Memorial Union Reinvestment
Design Committee Meeting #4
August 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes
Beefeaters – Memorial Union

Members
Katie Fischer, Union President  X  John Staley, UW Faculty/Staff Rep
Colin Plunkett, Student Project Manager  X  Mark Haebig, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)  X
Kathryn Von Below, Project Manager, Ex-Officio  X  Tom Smith, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)
John Skic, Student Appointee  X  Kelli Kruschke, ASM Chair Designee
Brigid Hogan, Student Appointee  X  Rachael Smith, ASM Appointee
Kathryn Von Below, Project Manager, Ex-Officio  X  Mark Haebig, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)
Kathryn Von Below, Project Manager, Ex-Officio  X  Tom Smith, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)
Kathryn Von Below, Project Manager, Ex-Officio  X  Kelli Kruschke, ASM Chair Designee
Kathryn Von Below, Project Manager, Ex-Officio  X  Rachael Smith, ASM Appointee

Guests: Jay Eckleberry, Union Staff, Prem Mansukhani, Union member, Dale Carder, Union member, Julie Kreuner, Union member, Randy Wilmot, Union member, Mark Krasberg, Union member, Dan Moser, Union member/URPL Graduate, Catherine Woodward, UW Academic Staff/Union member, Jake Immel, Office Associate, Director’s Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Ms. Fischer called the meeting to order on August 9, 2011 at 6:03 p.m.  She noted that quorum was not met, therefore the group would not be voting on action items indicated on the meeting agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Approve Meeting Minutes    | Ms. Fischer requested the following statement on page 4 be struck from the July 12 minutes: “… the east entrance will not create as much traffic as it currently does, and the project is looking to the VIP/Box Office building entrance as a new main entrance to the building.”

Katie would like the minutes to reflect the following:
“…Ms. Fischer responded as Alumni Park is created, the Union will look to re-brand the VIP/Box Office entrance to be the main entrance; guest/hotel drop-off traffic will move west to the main entrance. Thus reducing traffic near the East Commons entrance for these activities. However, with the addition of Alumni Park, she believes there will be increased traffic into Memorial Union from the Commons Entrance.”

Mr. Crabb asked for future instances, if meeting minutes would state the meeting date in the document’s heading as opposed to only the Call to Order section. Future minutes will reflect the addition. |
Open Forum

The July 12 meeting minutes will reflect the requested changes upon approval. The approval of those minutes as well as this meeting’s minutes will take place at the next Design Committee meeting.

Mr. Jay Eckleberry, Union Staff, spoke to the group in reminder of the project’s importance and urged smart decision-making on the part of Design Committee executives.

Mr. Prem Mansukhani, Union member, former Union Council student member, noted his concern with the direction of the Hoofers area design. He expressed understanding for the need to look at the financial bottom line in order to be sustainable, but fears that cost measurements and bottom line versus revenue generations are not being perfectly balanced against the value of long-term involvement of community and Union members from an economic perspective. Conversely, he noted the potential negative effect it could have when members lose faith in the building and organization.

Mr. Dale Carder, Former Sailing Club Commodore (’02-’03) and Union member, raised his concern about the project’s direction. He stated there is an opportunity to create a space that will last for the next one-hundred years that engages the community and fosters on-going student relationships. The project’s design appears to be filled with compromise rather than a vision of the future for this building.

Ms. Julie Kreuner, Union member, stated concern for the design in potentially removing outdoor space. There is limited seasonal time to spend outdoors and the project’s design cannot take this space away; rather it needs to maintain or create additional outdoor space near the lake.

Mr. Randy Wilmot, Union member, urged the committee to make sure the design process is opened up or made as public as possible for transparency, noting using a website as such a tool. If not, he told the committee to expect criticism. Also, Randy stated that the waterfront is and urban space that is such an important part of the campus that is used and valued by the Madison community.

Mr. Dan Moser, Union member, reiterated the importance of the project’s transparency. He also asked about seeing diagrams or designs on the MUR website.

Ms. Catherine Woodward, UW Academic Staff and Union member, spoke to the Union’s iconic feature...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Committee Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Fischer reminded the committee that it exists to review the project and make recommendations to various bodies and groups involved with the project. The Design Committee recognizes that the decision-making process lies with Union Council, the Union’s governing body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Fischer thanked the public for appearing and speaking to the committee and without objection, ended the open forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Fischer thanked the public for appearing and speaking to the committee and without objection, ended the open forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walter addressed a recent message communicated by Design Committee member, Professor of History, John Sharpless, to the group addressing concern of the evolution of the MUR project and Design Committee’s participation within the project. Upon reviewing Mr. Sharpless’ comments and examining previous committee materials and meeting minutes, Mr. Plunkett and Ms. Fischer prepared a description to share with the committee and will be communicated at future meetings to inform members not present tonight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hank revisited the Student Union Initiative (approved by students in 2006) as a reminder of the Memorial Union’s goals to renovate and upgrade the facility. Hank mentioned expanded student lounge space, a coffeehouse, renovating Hoofers spaces, and improving the lakefront were all advertised as improvements to Memorial Union.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hank then reviewed the Cost Model Summary that breaks down the cost the project’s phases. Phase I will cost $51 million, focusing on the West Wing (includes the Theater and Hoofers) and other building areas. He stated that the architects included Phase I, Phase II, and Other/Donor Funding as individual budgets within the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hank also attempted to interpret Mr. Sharpless’ concern of a potential Phase III within the project. The Cost Model Summary numerated the Proposed Phases Column as such:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

within the city of Madison. She stated the building’s biggest feature is its location on Lake Mendota and the outdoor space. The outdoor space holds a lot of historic, current, and future value. Catherine also added her support for project transparency as articulated by previous speakers.
• Phase I: “1”  
• Phase II: “2”  
• Other/Donor Funding: “3”  

The Theater Lounge was a highlight of Mr. Sharpless’ message, which carries a “3” or “Other/Donor Funding” status. Mr. Walter noted the purpose of the Theater Lounge is first, to be a student lounge space and second, as increased lobby space for the Theater, including concession/serving counter for modern protocol concerning Theater operations. There will not be any priority placed on banquets, receptions, and weddings—the space is not designed for such events.

Ms. Groose asked if “add alternate” items could be added to the project, how they would potentially be decided upon. Mr. Walter answered that Design Committee and Union Council would be asked to approve a list of “add alternate” items included within the bidding process. Hank mentioned one of two events would take place:

1. Both Design Committee and Union Council would look to weigh “add alternate” options with extra/additional funding to come to a decision.
2. Design Committee would be asked for priority “add alternate” items in advance.

Mr. Crabb requested the location of the addition to the front of the Theater on the Cost Model Summary, where Ms. Groose clarified item 10.32, “Theater Lounge Addition – North.”

Ms. von Below spoke to the potential “add alternates” on the Cost Model Summary and floor plans. When floor plans are addressed, some “add alternates” and Other/Donor Funding items could show up on floor plans. As the Design Team is hired, they draw these areas out, and they can be used as development tools in grants or other funding areas. Wendy expressed the items still lie within the “Other/Donor Funding” category, the committee and project does not want to mislead anyone, but simply use the modeled floor plans as an item for raising the “Other/Donor Funding.”

Mr. Walter presented the “Multi-phased” document highlighting the areas of each floor that lie within Phase I, II, and Other/Donor Funding. Hank again referred to the fact that the “Other/Donor Funding” category could be what Professor Sharpless refers to in speaking of Phase III and changes made in the project’s design. The
Design Committee also recently approved the “Multi-phased” document, and the Theater Lounge fits within the “Other/Donor Funding” category.

Mr. Plunkett made an address to the topic of the questionable Phase III from the March 28, 2011 Design Committee meeting minutes that showed “The report is broken apart into Proposed Phases of funding compilation. “1” for Phase I, “2” for Phase II, and “3” for another way of funding, through donors, campus contributions (non-student fees), Operating Revenue, etc.”

In addition, once Mr. Sharpless returns from a brief leave, Mr. Plunkett will communicate opportunities to discuss the items that Mr. Sharpless brought to the committee’s attention.

Colin made note of the website where meeting minutes and information on the MUR can be found:

www.unionreinvestment.union.wisc.edu

Any questions or concerns about the website or project can be sent to:

designcommittee@union.wisc.edu

Mr. Plunkett gave a report on the most updated floor plans, which have been made available to Design Committee by the architects. A secure, updated version will be made available on the MUR website for public view. Colin made note of areas that have been changed in recent floor plan designs:

**First Floor:**

- **Rearranged Hoofers Shop:**
  - Paint Booth is moved as far west as possible to satisfy venting exhaust from the paint. It now can travel under Park Street and exit from a sail tower located just off of the Helen C. White building.

Ms. von Below noted that this is the preferred location to vent the exhaust, but the exact location has not been confirmed. A wind tunnel study could be conducted to show if the underground venting solution could work relating to how the escaping exhaust affects the nearby environment (Helen C. White Hall, the terrace, etc.).
• **Boat Storage:**
  - Funding does not exist to store boats outdoors—schematic design has been re-worked to create a location to store the boats indoors.

Ms. von Below stated that to stay within the budget of the project, “wiggle room” would need to be found, or another means of funding (such as donor) to have the storage located outdoors. A location to the west of the Lake Lab has been identified, but at the time was not included in the cost model, therefore an alternate method of work or funding is necessary in order to provide exterior boat storage.

Mr. Crab mentioned if the outdoor space was to be funded; a lot of indoor space would become open for use as recommended in approval and amendments to Schematic Design by the previous Design Committee.

Ted said if money was an issue, what would be the difference of the indoor space costs versus outdoor space cost model.

Ms. von Below responded that the Design Team has worked on its cost model in building a secure structure for the outdoor boat storage space, which is not small. In the overall project, much of the Hoofers space is existing space and a constant balancing act exists of creating new space versus working with existing space, while staying within the $52 project terms.

Ms. Fischer noted the floor plan designation regarding the Hoofer Advisor’s Office, in which Ms. von Below explained the desire to have a collaborative space in which there are no private offices, and officers wanted close contact with the Service Desk.

Mr. Feehan clarified thoughts on area layout, where the current Outdoor Programs Office (OPO) will be where the Service Desk is placed. The Financial Specialist and intern office area will be located nearby, and the opened advisor’s spaces near that area.

Mr. Haebig asked if it was always known that the Hoofers renovation would be the most expensive part of the project. Mr. Walter answered it was not expected, but as the project become more and more visible, discussion and direction leaned in that way.

Mr. Crabb suggested an idea to obtain the square footage of how much is currently allocated to Hoofers and how much it will be under the project’s design, saying it would be helpful for Hoofers and Design Committee to
see the comparison in space. Mr. Walter added support to Ted’s comment.

### Brat Stand:
- Due to codes, the Union can no longer keep the Brat Stand an open area
- Desire is to maintain an essence of its current setup—for patrons to be able to still get the Brat Stand environment; outdoors feel, food/smoky aromas, and interaction
  - A half indoors, half outdoors addition, a transparent façade can be constructed off of the east side from Hoofers
- Enclosed area poses different methods of supplying the Brat Stand’s inventory via the underground loading dock.

Ms. von Below added the cooking area of the stand needs to be enclosed, and located in the larger rectangle on the design. The smaller design will encompass packaged, snack support.

Mr. Walter clarified the idea will be for customers to still get the outdoors feel of the current brat stand, while legally all cooking procedures must occur indoors, where Ms. von Below confirmed.

Wendy noted the indoor venting for this space is looking to be located at the south end. Hood protection systems that allow the aromas to escape are being researched as well.

Mr. Haebig asked if there would be an expanded effect of an indoor on the terrace/brat stand season, where Ms. von Below answered that it has not been determined.

### Rehearsal Room:
- Allows for Theater rehearsal space without taking Theater/Play Circle spaces offline
- Back of House is unchanged
- Level changes made (noted in goldenrod color on Floor Plan)
- Challenges with ceiling height
  - Possible to excavate around elevator lobby space and providing ramps up to Hoofers, west into the Theater, and south into Mechanical space

Ms. Groose requested additional information on Winkler
Memorial Union Reinvestment  
Design Committee Meeting #4  
August 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes  
Beefeaters – Memorial Union

Lounge and the carpeted lobby, where Ms. von Below responded mechanical repairs are needed, and resulting carpet and ceiling updates will take place.

- **Theater:**
  - Bus Stop Lounge will house the VIP/Box Office
    - Box Office will allow for ticket cueing to take place
  - Accessible restrooms will be added at two locations in the North/South corridor
  - Double-doors will be added as a “sound lock” (will keep out distracting sound from area outside and near Theater doors)
  - Moving the Control Booth from upper balcony to lower level will remove some seating in the lower level, but increase upper seating area
  - Added stairways as well as ramping

Mr. Feehan noted not being able to view the Theater additions, Ms. von Below stated there is an elevator in the Theater Lounge, a support area (serving staff, beverages), and further east portable bar/beverage stations, as well as the Service Corridor and ramping.

- **Service Bar/Games Room:**
  - Seating will be similar to current setup (booths and tables), separate seating area from games area
  - Games setup (billiards, dart boards, etc.) still undecided

Ms. von Below noted that the Stiftskeller restoration will be a part of Phase I and will include a new bar and service window (to the terrace) location.

**Second Floor:**

- **Theater:**
  - Stairway in the northwest area will connect the Upper Deck to gain public access to seating, expanding public area

Mr. Haebig asked if this area would cause problems, dealing with intermingling of Theater intermission crowds and functions versus public use. Mr. Walter answered there will be more opportunity for overall use for both parties and that Theater staff will likely have to monitor Theater re-entry via checking ticket stubs at the Upper Deck’s Theater access doorway.
Ms. Fischer requested the deck’s capacity, where Ms. von Below replied that the number is currently being studied.

- **Class of 1925 Gallery:**
  - Decided on square configuration versus diagonal space
    - Creates more display space
  - Double door entry decision
    - Provides more energy/humidity control

- **Play Circle:**
  - Two separate entrances have been changed to double door entrance

Ms. Groose inquired if this newer configuration had been approved by the Historical Society, where Ms. von Below responded that the layout has been approved, but the physical entryway has not; as the meeting with the Historical Society did not cover the physical entryway, but approves the overall layout concerning technical improvements. The next meeting with the Historical Society will cover the entryway.

Mr. Crabb asked for clarification of the north area stairwell. Mr. Plunkett stated the stairway replaces the existing set in the same location, but adds ramp access to the location as well for more accessibility. Ted also requested that the Design Team look into this area’s door design and structure in order to have as much space for traffic flow as possible.

**Third Floor:**

- **Theater Offices:**
  - Slight adjustments to layout

- **Union/Theater Storage:**
  - Proposed infill space (behind stage) due to lack of need for former theater scenery storage

**Fourth Floor:**

- **Finance/Accounting Office:**
  - Account Manager’s office space moved northeast
  - Study taking place to verify whether stairway can be removed to give additional space

- **Human Resources Suite:**
  - Slight adjustments to layout

**Fifth Floor:**

- No significant adjustments to report
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4th/5th Floor Vote
As noted earlier, due to quorum not being met, Fourth and Fifth floor plans will be distributed to the Design Committee before the next Design Committee meeting. Additional discussion and approval action will take place at the next meeting, if quorum is met.

Overall Discussion:
Mr. Haebig requested clarification on the type of voting taking place with the Fourth and Fifth floor plans, where Ms. von Below confirmed voting will be on Design Development.

Hoofers Open Forum:
August 10, 2011
7:00 – 8:30 p.m., TITU
Presentation followed by open forum.

Public Open Forum:
August 30, 2011
5:30 – 8:00 p.m., TITU
Architects will be made available at this meeting.

Future Design Committee Dates:
- September 20
- October 18
- November 15
- November 29
- December 13

All meetings will be held on Tuesdays at 6:00 p.m., TTIU

Mr. Crabb suggested a meeting in late August to members of Design Committee absent from summer meetings up to speed. Other members present added agreement; Mr. Plunkett will explore dates and times for a late-August meeting.

The next Design Committee meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday, August 16, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. Check TITU for room location.

Adjournment
There being no further business, Ms. Fischer adjourned without objection at 8:02 p.m.