# river ARCHITECTS | SMITHGROUPJJR

University of Wisconsin – La Crosse Science Lab Building DFD# 13B3H / RA# 1290.A October 2, 2014

## PROGRAM VERIFICATION MEETING NO. 4 / OCTOBER 2, 2014 - DESIGN COMMITTEE

MEETING START TIME: 10:45 a.m. MEETING END TIME: 11:30 a.m.

### PRESENT:

Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	Val Schute	River Architects
Heidi	UW-La Crosse	Mike Adler	River Architects
Doug Pearson	UW-La Crosse	David Johnson	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse	Andrew Cherry	SmithGroupJJR
Aaron Monte	UW-La Crosse	Jeff Kocinski	SmithGroupJJR
Cynthia Berlin	UW-La Crosse	Nikki Taylor	SmithGroupJJR
Karoline Auby	UW-La Crosse		
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse		
Bill Schwan	UW-La Crosse		
Eric Gansen	UW-La Crosse		

## NOTES:

- 1. David Johnson gave an overview of the program verification process. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
  - a. David noted that we are to a point where we don't want to reduce the program any further and we don't want to compromise the teaching mission of the college.
  - b. David noted that since the labs are at their right size, future growth may be an issue if ever needed.
  - c. SGJJR provided a summary of findings from user group conversations.
  - d. SGJJR looked at all class labs as described after Program Verification 3; most are meeting the room utilization requirements from the State.
  - e. As the project progresses, attempts will be made to recover some of the space lost in Program Verification.
  - f. Microbiology had significant savings during the group discussion. Two spaces seem undersized and now be the appropriate time to add back some space in.
  - g. Physics had productive discussions about support space. Although the possibility does not exist to merge target labs, some savings were still achieved.
  - h. SGJJR reiterated that offices for lab technicians have been moved back into Phase 2.

#### 2. Misc. Reductions:

- a. Chemistry:
  - Concern was expressed regarding merging of Biochem and Microbiology.
  - Chemistry asked whether there was an ability to centralize prep space to feed 4-6 spaces, and
    whether this had potential space savings? SGJJR agreed to test this method through drawing,
    but does not want to take additional space in anticipation of an untested methodology.
- b. Microbiology:
  - Reduction in research lab size from 640sf to 480sf.
  - Shared laboratories plus a few standalone laboratories.
  - Microbiology BSC Tissue Culture Room proposed to add sf to this space.

# river ARCHITECTS | SMITHGROUPJJR

University of Wisconsin – La Crosse Science Lab Building DFD# 13B3H / RA# 1290.A October 2, 2014

#### c. Physics:

- Physics expressed that they would deem it worthwhile for the design team to take a close look
  at the class schedule and how things fit together. The need for storage and a desire for tables
  was reiterated. SGJJR explained that the STEP group had very productive group
  conversation with the design team; a summary of SGJJR's understanding was provided.
- 1,000 to 1,500 sf reduction from Program Verification No. 3.
- d. Geography & Earth Science:
  - Forgot to mention the need for a "mud room" in pre-design and previous Program Verification
    meetings. The space would be used by students to pull off boots and process cores and other
    field samples. SGJJR explained the need to manage these spaces in aggregate at the
    building level. This function is currently shown as 13C Environmental Sample Processing
    Room.
- 3. Thematic Organization:
  - a. Environmental Cluster seemed to be appropriate.
  - b. Cell and Molecular Cluster Proposed shared autoclave support space was discussed further discussion among the departments is needed.
  - c. SGJJR reviewed diagrammatic clusters, which were generally well received. Some minor corrections were noted by user groups. SGJJR reiterated that the researcher groupings and adjacencies should be discussed and tested with the departments/research groups.
  - d. Biology suggested they might move more terrestrial researchers into the Anatomy/Physiology group area.
- 4. Mike Abler expressed concern about future growth. SGJJR clarified that the program can't support sustained growth at the rate recently observed because the program does not have much expansion space. Bob Hetzel shared that Phase 2 is now in the 2019-21 biennium. As the institution grows, the University will have to look at what Phase 2 means. Physics speculated that the backfill use of Cowley Hall is unlikely to fit into the same program as Phase 2 as currently planned.
- 5. Next Steps:
  - a. Design Committee Meeting: October 23, 2014 (10:00-12:00)
  - b. Detailed planning meetings with the departments to define laboratory specifics (equipment, services, etc.) two days to review guideplates and room data sheets for each laboratory SGJJR to populate the general spaces and will provide templates for the more detailed spaces. These will be distributed prior to the meeting for review.
  - c. Design Committee Meeting: November 13, 2014 (TBD)
  - d. Design Committee Meeting: December 11, 2014 (TBD)
  - e. Layered vs. Bookend organization building-wide consensus is needed
  - f. Biology expressed that the lab planning segment for pre-design was conducted by Paulien & Associates, but not well.
- 6. SGJJR described concerned reactions in the town hall meeting about research concepts being too transparent. The committee members clarified that they like daylight, but dislike views from corridors into research labs.