

## DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

---

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

**DFD PROJECT NO:** 19G1J  
**RA PROJECT NO:** 1290E

**MEETING DATE:** February 11, 2021

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

---

### ATTENDANCE:

Cathy Weiss	UW-System Administration	<a href="mailto:cweiss@uwsa.edu">cweiss@uwsa.edu</a>
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:bhetzel@uwlax.edu">bhetzel@uwlax.edu</a>
Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:sschumacher@uwlax.edu">sschumacher@uwlax.edu</a>
Mark Sandheinrich	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:msandheinrich@uwlax.edu">msandheinrich@uwlax.edu</a>
Mike Ablor	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:mablor@uwlax.edu">mablor@uwlax.edu</a>
Tony Sanderfoot	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:asanderfoot@uwlax.edu">asanderfoot@uwlax.edu</a>
Colin Belby	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:cbelby@uwlax.edu">cbelby@uwlax.edu</a>
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:tweaver@uwlax.edu">tweaver@uwlax.edu</a>
Aric Opdahl	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:aopdahl@uwlax.edu">aopdahl@uwlax.edu</a>
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:rallen@uwlax.edu">rallen@uwlax.edu</a>
Shelly Leshor	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:slesher@uwlax.edu">slesher@uwlax.edu</a>
Val Schute	River Architects	<a href="mailto:v.schute@river-architects.com">v.schute@river-architects.com</a>
Mike Adler	River Architects	<a href="mailto:m.adler@river-architects.com">m.adler@river-architects.com</a>
Andy Hudzinski	River Architects	<a href="mailto:a.hudzinski@river-architects.com">a.hudzinski@river-architects.com</a>
Jeff Kuhse	River Architects	<a href="mailto:j.kuhse@river-architects.com">j.kuhse@river-architects.com</a>
David Johnson	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:David.Johnson@smithgroup.com">David.Johnson@smithgroup.com</a>
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com">Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com</a>
Lana Zoet	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com">Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com</a>
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com">Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com</a>
Steve Hackman	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com">Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com</a>

---

### PROGRAM REVIEW:

1. Meeting was held with Science Education on February 3, 2021. The following items were noted:
  - a. Flexibility key driver.

- b. Support space needed for different groups.
  2. Meeting was held with Biology to review the Vivarium on February 8, 2021. The following items were noted:
    - a. Confirmed the space needs.
    - b. Lab manager added back into the Vivarium program.
  3. Office Space Summary:
    - a. Adjustments made for full-time Physics lecturers.
    - b. Lab Manager included in the Physics office space allocation.
  4. Classrooms:
    - a. Scott met with Registrar and the Dean's Office to verify the classroom sizes and quantities. The following items were the focus of those discussions:
      - What would be needed in order to have an early move-out of Cowley?
      - Review classroom scenarios.
      - Covid capacities and software limitations made the scenario review a challenge.
      - Scott running filters of the 2019 course file.
    - b. 40-seat classroom could function within a 50-seat classroom.
    - c. What else would be considered for potential removal if the floor plate worked better?
    - d. Mike Abler noted that the analysis appears to be showing replacing the 11 Cowley Hall classroom spaces with only 8 classrooms. Scott commented that consideration needs to be given to all the other educational spaces being added.
    - e. Robert commented that a number of 40 seat rooms in Cowley are used and assumes those courses would be taught elsewhere.
    - f. Shelly noted that the impression among the departments is that there isn't a lot of scheduling availability in Centennial for science courses.
    - g. Cathy noted utilization standards from System. Cathy understands the pinch of space. Bob added that UW-System is looking for the universities to schedule courses outside of the 10:00am to 2:00pm timeslot and better utilize space already provided on campus. Cathy added that room utilization requirements have increased from 32 hours to 40 hours.
    - h. Robert commented that the classroom needs appear to be focusing on science courses that require utilities and prep, thus pushing Math to use other buildings.
    - i. Todd noted that the classrooms in PSSC are planned to be shared among the campus and can be used by others.
    - j. Mike expressed concern regarding the effort it has taken the last 10 years to schedule courses between Biology and Chemistry as students are required to take these courses and as such, they can't be scheduled simultaneously.
  5. Shop & CS Engineering:
    - a. Program information has been relayed to the Design Team by UWL. No square footage adjustments.
- 

## **DESIGN & PLANNING:**

1. Level 0:
  - a. Vivarium, mechanical, specimen (back of house), shops, and classrooms.
  - b. Core spaces stacking up on each floor.

- c. Elevators sized to accommodate gurney and address the capacity similar to Centennial Hall.
  - d. Shelly commented on the inadequate size depicted in the support space between the two 150-seat classrooms.
2. Level 1-4:
- a. Emma noted one of the active learning rooms is smaller than the others.
  - b. Entrances at southwest and south-central locations. Two east entrances to serve public and Vivarium.
  - c. Shafts for mechanical utilities still developing.
  - d. Biology spaces located at southeast.
3. Roof/Penthouse:
- a. Location of mechanical and observation platform being developed.
  - b. Repelling to utilize the waiting area for the observation platform for repelling waiting. Waiting doesn't need to be indoors.
4. Classrooms:
- a. All agree ramping in main hallway not preferred, particularly on level 1.
  - b. Consider rotating 150's so as to provide entrances at the back of the room and locate the teaching wall at the north side.
  - c. Room aspect ratio in the 150's was noted as being at the maximum of 1:1.5.
  - d. Examples of active learning arrangements presented for discussion. How these spaces are intended to be used for instruction will have an influence on layout and flexibility.
  - e. Sound isolation concerns between rooms sharing common walls or prep space noted by Mike Abler.
  - f. Back-of-room entrance preferred whenever possible, particularly at larger classrooms.
  - g. Demonstration benches are an obstruction – who needs them and how are they utilized? What utilities are really needed? Could the sink, air, gas, etc. be located in the prep space?
  - h. No need for demonstration bench for Biology or Geography.
  - i. Todd commented that there is minimal demonstration conducted in a 40 or 50 seat classroom for Chemistry.
  - j. Shelly noted that Physics does conduct demonstrations in 40 and 50 seat classrooms as well as larger lecture halls. The use of a fixed bench with lab services may not be necessary. Shelly requested abundant power outlets provided within the classroom prep room and to provide double doors or 1.5-leaf doors similar to Phase 1 for access between the classroom and prep room. Request space for rolling table with power connection to floor.
  - k. Chemistry requests lab services at the demonstration bench within the larger classrooms.
  - l. Provide additional work surface area in the active learning rooms. Students will often have their laptop in class so adequate table size is needed.
  - m. Committee would prefer to have a classroom layout without two students being isolated as depicted in the 50-seat classroom diagrams.
  - n. Power availability in the classrooms was discussed. More discussion needed in order to determine the appropriate amount and location.
5. Lower-Level Classroom Daylighting:
- a. Examples were presented on the various strategies to bring natural light into the lower-level spaces through the use of areawell windows, clearstory windows, and overhead skylights or light shafts.

- b. Shelly noted that Physics may need a classroom with room darkening. Shelly to verify room size where this might be required.
  - c. Todd noted concerns regarding having too much natural light with presentations and image quality.
  - d. Robert asked if consideration could be given to bringing natural light into hallway spaces in the lower level rather than the classrooms. Shelly commented that light is not ideal in larger lecture halls.
  - e. Group feels the large lecture halls are not required to have natural light.
6. Specimen Display:
- a. Various ways of displaying the artifacts were presented. Immersive, Thru, and Terminus.
  - b. Utilizing thickened walls between classrooms and hallways for displays.
7. Departmental Organization:
- a. Prioritizations summarized by Emma (what we've heard).
  - b. Todd – adjacency of chem labs important.
  - c. Colin – GIS labs close to offices – back and forth. Acceptable if research labs are not directly adjacent to offices.
  - d. Mike H. – All Micro spaces are located on level 4 in Phase 1.
  - e. Shelly – Physics and Chemistry would work better together.
  - f. Robert – Math Library doesn't have to be on same floor. Math and Science co-location high priority.

---

**SCHEDULE:**

- 1. The project schedule was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Work Session No. 5 scheduled for February 25, 2021.
  - b. Add Work Session No. 6 for Executive Committee meeting only.
  - c. Val commented that if there isn't clear direction on how to proceed with the classroom program, the design team will likely need to pause on concept development. Bob and Scott to review. 40-seat classrooms to be omitted. Omission of one of the 100-seat classrooms to be determined.

---

ACTION ITEMS SUMMARY		
1	Verify room darkening 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](mailto:m.adler@river-architects.com) if there are any discrepancies.