

DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

PROJECT: University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
PRAIRIE SPRINGS SCIENCE CENTER – PHASE II
La Crosse, WI

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

MEETING DATE: January 14, 2021

MEETING TIME: 10:30am-12:30pm

ATTENDANCE:

Cathy Weiss	UW-System Administration	cweiss@uwsa.edu
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	bhetzel@uwlax.edu
Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Mark Sandheinrich	UW-La Crosse	msandheinrich@uwlax.edu
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse	mabler@uwlax.edu
Tony Sanderfoot	UW-La Crosse	asanderfoot@uwlax.edu
Colin Belby	UW-La Crosse	cbelby@uwlax.edu
Cynthia Berlin	UW-La Crosse	cberlin@uwlax.edu
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	tweaver@uwlax.edu
Aric Opdahl	UW-La Crosse	aopdahl@uwlax.edu
Chris Rolffhus	UW-La Crosse	krolffhus@uwlax.edu
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	rallen@uwlax.edu
Taviare Hawkins	UW-La Crosse	thawkins@uwlax.edu
Eric Gansen	UW-La Crosse	egansen@uwlax.edu
Shelly Leshner	UW-La Crosse	slesher@uwlax.edu
Val Schute	River Architects	v.schute@river-architects.com
Mike Adler	River Architects	m.adler@river-architects.com
Andy Hudzinski	River Architects	a.hudzinski@river-architects.com
Jeff Kuhse	River Architects	j.kuhse@river-architects.com
David Johnson	SmithGroup	David.Johnson@smithgroup.com
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com
Lana Zoet	SmithGroup	Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com
Gregg Calpino	SmithGroup	Gregg.Calpino@smithgroup.com
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com
Steve Hackman	SmithGroup	Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com

PROGRAMMING:

1. Departments have commented on the design related in Phase 2 to be student centered, collaborative, and face-forward.
2. Biology:
 - a. Department interested in private office equity.
 - b. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - c. Vivarium reductions account for large portion of space reduction in the circulation as well as some various program elements. Further review and discussion needed.
 - d. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections.
 - e. Re-sizing of various spaces to better align with the lab planning module.
3. Chemistry:
 - a. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - b. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections.
4. Dean's Office:
 - a. Two offices were reallocated in increase conference room size. Second ADA and Dean's Assistant Office were noted as not needed by the Dean's Office staff. The size of the Dean's Conference Room was requested to be increased to seat 20 people.
 - b. Adjacency to campus community was discussed.
5. Geography & Earth Science:
 - a. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - b. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections.
 - c. Four faculty research labs requested. Further review and discussion needed.
6. Mathematics:
 - a. Team Room recategorized into Library.
 - b. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - c. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections. Math Education near Science Education.

7. Microbiology:
 - a. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - b. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections.

 8. Physics:
 - a. Small meeting room added. Note, this square footage was reassigned from previously programmed space that was determined to be duplicated or not needed (lab support staff office, student workers, ADA, etc.) Confirmation of direction for chair's offices needed.
 - b. Adjacencies identified within the department as well as cross-discipline connections.
 - c. Recategorized Waiting Room with Observation Platform.
 - d. Further review and discussion needed regarding sharing of computational computer lab space.

 9. Classrooms:
 - a. Added 72-seat active learning classroom. *(Following the meeting, direction provided by UWL to provide three 84-seat active learning classrooms. Pending confirmation.)*
 - b. Increased 80-seat classrooms to 100 seats.
 - c. Pairing of classrooms being considered for sharing of prep/storage space whenever possible.
 - d. Assumptions made by design team for seating arrangements and sf/station required.

 10. Misc. Instructional Support:
 - a. Recategorized Student Organization.
 - b. Reassigned Maker Space to Computer Science Engineering.
 - c. Recategorized Faculty Resource Centers.
 - d. Specimen Museum displays to be distributed throughout the building.
-

GUIDING PRINCIPLES & PLANNING

1. Link:
 - a. Social heart of the facility – stitch together phase 1 (lab heavy) with mosaic of spaces in phase 2.
 - b. Looking to provide relief, social interaction, high degree of transparency to interior spaces as well as the outdoors.
 - c. Exploring double-height spaces.
 - d. Values noted during departmental meetings.
 - e. Floor plate comparisons and exploration of opportunities (2021 to 2017 10% Concept Design).
 - f. Third floor collaboration area opportunity.
 - g. Café planned to be gathering area/lobby and not include food service.
 - h. Considering relocation of GIS Labs to lower level.
 - i. Considering amphitheater-style riser in gathering area.

2. Comments:
 - a. Mike Abler:
 - Further discussion is needed between Biology, Math, and Science Education. Adjacency illustrated showing Math and Science Ed on different floors is not ideal.
 - Concerned about student queuing space outside the classrooms and noise. Collaboration/study areas to be open or enclosed? Transparency at the classroom wall and soundproofing a concern.
 - b. Tav Hawkins:
 - Noted concern about the adjacency illustrated showing Math and Science Ed on different floors.
 - Link needs to be more student-centric.
 - c. Tony Sanderfoot:
 - Likes idea of stadium seating but concerned with accessibility.
 - 40 and 50 seat classrooms – like idea of interchangeability but concerned with scheduling. David noted assessment needed to understand need for flexibility.
 - d. Cynthia Berlin:
 - GIS labs located in lower level – concerned if four research labs are located elsewhere.
 - David suggested the design team should map departmental spaces in 3D for understanding of where spaces are located within each department.
 - e. Robert Allen:
 - Agrees the link is the heart of the P1-P2 combo but doesn't see it with the configuration illustrated. Disagrees with classrooms being in the link. Not unique. Treehouse is unique. Science Ed/Math Lab are also classroom settings. Nothing new than other buildings. Are there more things that could go in the link?
 - f. Eric Gansen:
 - Current Cowley has an area where all floors connected which allows for physics experiments.
 - Scott noted challenges of connecting more than 2 stories with the current building codes. Further exploration needed.
 - g. Shelly Leshner:
 - 150-seat classrooms – congestion issue with rooms adjacent to each other. Going to be difficult to circulate through the building with how these are located in the design.
 - Students waiting in hallways, not necessarily the entering/exiting.
3. Classrooms:
 - a. The 150-seat classrooms depicted in the 2017 10% Concept Report depicted a tablet-arm, fixed auditorium-style seating arrangement with a sloping floor (not steep). Current trends are to utilize fixed tables and movable chairs with two rows per tier to allow for more collaboration.
 - Cynthia commented that the ability to change the furniture arrangement in the classrooms is helpful.
 - Tony noted that the spaces in Centennial Hall with tables and chairs are more popular than fixed auditorium seating.
 - David Johnson commented that in order to accommodate table and chair seating, it does mean additional square footage.

- Tav expressed a desire for pod arrangements. These would be provided in the active learning classrooms.
 - Eric expressed the desire for storage/prep space on the same floor level as the demonstration/teaching level of the sloped classroom.
4. Departmental Offices:
- a. 2017 10% Concept Report floor plans depict the office quantities needed. Final locations of the departments to be determined. The concept plans create desirable and less-desirable offices with inboard and outboard locations. Faculty collaboration zones were less distributed.
 - b. State of Wisconsin Sustainability Guidelines promote natural light and views to as many spaces as possible, but put public spaces ahead of offices.
 - c. Alternate Layout Option 1:
 - Places offices inboard with circulation and collaboration areas at the perimeter.
 - Modularity offers flexibility as things change.
 - d. Alternate Layout Option 2:
 - Angled exterior wall to provide additional square footage. Places offices inboard with circulation and collaboration areas at the perimeter.
 - Modularity offers flexibility as things change.
 - Resource, research, shared spaces, etc. to the south.
 - e. Robert Allen:
 - Likes equality but "vertical" hallways may create division or faculty clusters.
 - Do all floors need to be the same? David noted that the modularity could provide opportunities. If adopted on one floor, it would likely be the same on all floors.
 - Commented on the amount of daylight/glazing required to the hallway and how faculty may react to that idea. A visual of what those spaces could look like would be helpful.
 - Not comfortable making any decision today.
 - f. Bob Hetzel:
 - Concerned about how Department Chairs feel about senior faculty not having a window to the exterior.
 - Mike Abler noted that it could be an issue for some but it's not an issue for him personally.
 - Tav Hawkins commented that faculty who spend most of their day in the lower level spaces in Phase 1 would appreciate having access to daylight in their office environment.
 - Shelly Leshner noted that she has seen this done at other facilities and likes the idea.
 - Cynthia Berlin commented that she appreciates windows and privacy.
 - Tony Sanderfoot noted a concern for student wayfinding to the various office pods.
5. Site Opportunities:
- a. Various aspects of the site are being reviewed and assessed by the design team. These include student movement between buildings, parking, entrances, utilities, landscaping, and overall usage of the site.
 - b. Bob noted that the circular flag plaza has been relocated and the area needs to be re-worked. Could provide a new entrance opportunity into the campus from East Avenue.

- c. Gregg Calpino commented that it would be good to identify opportunities during this project even if they can't be afforded so as to plan for future development of the site.
- d. Val Schute noted that the southern courtyard at Centennial Hall is a result of a deliberate design intention to provide daylight into as many spaces as possible. There could be an opportunity at Prairie Springs to activate the courtyard and possible differentiator to what's going on within the building.
- e. Chris Rolhus commented that there is currently a high degree of student traffic between Centennial Hall and the southwest corner of Cowley Hall.
- f. Mike Abler noted that there could be an opportunity for outdoor seminars and lectures if seating is provided.

PROJECT SCHEDULE:

- 1. Mike Adler reviewed the project schedule. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - a. Technology Visioning Session scheduled for January 20, 2021 to review teaching methods within the classrooms, technology needs within the shared spaces, etc. Next round of departmental meetings will include discussions regarding technology within the departmental spaces.
 - b. Sustainability Charrette scheduled for January 21, 2021 to gather feedback from the stakeholder groups regarding sustainable design strategies. This meeting is a requirement for the projects of this size within the State of Wisconsin.
 - c. Departmental review meetings are scheduled for January 25, 26, and 27, 2021.
 - d. Design Committee and Executive Committee meetings scheduled for January 28, 2021.
 - e. 10% Concept Report complete in March 2021. Draft submittal tentatively scheduled for February 15, 2021.

ACTION ITEMS SUMMARY		
1	Provide information regarding Vivarium program requirements	UWL
2	Provide direction regarding Geography/ES research labs	UWL
3	Provide information regarding Science Education Methods Lab program requirements	UWL

Note: 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.