

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: December 10, 2020

MEETING TIME: 12:30-2:00pm

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
Gubbi Sudhakaran	UW-La Crosse	gsudhakaran@uwlax.edu
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse	mabler@uwlax.edu
Colin Belby	UW-La Crosse	cbelby@uwlax.edu
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	tweaver@uwlax.edu
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	rallen@uwlax.edu
Taviare Hawkins	UW-La Crosse	thawkins@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
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

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1. Executive Committee
2. Design Committee
 - a. Executive Committee + Department Chairs/Representatives
3. Architectural/Engineering Team
 - a. Val Schute noted one difference with the design team as compared to Phase 1.
All building systems engineering to be provided by Ring & DuChateau.
 - b. Design team is made up of 50+ members from six firms.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

1. Vision: Science program developed in Pre-Design Study but was a vision prior to that report. Pre-Design Study indicated the project couldn't be done in one phase due to size and cost. Phased implementation approach started in 2011.
 2. Phase 1: 2014 to 2018 – lab intensive and intentional vision of the University.
 3. Phase 2: 2017 10% Concept Design included programming and concept design.
 4. Leverage the positive and negative lessons learned from occupying Phase 1 for two years in order to make Phase 2 and the entire facility even better.
-

DESIGN GUIDELINES/ASSUMPTIONS

1. Guidelines/assumptions were developed in 2010 as aspirational goals and have been measured and evaluated in the Phase 1 work. It is necessary to reconfirm these qualitative criteria for the Phase 2 work.
-

GOALS FOR COWLEY HALL/SCIENCE BUILDING PROGRAM

1. Criteria developed by the project stakeholders in Phase 1 and referred to throughout the process. It is necessary to reconfirm these qualitative criteria for the Phase 2 work.
-

SUSTAINABILITY

1. Lana Zoet provided an overview of the newly developed DFDM Sustainability Guidelines. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - a. Measures are based on AIA Framework for Design Excellence (10 measures).
 - b. SmithGroup involved in developing guidelines with DFDM.
 - c. Next (first) step will be to conduct a sustainability charrette to establish goals. The charrette will include project stakeholders, departmental users, and the design team.
 - d. UWL Prairie Springs Science Center, Phase 2 will be the first project to implement these guidelines.
-

VIRTUAL ENGAGEMENT

1. David Johnson reviewed various tools available to the design team that can contribute to the design and information gathering process in the virtual environment. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - a. New technology and various applications available.
 - b. Virtual whiteboard technology.
 - c. Higher degree of stakeholder engagement.
 - d. Create a virtual database resource of project information in a central/accessible location for stakeholders review and input.
-

WHERE HAVE WE BEEN?

1. Review of program composition developed in the previous 10% report.
2. Program comparison between Phase 1 compared to Phase 2.
3. Thematic Organization (reminder of distinct effort in Phase 1)
 - a. Break-down barriers/silos and continue the blending of interests among the science community.

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

1. Continue the interdisciplinary approach from Phase 1 into Phase 2.
 2. Program Summary:
 - a. One-third of the program is laboratory space.
 - b. Supporting STEM Success.
 - STEM Persistence Framework.
 - Peer-to-Peer learning environments.
 - Team-based learning and discovery.
 - Demands placed on faculty.
 - Peer-to-Peer faculty collaboration.
 - c. Supporting Faculty
 - Opportunities for faculty experience.
 - d. Pandemic
 - More adaptable = less vulnerable.
 - Adaptable learning spaces (multiple mode, multiple density).
 1. Hyper-flex classrooms to maximize flexibility.
 - Classroom spaces
 1. Sizing of spaces will be critical moving forward.
 - e. Site Programming
 - Don't want to lose sight of the connection to the outdoors.
 - Academic opportunities that could transition from in to out.
 - How can it support the interior program?
 - Activate the courtyard as an exterior science experience.
-

VIRTUAL WHITEBOARD

1. Phase 1 Recap:
 - a. Modern (Colin)
 - b. Clean (Todd)
 - Missing the community and interaction with staff and students
 - No views to exterior from Chemistry labs
 - c. Deconstructed in a good way (Robert)
 - d. Sterile in a good/not so good way (Colin)
 - Could have showcased a little more of what the students and faculty do.
 - e. Utilitarian (Mike Abler)
 - f. Efficient (Todd)
 - g. Easy to access spaces (Taviare)
 - h. Loud spaces (neg) (Taviare)
 - Specifically active learning classroom on first floor
 - i. Reconfigurable spaces would be more adaptable (Taviare)
 - j. Lack of electrical services at rear and side display benches (Taviare)
 - k. Bob – comments are very helpful and Phase 1 lab intensity was a risk without collaborative spaces
 - l. Mike Abler – faculty felt they weren't heard on the implementation standpoint – when they asked for specific things, it wasn't because they wanted the best, but they wanted things that work. Many things that just don't work. Autoclaves as an example. Used a company that UWL wasn't familiar with.
 - m. Mike Abler – flexibility in the spaces
 - n. Colin – benchtops in the teaching labs weren't how they expected in terms of seating capacity vs available space
 - o. Robert – great collaborative technology and areas
 - p. Colin – Roomy – lots of good storage space

- q. Colin – Connected (between spaces and between floors)
- 2. Expectations for Phase 2:
 - a. Robert – Office spaces that are usable and furniture that makes sense for faculty in STEM
 - b. Todd - ADA's to be included in the department office design phase
 - c. Colin – office pods, ADA's, faculty (including IAS) from department in one area of the building – adjacency
 - d. Cathy – Per UW-System Standards, ADA's do not qualify for enclosed offices. Creative solutions will be needed for security of personal data, technology, etc.
 - e. Robert – side nooks with displays where students can collaborate
 - f. Todd – space for community demonstrations would be great
 - g. Colin – small conference room spaces like found on each floor of Centennial
 - h. Taviare – more student storage spaces/locker
 - i. Taviare – No place for students to put things (books, lunch, etc.)
 - j. Robert – doesn't want the building to look like a high school
 - k. Colin – nooks within the lab and classroom entrances help declutter workspace within the labs
- 3. Mapping Major Nodes of Activity:
 - a. Colin – Phase 1: Teaching and research spaces mostly, while the areas outside the classroom is more linear and doesn't provide quality group work
 - b. Robert – in existing Cowley, the faculty lounge is very active. Would like to see a space (café, resource area, etc.) allow for random things to happen within the building
 - c. Colin – Centennial: coffee, open to floor above, open/flexible seating
 - d. Colin – entrance to existing Cowley has activity
 - e. Cathy – Mathematics activity common among campuses, why?
 - f. Mike Abler – outdoor area for students when weather is nice (outdoor seating/gathering area – Wittich) provides student energy to courtyard area
 - g. Colin – Student Union tables with technology/charging are popular
 - h. Taviare – outdoor lecture area would be really interesting
 - i. Taviare – Sun vs shade: adjustable would be ideal or maybe have ability to project to individual laptops
 - j. Colin – other buildings have geology display that extends to the exterior (little kids/outreach to community learning experience)
- 4. Classrooms
 - a. Mike Abler – faculty in Biology were disappointed there was only one Active Learning Classroom – keep in mind for additional spaces. Covid = larger/fewer sections
 - b. Bob – gave an overview of the classroom/contraction issue across campus. Need more definition in the planning process
 - c. David – tiered configurations 150 likely. 80-seat maybe want to be an active learning arrangement. Colin added that Geography teaches multiple 90-seat sections
 - d. Colin – solid walls in Cowley Hall aren't soundproof, how will moveable partitions provide acoustic separation? David noted how these have improved over the last couple decades.
 - e. Scott – large room in Student Union has a partition being used and it was found that not all three spaces could be used simultaneously
 - f. Todd – five General Chemistry sections of 90-100, Organic Chemistry approaching these levels as well. At least 6-10 in a 90+ lecture setting
 - g. Taviare – five sections of 90 (cowley 100)

5. Faculty Spaces

- a. Taviare – similar to space students have. Would be nice to not have to take a classroom or meet in a faculty office – reserve the space for small meetings similar to Centennial
- b. Mike Abler – some sort of lounge, resource, support space for informal meetings and collaborate over lunch or coffee – conference rooms aren't great for this function
- c. Todd – any kind of space for students (shared space) – chemistry students are desperate
- d. Colin – disconnect with location of faculty offices with labs/classrooms
- e. Todd – Can spaces/functions be mixed up more between offices and classrooms?
- f. Ideal space for 1-on-1 with students? Todd – has turned his office into more of a collaborative space and has been meeting with students in Murphy. Enjoys being in a shared space with other faculty. Robert – rare to meet with a single student and more often is with 3 or 4, area needed for offload to meet with students.
- g. Mike Abler – if you can get out of your office to a more collaborative space, students are more willing to meet with faculty (more inviting, more neutral)
- h. Colin – workstations within the collaborative areas with specialized software so faculty can work outside of their office

6. A link to the virtual whiteboard for viewing can be found here:

<https://app.mural.co/t/smithgroup1662/m/smithgroup1662/1607453321341/255e57624e6930460e9efd36630998469123a697>

PROJECT SCHEDULE:

1. Mike Adler reviewed the project schedule. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
 - a. 10% Concept Report complete in March 2021.
 - Includes programming and design.
 - b. Preliminary Review documents submitted in June/July 2021.
 - Includes detailed drawings for review by DFDM and the project stakeholders.
 - c. Final Review documents submitted in January 2022.
 - Includes final detailed drawings for review by DFDM and the project stakeholders for bidding.
 - d. Bidding to be complete in April 2022.
 - e. Construction complete for Fall Semester 2024.

NEXT STEPS:

1. Departmental Review Meetings:
 - a. Meeting to be held between December 11, 2020 and January 7, 2021.
 - b. Agenda:
 - Review of the various departmental spaces (offices, work rooms, labs).
 - Review of the shared spaces within the building (classrooms, collaborative learning spaces, conference rooms, resource areas, etc.)
 - c. Meetings will be scheduled based on the availability of the departments and design team and will be conducted virtually. Scott will coordinate the meeting schedules with the design team.

2. Work Session No. 2:
 - a. Executive and Design Committees to meet January 14 or 15, 2021. Scott will coordinate the meeting schedules with the design team.
-

OPEN ISSUES:

1. There are currently no open issues.
-

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.