

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REVIEW MEETING / MARCH 26, 2015

MEETING START TIME: 10:00 a.m.
 MEETING END TIME: 12:30 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	Tony LoBello	SmithGroupJJR
Doug Pearson	UW-La Crosse	David Johnson	SmithGroupJJR
Bruce Riley	UW-La Crosse	Jeff Kocinski	SmithGroupJJR
Bob Hoar	UW-La Crosse		

NOTES:

1. Program Schedule Review:
 - a. The final draft of the 10% Concept Report will be submitted within the next week.
 - b. Project is now moving towards the Preliminary Review (35%) submittal.
 - c. Design Committee meetings to continue to be held on Thursday's. Upcoming meetings tentatively scheduled are as follows:
 - Executive Committee meeting to be held April 15th from 9:00-11:00.
 - Proposed meeting for April 9th to be changed to April 16th from 10:00-12:00 with the Design Committee.
 - Proposed meeting for April 30th to likely be changed to May 7th.
 - d. The critical milestone dates were reviewed and discussed. Beth Alderman to discuss the possibility of having the project approval added to the Board of Regents meeting scheduled for July. If July is an option, the final Design Report must be to DFD by June 19th. This scenario results in the draft submittal being submitted at the end of May. Beth noted that the budget and schedule are the critical components of the Design Report.
 - e. Beth noted a third scenario in the project schedule which would have the project on the agenda for the September or October SBC approval. Beth noted that if this is the case, UW-System/UW-La Crosse would need to fund the AE fee to continue working on the project.

2. Project Cost Review:
 - a. David Johnson reviewed the current construction cost estimate as compared to the overall project budget.
 - b. Bob Hetzel asked if the design team is carrying a design contingency in the estimate. Val Schute commented that there is currently an 8% allowance in the construction cost to cover the unknown items that typically get resolved between Conceptual Design (10%) and Preliminary Review (35%). Bob noted that it does the campus no good to deliver a project at \$78M in lieu of the full \$82M.
 - c. Beth Alderman noted that unit prices can be added to the specifications as a way to get competitive estimates for potential changes during construction.

- d. Beth noted there are only two options if the project comes in over budget. 1) Design team redesigns the project at their own expense and the project is re-bid. 2) Use Moveable and Special Equipment fund allocations. Bob Hetzel commented that UW-La Crosse has \$2M set aside for this project should the need arise.
- e. Beth commented that currently, DFD projects are showing a trend in bids coming in high for mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work while the general construction is commonly under budget. David Johnson described a method of moving various elements of laboratory casework from the construction budget to the FF&E budget and vice versa. The casework budget is tracking high and the lab planning group will work to refine and define the equipment and casework with the users. David feels this could reduce this cost by 15%, but there is no guarantee. During the upcoming lab planning review meetings with the users, SmithGroupJJR will inquire each user group on equipment anticipated to be moved from Cowley Hall. Currently, the cost estimate has most, if not all of the equipment as being new. David added that one of the primary goals is to create consistency and efficiency with the goal of decreasing the amount of variety in the casework. Bob Hoar questioned if this complexity is reflected in the current estimate.
- f. David Johnson noted that for the scale of this project, the entire FF&E budget is likely to be used.
- g. Beth Alderman noted that the Project Contingency needs to be adjusted per the increased Construction Cost.
- h. The current design scheme provides a loft-like feel to the interior with exposed ceilings in the corridors. Heidi Macpherson commented that this concept could look dingy over time. UW-L is concerned about the ease of maintenance using this concept.
- i. A list of items that the Design Team felt could be reduced or eliminated in the cost estimate were reviewed and discussed.
- j. Bob Hetzel expressed concern over the finish materials being proposed for the penthouse and recommended reviewing the Student Center design for reference.
- k. The following items were discussed for possible reduction or removal from the project:
 - Corridor Ceilings:
 - Floating clouds could be used at various areas.
 - Provides clear access to the utilities.
 - Heidi Macpherson commented that removal of the ceilings would not be her first choice for a cost reduction strategy.
 - Concern expressed over maintaining cleanliness of the elements above the corridor.
 - Corridor Floors:
 - Terrazzo preferred.
 - Rubber flooring could be used throughout with terrazzo only at the lobbies.
 - Corridor Walls:
 - Maintenance of the wall surface is a concern.
 - A wainscot is preferred to provide protection and ease of maintenance.
 - Penthouse Exterior Wall Materials:
 - Refer to Student Center for metal panel finish.
 - Class 1,000 versus Class 100 Clean Room:
 - To be verified with user group.
 - Structural Floor System:
 - Currently being discussed with DFD technical staff.
 - Future flexibility a concern.
 - Elevator:
 - Cost savings depicted on the slide and in the spreadsheet may be incorrect. Design Team to verify.

- Removing south passenger elevator and rearranging the area around the link to Phase 2 should be explored.
 - Wood Feature Walls:
 - Committee agreed with removal of proposed walls.
 - Railing Types:
 - Committee agreed with idea of further exploring the options.
 - Restroom Wall Tile:
 - No comments were provided.
 - Laboratory Doors:
 - David Johnson noted that the best practice is to provide two means of egress from the labs that have hazard concerns.
 - Concern about exiting through the Lab Prep room for safety reasons as those doors are typically locked.
 - Transom Glass:
 - Daylight into the labs won't have an impact on achieving LEED certification.
 - Parapet Heights:
 - Fall protection requirements to be verified.
 - l. Executive Committee to be provided with working spreadsheet to provide further evaluation of items to be included in the cost reduction process.
 - m. Beth Alderman noted that the construction cost should be as close to the budget as possible at this time.
 - n. Bob Hetzel noted that the Design Committee will need to be given an opportunity to provide input on the interior design and cost reduction strategies.
3. Exterior Design Review:
- a. Bob Hetzel commented that the development of the elevations seems to be moving away from the "traditional" feel of the UW-La Crosse campus.
 - b. Bob Hetzel commented that he wasn't fond of the color of the parapet cap or the lintels over the windows. His preference was the lighter stone for the lintels and parapet cap.
 - c. Heidi Macpherson commented that she liked the proposed stone base. Bob Hetzel noted that this approach reflects the campus architecture nicely. Beth Alderman added that she felt the building's appearance is less overwhelming.
 - d. Bob Hetzel noted that the construction of Phase 2 could be delayed at least 10 years.
 - e. The north entry design was accepted by the committee.
 - f. For the next Design Committee meeting, side-by-side imagery will be provided to show the previous design and proposed exterior design concepts.

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.