# river architects

## **DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

PROJECT:	University of Wisconsin – La Crosse PRAIRIE SPRINGS SCIENCE CENTER – PHASE II La Crosse, WI
DFD PROJECT NO: RA PROECT NO:	19G1J 1290E
MEETING DATE:	February 25, 2021
MEETING TIME:	10:30am-12:30pm

### ATTENDANCE:

Alex Roe	UW-System Administration	aroe@uwsa.edu
Cathy Weiss	UW-System Administration	<u>cweiss@uwsa.edu</u>
Bob Hetzel	UW-La Crosse	<u>bhetzel@uwlax.edu</u>
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	<u>cbelby@uwlax.edu</u>
Joan Bunbury	UW-La Crosse	jbunbury@uwlax.edu
John Kelly	UW-La Crosse	jkelly@uwlax.edu
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	<u>tweaver@uwlax.edu</u>
Aric Opdahl	UW-La Crosse	aopdahl@uwlax.edu
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	rallen@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 <u>.kuhse@river-architets.com</u>
David Johnson	SmithGroup	David.Johnson@smithgroup.com
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com
Lana Zoet	SmithGroup	Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com
Gregg Calpino	SmithGroup	Gregg.Calpino@smithgroup.com
Shane Bernau	SmithGroup	Shane.Bernau@smithgroup.com

### river Architects

### FLOOR PLAN UPDATES:

- 1. Program updates include the following:
  - a. 40 seat classrooms removed.
  - b. One 100 seat classroom to be white-boxed.
- 2. Floor plans were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Coordination taking place with mechanical spaces, shafts, equipment, etc.
  - b. Vivarium flipped, locating the animal rooms to the north.
  - c. Shop relocation discussed briefly. Roger asked how close it would be to the NMR.
  - d. Three active learning classrooms in one location along the western end of the southern bar.
  - e. Removal of 40 seat classrooms opens up the areas for additional collaborative/queuing space.
  - f. Departmental priorities reviewed. No comments.
  - g. Penthouse connection to Phase 1.
  - h. 56% efficiency currently.
  - i. Rooftop observation area located at the link at a mezzanine level in order to capture the views in all directions. Connection to stair in Phase 1 provides an additional opportunity for egress.
  - j. Val commented that the hallway width in front of the active learning classrooms is 12'-0". Bob added that for reference, Centennial has 8'-0" hallways so 12' is a good dimension.
  - k. Emma commented that the Science Ed space now has two support spaces after meeting with nutrition and receiving feedback.
  - I. Mike Abler: Likes idea of moving greenhouse to the east as depicted. Some faculty have expressed an interest in an outdoor garden area between the greenhouse and the south-central entrance.
  - m. Joan Bunbury: Geography disjointed from teaching and research labs in Phase 1.
    - Emma explained the reasoning for the placement and its implications with other space priorities.
  - n. Robert Allen: Preference is to have math offices on the same floor as the math and science ed spaces.
    - Emma and Coty commented that they can look at options of switching biology and math offices.
  - o. Mike Hoffman: Can all of Microbiology be located in the eastern end of the southern bar?
    - Emma noted that they could but with 3 leftover offices.
    - Colin stated it's okay to move geography to the west in the plan if they all stay together. Colin understand why why microbiology would like to stay together.
  - p. Mike Abler: Biology can make any office arrangement work.
  - q. Colin Belby: May be more of an adjacency between Geography and Biology more than Geology and Microbiology.
  - r. GPS antenna needed for Geography.
  - s. Observation Waiting sized for 20 people currently. Considerations of having accommodating waiting in a classroom space.
  - t. Rooftop observation area to have controlled access from the stair and elevator.
  - u. Emma reviewed the program comparison between now and the 2017 10% Concept Report and noted that the efficiencies were very similar even with the added corridor in the current office layout.

### *river* architects

- v. Scott feels that the first floor by the Dean's Office may not be the best location for the student organization space.
- 3. Link survey results presented. Science on Display, Open Collaborative Areas, Writable Wall Surfaces, 4-6 Person Huddle Rooms, Large Informal Gathering Area were the top votes.
- 4. Classroom diagrams were reviewed and discussed.
  - a. Mike Adler noted that the design team working through the coordination issues related to technology, structural, HVAC, and lighting.
  - b. Mike Adler commented that the 50 seat classrooms are a little shallow in depth and the front row gets close to the teaching wall. 24x72 table size indicated per direction from UWL.
  - c. Mike Adler commented that there are many layout options for active learning classrooms but it depends how the faculty intends to use them.
    - Added that a projection screen could be added to any wall.
  - d. Colin asked if the instructor's podium is fixed or mobile.
    - Mike added that it could be either. It could be in the middle or along a wall.
    - Teaching podium needs further review and discussion regarding portability vs AV equipment.
  - e. Colin commented that he likes the big windows in the active learning rooms. "would be a nice feature"

#### EXTERIOR DESIGN:

- 1. Val Schute reviewed the exterior design progress. The following items were noted:
  - a. Design Goals were identified early in the design of Phase 1.
  - b. New sustainability guidelines have influenced decisions on this phase in a good way.
  - c. Material palette of Phase 1 reviewed.
  - d. Phase 1 vocabulary and design parti represented with glazing at collaborative spaces along with masonry and punched windows at task-based spaces (research and teaching labs).
  - e. Phase 2 difference and challenge is how the activities on levels 2-4 influence the exterior expression.
  - f. Elements from Phase 1 reinterpreted in Phase 2.
  - g. 1-story form at courtyard has opportunity for green roof with a green wall at the south end of the west face of the link.
  - h. Concerns expressed of the weathering of materials in Phase 1 and matching of those materials in Phase 2.
  - i. Mike Abler:
    - Commented that the precast on the southwest "doesn't go."
    - Likes how the entrances mimic each other.
    - Snow accumulation and water drainage with back-pitched greenhouse roof a concern. Potential rainwater collection system for garden.
  - j. Colin Belby: Sunlight and temperature control within heavily glazed spaces.
    - Colin commented that the south curtainwall on phase 1 can be warm at times with direct sunlight but not a major issue.
    - Coty commented that we would study these solar issues.
  - k. Coty commented that the Southwest "beacon" could take a number of forms as well as the greenhouse and one story bump on the north.

### *river* architects

#### SITE DESIGN:

- 1. Meeting held on February 12, 2021 to review the site design with Bob Hetzel and Scott Schumacher. Items reviewed during that meeting included the following:
  - a. Campus Master Plan, Campus Mall & Circulation.
  - b. Single spine vs parallel pedestrian pathways in the central mall area.
  - c. Grade change from clock tower to East Avenue.
  - d. Well head protection zone.
  - e. Project boundary and edges.
  - f. Sustainability Guidelines and campus standards. Bike parking example provided. Phase 1 and Phase 2 considered holistically.
  - g. Stormwater management. Pulling ques from Phase 1, Centennial Hall, Wittich Hall, and the Student Center. May not be required per DNR permitting but plan to implement because of its inherent benefits.
  - h. Existing trees. UWL provided informal survey and analysis of the existing trees. Many likely to be removed during construction. Additional assessment will be conducted as the process moves forward.
  - i. Gateway and Service.
  - j. Plantings. 20% native vegetation required by DFD.
  - k. Emergency vehicle routes and influence on pavement locations and profiles.
  - I. Site concept comparisons reviewed in prior meeting. Various patterns were depicted.
  - m. Cellular design draws from pattern of circulation and site amenities.
- 2. Conceptual site design presented. Pathways and entrances identified. Courtyard design in progress as the building architecture and landscape forms are trying to relate to each other. Shading opportunities within the courtyard through planter areas to provide shade along south façade of Phase 1.
  - a. Colin Belby:
    - Can locally harvested stone be used rather than concrete for seat walls and/or retaining walls.
    - Concerned with number of sidewalks but understands that the pathways are likely to occur.
    - Likes how the courtyard sidewalk path feels like a meandering river.
  - b. Mike Abler:
    - Sidewalk adjacent to greenhouse as illustrated provides a nice opportunity for display.
    - Tony suggested a buffer zone between sidewalk and greenhouse.

#### SCHEDULE:

- 1. The project schedule was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Work Session No. 6 scheduled for March 11, 2021. Meeting to be held with the Executive Committee to review project budget and schedule.

**ACTION ITEMS SUMMARY** 

# river Architects

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.