for conferences and there may be a need for kitchens on floors to accommodate this too. The new hall at UW-Stout has a residential style kitchen on each floor. International students require a more elaborate kitchen than just a counter and sink. They may be cooking with an oven, wok, etc. Controlling food cooking smells on the floor is necessary, which can get into costs for fire protection on hoods, and/or grease traps. At Mankato they have a kitchen near the lounge (no refrigerators). Range, sink, counter space works well
 - f. There is a preference for RAs to have their own room. Students agree with that. A single room for RAs allows privacy for talking to residents.
17. Materials and Systems were discussed:
- a. There are several options for building superstructure, but the most commonly used are concrete block and plank or a concrete frame with infill wall systems. Is there a need to plan for a future different use for this building? No, UW L has no history of converting res halls to academic buildings. Determine need for structural system flexibility after programming and structural bay spacing is established.
 - b. Campus noted that drywall partitions are a maintenance issue. There are lots of dings, etc. at Reuter Hall. '60s buildings with painted block walls hold up better over time. However, other campuses are trying to get away from an

institutional look in campus housing. The students noted that Reuter Hall walls damage more easily and taping posters, picture, etc. to a wall is more of a problem, and that the drywall limits the amount of decoration the students can add to a room. The complexity of the wall layout, and the cost of masonry walls vs drywall will also be an evaluation factor. Skim coating CMU with plaster is an option that works well and is more residential looking, but it does have a significant impact on budget

- c. These new buildings will probably all stay as residence halls, but remember that residence halls have historically undergone extensive renovation every 50 or so years, so flexibility is still an issue to consider.
- d. Maura Donnelly left the meeting due to technical difficulties with the telephone connection. Jonathan Parker will call her later with a wrap up of the meeting after programming meeting is over
- e. What are the current utility costs for Reuter Hall? How do they relate to the other buildings on campus? UW-La Crosse can provide this data, but it's not easy to obtain due to limited metering. UW L would like the new building to have more metering than Reuter Hall.
- f. Does campus, system, or DSF have any unusual goals for accessibility for this building? UW L would like to exceed ADA minimum standards (but not to the extent of UW-Whitewater). EUA should inform the committee regarding ADA requirements. UW L would like to look into having more Type A units for summer conferences.

18. What students will be housed in these buildings?

- a. UW L is still studying this question. Some say sophomores, some want freshman/sophomore mix. There will be international students in this hall too. UW L thinks the focus will be predominately sophomore. What is unique about sophomore style housing? This question will continue to be studied.
- b. Community bathrooms, rather than those within the suites, creates more opportunities for student interaction, but is this what the majority of students are looking for?
- c. International student population ranges from 18-25 years old.
- d. Should there be honors houses? Learning communities?
- e. Should the Hall be designed for a specific population? Does this limit flexibility? Campus does not need another Reuter Hall on campus.
- f. Campus and Students want a hall that has a variety of spaces that create more student interaction.
- g. Housing on campus should address the "Sophomore Slump" syndrome – meaning the provision of academic and social support as these students become more independent.
- h. Campus felt that it's better to have a grade level mix in the residence halls (freshmen/sophomore) for developing the leadership model. One of the students felt strongly that a residence hall with only one class level would be very undesirable because it would not provide learning opportunities via an interaction with a diverse age range of students.

- i. Campus felt that, if bathrooms are outside of the suites they should be separate "private" bathrooms located in a common location – male and female side by side. Bathroom/shower rooms outside the suite (like Sanford Hall) work OK and would be acceptable for some of the summer programs.
- j. Campus felt that there will be juniors and seniors attracted to the living arrangement in this hall v. Reuter Hall.
- k. Campus would like more standardized suites, but with some variety. Stay away from a "have and have not" situation – room hierarchy related to differences in room amenities or sizes.
- l. The halls would be open 24/365
- m. Campus needs to study the demand for single rooms further.
 - 1. Only for RAs? Paula Knudson – Would students pay more for upgraded facilities (like singles)?
 - 2. Students would pay more for singles, but cost for building this must be taken into account
 - 3. Consider providing some singles for special circumstances (health issues, disabilities, etc.)
 - 4. Ogg Hall has a single room on the first floor for medical purposes.
 - 5. It's possible to have a configuration that has all of the rooms designed as one size, and rent them as doubles or singles, depending on what the student will pay.
 - 6. Whatever they type and mix of singles decided upon, it will impact the first cost, operational cost, and debt service of this project, so this would need to be studied further.
 - 7. Nick Nicklaus – Tours of other campuses may provide a direction for this decision.
- n. Who is the customer? What is their demand?
 - 1. Campus felt that students will stay on campus if they can get into "upgraded" housing
 - 2. Sophomore students living off campus have a lower GPA
 - 3. Tie in some services for student advising/director.

19. Dwelling unit configuration was discussed

- a. What number of occupants should be targeted per unit? Is bathroom included in unit?
- b. Campus noted that studies discourage having odd numbers of students in a suite. Campus is not entirely opposed to an odd number. Would share a common space other than a bathroom. Could be two doubles and single sharing a bathroom (single might become RA unit)
- c. Campus was willing to consider a ratio of eight students sharing a bath/shower facility. At Ogg Hall, eight students share a bathroom, but the bathroom has two toilets, two showers, and two sinks.

- d. Campus asked if EUA will be surveying students to gauge preferences? Not exactly, EUA had planned on having workshops/not focus groups. Campus noted that students being engaged need to be "average students" not an RA's – you get different answers. Campus prefers a focus group approach over a workshop. Campus noted that a focus group should represent the middle 70% of students. Residence life could get out an electronic survey to all students on campus
- e. Campus felt that socialization is important but also felt that, if students were surveyed, they would choose a bathroom within a unit.

20. Furniture expectations were discussed

- a. Can furniture be lofted?
 - 1. All of residence life furniture is all movable and lofted giving flexibility in room arrangement.
 - 2. Few students opt for the high loft, more like a medium height loft. Women generally don't like high lofts

21. Closets were discussed

- a. Campus noted that 85% of students don't use their closet doors. Wardrobes don't last. Closets get beat up
- b. What is the linear footage of closet desired? Not known, this needs to be studied. Minimum closet length of 48" was recommended.
- c. One student noted that he doesn't like open closet, looks messy
- d. Built in closets do limit flexibility of the furniture layout
- e. Campus liked an arrangement with a tall closet with shelf unit on top

22. Storage space was discussed What constitutes a house?

- a. 43,000 sf of space in program was for general Residence Life storage.
- b. Building operations needs storage space too.
- c. Campus noted that international students require more in-hall storage because they can't take items home.
- d. Campus felt that student access to storage can be through the passenger elevator.
- e. Single doors in corridors create a problem with moving equipment in.
- f. Campus noted that no vehicular access is required to basement area (Reuter Hall lift works well)
- g. Basement should have humidity control
- h. Campus noted that there needs to be a long discussion on the Residence Life office location, arrangement, access, and separation from the hall proper. There is concern among students that Residence Life offices be separated from hall floors. The Residence Life office is open 18-hours per day.
- i. Bob Hetzel felt that laundry facilities on each floor is a better socialization element than a single laundry on the first floor. Need to look at what is being built today at other institutions.



- j. Campus felt that there is a need for some centralized hall food preparation area for small groups.
- k. Campus felt that Classrooms are a possibility – hasn't been discussed yet
- l. Campus requested a large meeting room in Residence Life Offices, one that could accommodate 40 students
- m. Campus liked the notion of some shared socialization spaces. Houses should also have their own socialization space.
- n. Campus intends to keep a relatively small staff/student ratio/1:30

23. Mechanical

- a. Locate water softeners close to route for moving salt in, and make sure the hallway path and elevator can accommodate a pallet jack.
- b. Overhead fan coil units are somewhat of an issue because of limited access.
 - 1. During steam shut down periods you can get condensation above ceiling at these units.
 - 2. There haven't been a lot of maintenance issues to date on these units however.
- c. Janitor closet locations in Reuter Hall have worked well
- d. Stay away from 24' heights to lighting (stairwells) – difficult to replace lights.
- e. On Reuter first floor 14 foot height to lighting fixture – can't get a ladder that size into space the space
- f. Green roof – accessible or inaccessible?
 - 1. Possible LEED points
- g. UW La Crosse is its own storm water utility

24. Cost was only discussed briefly. Cost will be discussed more thoroughly at the next meeting.

- a. The current total budget for this project is \$48,000,000.
 - 1. EUA prefers to carry a higher contingency
 - 2. Need to design alternates to help deliver the project on budget
 - 3. Develop a "need" and "desire" list during budget analysis

To the best of my knowledge, the following items represent the information discussed. If there are any discrepancies or omissions, please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert Cooper, AIA
Principal

cc: All Listed Above, A/E team
MM 2008 0826.doc