

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Location:	Virtual	Project/No:	Design Review Board – January 2024
Date/Time:	1/16/24 – 9:00am	Re:	DRB Meeting Notes
Notes By:	Janine Glaeser, UW-Madison FP&M, CPLA	File:	P:\SHARE\Design Review Board\2024 MEETINGS\01-16-24 MTG\

Agenda (virtual):

- 9:00-10:00am: Informational Presentation - Department of Psychology PCC Building Pre-Design Project # A-23-006 / 9950-2310–SmithGroup – Scott Utter PM

Committee Attendees:

Heidi Natura
Mary Czyszczak-Lyne
Kevin Firchow
Rafeeq Asad
Terry Steelman
~~Lindsey Stoddard-Cameron~~
Ex Officio: Aaron Williams
Ex Officio: Peter Schlecht

Williams shared a Statement on Indigenous Lands.

DRB #1 – Department of Psychology PCC Building Pre-Design Project # A-23-006 / 9950-2310– Informational Presentation by SmithGroup – Scott Utter PM

Attendees:

- Monika Miller - SmithGroup
- Lana Zoet – SmithGroup
- Aaron Gibbs – SmithGroup
- Dean Eric Wilcots – Project Sponsor
- Kurt Stephanson, Letters & Science
- Chris Bruhn, Letters & Science
- Scott Utter – Project Manager FP&M
- Cindy Torstveit, Associate Vice Chancellor FP&M
- Gabe Mendez, Transportation FP&M
- Jonathan Bronk, Landscape Architect FP&M

Facilities Planning & Management

University of Wisconsin-Madison 21 N. Park Street 6th floor Madison, Wisconsin 53715-1211
(608) 263-3000 www.fpm.wisc.edu

- Rhonda James, Landscape Architect FP&M
- Brent Lloyd, Real Estate FP&M
- Missy Nergard, Sustainability FP&M
- Nathan Janda, Sustainability FP&M
- Lexie Baslington, Administrative Assistant FP&M
- Ginny Routhe, Assistant Vice Chancellor Project Delivery FP&M
- Paula Veltum, Assistant Vice Chancellor Real Estate FP&M

Preamble:

Williams:

- This project would require a Major amendment or likely incorporation into the 2025 CMP.
- The project goal is to bring three entities together for space, research, and campus efficiency.
- This project will develop a Pre-Design for replacement of the existing Brogden Hall, built in 1964, which has reached the end of its useful life and is not a candidate for reuse and recapitalization. The project creates a new building for consolidation of three major departments (Psychology, Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD), and the Center for Healthy Minds (CHM)) while meeting the university's long-range strategic goals of maintaining and growing our faculty, improving access for all students, enhancing our educational experience, improving our research portfolio, growing enrollment and generating revenue. These three departments are aligned in their academic and research missions. Co-locating them in a new building will provide efficiencies and new opportunities in their research efforts, clinic operations and other academic efforts that have not been possible to date. A significant portion of their research projects are currently housed in the Waisman Center due to a lack of lab space.
- An informational presentation will be given to JCAC on 1/25/24

Dean Wilcots introduction

- This project arises from critical needs in L&S, bringing together Psychology, CSD, and Center for Healthy Minds. All tie together around behavioral and neuroscience, plus speech and hearing development. The project goal is to bring these departments together on campus, meeting the needs of research and students.
- Existing facilities are not sustainable. Brogden hall is an insufficient building and does not fit the department staff. Communication Science Disorders is in an old dorm on the lakeshore, shared with marine science and does not have space for research. Center for Healthy minds is currently off campus in leased space.

Presentation:

Monika, Lana, Aaron

- Objective of study is to determine the size of a new program that joins three departments in one building. The team reviewed the existing space and determined a program for the collective vision. The team also evaluated viability of several sites and decided to move forward with the existing Computer Science site located on W. Dayton Street.
- The team reviewed the Computer Science site location, context, and existing building. There is an existing super node in the northern tower which must remain operational.
 - Option 1: Maintain existing tower and develop south half of site with new program.
 - Team reviewed site layout and circulation.
 - Team reviewed the program and massing images.
 - Option 2: Maintain existing basement and first floor, add new construction above.

- Team reviewed site layout and circulation.
 - Site layout – retain only basement and first floor of super node.
 - Loading dock shifted to Dayton, adj to parking entry.
 - Building entries at south and west facades.
- Team reviewed the project schedule.
 - The IT Node requires more study to determine full scope and impacts.
 - Estimate a total project duration of 200 weeks.

Committee Comments:

Schlecht:

- Thank you to the team for gathering a lot of info in a short period of time.
- This is one of universities top 10 projects.
- We looked at many different sites. Due to size and location, this is the most appropriate site. It does come with some encumbrances, i.e. the IT node.

Czynszak-Lyne:

- For the next presentation, show views adjacent to Union South. How does this new building impact Union South and its lodging spaces.
- What is the cost differential between the two options?
 - SmithGroup – Miller: the IT node is an extra factor yet to be studied. Current estimates excluded scope of IT node work and show a price difference within 20%
- Is this a GPR or Gift funded project?
 - Funding is a combination of the two – GPR and Gift.

Asad:

- Option 1 is preferred because it responds to site better and is more appropriate for the context.
- Option 2 feels heavy and looks like some massing elements are fighting against one another.

Steelman:

- There is potential with both options. Is it estimated there would be a greater benefit with removing the tower rather than incorporating it into the program?
- Option 2 is positive in how it drops in scale and peels back at corner, but it is still a very bulky building. Would prefer to have more site left.
- Option 1 looks like the upper level terrace could be habitable.
- Option 1 has good potential with keeping existing infrastructure and recladding exterior.
- The penthouse is under scaled on both options. It will be important to get the correct scale of that penthouse.
- What is the floor to floor height of the existing tower and how much constraint does it put on the building?
 - SmithGroup: The lower levels have a taller floor to floor 14-15'. The height does decrease to 12' in the existing tower. The top floors could go to taller 14' floor to floor at the vivarium. New construction proposes a 15' floor to floor height.
- It is tough to work within a 12' height and could cause a significant price differential. Take a

closer look at that when comparing schemes.

Natura:

- Parking appears to be super light for a huge structure.
 - o Transportation: The provided parking is for the clinic space only and not for permit or general campus visitor parking.
- There seems to be an increase in density.
 - o Transportation: We have some ability to relocate employee parking. It will be a challenge to accommodate with the existing garages, but there may be future new garages.
 - o Williams: parking will be a challenge and needs to be specific to clinic functions. BRT will be part of this solution. We need to promote transportation alternatives to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips to campus.

Firchow:

- Agree with comments from colleagues.
- Street activation will require further study.

James:

- Given the character of well-being is a focus for this project, we want to see how nature is brought into this in future presentations.

Summary:

Peter Schlecht Summarized the comments:

1. Show this project in relation to Union South and how this new massing impacts the Union south building and lodging unit views.
2. There is a cost difference between the two schemes of approximately 20%, this does not include the pending IT node considerations.
3. The project is proposing to use GPR & gift/grant funds.
4. There is a preference for Option 1 as being more cohesive for the site. Option 2 does not respond as well to the site.
5. Option 2 did not provide more advantages.
6. Option 1 terrace green space is a benefit. Option 2 does not provide more green space.
7. Further study the impacts of floor-to-floor height for each option and consider cost impacts of 12' floor to floor ceiling of the existing structure.
8. Study the penthouse and ensure those are right sized. They appear undersized.
9. Provide more information on who the parking serves and how it is more clinic focused.

NEXT MEETING February 20, 2024 beginning at 9am – Location TBD

- Terry requested Feb. meeting be in person.

Tentative Agenda Items Include:

- UW Health D2 Module Expansion Project
- Lakeshore Path Limnology Bike/Ped Bypass Route