



MEETING NOTES

Meeting Location:	Virtual	Project:	Design Review Board – December 2025
Date/Time:	12/16/25 – 8:30 am	Re:	DRB Meeting Notes
Notes By:	Janine Glaeser, UW-Madison FP&M, CPLA	File:	P:\SHARE\Design Review Board\2025 MEETINGS\12-16-25 MTG\

Agenda (In Person):

- 1. Athletics Hall of Fame #22D5A**
Final Approval Requested – DRB #3 Final
- 2. WIMR East Wedge Cyclotron & Expansion #1485-2343**
Design Development Review – DRB #3 Introduction to Design Updates

Committee Attendees:

Heidi Natura
Mary Czyszczak-Lyne
Kevin Firchow
Rafeeq Asad – excused absence
Terry Steelman
Tonia Pittman
Ex Officio: Scott Utter
Ex Officio: Peter Schlecht
Staff: Janine Glaeser

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Schlecht called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Roll call confirmed quorum.

APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES

November 18th DRB Meeting Notes were approved.
- Czyszczak-Lyne motioned to approve; Steelman seconded motion

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

- None

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

- Utter read the Land Acknowledgement

DRB Item #1: Hall of Fame Relocation Plan #22D5A

Final Approval Requested - DRB #3

Attendees:

- Jim Hinze, Berners Schober
- Paul Joran, HOK
- Jason King, UW Athletics
- Jeremy Schechterle, JP Cullen
- Barry Fox, UW Athletics
- Gabe Mendez, UW FP&M Transportation
- Paula Veltum, UW FP&M Physical Plant
- Lori Wilson, UW FP&M Communications
- Aaron Williams, UW CPLA FP&M
- Jonathan Bronk, UW CPLA FP&M
- Rhonda James, UW CPLA FP&M
- Van Van Wyk II, UW CPD FP&M
- Sadie Derouin, UW FP&M Sustainability

Project Introduction: The UW Athletics Department is proposing to relocate the existing Hall of Fame from the original location adjacent to the former shell to a new location.

DRB Review History:

- | | |
|------------------------|----------|
| - DRB #1 | 9/16/25 |
| - JCAC Referral to DRB | 10/23/25 |
| - DRB #2 | 11/18/25 |

Project Schedule:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| - Final Documents: | February 2026 |
| - Construction Start: | May 2026 |
| - Completion: | September 2026 |

Recommendations from JCAC 10/23/25:

- JCAC recommendation, provide info on other campus locations considered (and why they don't work). Include a response to why the retaining wall by the sidewalk does not work.

DRB comments:

- Schlecht (Chair):
 - Commended the athletics team for the rapid turnaround of project changes.
 - Appreciated the team being reactive and responsive to comments.
- Steelman:
 - Stated a preference for the new site over the other one.
 - Noted the design takes an undeveloped edge and makes it occupiable.
 - Described the cascading walls from the Kohl Center as a powerful move.
 - Expressed concern that the sloping wall creates an oppressive, "canyon" feeling.
 - Suggested the design would be more successful if the wall were a soft landscaped or terraced edge with ramps.
 - Believed a 42-inch wall is oppressive and creates a dark spot in this area.

- Appreciated the long-term capacity of this effort.
- Preferred to see the lighting running in one direction.
- Requested the design team address the notion of breaking the retaining wall down.
- Questioned what the experience will be like in this "hole" if there is no transparency.
- Czyszak-Lyne:
 - Questioned the heights of the walls.
 - Raised concern about skateboarding and climbing.
 - Questioned the look of the lighting for safety when there is no snow on the ground.
 - Suggested looking at adding streetlight bollards along the edge for safety along Francis.
 - Stated the current project is a much better project.
 - Moved to approve the design with the request to examine contingencies suggested by the DRB, campus staff, and City staff.
- Firchow:
 - Thanked the team for all the work in the last month.
 - Questioned if the buffer area is all on the Kohl Center property or in the Right-of-Way (ROW).
 - Asked if the three existing trees showing there are able to be maintained.
 - Stated that landscaping removed must be replaced in kind on the site.
 - Questioned the materiality of the wall (plaque side and landscape side).
 - Emphasized the need to start the City approval process for city zoning and ROW improvements.
 - Seconded the motion for conditional approval.
- Natura:
 - Appreciated the work and the response to working with the grades.
 - Noted that more work is needed to develop details.
 - Appreciated looking back to the Kohl Center for guidance on details.
 - Suggested a way to round the bend to make the outdoor room more connected to the plaza.
 - Recommended adding seating in the center to warm the large expanses of concrete.
 - Noted a little more work needs to be done on the lighting, specifically double-checking the effectiveness of the wall wash.
 - Suggested the end walls seem like an opportunity for branding to liven the space.
- Utter (Ex Officio):
 - Stated a preference for the spacing between the walls, as it offers more room for viewing multiple walls.
 - Contended that tightening the walls up is not necessarily the solution

Czyszak-Lyne move that we approve with the request to examine the contingencies made by DRB – campus staff and City Staff.

Firchow – clarification – are we requiring them to make some changes or just to continue to look at it.

Czyszak-Lyne – clarified the approval notes the team will continue to explore, taking into consideration of comments from Heidi and Terry regarding the wall.

Firchow – seconded motion.

Discussion on motion.

All in favor – motion carries

Steelman – puts a lot of delegated responsibility on you and staff. I would like some assurance that you have some conversation to look at wall.

Schlecht – yes, I heard you and we are thinking about it. What are we going to have forward. We appreciate the comments on how to connect with the landscape. Though we are not yet sure how the corner will be dealt with, we have some good feedback and opportunities.

- **Public comments from the chat:**

- There is space to add trees in tree grates and Silva cells between the walls and finish adding trees along the sidewalk allée to make this space feel like a sports memorial within a tree grove. Shade the hardscape to make the space more welcoming to visitors, address some stormwater, and mitigate urban heat island effect.
- Seating within the memorial would be more inviting (maybe building them into the memorial walls) with the trees would make this really feel like a space someone wants to visit and be in for a time. A place to have photos taken.
- Would additional trees on this side of the lawn be appropriate?
- Max. plaque height at 2 vs. 3, expand to the west side for symmetrical presentation on the site.
- This is an extension from the Camp Randall project. We will lose green space at this site and it is going to be important to try to preserve as much as possible.

Agenda Item #2: Design Development Review – DRB #3 Introduction to Design Updates

Project Name: WIMR East Wedge Cyclotron & Expansion #1485-2343

Attendees:

- Scott Kammer, AE Potter Lawson
- Mark Wells, UW SMPH
- Matt Efflandt, UW FP&M PM
- Gabe Mendez, UW FP&M Transportation
- Paula Veltum, UW FP&M Physical Plant
- Lori Wilson, UW FP&M Communications
- Aaron Williams, UW CPLA FP&M
- Jonathan Bronk, UW CPLA FP&M
- Rhonda James, UW CPLA FP&M
- Van Van Wyk II, UW CPD FP&M
- Sadie Derouin, UW FP&M Sustainability

Project Description: Located within the “Health Sciences Neighborhood”, the Wisconsin Institutes for Medical Research (WIMR) project proposes to construct a 14,451 two story addition for the UW School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH). The “East Wedge” addition will be located between the WIMR I and WIMR II towers and include a lower level 30MeV Cyclotron with first level laboratory & office spaces. The DRB last reviewed this project on 10/15/24 and JCAC received an informational presentation on 9/26/24.

DRB Review & History - Anticipated:

- DRB #1 Info 8/20/24
- JCAC Info 9/26/24
- DRB #2 10/15/24
- DRB#3 Update 12/16/25
- JCAC Recommend 1/22/26
- DRB #4 Approval 2/17/26

Project Schedule:

- Bid Date 8/2026
- Start Construction 11/2026
- Substantial Completion 4/2028
- Occupancy 5/2028

DRB comments:

- Steelman:
 - Appreciated that comments were taken to heart, resulting in positive changes.
 - Accepted the cyclotron need for louvers and right setbacks.
 - Questioned if the louvered piece will have a comparable frame and relationship to the metal spandrel on the right.
 - Stated satisfaction with the entire project being built at one time with a green roof.
- Czyszczak-Lyne:
 - Stated that she loves the new and improved design.
 - Questioned if there is an opportunity to punch through the white area of the green roof to bring in light.
 - Accepted the idea of adding a light monitor similar to Vet Med.
 - Suggested making use of the space for workers.
- Natura:
 - Questioned the dimension of the overhang on the louvered box and the performance of plantings underneath.
 - Suggested having an inert material right underneath the overhang due to drought being more of an issue than light.
 - Inquired if there is an internal program for getting people out onto the green roof space to enhance their experience.
- Schlecht (Chair):
 - Questioned if the design team would be opposed to adding a monitor similar to Vet Med.
 - Requested the design team show a 20-year outlook for the trees, making them more realistic.
- Utter (Ex Officio):
 - Asked if there was any thought of continuing first-floor openings across the bottom (similar to the West Wedge), even if non-functional.

Public Comment:

- Aaron Williams (Staff):
 - Recommended that the landscaping be simplified and match what is on the West Wedge, as the current plan was "a little too intense".
- Mark Wells (UW SMPH):
 - Mentioned that the triangular area in the back is an existing light shaft from the

basement.

- Noted that the idea of using that nonstructural space could work well.
- Stated that comments in the chat will be incorporated.

- **Public Comments from the chat:**

- Appreciate your efforts on the green roof - I know there were a lot of discussions to figure out how to make that work.
- Are trees on the green roof possible?
- How is spandrel glass replaced (replaced from exterior, if damaged?)

January 20, 2026 is the next DRB meeting.

These notes are what the writer understands of the proceedings. Please contact or email any changes to the writer within 5 working days if not in concurrence. End of meeting notes.