



**Design Review Board
October 10, 2017**

Projects Reviewed:

**Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion Study
Camp Randall South End Zone Feasibility Study
Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study
Hoofers Boat Dock and Deck Replacement Study**

Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion Study

Gary Brown
Annette Wilkus

Interim Chair, Design Review Board/FP&M CPLA
Design Review Board

Ad Hoc Design Review Board Member:

Jason King

Athletic Department

Campus Affiliates:

Stu LaRose
Terry Boehner

FP&M CPD, *Interim University Architect*
FP&M CPD

Nielsen Tennis Design Team:

Brian Beaulieu

Edge Consulting

Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion Study

Project Background:

This study will evaluate, plan, and design the addition of outdoor tennis courts on the north side of the Nielsen Tennis Stadium as a replacement and expansion of the existing six outdoor courts. Various layout options will be evaluated including setback requirements and redeveloping the existing courts to make room for a total of eight, side-by-side tennis courts.

Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion Study

Presentation:

1. Purpose of the project is to expand capacity and improve the player and spectator experience at existing outdoor tennis court complex.
2. Current access to the existing outdoor courts is only via indoors through Nielsen.
3. No outdoor court lighting now.
4. Site presents some environmental restrictions - wetlands to west.
5. Seventy-five foot wetland buffer required by CARPC (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission).
6. Any fill if suggested within the 100-year flood plan would need CARPC review and approval. Wouldn't put anything impervious in the floodplain area.
7. Would expand to eight courts but the proposed design is staying outside of the environmental corridor so no approvals needed
8. The project proposes all new asphalt tennis courts - grades will stay the same, color schemes updated.
9. The project will also add a new spectator route from the Goodman ticket booth – more convenient for spectators and they won't need to walk through Nielsen to get to the outdoor courts.
10. The project will require changes to the grade and fill in area to the east near the Lot 76 parking structure. Calling for new storm sewer.
11. By shifting courts to the east, need new water main which is a dead-end from Goodman connection.
12. Enhancement items start with adding court lighting and a sound system, neither of which exist today.
13. Lighting – poles with LED fixtures to NCAA standards so college matches can be held here.
14. Lights can be zoned for two courts at a time.
15. Individual scoreboards for center six courts mounted to softball training center.
16. Currently there are a few bleachers and standing room only viewing.
17. This project plan would include new spectator seating for about 600 people.

18. Also looked at solid seating options which would increase capacity to 900.
19. Thought about spectator experience. Bleachers - looked at 8 x 10 foot height so players don't look into them.
20. Several options possible which will get flushed out in final design - how much can players see versus seating capacity versus cost.
21. Bleachers would be elevated with tubular support
22. Pole mounted speakers for music during practices and announcements during events.
23. Controls for sound system go back to Goodman.
24. Components and amplifier would be the same as other Athletic facilities around campus for technical staff usability and similar standards.

Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion

Discussion:

1. Are 60-foot light poles standard? Number of lights depends on height of pole. Would need more lights with shorter poles.
2. Are the two end courts for practice? Correct. The six main courts are competition courts. The Big 10 average is to have ten courts.
3. Annette: How close is environmental corridor? From environmental perspective, make sure the project stays away from the mapped environmental corridor and be careful when you're in construction.
4. Can disturb it as long as we're not adding pavement and restore it. Can regrade into it with a permit from the WisDNR.
5. If we start filling areas too outside of the courts, then the project needs further regulatory approvals.
6. For any net fill, could cut a swale. Would need administrative authority and have record on file to show that compensated for fill.
7. Construction logistics plan - will need to be precise about them.
8. Think about your staging area - could stage to west but you need to consider compaction, especially in the environmental corridor, flood plain or near the wetland boundary. The project team thought that the contractor should be able to stage in area of grass near Goodman.
9. Existing access available on paved surface west of training center.
10. Replace asphalt all the way down? The design team suggested that they could save as much as possible, leave as much gravel as possible in place.
11. Is there preference to topping? Will use an acrylic surface similar to Nielsen's indoor courts so players can move from indoors to outdoors and play at the same speed except wouldn't do cushion outdoors.
12. This blue-green color scheme is the US open look which is now mostly standard.
13. No advantage to blue-green color scheme - it's more optics.
14. This project would be a significant upgrade to the tennis program.
15. A donor came forward with a gift to make it more possible.
16. Jason: We're excited about dressing up Goodman to make a more appealing entrance into tennis courts.
17. Fiske's Comments via October 6, 2017, teleconference:
Seems straightforward. Overall with landscape screening seems good. Confirmed north-south orientation. Pedestrians seem pinched on the east but looks better than having to go through the existing building.

Nielsen Tennis Court Expansion
Summary:

1. Come back to DRB once more during final design. Maybe in January or February.

8. Athletics has continued communication with stakeholders in area—Regent Apartments behind the fire station—sounds like there could be a lot of potential redevelopment – so those two things can be in sync. Talked to Steve Brown and they want to create some plaza-type area that could work together with something we do at the northeast corner of the Monroe St/Regent St intersection.
9. There will be future changes to Crazylegs Lane – now a complex series of streets. The city of Madison has developed final design plans now for removing Crazy Legs Lane and creating a new urban park in this area.
10. As we worked through CMP and considered Camp Randall itself and premium seat options, it occurred to us that the iconic gable end of the Field House which is a prominent feature of the building, is covered visually now by bleachers and so we thought about ways to pull that back and embrace that iconic façade inside the football stadium.
11. Basically about 5,500 seats in that are general admission bleacher seating in that area currently.
12. Costs were prohibitive to do Athletic MP option so tried to stay out of Field House as we look at new options which is not to say that those can't be exercised in the future.
13. This study took those various premium seating options and broke them down to what is feasible for Athletics and what could ideally be phased for construction.
14. Option 1: Create a field club and maintain existing seating.
15. Could do upper club lounge and not do anything below, except you would need some seating with that so it could be phased.
16. Field Club would provide some seating for someone sitting at 50-yard line to buy a ticket and use it in the lounge area, for example.
17. Associated with that lounge is an open bull pen which becomes a place to “see-and-be-seen” at field level and sit behind the end zone with a series of seats that could also be sold with access to the lounge.
18. This scenario would demolish all existing seats in the south endzone and install all new seats with seat backs.
19. As the design team looked at a field club lounge, they realized the available square footage was not adequate so they looked at another option that went from 4,000 to 11,000 sq. feet but that option would involve the demolition of more of the bleachers.
20. Option 2: Looks at premium seating at mid-level which is the upper concourse level, turns existing concourse into loge lounge. All the loge seats would be associated with that and then some club seats that would wrap around. The Loge seats would be covered by the terrace above.
21. Existing concourse is demolished along with seats then provide roof and covering for loge seats below. Would have to replace camera location.
22. Terrace above that point would not be used for patrons but could be used in future
23. Option 3: Provides the above noted terrace and associated fixed seating along with a camera platform in middle. In order to make the space accessible, a new elevator would need to be installed as part of this option. Would do some restrooms associated with that construction as well.
24. Options 2 and 3 run in tandem.
25. In order to do option 3, would have to do option 2.
26. Would have to run vertically with elevator shaft so everything becomes accessible.
27. Terrace view – no work inside the Field House but would still pull it off façade and set it up so you could connect in the future. Question: Do you know which way you're headed? Will you set yourself up to do full build-out eventually?
28. Athletics' desire is to do all seat backs in areas that are renovated. There would be a cost savings but Athletics would be able to charge a little more to offset the additional cost. The whole area would have some premium services to go along with that seat.
29. As a future project, Athletics hopes to restore the exterior face of the Field House as well as restore the existing historic windows.

30. Fiske had a question about phasing which has been addressed. Otherwise he was fine with the project in a prior teleconference review.
31. If the current DRB is signing off on this feasibility study and we come back to 11-member DRB will there be a problem? Gary Brown noted that most people on the new DRB will have seen the proposed project through Athletic Facilities Master Plan but may have to do a quick overview for a few new people. The project will still require a conditional use review process with the city of Madison because both the Kohl Center and Camp Randall have a different zoning review process. Both projects will need Type 2, environmental impact assessments by third party consultants. Once you have design contract, we'll hire a WEPA/EIA consultant.
32. Fiske's Comments via October 6, 2017, teleconference:
Great project. How do they deal with ADA? Could phase the project to make it more feasible.

Camp Randall South End Zone Feasibility Study
Summary:

1. Make sure we are set up in case we do the whole project eventually.

Project Review: Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study

Present:

Design Review Board Members:

Gary Brown *Interim Chair, Design Review Board/FP&M CPLA*
Annette Wilkus *Design Review Board*

Ad Hoc Design Review Board Member:

Jason King *Athletics*

Campus Affiliates:

Stu LaRose *FP&M CPD, Interim University Architect*
Terry Boehner *FP&M CPD*
Matt Collins *FP&M CPD*
Tim Luttrell *DFD*

Camp Randall Design Team:

Ian Griffiths *BSA*
Nate Appleman *HOK*
Jeff Schaub *HOK*

Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study

Project Background:

This is a pre-design study to evaluate and plan an addition to the Kohl Center consisting of approximately 40,000 GSF on three levels. The addition will house Sports Performance, an expanded kitchen, Academic Leadership Center, Training Table, and administration suites for Men's Hockey, and Men's and Women's Basketball. Additional work within the existing arena will include reconfiguring of other existing facilities within the building, Conceptual design started during the Athletic Facilities Master Plan process.

Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study

Presentation:

1. This project is an expansion study for the Kohl Center to provide additional offices and student support spaces for student-athletes on campus.
2. Design goals were to create a student-athlete hub and an efficient flow for staff and student-athletes.
3. This study changed from the Athletic Facilities Master Plan, expansion is in new location and Kohl Center expansion contribution to south community area.
4. Biggest driver was creating three student-athlete hubs on campus. Camp Randall was thought to be main hub but over time, athletics programs have grown and Camp Randall can't grow anymore. The idea was distributing that. Part two is at the Kohl Center will add resources that enhance the life of the student-athlete.
5. Biggest thing we'll encounter is the railroad and commuter path to the south as well as anticipated business development.
6. As we were talking to user groups, started to realize that men's and women's locker rooms weren't going to change and having a student-athlete hub at the opposite end didn't make sense.

7. Not many options after southeast corner. How can we expand over loading dock, get 40,000 sq ft. Put about three levels on this expansion.
8. Looked to build over loading dock - span over it.
9. Currently, can get two semis down there. Do it all the time.
10. How to span over entire structure and have really good clearances. Challenge to put in columns.
11. Edge of building would line up over concourse level – 24 feet above loading dock.
12. Programming: Dining area, nutrition hub. Doing more renovation additional offices for expansion of Athletic dept as well as men's hockey.
13. Circulation for fans: Can still get into main entry on west. Reduction of ticket offices but not ticket windows.
14. West entrance provides entrance for student-athletes. Accessible for student athletes, quick access to nutrition, etc.- pulling existing academics and offices as opposed to splitting it.
15. Current office renovation going on now that we can use.
16. Main design idea is about bringing curtain wall of windows across -- match up to existing window lines to make it look like its always been there.
17. Final part is looking at the south neighborhood connection, the area south of the railroad tracks. Looking at the 2015 Campus Master Plan, that area is part of a planned urban development region being built out by a private developer.
18. Actually, area is not part of university but is zoned for commercial transitional development.
19. Athletics and FP&M staff have had discussions with Joe Alexander who is actively talking about selling a part of the land south of the tracks to a hotel developer. Talking also about a parking structure and then other commercial space to the east. Do the developers have site plans yet? No. Athletics' stance is we just want to listen.
20. Good communication to develop a plan for all of these things to work together.
21. Idea of how do you get fans over train tracks, which is best location to tie in.
22. Expansion stays away from that point.
23. Ability for pedestrians to go over tracks, not just a game day path but other times. It should be an everyday pedestrian pathway.
24. What is the ability to cross of railroad tracks connect to Kohl Center? We have an interest in having a better crossing to Kohl Center. We want to have a better traffic pattern. Would help patrons coming to our events. The parking structure would be part of the discussion.
25. Do we want to stick going to gate C entrance since that's primarily entrance for us.
- 26.
27. One of the key things is how much clearance we need over railroad lines, how floor lines meet up. Will want to look at cross section.
28. Want to have a walkway above and over tracks?
29. Lots of permitting with railroads.

Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study

Discussion:

1. Stu: Huge improvement moving addition to southwest corner and carrying rhythm across. Nice tie-in to the existing architecture and mass of the Kohl Center.
2. The 24-foot span is not a huge distance. Actually about 50 feet but loading dock 24 feet.
3. Looked at taking whole end of building and make it a truss.
4. How do semis turn around? They back into loading dock - come down towards the wall and then swing around.
5. Have semis for big concerts – they'll bring up 10 to 18 semis and have busses back there as well.
6. City won't allow us to back any vehicles from or onto West Dayton Street.

7. Fiske's comments were he liked the addition and saw its change as an improvement but said good luck with engineering.
8. Annette: Reduction of ticket offices but not ticket booths?
9. The number of windows, the surface area wouldn't change.
10. Not as many people are coming up to windows now. Keep windows but smaller support area behind. There's unused office space now.
11. Does Athletics have enough expansion for the future?
12. Could still use more office space but this puts us in a better position.
13. Renovating mens basketball now so why wouldn't we use the space now?
14. Will back fill existing men's hockey space and existing women's office.
15. Don't know about future expansion on this site.
16. Our initial addition on the southeast seemed more of an issue for student-athletes to traverse to get to resources. Future expansion of office in the southeast corner would not have adjacency issue.
17. Loading dock with sports medicine above it? Pay attention to air circulation.
18. Fiske's Comments via October 6, 2017, teleconference:
See carrying of glass façade to addition. Rhythm is good. The yellow circulation arrow in middle is puzzling. One on east could be used by campus and public without going through building. The big deal is the loading dock. The change is an improvement.

Kohl Center Addition Feasibility Study
Summary:

1. Good direction. We'll see when you get into design development.
2. Don't know schedule yet but hope for enumeration in the 2019-21 capital budget
3. Once we get some numbers, we'll move forward with the project design and be back for further reviews

Project Review: Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Present:

Design Review Board Members:

Gary Brown
Annette Wilkus

Interim Chair, Design Review Board/FP&M CPLA
Design Review Board

Ad Hoc Design Review Board Member:

Joel Gerrits

Hoofers

Campus Affiliates:

Stu LaRose

FP&M CPD, Interim University Architect

Terry Boehner

FP&M CPD

Matt Collins

FP&M CPD

James 'Jim' LaGro

Campus Planning Committee

Dave Elsmo

Hoofers

Jacob Hahn

Hoofers

Camp Randall Design Team:

Andy Luehmann

SmithGroupJJR

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Project Background:

This project, located on the south shore of Lake Mendota immediately west of Memorial Terrace, includes replacement of all components of the boat docks and storage decks including ramps, gangways, and anchoring systems, as well as shoreline restoration and other site amenities for the UW Hoofers Sailing Club.

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Presentation:

1. Feasibility study: boat dock and deck replacement project - not yet in construction drawings yet.
2. Goal is to submit 25% to DNR for permit by end of October.
3. Project mimics what's in the Campus Master Plan.
4. Hoofers is the largest student organization on campus. Purpose of club is to promote sailing.
5. Existing conditions: fixed docks get removed seasonally by members.
6. Project goals: Hoofers wants ability to launch boats easily and safely with the least amount of mechanical involvement.
7. Shoreline is a heavily used path. Not officially the Lakeshore Path but much interpretation that it is.
8. When users transport boats, it's not always the safest situation.
9. One of the goals is to reduce congestion.
10. Existing wood deck structure will remain.
11. A lot of the existing structures are near end of life. Each year, system needs repair.
12. Current system evolved and developed over years. Has met needs but there are safer ways to install docks.
13. Current ramps have algae build-up which is not as safe.

14. What can we do to alleviate some of those issues?
15. Looking to update the davit crane. Right now it's along shoreline and liket to get that in the water that allows them to take boats form the water onto a trailers which would help alleviate a lot safety concerns
16. The curb stays and would improve the green space between it and the path.
17. Donor benches would be reincorporated and replaced, and re-recognized somehow
18. Piers would be replaced with a floating dock system with a gangway through it.
19. All docks will be seasonally installed and reinstalled so looked at systems to do that easily.
20. Deck largely replaced in kind for easy access to motor boats.
21. Skow pier replaced in kind sizewise with gangway.
22. Flanking it are fixed decks with stone up existing dock wall. These deck have to expand that in some fashion so we'll probably fix them to the dock wall.
23. Biggest change is what we're calling the T dock - this is a higher profile floating dock stystem
24. The T is a 20 to 22-inch free board. Along the inside is a solid platform that slopes down to water.
25. Allow us to store tech boats stored along shorewise will be stored on the deck on the water. The sloping platform will allow users to get boats onto and off docks prettily easily.
26. Further west is the the Laser and Byte low profile dock which are the smallest boats, easily picked up so someone can go down gangway and slide them into water.
27. Relocated the crane - moved it out in the water surrounded by skow desk - need enough water depth for when they place boats over water. Looking at minor improvements.
28. Improvements to concrete at eah of the gangway locations to handle the structural needs at the gangway locations.
29. Largest improvement is currently ashphalt paved. Worked with club since this is large open space, make it green lawn space, replacing the trees which are at end of their life.
30. Green space provides lay down space to fold sails and is also nice place to gather small groups when they have their summer programs.
31. Concern with it being worn and trampled on but could change it in future if problem.
32. Goals of this project is to get boats on the water.
33. A couple vendors make a system for lots of wave action. Looking at composite. We could do wood or concrete but composite has come a long way and more people going with composite.
34. Won't have fingers slips sticking out into the water.
35. Can put solar deck lights on piers.
36. Would replace rail system that allows the boats to be lowered in and out of the water.

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Discussion:

1. Annette: Not touching the bulkhead?
Site investigations show that we might have concerns regarding undermining of the shoreline which is close to 40 years old.
2. The existing seawall is a four-foot high, freestanding wall with an existing concrete walk tied into it with rebar.
3. Wave action over the years has hit the wall and riprap stone and washed out the base material under the wall and the walkway. –
4. Currently investigating options – it's 450 lineal feet of wall that was not in the current project budget to replace.
5. Annette: What is the permitting?
6. It all needs DNR permits. Would include wall replacement or repair work with DNR permit process. Doesn't change much for permitting just becomes another element.

7. Suggestion: If worried about lawn being trampled, there's a product called geo fibers that helps stabilize and with compaction. This was used previously on campus and has shown good results. Make sure that you have really good drainage underneath and detail that in drawings.
8. Jim: Having spent time there on a Friday or Saturday night, there's a lot of traffic and confusion in the area. Are you comfortable with circulation and potential traffic?
9. The main goal of project was to provide quicker, easier access. Most of our injuries and damage that occurs comes with launching off current rail systems or bringing boats down the ramps. It's difficult for people to do by themselves, even with the smaller boats which can be heavy.
10. This plan gives easier access and speeds up process. The skow dock go straight to lift and the T dock provides safe harbor on windy days. Overall, it's a much safer area.
11. Gary: It's more about boat traffic on the water between the proposed piers. Is there enough space so the novice sailors don't get stuck or crash into the piers, especially on a north wide day?
12. Skows aren't allowed to come to docks with sails up anymore.
13. Gary: Can we move the Tech pier down to the west to make more room between the Tech pier and the slope pier?
14. It's about teaching users how to use the equipment properly.
15. Idea behind this we're leaving a walkway so people can walk their boats and launch out the bow.
16. If boats miss mark here, they have two docks to use. This provides more of a safe harbor where manavering would be much easier.
17. Layout seems crowded. Plenty of shoreline to use. Could you slide the last two piers down? Put on west side?
18. Most of the proposed piers are being put into the current and existing pier locations.
19. Any shuffling of docks wouldn't negatively impact what's going on.
20. Shrinking the length of the scow dock would be more appropriate. Crane put there to be in 15-minute loading zone.
21. Each slot has sunken D-rings that pop out of deck. Then there's a walkway the whole way out.
22. Stu: Is DNR requiring dock be public?
23. Yes. University has so much shoreline, comes down to size of dock.
24. If dock exceeds six feet wide and surface coverage on the lake can't exceed 200 square feet.
25. Quick analysis to meet 200 sq ft platforms but then open water between them which creates safety issues.
26. Would signage cover it? Asking DNR - can we restrict it from dawn to dusk or say dock is intended for Hoofers Club? Just the T dock affected.
27. Technically private from waterway. Do not need to allow transient boat access.
28. Most people going on pier are reasonable and comply.
29. Bench seating area – double as storage bench that people can sit on and hang out - most will want to be on north side which takes them out of action - also reduces spay over the decking.
30. Fiske comment via prior teleconference: What about trees – all the existing trees are at the end of their useful life and will be replaced.
31. Thought about doing secure storage in space adjacent to lake lab but decided not to make improvements that might be affected at a later date.
32. Path so close to water, if someone falls, could be hurt bad. Have you thought about dressing it up or make it more accessible? Could we shift path?
33. This area has always been considered more of the active Hoofers area. Open to doing something different.
34. Could we shift green space to concrete wall but and tie into sea wall?

35. Fiske's Comments via October 6, 2017, teleconference:
Want to figure out land side. Important to understand storage needs. Concerned about squeezing in pedestrian movement. Make turf system right for tracking. Any provisions for stormwater run-off?
Need to be careful for transitions.
36. Lots of options - right now just trying to fix problems.

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Summary:

1. When you come back, the DRB will want to see more of the design details, especially related to stormwater management, plant material selections, etc.
2. Come back once at least once more when you know more about the wall.