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Grainger Capital Café Feasibility Study
Project Background:

The study will assess and propose solutions to approximately 24,000 GSF of the first floor café and dining room in Grainger Hall as well as an adjacent exterior courtyard. The School of Business and the Wisconsin Union are interested in creating a collaboratively focused, unique dining experience on campus and the Capital Café is one of the best locations to bring people together. The project will specifically look at creative ways to upgrade the current café in order to provide better integration with the building and create a popular destination for students, staff, and faculty. In addition, declining café sales, increased competition, and previous facility studies suggest there are opportunities to enhance the café/dining area and make it a thriving destination for the school and campus. This is our initial review of this project.
Grainger Capital Café Feasibility Study
Presentation:

This project is a broad scope study of the Grainger Capital Café including what changes could be made to the interior foodservice operations and how the underutilized exterior courtyard could function better for dining and school events. The design team interviewed Business School students who reported that they’re looking for spaces in the building to recharge during the day. They often arrive at Grainger at 8 AM for classes, eat lunch in the café, and stay in the building for more classes in the afternoon.

Overall design concept:
- Create an identity unique to the Business School.
- Follow interior design palette from the Learning Commons (currently under renovation).
- Associate outdoor space with interior space.
- Clearly articulate an exterior entrance from the courtyard for students to arrive at the building and be greeted by a bright lounge space adjacent to the newly remodeled coffee house.

Interior:
- Improve foot traffic through the space.
- Split the coffee and dining space into two distinct spaces and reposition the Executive Dining Room to make room for the coffee house.
- Replace current courtyard windows with a more transparent glass to allow more light and visibility between the courtyard and adjacent areas.

Exterior/Courtyard:
- First impression of current courtyard is that it’s not very inviting.
- Concept is to create three different zones within the courtyard.
- Borrow from intimate interior spaces and create outdoor spaces with separation of the various outdoor rooms.
- Eastern side of courtyard would relate to the dining area by allowing students the opportunity to purchase food and then bring it out into the courtyard.
- Middle courtyard has flexibility to host smaller to medium sized events.
- The western side would function as a more quiet zone, defined by using different types of outdoor furniture.
- Tree plantings and a potential removable exterior canopy would provide more shade.
- Create buffers from street noise and busy vehicular traffic on W. Johnson Street.

Grainger Capital Café Feasibility Study
Discussion:
- Over the years, there’s been a waxing and waning of catered events in the courtyard. The Business School has a desire to have an outdoor space for events.
· Currently, there’s not a good flow from inside to outside. The courtyard could also provide more visual interest in winter. Students could make snow sculptures that could be seen from inside the café for example.
· There’s currently a disparity between the two wings of Grainger with the belief that there are the haves and have nots. The Wisconsin School of Business (WSB) would like to take elements of light wood and cherry wood from both wings to create a bridge between the two, adding glass so people will view the space as shared space.
· The study suggests addressing the main courtyard entrance with more architectural details. Pull in some elements from the main entry using the university emblem. The intent is to put a vestibule at the courtyard entrance since there’s a problem with the doors letting in cold air.
· Currently the existing set of doors on the NW side of the courtyard draws people to an inaccesible entrance. It would be good to explore mimicking these doors on the NE side of the courtyard but the design team stated adding doors and a vestibule on the NE corner creates a pinch point in the plan. It was stated that the number of doors on the NW side could be reduced especially if the glass was replaced. A curved trellis was suggested to help highlight the entrance. An entrance at the SE corner of the building was also discussed but it took up a lot of space. There seems to be more work to figure out better options to emphasize the courtyard entrance and make it more visible and inviting.
· The side of the courtyard closest to café is intended for students to bring their food outside and enjoy the outdoors. The center courtyard area is the between-classes space for hosting events. Space to the west is off-the-beaten-path space, a little quieter but intended that there would be a lot of back and forth between the various exterior spaces. It might be nice to soften this edge to create less of a separation. The tensile shade structure will be very important as a way to create space between the east and west sides of the courtyard space.
· The courtyard is intimidating now due to the looming height of the building but adding a canopy brings it down to a more human level.
· Think about the symmetry of the plan. It’s one thing to just say that one side is quiet and one is not.
· The challenge is how you take the eastern third and then add circulation paths to get there.
· Building a wooden pergola is going to look like the center of the space. This element needs more work. The circulation patterns need to be clear like the diagonal sidewalk.
· A furniture layout would be helpful because ultimately that will be key in programming.
· The concrete paving design has a lot of room for improvement.
· Look at having some type of solid canopy attached to building – could do more to provide really useful weather protection and make the space more functional for another month of the year during the shoulder seasons.
· There is a lot of street noise at the southern end of the courtyard that enters the space unimpeded. Encourage placing low walls if structurally feasible.
· Having a landscape architect involved would be good next step and would be important in the final design process for the exterior courtyard.
· The details of the translucent tensile structure will be important. Depending on the percentage of opacity, the canopy might be uncomfortable. Need something creative. Seats along the courtyard walls might address seating needs but something not as permanent might be preferred.
· Very pleased with the community spaces for places to hang out and connect. Currently, the building lacks a human scale in many ways. The Campus Master Plan (CMP) defined this space as not only an amenity for the Business School but for general campus users as well.

· Will Executive Meeting space be more private? The intent was to provide some structure to the space for private functions but serve as open space when not reserved through the use of operable glass walls.

· How often will Executive Meeting room be used as a private space? It gets used heavily during certain times of the academic year. Concern was that it takes up a large amount of space. This design opens it up to other uses. Considered option to not replace it but didn’t want to set up too big of a chain reaction. Its replacement in the southeast corner also creates a nice quiet space. You move from noisy in the front to quieter in back.

· When it’s closed off, will people even know to go back there? Make sure you’re not creating a dead space.

· What will the proposed Humanities building across the street do about shadows in the courtyard? CMP shows a new Humanities Hall as six stories which could change and be higher. It will be important for both projects to look at the potential set-backs and step-backs on that building and do shadow studies. There could be some reflected light but the project will need to study this in the next phase of the project.

· Intrigued about the issue of wood. When you start introducing wood, it’s a bold step which is not currently the branding of Grainger. If you suddenly have faux wood beams out in the courtyard, does it seem that the building can’t make up its mind? Don’t want too many things going on. Need to look at how the wood transitions between the spaces.

· Does this plan account for the appropriate growth of the school? Kitchen is not growing in size and Wisconsin Union anticipates increased capacity in the Humanities building across Johnson Street. The new design will be able to handle the business we think we’re leaving on the table now. The separate coffee house plan was key to meeting the projected growth.

---

**Grainger Capital Café Feasibility Study**

**Summary:**

Many positive directions in the study. A landscape architect will need to be on board when this study becomes a defined and funded project. The courtyard entrance, canopy, and furniture plan should be further studied and developed in the future project.
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Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement
Project Background:

Located on the south shore of Lake Mendota, this project includes replacement of all components of the boat docks and storage decks as well as shoreline restoration and other site amenities for the UW Hoofers Sailing Club. The project was initially presented at the October 10, 2017, Design Review Board meeting and returns to DRB with more design detail related to storm water management, conceptual planting designs and information about the new seawall. This will be our final review of this project.
Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Presentation:

A Hoofers shoreline master plan was completed about a year ago. Hoofers is the largest student organization on campus and they have the second largest sailing club in the country behind the Naval Academy in Annapolis, MD. The master plan process identified two project goals: 1) create the ability to quickly launch boats with the least amount of volunteers and 2) increase safety along the shoreline. During the project design process this past fall, the design team discovered that a portion of the seawall is being undermined and needs to be addressed. Wave action over 40 years has seriously eroded the foundation under the wall.

The club currently stores boats on racks on the shoreline along a walking path. Some of the larger sailboats are on fixed docks which are in need of replacing. Dock installation is a very cumbersome system, not always the safest to install, and it's time-consuming for a volunteer organization. The graded ramps cause concern because there’s a lot of algae and zebra mussels on them. They become slippery and are a safety hazard.

General feedback has been to reduce bicycle-pedestrian conflicts along the shoreline path. Transportation Services chose not to move forward with a combined use pedestrian/bicycle/vehicular mall in place of the existing service drive. FP&M prefers to keep a path of at least ten feet wide along the shoreline.

Docks/decking will be a combination of seasonal floating piers and permanently fixed. The current design has been submitted to the DNR for a permanent structure which would reduce maintenance at the sloop and scow decks. All other docks would be floating and removable. The current davit crane is undersized. Pushing it out over the revetment stone takes it off the shoreline and away from pedestrians.

Landside: For the new revetment, the design team is proposing the use of angular stone that interlocks and protects the shoreline edge more efficiently than the more rounded, glacia till. The DNR submittal shows that the project is not extending the footprint into the lake. The project will also make improvements along the shoreline to pull boat trailers near the davit crane which is used to place boats in and out of the water.

The project will improve the green space along the shore for Hoofers and improve the public experience of the shoreline. The Club leadership doesn’t know how they’re going to specifically use green space area yet other than for sail folding and dryland small group teaching. The current plan is to sod the greenspace for now and see how it goes. The project will also include some perennial grasses and forbs in a rain garden at the low point north of the service drive to collect stormwater and treat it. The maximum width of the green space about 20 feet.

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement

Discussion:

- The Wisconsin Union has several donors confirmed and they are working with the Foundation for additional gift funding for items such as benches.
• Do they really intend to take docks out in the winter? Yes. Hoofers does have the option of floating them over to the north side of lake where they would be frozen into the ice for storage. This is a common practice on some lakes that have protected areas. They are also thinking about a contract to remove and store the pier systems. Boats will still be stored along the shoreline over winter. The Goodspeed Family pier sections are currently removed by a contractor. They also do inspections after storm events.
• Soil compaction in the greenspace is going to happen and without irrigation it’s going to be harder to maintain. Could do additives in the soil to reduce compaction.
• Can you kayak, canoe or wind sail there? Hoofers does have a windsurfing program but the kayaks and canoes are rented by Outdoor UW, a different program in the Wisconsin Union. Those are stored inside the main building.
• This is my favorite part of campus and it’s nice to see the boats separated from the walkway and on the water.
• Wave action on this side of the lake can be heavy at times. Not confident that a planting design solution would work in the revetment area.
• Native plants installed properly could survive and think it’s a missed opportunity. It’s not very attractive, and more of a civil engineering solution. It doesn’t have to be that deep.
• Not aware of other projects with similar wave and ice conditions. Have seen ice shoves break up in the spring, sometimes with big chunks. Would like to look at some precedents and how to introduce more plantings along the shoreline.
• What is the proposed material for decking? Most vendors can use any hardwood. Composite decking is now more affordable and is likely what will be used. There are a couple color choices.
• What is the environmental impact? The project has been submitted for a permit now to the DNR. No initial comments have been received. The DNR fisheries group may want to use this project to promote fish habitat. The Goodspeed Family Pier and the overall shoreline project at the Union did some work for fish spawning in the lake. Shouldn’t be any impact to the environment since there’s just a little more square footage of docks, but the DNR will have the final say. The number and size of piers is based on your overall length of shoreline owned. The university owns about four miles of lakefront so we can do a lot of piers but want to be careful about this area. We know that it has walleye spawning beds not too much further from the piers.
• What about goose poop? With constant activity of this club, it will be reduced during the day. The docks have water and electrical hookups so they can be power-washed.
• Is the permanent dock section going to be a problem with the DNR? We had a pre-permit meeting with DNR but we’ve had no feedback yet. Initial feedback has been very positive so far.
• What is the separation of bikes and pedestrians on the path and how does it meet safety requirements? The intent is to have the bikes use the service drive and the pedestrians use the shoreline sidewalk.
• There is a six-inch curb along the sidewalk on the north side which will go a long way to prevention and also give joggers some point of reference.
• The path is 10-feet wide with 18 feet of green space next to it to the south. The key to the bike path will be signage marked as shared road (“sharrow condition”). FP&M staff are working with Transportation Services to look at a bike path/bridge diversion that would have bikes and pedestrians on the north side of Limnology. What’s happening now is that they end up in the parking lot and there are a lot of conflicts. Moving the pedestrians and bicycles to the north to get them out of parking lot would help reduce conflicts with vehicles. Maybe a material change or step or ramp to separate the uses would help. FP&M will hire an engineer to review the proposed future bridge connection north of Limnology. Want the bikes to stay in the service drive and not get mixed in with Hoofers activities. Most bicyclists want to stay in the service drive anyway.
· Unless that walkway is widened north of the Limnology Lab, there’s not enough room. That is the intent of the bridge and widened path north of Limnology, which is a separate future project.
· Such a great destination. What about site furniture? Where are those moments of repose? Could there be a seat wall there where you could take a sandwich? Working with the Foundation to locate some benches in the greenspace.
· From the club’s and the Wisconsin Union’s perspective, it’s not ideal to have people hanging out along the shoreline, especially late at night. The Union has responsibility for enforcement there now and it’s difficult as it is so far away from the main Terrace activities.
· What about lighting? Some strip lighting will be built into the curb along the north side of the sidewalk. The docks have square, solar puck lights that light the edges of the piers.

Hoofers Dock and Deck Replacement
Summary:

Since the timing of this project is before the new DRB is fully operational, this project will not be reviewed further under the new process. In general, the project looks good. The DRB would like the consultant team to look at the feasibility of adding more plant materials along the revetment area. The team should also look in more detail at the stormwater management and rain garden concept as well as how to store the boats in the winter without compacting the soil/sod in the greenspace. Trees will be located so that they do not impede Hoofers’ use of the shoreline yet provide them with shade in the heat of summer. Trees should only be located on the far east and west end and around the rain garden. Care should be taken on the east end to assure the necessary turning radius for trucks with large boats and trailers can make the turns in to the davit crane and get back out again.