

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REVIEW MEETING / OCTOBER 16, 2014

MEETING START TIME: 1:00 p.m.
 MEETING END TIME: 3:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Beth Alderman	Division of Facilities Development	Val Schute	River Architects
Maura Donnelly	UW-System Administration	Mike Adler	River Architects
Heidi Macpherson	UW-La Crosse	Tim Tracey	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	David Johnson	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse	Andrew Cherry	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hoar	UW-La Crosse	Coty Sandberg	SmithGroupJJR
		Bill Patek	SmithGroupJJR
		Tom Rodgers	SmithGroupJJR

NOTES:

1. A meeting was held with UW-La Crosse, DFD, UW-System Administration, River Architects, and SmithGroupJJR to review the agenda and materials being presented at the upcoming Schematic Design Review Meeting No. 1 to be held on October 23, 2014.

2. David Johnson reviewed the current Building Program. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - a. The program is a draft with additional refinement still to come. The underlying goal is to provide a building program that fits within the project budget.
 - b. The program has been reduced as much as possible without affecting the educational mission of the campus.
 - c. Items that changed due to merging, duplication, right-sizing, additions, and deletions were noted.
 - d. Total ASF upon completion of Program Verification Meeting No.4:
 - Phase 1: 100,530 ASF
 - Phase 2: 90,013 ASF
 - e. Bob Hetzel commented that a faculty member in Chemistry has expressed concern over the loss of teaching space. David Johnson noted that this was done with discussion with the department and was due to the lack of utilization in the existing labs. David added that a merger was agreed upon between Chemistry and Microbiology to share a lab. Bob Hetzel recommended relaying this information at the next meeting.

3. The Project Cost was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. The projected construction cost as of this meeting is \$62.8M.
 - b. The committee agreed to the building program and the projected construction cost.
 - c. Various program reclaiming options were proposed including the following:
 - Adding the Laboratory Technician Support spaces into Phase 1. Beth Alderman agreed that this could be explored if the budget allows.
 - Adding informal collaborative learning spaces.
 - Providing additional areas for touchdown seating.
 - Explore ways of incorporating meeting spaces as requested by the user groups.

- d. Bob Hetzel recommends sticking with the program as outlined in the 2011 Pre-Design Study and providing only laboratory spaces in Phase 1.
 - e. David Johnson noted that there may be an opportunity to provide various lab spaces in Phase 1 that have been moved to Phase 2.
 - f. Design Team to provide a list of prioritizations by category for the Design/Executive Committee to review which would itemize the potential additions to Phase 1. An example could be as follows:
 - 1st: Recapturing Teaching Lab Spaces
 - 2nd: Student Collaboration Space
 - 3rd: Faculty Meeting Space
4. Campus Context:
- a. Bill Patek reviewed the 2005 Campus Master Plan and how it was developed. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - Analysis to be conducted that focuses on Phase 2 being completely new. The 2011 Pre-Design Study had two scenarios to assess. With Phase 2 being new construction, the campus mall could be addressed differently.
 - Badger Street to become pedestrian use only. Bob Hetzel commented that UW-La Crosse has advised the City of La Crosse to not have the bus route run through Badger Street. Bob also noted that parts of Badger Street may still be under the control of the City of La Crosse. Bob added that the Student Center project did not address any redevelopment of Badger Street.
 - b. Val Schute reviewed the Architectural Design Guidelines as outlined in the 2005 Campus Master Plan. Val noted that the guidelines aren't meant to be prescriptive but interpretive.
 - c. Bob Hetzel commented that the intent of the University is to have the Science Lab Building follow the Architectural Guidelines. Maura Donnelly clarified that the outward-facing/campus-facing portions of the project should adhere to the guidelines, but that inward-/self-facing portions could be interpreted more loosely and deviate from the guidelines if there is a clear intent to internalize space relative to the campus green. Maura used the new Student Center as an example noting that 3 faces respect the campus guidelines, while one does not. The difference was that because the Student Center is not an academic building, the deviation could be placed on a public face; because the Science Building is an academic building, deviation would have to be on the private faces.
 - d. Bob Hetzel noted that the University desires to seek LEED Gold Certification. David Johnson described the common challenges for laboratory buildings when seeking higher levels of certification.

5. Conceptual massing models were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Scheme 1:
 - David Johnson noted that the diagrams presented are testing the adjacencies and neighborhood concepts discussed during program verification.
 - Bob Hetzel commented that it is difficult to get a full understanding of the concept without Phase 2 shown.
 - Maura Donnelly expressed concern regarding the encroachment of the building beyond the Wittich Hall line.
 - b. Scheme 2A & 2B:
 - Beth Alderman commented that Scheme 2B doesn't crowd the plaza area outside the southeast corner of the Student Center.
 - c. Scheme 3:
 - Maura Donnelly commented that the west courtyard could provide an opportunity to display science or do something unique to the building that is science related.
 - Bob Hetzel noted that there will be a high volume of traffic from the Student Center.
 - Heidi Macpherson noted that it would be helpful to understand the form of Phase 2.
6. Concept diagrams of the lab planning module were presented and discussed. No comments were noted.
7. Schedule:
 - a. October 2014:
 - Schematic Design Review Meeting No. 1 (Design Committee) – Oct. 23, 2014 (10-12:00)
 - Science Focus Group Meeting (Departmental Representatives) – Oct. 23, 2014 (1-3:00)
 - b. November 2014:
 - Sustainability Charrette – November 12, 2014 (1-5:00?)
 - Schematic Design Review Meeting No. 2 (Design Committee) – Nov. 13, 2014 (10-12:00)
 - Lab Planning Review Meeting No. 1 (Departments) – Nov. 13, 2014 (TBD)
 - c. December 2014:
 - Schematic Design Review Meeting No. 3 (Design Committee) – Dec. 3, 2014 (2-5:00)
 - Lab Planning Review Meeting No. 2 (Departments) – Dec. 3-4, 2014 (TBD)
 - Schematic Design Review Meeting No. 4 (Design Committee) – Dec. 18, 2014 (10-12:00)
 - Lab Planning Review Meeting No. 3 (Departments) – Dec. 17-18, 2014 (TBD)
 - d. January 2015:
 - Draft 10% Concept Report Submittal
 - e. February 2015:
 - Final 10% Concept Report Submittal

Meeting Notes by: River Architects and SmithGroupJJR

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.