<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Departments &amp; Groups</th>
<th>Program Group &amp; Departments Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sangren Hall</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIS - Academic Technology and Instructional Services</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECP - Counselor Education &amp; Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECP - Center for Counseling and Psychological Services</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE - Dean's Office</td>
<td>7,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE - Dean's Office - Student Services</td>
<td>3,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE - ETS - Educational Technology Services</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Services</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELRT - Educational Leadership, Research &amp; Technology</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology - Kercher Research Center</td>
<td>2,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLS - Special Education &amp; Literacy Studies</td>
<td>3,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLS - Reading Clinic</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLS - Early Reading First Grant Center</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLES - Teaching, Learning &amp; Educational Studies</td>
<td>6,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>16,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Instructional Spaces</td>
<td>32,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Resources</td>
<td>5,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Space</td>
<td>19,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sangren Net Area</strong></td>
<td>121,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Support Area</td>
<td>77,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sangren Gross Area</strong></td>
<td>199,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Units shown above are Square Feet*
**Critical Success Factors:**

1. The design of the building must be student-centered, enabling group study and promoting emotional attachment to the institution.

2. Learning environments must be technologically advanced.

3. The building should be flexible and adaptable to support changing needs over time.

4. The building should embody sustainable design principles and be durable and maintainable.

5. The organization of the building should support and promote collaborative research.

6. The facility should create an iconic image for the College of Education.

7. The building should provide up to date specialized spaces important to the mission of the College of Education.

8. The building should be a warm and comfortable environment, and exude the concept of family.

9. The environments should display a focus on education and human development.

**Additional Project Objectives:**

1. Improve the efficiency of classroom utilization on campus.

2. Create a front door to the facility on the Michigan Ave corridor, and further develop the pedestrian mall depicted in the campus Master Plan.
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Option 1 - “Renewed Life”

Advantages:

- Some improvement to wayfinding and building circulation issues.
- Clinics are located at a main entry.

Disadvantages:

- Does not meet all program requirements (including second large lecture room, desirable improvements to research and teaching spaces, optimal classroom layouts, relocated electrical substation).
- Exceeds project budget. Need to include costs for program area not included (additional $2-3 million to provide elsewhere on campus).
- Existing structure limits flexibility for new uses.
- Does not create new iconic image for College of Education.
- Does not strengthen pedestrian relationship to Michigan Ave mall (no front door on Michigan Ave).
- Existing steps between north & south wings still need to be addressed (barrier free issue).
- Mechanical & Electrical space locations are problematic.
- During construction building occupants and function must be relocated.
- Library location does not contribute to commons/media center image (per program).
- Existing courtyards are not utilized or improved.

Energy Modeling (Based on design meeting energy code minimum requirements):

- Estimated Energy Cost per square foot per year: $2.09
- Cost savings per square foot per year (compared to existing building): 39%
Concept 2-"the heart"
Concept 2-"the heart"

Building Parti
Concept 2-"the heart"
First Level Floor Plan

SHWGROUP

11 August 2009 22
Concept 2-"the heart"
Second Level Floor Plan

UNACCOMMODATED PROGRAM

14U sq ft - as part of the Medium Classroom
Concept 2- "the heart"
Third Level Floor Plan

11 August 2009
Concept 2-"the heart"
Roof Level Floor Plan
Concept 2-"the heart"

Section

11 August 2009
Option 2- “The Heart”

Advantages:

- Creates new commons/atrium spaces in building, which enhance student-student and student-faculty interaction, promote ‘student-centered’ mission and goals and create academic community.
- Some improvement to wayfinding and building circulation issues.
- Creates commons/media center synergy.
- Clinics are located at a main entry.

Disadvantages:

- Does not meet all program requirements; (including second large lecture room, desirable improvements to research and teaching spaces, optimal classroom layouts).
- Exceeds project budget. Need to include costs for program area not included (additional $1-1.5 million to provide elsewhere on campus).
- Still maintains existing structure, with limited flexibility for new uses.
- Does not create new iconic image for College of Education.
- Does not strengthen pedestrian relationship to Michigan Ave mall (no front door on Michigan Ave).
- Existing steps between north & south wings still need to be addressed (barrier free issue).
- Mechanical & Electrical space locations are problematic.
- During construction building occupants and function must be relocated.
- One courtyard is not utilized or improved.

Energy Modeling:

- Estimated Energy Cost per square foot per year: $2.02
- Cost savings per square foot per year (compared to existing building): 41%
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Option 3- “Staircase to Education”

Advantages:

- Program requirements are met, including 2 large lecture halls and improvements to research and teaching spaces.
- Creates new commons/atrium spaces in building, which enhance student-student and student-faculty interaction, promote ‘student-centered’ mission and goals and create academic community.
- Allows phasing of construction, if only partial funding is provided (Will need to study program & infrastructure further if phasing is pursued).
- New construction allows for optimal classroom layouts.
- Improves wayfinding and building circulation issues.
- Better front door on Michigan Ave.

Disadvantages:

- Exceeds project budget
- Still maintains most of existing structure, with limited flexibility for new uses.
- During construction building occupants and function must be relocated.
- Commons areas called out as part of circulation areas-tough to furnish and use.
- Loading dock location is poor, since adjacent to pedestrian mall

Energy Modeling:

- Estimated Energy Cost per square foot per year: $2.01
- Cost savings per square foot per year (compared to existing building): 41%
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Advantages:

- Projected cost is close to project budget (with additional funding shifted from temporary facilities).
- Program requirements are met, including 2 large lecture halls and improvements to research and teaching spaces.
- Creates new commons/atrium spaces in building, which enhance student-student and student-faculty interaction, promote 'student-centered' mission and goals and create academic community.
- Most efficient scheme- space use & energy use.
- New construction will enable a higher LEED rating to be achieved.
- Greatly reduces the need for temporary facilities & occupant relocation during construction
- Provides more space for parking at north end of site, opportunity to create new green spaces and pedestrian hubs.
- New construction allows for optimal classroom layouts.
- Efficient building circulation
- Better front door on Michigan Ave.
- Best layout for access to Mechanical & Electrical spaces.

Disadvantages:

- Reduced amount of material reuse, although demolition waste is to be recycled.
- Recent Lobby/Elevator addition at north side to be demolished.

Energy Modeling:

- Estimated Energy Cost per square foot per year: $1.76
- Cost savings per square foot per year (compared to existing building): 48%