

SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW MEETING NO. 5 / JANUARY 14, 2015

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
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	Mike Adler	River Architects
Heidi Macpherson	UW-La Crosse	Jeff Kocinski	SmithGroupJJR
Doug Pearson	UW-La Crosse	Tony Lobello	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse	Nikki Taylor	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hoar	UW-La Crosse	Tom Rogers	SmithGroupJJR
		Coty Sandberg	SmithGroupJJR
		Raquel Guzman Geara	SmithGroupJJR
		David Johnson	SmithGroupJJR
		Tim Tracey	SmithGroupJJR

NOTES:

1. The Project Schedule was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Draft 10% Concept Report due January 29, 2015.
 - b. UWL, DFD, and UW-System review comments of the Concept Report complete February 2, 2015.
 - c. Final Concept Report due March 5, 2015.
 - d. Beth Alderman noted that the Design Team needs to schedule the Peer Review with DFD. Beth asked for a 3-4 week notice.
 - e. Beth Alderman commented that the State Building Commission will not be meeting until August. Beth noted there could be a meeting in February. Beth recommends planning on an August meeting.

2. Tony Lobello gave a recap of Schematic Design Meeting No. 4 held on December 18, 2014. The following items were noted:
 - a. Campus context and materiality were reviewed.
 - b. Exterior concept "Modular 2" was selected by the committee.
 - c. Val Schute noted that the design is at a measuring point to understand if the team has listened to the requests of the campus.

3. Tom Rogers reviewed the site design concept. The following items were noted:
 - a. The goals of the site design were presented.
 - b. A pedestrian experience will be created with the connections to the Student Center to the north along Badger Street.
 - c. Stormwater infiltration areas were presented.
 - d. The loading area for Phases 1 and 2 were presented. A 40-ft panel truck can be accommodated with a T-turnaround. Tom noted the difficulties of getting a semi trailer backed into the loading dock. Bob

- Hetzel commented that the design shouldn't accommodate a semi trailer for the limited times one will deliver to the building.
- e. ADA parking was reviewed. Parking lot C-2 is possible. Tony Lobello noted the implications with LEED if parking is available at the building. Concerns regarding safety of those using the ADA stalls if they are located in the east service court. Bob Hetzel recommended providing ADA stalls in C-2 and the service yard. Deliveries can be scheduled to accommodate the needs of the ADA parking.
 - f. Tom Rogers noted that Badger Street will be closed during construction of this project so if possible, the redevelopment of Badger Street would ideally occur with this project.
 - g. Beth Alderman discussed the schedule scenarios associated with the redevelopment of Badger Street.
 - SmithGroupJJR's proposal for the Badger Street is being reviewed by DFD. Once accepted, the study can begin and will not need to be included in the 10% Concept Report. The design study has to take its own course and go through the proper design reviews. Because it will be developed by SmithGroupJJR, continuity will result and the hope would be that the project merges with Phase 1 of the Science Building before going out for bids.
 - Beth recommends a mention of the mall development within the Concept Report but noting it as a possible contingency item.
 - Bob Hetzel would like to see the northern node of the mall included with the Science Building project.
 - Beth Alderman questioned the funding source for Badger Street. Bob Hetzel noted that UW-Eau Claire's Centennial Hall incorporated a large portion of their campus mall as part of its project and he'd like to see the same happen at UW-L. Beth noted that it may be possible to use some of the contingency funds allocated to the Student Center for a portion of the work on Badger Street.
 - h. The courtyard between Phases 1 and 2 was discussed. The proportions are similar to the south courtyard at Centennial Hall. Space will be needed for stormwater infiltration. The courtyard will serve as an anchor point on the quad.
4. The current floor plans were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
- a. The north and west entrances have been enlarged as requested by the committee.
 - b. Level 1 consists of primarily teaching lab spaces with support space to the southeast.
 - c. Environmental Sample Processing will be divided into two functions; wet and dry.
 - d. David Johnson noted that the mechanical shafts may increase slightly as the design moves forward.
 - e. The current plans depict more detail, including doors, windows, lab benches, etc. The guideplates will illustrate the room details within the Concept Report.
 - f. Since two stairs are required by code, the third stair previously shown along the south end of the building was removed and will be incorporated into Phase 2.
 - g. The west vestibule will move outward slightly to align with the exterior images.
 - h. Val Schute noted that the main east/west and north/south corridors terminate with access to natural daylight.
 - i. Bob Hetzel expressed concern with the limited corridor size at the south connection to Phase 2. With people standing in the hall waiting to use the elevator, this area will become a bottleneck between the two phases.
 - j. Chemistry lab support spaces have been revised. Users had expressed an interest in tailoring the support space to gain space within the instructional labs for standing equipment and setups. The Stock/Prep room was recessed at the corridor to provide more space for student queuing.
 - k. Reductions in support have been tested through drawing and diagramming. River Studies tank rooms and research along with Geo/ES as methodological bridge between.

- l. An option for shell space is depicted on Level 3 with the possibility of moving two Chemistry spaces from Phase 2 into Phase 1. An additional option includes a second Biochemistry Lab.
 - m. David Johnson commented on the option that the team is considering of moving the Aquatics Lab to level 2. The switch may not work because it would require swapping with Organic Chemistry.
 - n. All restrooms will provide ADA accessibility.
 - o. Val Schute noted that the design process has involved the engineering team from the beginning. The basement and penthouse have been reviewed several times to develop the most efficient use of these spaces.
 - p. Added doors to suite the Radiation Center.
 - q. Access to the penthouse will be through the east stair and through a roof hatch at the west. Additional study is taking place to ensure adequate circulation through the penthouse.
 - r. A diagram was presented which showed the differences in corridor occupancy between Centennial Hall and the New Science Building. The committee agreed with the comparison.
 - s. Val Schute presented a sketch showing a possible connection design with Phase 2. Features of the space include collaborative learning opportunities, an elevator, and grand stair.
 - t. Beth Alderman asked where the public roof access would be located. The current idea is to locate this function on the south end of Phase 2.
5. Interior design concepts were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
- a. The recessed niche provided at the doors into the labs will provide an opportunity to identify those spaces through the use of color, material, or iconography.
 - b. Table and chair seating within the collaborative learning pods preferred over other options shown. Beth Alderman noted that furniture could drift into the corridor and may be an issue at times.
 - c. Transom height windows at the interior walls along the corridor were acceptable to the committee.
6. The exterior design concept was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
- a. Doug Pearson asked if the alignment of the windows works with the lab benches. The window offsets between floors do work within the lab bench spacing.
 - b. Heidi Macpherson commented that the angled element at the windows in the brick massing don't work as well as they do in the stone walls.
 - c. Bob Hetzel commented that stone lintels over the windows provide a strong academic look, unlike the windows at Wimberly Hall. Bob commented that the soldier course of brick could be a nice alternative since Graff Main Hall also has a similar detail. A continuous horizontal stone lintel was modeled during the meeting and the committee felt it was too "stripey."
 - d. Bob Hetzel recommends reducing the size of the stone fin wall on the east elevation and increasing the size of the curtainwall. Bob also recommends adding windows to the stone fin wall on the west elevation.
 - e. Bruce Riley and Heidi Macpherson indicated their approval of the material presented.

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.