NOTES:

1. Val Schute opened the meeting noting that the full sized floor plans that were available for viewing do not include all the revisions requested in the recent lab planning meetings. The plans displayed illustrate most of the room configuration changes that were requested during those meetings.

2. The Project Schedule was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Upcoming meetings tentatively scheduled are as follows:
      • Executive Committee Review Meeting to be held April 30, 2015.
      • Design Development Review Meeting No. 2 to be held May 7, 2015.
      • Executive Committee Review Meeting to be held May 21, 2015.
      • Design Development Review Meeting No. 3 to be held May 28, 2015.
   b. The critical milestone dates were reviewed and discussed. The following items were discussed:
      • Board of Regents Approval: July 9, 2015.
      • Preliminary Review Submittal (35%): July 16, 2015.

3. Project Cost Review:
   a. The following cost reduction strategies are being implemented into the project:
      • Eliminating the corridor ceilings
      • Providing rubber flooring at the corridors
      • Corridor wall protection
      • Structural floor system
- Eliminate second passenger elevator
- Remove second set of lab doors where possible
- Wood feature walls
- Railing types
- Removal of level 5 finish
- Reduce height of restroom wall tile
- Remove or reduce interior transom glass – committee recommends retaining where possible
- Revise stair finish
- Laboratory loft theme

a. A list of items that need further discussion or direction were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Researchers currently located in the Health Science Center need further discussion. The Executive Committee noted that this will not impact the design of project. A meeting will be held to review the existing space allocations in HSC and compare them to the new building.
   b. Biochemistry Lab/Shell Space: Bob Hetzel commented at the Executive Committee meeting that this space does not fit into the budget and will have to be outfitted at a later date using classroom renovation funds.
   c. Maura Donnelly commented that these discussions need to be handled by UW-L administration before they are brought to the Design Team.

4. The current floor plans were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Plan revisions stemming from the most recent lab planning meetings include the reconfiguring of the Anatomy/Physiology Labs, Chemistry Labs, and Microbiology Labs. The basement has been revised to follow the recommendations of the users to isolate the Core Microscope Suite and NMR away from the elevator. The loading area and restroom core have also been further developed.
   b. Mike Abler asked how the loading dock will be accessible when Phase 2 is implemented. The loading dock will remain completely intact and will become a service courtyard when Phase 2 is complete.
   c. Mike Abler asked if there are possibilities of configuring Biology research labs similar to Chemistry research labs.

5. Interior design concepts were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Clerestory windows into teaching labs proposed at the single loaded corridors when adjacent to natural light.
   b. Wood accents proposed at the wall within the door portholes into the labs.
   c. Mike Abler asked if the dark border at the corridor floors could extend out from the door portals to highlight the entrance.
   d. Mike Abler commented that if storage is provided at the front wall of the teaching labs, the presentation area may feel restricted.
   e. Eric Gansen commented that the presentation wall in many of the Physics labs is on the side wall. Would there still be the sliding markerboard and storage area? Eric added that cubby storage at the front of the room may be an issue for students and instructors.
   f. Design Committee prefers the concealed column design.

6. The exterior design concept was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Val Schute summarized the process of the DFD Peer Review meeting and the recommendations that were made.
   b. Mike Abler commented that the east elevation feels out of character compared to the other elevations.
c. Mike Abler questioned how the window heads relate to the ceilings.

d. Aaron Monte was in favor of the exterior design.

e. Eric Gansen asked if the construction of Phase 1 will have any impact on existing Cowley Hall. Val Schute commented that there may be vibration issues if sheet piling is used where the new foundations are in close proximity to the existing structure.

f. Future exterior images to show where Phase 2 connection occurs.
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