Ms. Fischer called the meeting to order on August 29, 2011 at 6:04 p.m.

No one came forth to speak.

Ms. Fischer stated the Design Committee exists to review the MUR 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. Katie also reviewed meeting and outside of meeting rules and etiquette.

Ms. Fischer reported that the Union’s Executive Team has a vacant student team member that needs to be filled by a student on the Design Committee. Those interested should contact Colin. At the September meeting, Design Committee will conduct a brief “why I would be a good addition to Executive Team” speech, a Q&A session, followed by a paper ballot vote. The student with the most votes will gain the position. The Executive Team meets on a weekly basis.

Mr. Walter revisited the message corresponded by member, Professor John Sharpless concerning the MUR project’s progression and Design Committee input. Hank addressed one of John’s remarks about moving the Theater Lounge from Phase 3 to 1 without Design Committee input. Hank reviewed the Wisconsin Union Facilities Improvement Plan from 2005, also stating the first referendum in the spring of 2005 which did not pass. The
Union conducted surveys and other research to rework the referendum and discover student’s desire from the Union. A new referendum in the spring 2006 included revisions. When the poll was taken of the student body, the DoIT system crashed, rendering the election results unusable. The Union referendum remained unchanged, but was postponed until fall 2006. Hank revisited the spring 2006 referendum proposal, and displayed the relevant PowerPoint presentation. Student surveys and voting showed interests in further accessibility at Memorial Union as well as an expanded Hoofers, Theater, and Student/Study lounge space.

The previous Design Committee tackled the issue of how to design a Theater Lounge to meet both Theater and Study Lounge requests, where to put such a venue, as well as challenges to such an addition/renovation. The architects studied two options, one with the addition to the North side of the Theater and the other to the East side. The Design Committee discussed both options in depth and ended up voting 10:2 in favor of the East option.

Once the MUR project began to take shape, architects and Design Committee developed Phase I and II:

- **Phase I**: West Wing and Fifth Floor
  - $52 million phase approved
- **Phase II**: Central Core and Commons Wing
- **Donor/Other Category**: Any potential project that will not be funded within Phase I or II
  - $20-40 million needs to be raised to complete additional project extras

Mr. Walter followed by reviewing the Cost Model Summary, mentioning that no Phase III exists. Hank did state that the numerical “3” listed under the “Proposed Phase” column heading should not have been displayed as such, but as a different symbol to represent the “Other/Donor Category.”

Hank also referenced the March 28, 2011 Design Committee meeting minutes, which clarify “The [Cost Summary Model] 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.”

Hank continued by stating that the architects are designing the Theater Lounge. This project lies in the “Other/Donor Category” as approved by Design Committee and Union Council, but if the funds can be accumulated, the lounge could be constructed during Phase I and as a result, be less expensive, rather than constructing
Mr. Walter explained the topic of “Add Alternates.” For example, if a bid for Phase I was closed at $50 million, less than the original planned $52 million, architects will design and state as many as five add alternates, other additions or renovation ideas that could be done, but simply cost more money that is not planned in the project’s budget. “Add alternates” or additional projects can be designed and bid on by contractors in order to pre-determine pricing options for consideration in the event leftover funding exists.

Mr. Crabb asked for clarification regarding add alternates and suggested an example if the Theater Lounge funding was obtained by donation, would the donation money take away from add alternates to Phase I area that would be cut back due to caution in keeping the $52 million budget. Hank addressed by confirming leftover dollars that are specifically budgeted for Phase I items could be designated to an add alternate, once discussed and voted upon by Design Committee and Union Council. Prioritizing add alternate items in advance could be necessary to smooth any process of add alternate consideration and approval.

Ms. Groose added that as a member of the 2010-2011 Design Committee, she felt there was an understanding of the number “3” notation as the Other/Donor Category, that there was discussion on it and therefore appropriately approved.

Mr. Guthier stated if any Other/Donor "add alternate" projects arise, the budget would need to be approved by the State Government and enumerated accordingly.

Mr. Crabb proposed a document he created last Spring with every item of the project denoted by the Phase it belonged to and made it available for submission or reference.

Mr. Haebig noted that other than the Theater Lounge, the Facility Maintenance Shop is the next largest Other/Donor Category item. Mark asked about this specific items stance, as Hank replied it lied within the Underground area. The Campuses Master Plan shows Lot 1, the parking lot between the Red Gym and Memorial Union will be torn down and Alumni Park will be built by the Wisconsin Alumni Association. Underneath would be loading docks used by the Memorial Union, Red Gym and Wisconsin Alumni Association.
Mr. Sharpless noted interest in looking at Mr. Crabb’s previously mentioned list of items and making a “wish list” to prioritize of different configurations and separate bids on them, in order to be prepared if an add alternate item is brought forward.

Ms. Fischer presented minutes from the July 12th (#3) and August 9th (#4) Design Committee meetings and asked for a MOTION, made my Ms. Groose. Ms. Ruocco SECONDED.

Ms. Fischer opened the floor for discussion. Mr. Crabb asked that in the July 12th minutes, page 6 be edited from “Crab” to “Crabb” as well as including “million” after “$52.” Ted also added his “request for a cost comparison summary of the outdoor canoe storage, so that it can be compared to the indoor storage space.” On page 7, he would like “request for a study on the entrance of the Craftshop to increase its visibility” to be included.

Ms. Fischer called the vote with requested revisions included. The MOTION PASSED without objection.

Mr. Plunkett brought forth the current Design Development floor plans of the Fourth and Fifth Floors:

**Fifth Floor**:
- WUD
  - Five Advisor Offices (120 square feet)
  - Work spaces for students
  - WUD Office (north side overlooking the lake)
  - Added deck area
  - Reception Desk
  - Lounge Space
- Hallway connecting the Marketing/Graphics Offices
- Restroom facilities
- Director’s Office Suite
- New north side meeting room
- Expanding connector pieces to include the Fifth Floor
- Mechanical Room space

Mr. Crabb asked for layout and material usage clarification, where Mr. Walter answered the area and material usage depends upon Historical Society requirements, but the project will go as far as possible in making renovations to the area more and creating energy efficiency.
Fourth Floor:
- TRC and HR Offices
  - TRC will have meeting/training space
- Finance and Accounting Offices with meeting room
- Council Room with lake view
- Production/Servery space to assist Great Hall
- Elevator
- Langdon Room remodeled

Mr. Crabb inquired about the old size of the Council room’s versus the new space. Mr. Plunkett stated the proposed space is 848 square feet.

Ms. Fischer ended discussion and requested a motion of approval, where Ms. Groose MOTIONED to endorse the direction of the Fourth and Fifth Floors of Design Development for action by Union Council. Ms. Smith SECONDED.

Katie opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Smith clarified the Council Room and yellow corridor eliminates a stairway, and will be on one complete level. Mr. Plunkett confirmed and added that the Connector Piece will alleviate the level changes.

Ms. Wroblewski asked if any of the student organizations currently housed in these floors will lose space. Ms. Fischer answered the Campus Women’s Center has a one-year lease on their designated space. This was a space allocation request by the Chancellor as a one-year lease, which is intended to be temporary house space. There are no current space leasing plans in the Fourth and Fifth Floor.

Mr. Walter noted a small level change near the elevator with doors on both sides, alleviating this change.

Mr. Crabb questioned if the Langdon Room will be remodeled as a part of Phase I, leaving the Capital View Room and foyer separate, Mr. Walter confirmed.

Ms. Fischer asked for an amendment to the Floor Plans, having “Men’s/Women’s” Restrooms be labeled as “Unisex.” Both Ms. Groose and Ms. Smith accepted as an amendment to the original motion.

Ms. Fischer CALLED THE QUESTION and the MOTION PASSED without objection.

Mr. Plunkett referred to the three proposed meeting dates for the
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September meeting. The dates occur on a Tuesday, Friday, and Sunday, respectively. A doodle will be composed and sent out immediately following the meeting and members should respond within the next 24 hours. Mr. Plunkett made note of the Open Forum, tomorrow, August 30th, beginning at 5:30p.m. See TITU for the room location, which is currently Tripp Commons.

Mr. Sharpless suggested at the end of the Fall semester, committees should be formed to address necessary items, such as maintaining certain building operations throughout Phase I. Mr. Smith asked if any significant developments or changes have been made to the project throughout the summer months in regards to discussion with architects and the Historical Society. Mr. Walter answered the biggest talking point was how paint fumes would be exhausted from the Craftshop and paint shop. Mr. Crabb asked about Canoe storage at the previous meeting, and requested an update on cost estimates in this area. Mr. Walter answered that on Thursday, August 22nd, Hoofers/Outdoor Rentals and the Sailing Club had discussions on where to store canoes and proposed the Sailing Club would be willing to give space to store some of the canoes. This proposal will need further discussion and then be given consensus by passing through all Hoofers clubs. Mr. Haebig asked for the Union’s stance on the Sunset Deck article that was printed in a local newspaper recently. Mr. Guthier commented the architects commissioned a Sunset Study for both the north and east deck options. Both renderings showed little impact on the view of the sunset. Union Council and Design Committee viewed the study and concluded there was a minimal impact. Mr. Guthier also noted the additional space and views being added from the deck.

With no further discussion, Ms. Fischer adjourned the meeting without objection at 7:18p.m.