BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES / DECEMBER 14, 2010

MEETING START TIME: 1:00 p.m. (Post meeting comments noted in italics.)
MEETING END TIME: 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gail Scukanec</th>
<th>UW-Eau Claire</th>
<th>Val Schute</th>
<th>River Architects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick Gonzales</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td>Mike Adler</td>
<td>River Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy Duyfhuizen</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td>Tom Butcavage</td>
<td>SmithGroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram deKoven</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td>Greg Mella</td>
<td>SmithGroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Smith</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td>Coty Ekhoff</td>
<td>SmithGroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wick</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hale-Wilson</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Ponkratz</td>
<td>UW-Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

1. The following items were distributed for the meeting:
   a. Meeting Agenda dated December 14, 2010
   b. Copy of PowerPoint presentation dated December 14, 2010

2. Val Schute opened the meeting with a review of the November 30, 2010 meeting notes. No comments were made.

3. Tom Butcavage summarized the discussions from the November 30, 2010 meeting and the following items were highlighted:
   a. Active learning
   b. Nature of public space
   c. Spontaneous learning
   d. Interaction between department and general access classroom spaces
   e. Master Plan influence
   f. Project vision

4. Val Schute reviewed the current draft of the Campus Master Plan and noted the following influences it will have on the Education Building project:
   a. The Master Plan is an outline summary of the next 20 years.
   b. Principles and Guidelines defined in the Master Plan will guide the design of the building.
   c. Quadrangles and Plazas will influence locations of entrances.
   d. City bus stop will remain on Park Ave. and a University bus stop may be positioned on Garfield near the pedestrian bridge per Rick Gonzales. (For now the city bus stop is to remain on Park Ave. UW-Eau Claire plans to examine this further with the master planning core group at their next phone conference. There will not be a bus stop at the base of the pedestrian bridge. Placing a bus stop at this location would mix bike, pedestrian, ADA access, and vehicle traffic in the same location. Through effective master planning, UW-Eau Claire will need to find a way to appropriately disperse and control these differing traffic needs.)
   e. Garfield will be closed to vehicular traffic and will only be used for University transit and pedestrians although public access will still be needed to the Ecumenical Religious Center (ERC). (Since this is a dedicated city street, the campus will have to approach the city and ask for their support to close off the street beyond the ERC parking lot. The campus needs to discuss this issue with the ERC as their support for street closing will be critical towards gaining city approval. Putnam Drive is also a dedicated city street and the city could have concerns as to how city residents gain access to Putnam Drive and Putnam Park. Vehicle and pedestrian traffic will need to be refined through the campus)
master planning process. The actual alignment of the street could be considerably different than the current master plan indicates. Adequate access to the ERC, a turnaround area for pick up and drop off, footbridge alignment, and locating the bus routes and shelters in locations that prevent vehicle exhaust from building lobbies will be examined further in the master planning process. Garfield will also be necessary for trash pickup, material recycling, and book deliveries to the library. The master planning process also needs to examine how express delivery, flowers, etc. will be delivered if Garfield is closed to public traffic.)

f. Rick Gonzales noted that because of the Education Building’s proximity to other buildings, more pedestrian traffic near Park Street is likely to occur, resulting in the added need for the bus stop location to remain. (With added large classroom space and other excess classrooms repurposed, there will be increased pedestrian traffic. The new student union location will also alter traffic patterns. It is unknown at this time how these patterns will change. Students will have a shorter distance to walk to catch a bus at this new building than at the new union. Thus, the time of year will impact traffic behavior. The food and beverage options within the new building could impact where students and faculty go to catch public transportation as well.)

g. Tom Butcavage reviewed the Design Guidelines. The following items will be influential in the building design:
   • Scale
   • Place-making
   • Buildings’ primary role in shaping campus space
   • Clear orientation and entry
   • Places for interaction, inside and out
   • Related interior and exterior interaction spaces
   • Object buildings and buildings that frame/create spaces physically strengthen place

h. Rick Gonzales noted that funding for quad projects is difficult and may not happen for a long time.

5. Val Schute reviewed the Evolution of the Campus Master Plan and the following items were noted:
   a. Rick Gonzales noted that if utility work is required at the west side of the building, the result may be work to the plaza/quad, which will affect the project budget, thus needs to be tracked as the design moves forward.
   b. The service corridor at the north side will have an influence if/when Zorn, Brewer, and Kjer are removed. (Zorn, Brewer, and Kjer are buildings with finite lifetimes. It would not serve the campus in the long term to design the new building footprint, entries, views, etc., based on existing buildings, pedestrian flows, traffic patterns, service access, uses, and parking patterns as these will change over time.)
   c. Rick Gonzales questioned the need for semi-trailer access to the south side of Zorn and noted that this requirement needs to be re-evaluated as it has a major influence on the design of the building. This evaluation will made by campus leadership.
   d. Ben Ponkratz noted that the future Garfield street layout appears to be cutting into the bicycle parking between Hibbard and Zorn.
   e. Schneider Hall addition shown to the west creates a formal edge to the quad. Rick Gonzales noted that the addition to Schneider needs to be verified to see if there is still support for the added entrance area.

6. Conceptual Design Option A was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Schofield, Schneider, Zorn, and Hibbard influence a simple building form.
   b. The main circulation corridor is anticipated to be 10 to 12 feet wide and include break-out spaces.
   c. Collaborative Learning spaces are formal and informal and should be set back from the hallway. A variety of spaces is desired.
   d. Faculty Resource provides limited access by being located on the fourth floor. Should these be combined or separate spaces? No preference, but should be located on the second floor nearer to the classrooms or even be adjacent to the cyber café.
   e. Views of the river from the second, third, and fourth floors.
   f. Axial alignment of east entrance with McKinley Avenue is interesting.
   g. Tom Butcavage noted that the west entrance could be a “porch” type entry that provides cover. Rick Gonzales added that a covered bike area should be considered.
7. Conceptual Design Option B was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Southwest corner alignment with center of Schofield Hall east elevation.
   b. Northeast corner entrance connects with Garfield and Park plaza in the future.
   c. Center portion of building on the south elevation is indented to create more outdoor area between Education Building and Schneider Hall.
   d. Distributed collaborative learning spaces is preferred approach.
   e. Central area of collaborative learning space breaks up long corridor.
   f. Glass walled classrooms could be distracting to teacher/students in the room.
   g. Student services located on first floor near east end of building. Gail Scukanec noted that Office of Multicultural Affairs prefers to be on the first floor. Ben Ponkratz added that the student service spaces should be easily accessible.

8. Conceptual Design Option C was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
   a. Rick Gonzales asked how the ramping would be handled at the large lecture halls on the first floor. Val Schute noted that the floor could be lowered to gain ceiling height at the presentation wall or raised up and the floor to ceiling height increased on the first floor.
   b. Rick Gonzales noted that all the schemes appear to have modern west façade’s with abundant glazing. The Design Team noted that the massing options presented aren’t meant to express materials.
   c. Mike Wick expressed a positive reaction to the single loaded corridor arrangement on the first and second floors.

9. A general discussion was held regarding the conceptual schemes presented. The following items were noted:
   a. Gail Scukanec: Likes the pull-back of the upper floors on the west and east ends
   b. Mike Wick: Likes the break-up of the hallways
   c. Carter Smith: Likes the connection to the west plaza area
   d. Kate Hale-Wilson: Likes the tower approach that is similar to Schofield
   e. Duffy Duyfhuizen: Likes the concentrated distribution of the student service areas and feels they should have an interior and exterior identity
   f. Rick Gonzales: Concepts B and C stand out above Concept A
   g. Ben Ponkratz: Concerned that Concept C might be less efficient
   h. Alignment of west end with the existing Zorn Arena was accepted by the committee.
   i. Restroom and elevator locations were questioned. Rick Gonzales noted the restrooms should be distributed to each end of the building on the first floor in order to accommodate the lecture halls, cafe, and bus stop.
   j. North façade of the Education Building will be very prominent when the existing Zorn, Brewer, and Kjer Theatre complex are removed in the future.

10. Rick Gonzales noted the importance of parking on campus. The construction of the Education Building is going to have a major impact on parking and needs to be assessed before taking the design concept to the City of Eau Claire for review. Construction limits, access, laydown area, and trailer locations need to be reviewed. Also mentioned were connections to existing utilities and potential locations for a building crane.

11. No campus buildings, quads, malls, etc. can be named at this time. The campus has developed a formal process that will determine the future naming of such items.
12. (The design team needs to understand how UWEC building committees function and their role in the process. The building committee is a recommending body, and not a decision making body. The committee will make recommendations on all pertinent issues for final determination by campus leadership.)

13. The next meeting is scheduled for January 4th from 1:00 to 3:30. River Architects to provide agenda prior to the meeting.

Meeting Notes by: Michael J. Adler, Associate AIA

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.