river ARCHITECTS | SMITHGROUPJJR

University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
Science Lab Building
DFD# 13B3H / RA# 1290.A
October 1, 2014

PROGRAM VERIFICATION MEETING NO. 4 / OCTOBER 1, 2014 – DESIGN COMMITTEE

MEETING START TIME: 8:30 a.m.
MEETING END TIME: 10:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Beth Alderman	Division of Facilities Development	Val Schute	River Architects
Maura Donnelly	UW-System Administration	Mike Adler	River Architects
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	David Johnson	SmithGroupJJR
Heidi Macpherson	UW-La Crosse	Andrew Cherry	SmithGroupJJR
Doug Pearson	UW-La Crosse	Jeff Kocinski	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hoar	UW-La Crosse	Nikki Taylor	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse		
Aaron Monte	UW-La Crosse		
Cynthia Berlin	UW-La Crosse		
Karoline Auby	UW-La Crosse		
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse		
Bill Schwan	UW-La Crosse		
Eric Gansen	UW-La Crosse		

NOTES:

1. Project Schedule:
    a. Fourth and final program verification meeting.
    b. Next phase – Schematic Design.
    c. Goal for Program Verification Meeting No. 4 is to have an approved space list that works within space and capital budget.

2. Program Summary:
    a. 2011 Pre-Design – 107,880 ASF (P1) + 93,065 ASF (P2).
    b. PV2 – 115,255 ASF (P1) + 94,705 ASF (P2).
    c. PV3 – 104,103 ASF (P1) + 91,083 ASF (P2) = 3,777 ASF reduction from Pre-Design.
    d. Merging (-3,840sf), Duplication and Right-Sizing (-2,687sf) of spaces produced a reduction in assignable square footage.
    e. Additions from Pre-Design (+2,750sf).
    f. Comparisons were presented by space type and by phase from Pre-Design through PV3.
    g. SGJJR noted that the research-active faculty population drives the research lab allocation. The design team will need to discover un-programmed social space in the gross area.

3. Project Cost:
    a. 3% over budget currently based on the current program as of this meeting.
    b. Closer we can get to the target, the better we'll be during schematic design.
    c. The design team asked, "Should we get closer to the budget before moving forward?" DFD says yes, and the design team agrees because it will be easier to be additive later in the process, rather than subtractive.
    d. Program Reconciliation Options:
        - SGJJR proposed removing the dark room from the program; the committee agreed with this proposal.
        - Biology:
            - Non-Human Anatomy/Physiology Lab – hold for now.
        - Chemistry:
            - Generally, there may be possible reductions in support spaces; SGJJR agreed to discuss with Chemistry during their departmental session on 10/1.
            - Proposed reductions couldn't be taken "off the cuff"; they require dialogue.
            - It is likely one or two reductions from the proposed list will be accepted.
            - SGJJR agreed to review space needs for Physical/Instrumental research space with the users.
        - Microbiology:
            - 7L1 Food Safe Prep area is still needed in the program.
            - 7R1 BSC room is still needed for student-focused use.
            - Regarding the research space allocation, SGJJR posed for consideration: Is there a direct relationship between the PI model at Madison and the application of the user-proposed arrangement at La Crosse? Proposed research space allocation from 640sf to 480sf.
            - SGJJR was advised that there would be savings in Microbiology space in the departmental meeting on 10/2; the department chair has that information from the faculty.
        - Physics:
            - Idea of combining Optics and Advanced Experimental Physics to be discussed further.
            - Second Studio Lab currently not included in the program.
            - 8L studio lab could return to the 2011 Pre-Design value, but that the increase in space seems warranted.
            - 8M1 Intro Prep/Storage could return to the 2011 Pre-Design value, since the increase doesn't seem proportional to instructional space increases.
            - 8O and 8P have the potential to be combined.
            - Physics had the following comments:
                - Users liked the notion of two rooms for two rooms, only adjusting size.
                - Users will need to verify that necessary distances are accommodated; the department will review with faculty who are teaching that course.

    e. Seeing significant savings in Phase 1 cost reductions due to the space types that are being considered for combining, right-sizing, merging, etc.
    f. Still about $1.5M delta to close on Phase 1, which is the focus of this visit. Strategies exist for Phase 2, but not the primary point of discussion this visit.

g. Lab techs were not able to be accommodated in Phase 1. The cleanest severance was to move them back to Phase 2, but these office/workspaces are a candidate to reintegrate if the project is under budget at 10%.

4. Neighborhoods/Thematic Research:
    a. Vertical Stacking – Synthesis (top) and Radiation/Imaging (bottom), after that, the remaining clusters can infill.
    b. SGJJR reviewed the modular approach to design and organizational approaches to research space. One of the design team's goals for this visit is to start discussing turning relational diagrams into space.
    c. Users suggested the following change for consideration by the Math department: Biomath would be computational; do they need to be in the expensive lab part or can they be in phase 2? Bruce Riley noted that the Math spaces are computational and may not fit into the lab intensive program of Phase 1.
    d. Chemistry indicated that Beyer, Opdahl need to move out of the Environmental Supercluster; they should be moved proximate to Physical/Instrumental Chemistry.
    e. Microbiology would prefer the Food Lab collocate with the Cell & Molecular Supercluster, and that new hires need to go with it. This will be reiterated and reviewed in the departmental meeting.
    f. Physics theorists do not need to be proximate to experimentalists.
    g. SGJJR explained that the Cell & Molecular Supercluster shows a high concentration of support spaces because these are the heavy users; the design team will need to investigate distribution within the building.

5. Space:
    a. Site Analysis – high traffic areas can set up major entrance points.
    b. Neighborhood by Floor – three schemes presented.
    c. Eric Gansen questioned if research space would be located near the entrances? Ideally, this would not be the case.
    d. Maura Donnelly asked if the modules shown are depicting actual spaces? No, these will be combined into open lab spaces merging 5 or 6 modules together.
    e. Layered vs. Bookend approaches needs to be discussed.
    f. Would storage be accommodated in full floor plate basement? (SGJJR indicated that this would likely not be the case.)
    g. Maura Donnelly recommended investigating a scheme focusing research spaces at south to provide proximity to faculty offices. (SGJJR indicated that this was being investigated as a possible scheme).
    h. Aaron Monte commented that he liked the proposed mirror scheme, in order to have views to the north in the class labs.
    i. Scheme 3 was well received. Maura Donnelly commented that the arc is reminiscent of a UW-Oshkosh project. A positive aspect of this scheme is that night/weekend work means office use rather than using energy-intensive lab spaces.
    j. SGJJR commented that the Phase 2 form has a profound potential to script the life of the building.

6. Next Steps:
    a. Schematic Design will reflect adjacency diagrams.
    b. Choices will be provided and evaluated.
    c. Quality model will be evaluated with each scheme.
    d. Clear direction should be the outcome at the end of Schematic Design Meeting No. 2.
    e. Detailed departmental meetings to identify laboratory requirements.
    f. Future sessions are designed to be one day, not two.
    g. RA/SGJJR needs feedback from users on how the information for these visits should be disseminated.

h. Lab designers need to be out ahead of the rest of the design team; this effort requires a large amount of time.
i. For departmental lab planning sessions, 3-5 users per representative group is preferred by the lab planning team.

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.