riverARCHITECTS

BIOLOGY MEETING NOTES

sschumacher@uwlax.edu

PROJECT: University of Wisconsin – La Crosse

PRAIRIE SPRINGS SCIENCE CENTER - PHASE II

La Crosse, WI

UW-La Crosse

DFDM PROJECT NO: 19G1J RA PROECT NO: 1290E

MEETING DATE: January 7, 2021

MEETING TIME: 9:00am – 10:00am

ATTENDANCE:

Scott Schumacher

Mike Abler **UW-La Crosse** mabler@uwlax.edu Anton Sanderfoot **UW-La Crosse** asanderfoot@uwlax.edu Val Schute **River Architects** v.schute@river-architects.com **River Architects** m.adler@river-architects.com Mike Adler Andy Hudzinski River Architects a.hudzinski@river-architects.com Jeff Kuhse River Architects j.kuhse@river-architects.com

David JohnsonSmithGroupDavid.Johnson@smithgroup.comCoty SandbergSmithGroupCoty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com

Lana Zoet SmithGroup <u>Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com</u>

Emma Cuciurean-Zapan SmithGroup Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com

Steve Hackman SmithGroup <u>Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com</u>

PROGRAMMING:

- 1. Emma Cuciurean-Zapan reviewed room-by-room program requirements. The following items were noted:
 - a. Mike Abler Amy Cooper has put together additional comments on the Vivarium. Scott to forward to Design Team. Space is a good idea now, may plan for future build-out. Steve commented on circulation space currently shown in the Vivarium could be reduced.
 - b. Work Room:
 - Two spaces of 120sf allocated currently sized for larger department.
 - Further discussion needed. Likely not two spaces. Printers, mail, etc. Scott noted possible alcove space for additional printer in another area of the department.
 - Tony asked if specialized facilities are needed on other floors if Biology faculty
 offices aren't on the same floor? Mike Abler doesn't feel it is necessary. Scott
 noted that this will be refined as office placement is determined. Scott noted

river ARCHITECTS

that it would be intended to have everyone have access to the same resources.

- Coty commented that the goal is for departmental offices to be on the same floor as much as possible.
- Card access to work room required per Scott.

c. Storage:

- Secure office storage locked doors, locked cabinets.
- Located near ADA area.
- Files near ADA area.

d. Reception Area:

- Student Workers (2) and ADA (1 only). Further review of configuration in relation to the ADA and reception area will be needed.
- Mike noted that the preference is to have the student worker located in the same space as the ADA.
- While the ADA won't have a private office similar to faculty offices, the space needs to have the ability to be secured and as such will likely be in a shared space with the student worker and reception area and include a door and windows to the corridor. Ability for the ADA workspace to be secured when away from their desk is important.

e. Department Chair Office:

- Small seating area near the Chair's Office.
- Less formal the better per Tony.
- Meeting space within the room vs small meeting area near Chair's Office?
 Mike and Tony don't feel the office needs to be any larger.
- Adjacency to ADA preferred. Scott noted that this arrangement will likely be consistent among departments. Further discussion needed.

f. Graduate Assistants:

- Two-person shared office spaces. 6 spaces of 120sf approved per Mike.
- Doors preferred for meeting with students. Future flexibility if faculty office is needed.
- Keeping the spaces adjacent to one another preferred.
- Windowless, inboard space would be acceptable.
- Close proximity to faculty offices desired.

g. Teaching Assistants:

- Two-person shared office spaces. 6 spaces of 120sf approved per Mike.
- Doors preferred for meeting with students. Future flexibility if faculty office is needed.
- Keeping the spaces adjacent to one another preferred.
- Windowless, inboard space would be acceptable.
- Close proximity to faculty offices desired.

h. Lab Manager + Lab Support Staff:

- Mike noted that space has been located in Phase 1 for these functions.
- Scott advised providing space in Phase 2. One single space is adequate rather than fours spaces programmed. Scott noted that this type of space may be desirable for all departments who have lab spaces in Phase 1.

i. Faculty Offices:

- Quantity noted is acceptable per Mike.
- Scott noted that project needs to design to the ideal. Do not want to move into the building and be full.
- Peer-to-Peer, Faculty-to-Student interactions:
 - Trend expressed by other departments is to meet in open areas or perhaps within a soft-seating environment close to the department.

river ARCHITECTS

- Mike noted that some conversations require privacy while some conversations benefit from an open environment. Mike tends to lean on the side of privacy.
- Café area and open study areas are important. Meeting students on "neutral territory" can benefit students.
- Mike expressed concern about meeting spaces within the departments and there may be an issue with faculty "taking ownership" of those spaces and limiting the shared use with other faculty.
- Faculty Resource Center:
 - Mike noted that whiteboards would be useful. Conferencing ability may not be necessary.
 - Tony noted that hallways are a great place for faculty collaboration. Tony noted that glass walls are not preferred.
- Windows into offices are required per Scott per State guidelines. Scott noted
 the Wittich Hall example as another way to block direct views into the office
 while still providing a visual connection while the room is occupied. More
 discussion needed. Steve noted that translucent or obscured glass at the
 middle section is another option...captures natural/ambient light without the
 distractions.
- j. Testing Rooms were noted by Mike as a beneficial programmed element in the project.
- 2. Outdoor Opportunities:
 - a. Bee hives.
 - b. Outdoor art.
 - c. Native grasses and plantings.
 - d. Outdoor lectures with projection capabilities.
 - e. Movies.
- 3. Adjacencies:
 - a. Biology works with all departments. Strong connections with Statistics, Geography/Earth Science, Chemistry, and Science Education.
 - b. Biology has labs on all floors, so won't be able to have offices on same level as labs throughout. This is acceptable to the department.
 - c. Science Methods + Math Education important to those groups per Mike.
 - d. Offices adjacent to research labs on levels 3 and 4 in Phase 1.
 - e. No greenhouse on the roof.
 - f. Vivarium on lower level security and isolation.
 - g. Collection Display hallway display cases for various items. Challenge with access to these cases for classes. Cases are always available vs central room. Displays next to a seating area would be beneficial.
 - h. Mike noted the mineral collection as a way of combining the sciences involved.
 - Club display? Scott noted that the Student Org space could accommodate this.
- 4. A link to the virtual whiteboard for viewing can be found here: https://app.mural.co/invitation/mural/smithgroup1662/1608068005145?sender=u7109dc06979f 23e2f6bb6071&key=bfd632a8-9773-4dbf-b2e1-4ff7bfef4b34

PROJECT SCHEDULE:

- 1. Work Session No. 2:
 - a. Executive Committee Meeting: January 14-15, 2021 (TBD)
 - b. Design Committee Meeting: January 14-15, 2021 (TBD)

river ARCHITECTS

c. Departmental Review Meetings: January 15-29, 2021

OPEN ISSUES:

- 1. Method for providing irrigation within the Greenhouse to be determined.
- 2. UWL to provide Vivarium comments and revision requests to Design Team.

Note: This constitutes our understanding of the issues presented. Contact River Architects, Inc. via phone at (608) 785-2217, or e-mail <u>m.adler@river-architects.com</u> if there are any discrepancies.