

PHYSICS 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 17, 2020

MEETING TIME: 10:00am-12:00pm

ATTENDANCE:

Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Mark Sandheinrich	UW-La Crosse	msandheinrich@uwlax.edu
Taviare Hawkins	UW-La Crosse	thawkins@uwlax.edu
Steve Harris	UW-La Crosse	sharris@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.khuse@river-architects.com
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

INTRODUCTION:

1. Coty Sandberg gave a brief overview of the agenda and goals for the meeting. The following items were noted:
 - a. Review program indicated in the December 2017 10% Concept Report.
 - b. Identify the high-level goals and needs of the department.
-

PROGRAMMING:

1. Coty Sandberg provided an overview of the current program for Physics. The following items were noted:
 - a. 40% Class/Research Labs + 50% office/departmental area.
2. No major changes or comments related to overall program per Tav.

3. Coty commented that while it is important to discuss, the specific locations in the building for the various spaces aren't as critical at this stage in the design process. Understanding the programmatic needs may determine location based on the various requirements.
4. Lana Zoet noted that the guideplate diagrams are not meant to illustrate exact room layout, but rather to capture the programmatic elements within the space.
5. Emma Cuciurean-Zapan review the current program for Mathematics in detail. The following items were noted:
6. Computational Computer Lab:
 - a. One space, 24 seats – ok per Tav.
 - b. Standalone entity.
 - c. Equipment: bi-directional. Conferencing equipment for remote teaching/learning.
 - d. Space should be something larger that could be reserved and shared among other departments – maybe a classroom space?
 - e. Associated with lab in Phase 1 – location/adjacency not important.
 - f. Location near faculty offices would be beneficial (nearby).
7. Faculty/Student Research:
 - a. One space, flexible seating, meeting area, writing surfaces, etc.
 - b. PC's vs personal laptops and additional monitors.
 - c. Project-based room. Students use this space during down time or when collaborating on a project.
 - d. Action Item: Tav to provide input on Theorists usage of space.**
 - e. Location near faculty offices would be beneficial (nearby).
 - f. Lana – benefit to combine spaces or do they need to be separate? Controlled access to the space needed. Retain as separate spaces per Tav.
8. Observation Platform:
 - a. Demonstration area – monitor and whiteboard to show activities. Places to discuss what you're going to be observing. Space also provides a place for Physics Dept to plan other experiments (dropping items from the roof).
9. Office Area:
 - a. Work Room – mailboxes, printing, office storage, microwave, small refrigerator, and office supplies.
 - b. Reception – ADA adjacency, Chair adjacency, Student Worker. Area for seating. Primary point of contact.
 - c. Department Chair – located off main corridor similar to faculty member. Slightly larger per Scott (small meeting table).
 - d. Ideal location for faculty/student meeting? Informal meeting place ideal per Tav. Place where technology and writing surface is available.
 - e. Student Worker: reception area – revise to 80sf
 - f. Lab Prep Student Worker: located in Phase 1. Currently located in Cowley but mainly because lab is still located in Cowley.
 - g. Lab Support Staff: Steve Harris – Currently has space in Phase 1, Room 1029. No space needed in Phase 2. Scott advised to retain for now. Highlight for future discussion.
 - h. ADA – (1) one required per Tav.
 - i. Instrumentation Specialist: Sarah has office in Phase 1. No space needed for Phase 2. Scott advised to retain for now. Highlight for future discussion.

- j. Office Storage – paper, supplies, presentation materials, etc.
 - k. Full Time Lecturers: (3) three indicated. Ok per Tav.
 - l. Department Chair: (1) one required.
 - m. Future Faculty: (1) one indicated. Ok per Tav.
 - n. Faculty Offices: (9) nine indicated. Ok per Tav.
 - o. Demo Storage: Adjacent to larger classrooms. Spaced identified in non-departmental building program category.
10. Faculty/Student and Peer/Peer Interaction was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
- a. Tav – tends to use equipment (talk shop) with other biologists. Could see more interaction with Mathematics in the future. Group meeting space where collaboration could occur would be nice. General coffee area provides opportunity.
 - b. Faculty Resource – comfortable seating, workspace, writing surface, living room feel. Door required/acoustic separation.
11. Adjacencies
- a. Biology/Physics connection. Closer to computational Mathematics faculty. Environmental Chemistry. Mathematics is universal.
12. Physics offices don't need to be co-located per Tav. They tend to be clustered but wouldn't need to be.
13. Experience:
- a. Any activities held outdoors? Tav noted many experiments occur outside. Ability to take the classroom outdoors is important. Seating similar to Wittich Hall plaza area, technology to display, tabletop bench area. Open to the outside community. Could use more of these experiences at UWL.
 - b. Steve added – need electrical and compressed air at the exterior for outdoor experiments.
 - c. Link Activities: meeting space, STEP (science teaching), student space, collaboration areas, shared computational space(?).
 - d. Lana noted issues related to departmental identity and having shared collaboration areas to draw students into the departmental area – like minded students/faculty.
 - e. Heart of Physics: Computation space – used for club meetings, discussions, resources, projects, etc.
14. STEP
- a. Biologist, Math Ed, and Physics – closer to office environment for more collaboration opportunities.
15. Seth King Lab (Phase 1):
- a. Large scale equipment requires special design considerations.
 - b. Mark Sandheinrich noted issues with the wall reinforcing and floor drain materials.
 - c. Scott Schumacher advises completing all departmental discussions then re-visit the entire program and look for potential swapping opportunities.
16. Shelly Leshner Lab (Phase 1):
- a. Plugs are too high – adjust for easier access.

17. Room 32 (Phase 1):
 - a. Computer Engineering located here per Tav.
 18. Classrooms:
 - a. No discussion held regarding classroom spaces.
 19. A link to the virtual whiteboard for viewing can be found here:
<https://app.mural.co/invitation/mural/smithgroup1662/1608067987362?sender=u7109dc06979f23e2f6bb6071&key=0137fd43-2cb0-4c4a-8c7c-a4ba17f125b5>
-

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

OPEN ISSUES:

1. Review issues noted from Phase 1 in separate discussion with users.
-

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.