

SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW MEETING NO. 2 / NOVEMBER 13, 2014

MEETING START TIME: 10:00 a.m.
 MEETING END TIME: 12:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Beth Alderman	Division of Facilities Development	Val Schute	River Architects
Maura Donnelly	UW-System Administration (phone)	Mike Swinghamer	River Architects
Heidi Macpherson	UW-La Crosse	Clint Rasmussen	River Architects
Doug Pearson	UW-La Crosse	Tim Tracey	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse	Andrew Cherry	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hoar	UW-La Crosse	Jeff Kocinski	SmithGroupJJR
Aaron Monte	UW-La Crosse	Tony Lobello	SmithGroupJJR
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse	Tom Rodgers	SmithGroupJJR
Karoline Auby	UW-La Crosse	Nikki Taylor	SmithGroupJJR
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse		
Cynthia Berlin	UW-La Crosse		
Julia Johnson	UW-La Crosse		
Jennifer Docktor	UW-La Crosse		
Julianne Merkes	UW-La Crosse		

NOTES:

1. The Project Schedule was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. The Design Committee was asked to evaluate the two schemes presented.
 - b. Val Schute noted that the process is now moving from pragmatic to intuitive, inspirational, and aspirational.
 - c. The Sustainability Charrette was reviewed in brief. The design team commented although the meeting was long, it was productive. The design team will chronicle information for online distribution.
 - d. The next steps include the following:
 - Break down, regroup, and push forward with the design.
 - Schematic Design Meeting No.3 will be held on December 3, 2014 from 2:00-5:00.
 - Lab Planning meeting dates by department were provided.
 - e. The goal of this meeting is to get the concept narrowed down to one scheme. The design team noted that parts of one could be melded into the other. The committee was asked to identify attributes that are favorable or undesirable in both schemes for correction.

2. The Program and Budget were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. The project is still on budget. The design team is working through efficiencies at the building scale to keep this the case.

3. The Site Context and Constraints were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted
 - a. The design team emphasized the importance of context, given the longevity of buildings on campus (50 years +)
 - b. An overview of the 2005 Campus Master Plan was presented:

- Three primary issues were addressed in the Campus Master Plan.
 - Place
 - Walkability
 - Better first experience
 - This project is currently dealing with the final big piece of the Master Plan. The design team is considering the following:
 - How does this relate to the campus as a whole?
 - What are the patterns?
 - c. Circular geometry was identified as a physical manifestation of nodes/anchors campus-wide.
 - d. Differences between the 2011 Pre-Design Study and the current state were reviewed.
 - A key component of the quad is its role as a campus core space for interconnection.
 - In the Pre-Design Study, the notion of keeping Cowley Hall as the Phase 2 building was impacting the reading of green space at the north end of the quad.
 - With demolition of Cowley Hall, the reading and function of the campus mall changes. The quad currently lacks an anchor at the northern terminus.
 - e. SmithGroupJJR reviewed the status of storm water approaches at the site.
 - The current municipal storm water system is at or over capacity. To keep excess water out of the system, this project needs to infiltrate on site.
 - The South and West sides of the site will be impacted in future; it is not desirable to invest in these areas in the current phase.
 - The North side of the site is a good option for investing in infiltration.
 - f. When evaluating the schemes, the design team asked that the committee do so with Site Goals in mind. The team suggested that the committee think of the building context from different experiential viewpoints.
4. Developments since the previous meeting were reviewed.
- a. SGJJR provided a summary of the process of narrowing to 2 schemes and reviewed overall changes to the schemes.
 - b. The schemes have been renamed for easier reference based on how they behave after Phase 2 is built. Scheme 2 (shear) has been renamed Confluence. Scheme 4 (L) has been renamed Meander.
 - c. The schemes are arranged around the programming module discussed in previous meetings.
 - d. The design team has begun coordinating with engineers. Efficiencies in MEP distribution are being incorporated to prevent excessive roof penetrations, relative to the 230 existing penetrations in Cowley.
5. The following general requirements for building were noted:
- a. Elevators:
 - Passenger elevators should be located in two locations.
 - A passenger elevator should be located in the NW corner by the primary entrance.
 - UWL-Assoc. VC questioned the proximity of handicap parking, which is presumed to be in the Ramp parking structure north of Wimberley Hall as they are likely to use this stair.
 - b. Room adjacencies:
 - Soil and sediments cold room is for research and needs to be located near the research labs.

6. Confluence
 - a. The central corridor is a major backbone to the building setup for Phase 2.
 - b. Val introduced corridor distances and provided comparisons to known corridor lengths across campus.
 - c. The scheme provides connectivity to the site and campus, and provides more room for storm water along the north side of the building.
 - d. UWL-Math questioned amount of traffic through central corridor. SGJJR confirmed that we need to treat the corridor for high traffic conditions, as this will likely be a major cut-through for pedestrians in winter months.
 - e. UWL-Biology questioned the move of the secondary entry from SW to S, and noted the facility of the south entry for phase 2 connection. Bio also noted that an elevator should be located at the NW corner entry for faculty who park in the Ramp parking structure.
 - f. Having the PCR by research labs was acknowledged as acceptable by UWL-Biology
 - g. The design team noted that the process has reached a point of opportunity to let interior and exterior circulation relate to each other.
 - h. UWL-CLS noted a need to consider the impact of outdoor concerts anticipated to occur on the new Student Center lawn. The design team acknowledged this constraint and encouraged the committee to consider this when evaluating the schemes.
 - i. UWL-Physics asked for confirmation that astronomy platforms should be located on the rooftop in Phase 2; the design team confirmed that this is the case.
 - j. UWL-Biology noted a preference for how the service yard is concealed in this scheme.
 - k. Need to isolate the slab/zone for mechanical vibration in the basement.
 - l. Link between the two phases will provide an opportunity to create shared collaboration spaces.
 - m. Comment was made how the main entrances are screened from the loading area and service yard by the building.
 - n. General storage associated with Physics should be located on Level 1.
 - o. Flip Sealed and Open Source labs and provide seating within the hallway.
7. Meander
 - a. The design team noted the need to create gracious connection as part of Phase 2.
 - b. Collaborative spaces are located by (and potentially attached to) circulation, as opposed to being discrete spaces.
 - c. UWL-Biology and UWL-Physics noted that 8'-wide corridors are too tight for equipment and student circulation.
 - d. UWL-Biology noted that ducts appear to eat away lab support opportunities in this scheme. UWL-CLS agreed that the scheme feels "awkward and cramped".
 - e. UWL-CLS asked whether we are able to split elevators within the current budget. The design team confirmed that it is currently within the cost constraints.
 - f. The design team reiterated that Meander trades N-S length for E-W length as it relates to the site.
 - g. UWL-Physics noted that there are some adjacency issues in this scheme.
 - h. Future connection to Phase 2 will be infill to the west of the southern leg and could result in more circulation space.
 - i. Student study space on west end of the building adjacent to the main stair.
 - j. Physics research spaces need to be located in the basement.
8. The committee was introduced to the Value Model criteria and groupings. Participants were asked to converse and rate schemes both aloud and on the blank models provided.
9. The design team solicited feedback on participant preferences. The following were provided:
 - a. UWL-Physics prefers the articulated massing of Confluence.

- b. UWL-Math prefers the pedestrian flow through the building in Confluence.
 - c. UWL-Students prefer the gracious north side space in Confluence.
10. The design team provided additional visioning imagery for design approaches being considered. UWL-Biology believes that this imagery will allow the faculty to envision the building future state more easily.

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.