

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC
Monday, August 12th, 2024
In-person Meeting

Architectural Commission

X	Renee Cheng, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	Gundula Proksch, Vice Chair	Faculty Council on Campus Planning and Stewardship	Voting
X	Cathy Simon	Professional Member	Voting
X	John Syvertsen	Professional Member	Voting
X	Andrea Leers	Professional Member	Voting
X	Linda Jewell	Professional Member	Voting
X	Edwin Harris	Professional Member	Voting
X	Valerie Lange	Student Member	Voting
<hr/>			
X	Steve Tatge	Associate Vice President of Asset Management, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Kristine Kenney	Director of Campus Architecture & Planning, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

Minutes by Laura Salish, Executive Assistant to the Director of Campus Architecture & Planning

Call to Order

The Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, Renee Cheng, called the meeting to order.

Approval of Past Minutes and Current Agenda

The May 6th, 2024 meeting minutes and current agenda were approved. Cathy Simon moved to approve; Linda Jewell seconded.

Discussion

Chemical Sciences Building, lots of labs, very expensive square foot. Sent out invitations for new commission members. Sent out a list to Commissioner, RFP firm selection. Requesting Commission members to choose each of their top 10 (long list). Slating committee members will move it to the top 3 (slating list). Next will be office visits with build contractor. Interviews with the slating committee and firms will occur in December. Top 3 builders: Mortensen, Hoffman, Skanska have had projects with UW within recent memory. Site is where the old chemistry library sits.

Discussed whether to recuse Andrea Leers from meeting, if her firm is interested in CSB. They were not planning on it, will stay for this project. Cathy Simon believes every university should go through the same level of planning, discussion and interest in the campus building. UW functions as an owner, heavily invested.

ASUW Shellhouse Restoration Project

Welcome

Introductions

Agenda:

Introduction and project goals

Site and Building History

Design overview and intent

Q&A

Problem Statement & Purpose

National Register of Historic Places (1975) and first Seattle UW Landmark (2018)

Underutilized and largely vacant as a storage facilities

Lacks basic infrastructure (life safety, restrooms, heat/climate control, accessibility challenges)

Water intrusion issues threaten to deteriorate the historic wood structure

Restoration is needed to preserve this historic asset and enliven it as an active useable destination for UW people and increase visitors.

Project Objectives

Goals:

Integrate the Shell House into UW student experience

Honor the stie's former use as a portage by Indigenous people

Project Scope:

-Structural stabilization

-Site work & utility infrastructure

-Accessibility improvements

-Building envelope thermal insulation, heating and vent, fire and life safety, restrooms

Hangar doors, filling with glazing

Aspiration Program:

Event Space

Retention of the Poco boat building workshop

Creation of active learning space

Building and event support elements

Interactive exhibit displaying history

Exterior deck as an extension of the interior space on the south side of the building.

Budget and Schedule

Owner soft costs: 4.4 million

Design build budget: 11.1 million

Restoration has been discussed for 7 years

Project Schedule:

Currently approaching 60% design milestone

Conclusion in Spring/Summer 2026

Existing Context (site detail)

Sited at a lower building location than surrounding
Hangar doors have been fixed in place since 1980, windows were replaced around the same time but have issues and need to be replaced again.
Pocock Shop on Mezzanine Level, would like to restore area to what it looked like back when building housed rowing

Eras in the Site:

Lake history

Since 2018 the Willapa Spirit Community have housed their canoe

The Cut: completed in 1916 and leveled the lakes

Character: The site surrounding the shell house has changed significantly over the past 106 years.

Landmark Designation: exterior, interior building volume, roof trusswork, site 20ft out around building.

Entitlements and Land Use

Building History: Built in 1918 for the war, rowing era 1919-1949, canoe house era (review this slide and extend)

Naval Era: The building was originally built to

Rowing Era" 1930s, Boys in the Boat era

1923 Pocock

Canoe House Era: doors reconfigured

1980 to present: mostly used for storage

Have tried to overlay the layers of change to see what it truly used to be

Design Concept diagram

Site Context diagram: active water use on south and east side, illustrated connections

Site Plan Proposed

New accessible path design concept in process

New north entry plaza and building plaza, newly fenced equipment and trash enclosure, gravel

overlay of existing west lot (not accessible)

Fire access hammerhead turnaround (new paving required w/ bollards)

ADA van space for drop off

New accessible connection Montlake deck

Level 1 floor plan diagram

Restrooms, storage, new entry and mechanical spaces below Pocock shop

Elevator and stair access

Elevated viewing and exhibit [platform

Event space for up to 400 people

New glazed connection to the site and water

Outermost existing hangar doors repaired and fixed in place

Level 2 Floor plan diagram

Renovate Pocock shop to include air conditioning, lighting and exhibit power
(get more from slide)

Building Elevations proposed

Mechanical louvers; lower window sashes to be removed and stored for future reversibility

New building entry on North side

Existing windows to be removed (north)

South:

2 hangar doors replaced and fixed in place

Doors reintroduced in historic locations

(get more from slide)

West: new asphalt composition, cedar shakes

Addressing window replacement and removal

Section Perspective E/W diagram

Retrofitting foundations

New slab

Every connection will get a gusset

Interior ductwork for heating and partial cooling system

Bringing everything up to code and creates a seismic diagram

Section Perspective N/S

New lighting and a/v

Hangar doors being replaced with glazing

Diagrams of Main Entry/Indoors/Mezzanine/Exterior

ASUW Shellhouse Discussion:

- (John) Deck to the south is really important to recall how the space was connected to water. Will be wonderful to open that side of building to understand its historical purpose.
 - First pass fixed floor in place. Looked at operation, issues with keeping doors open and keeping energy code.
- (John) Didn't respond positively to the white color, would love to see something more natural like its original
 - Not sure what color we're going to do yet, scraping out layers of color in current status.
 - Will likely be an off white/beige/tan.
- (Cathy) Nice that the entry leads to this big, water space. Want to ensure that we are doing justice. Consider having it be more interactive.
- (Edwin) I agree with John and Cathy's comments. If doors are fixed, is there an another area that can be opened up more?
 - As we put new surfaces on, what is the story? Speak to new life? Hard to project the patina.
- (Andrea) North face, are we keeping the historical doors for the right purpose? Is that what's important? Not adequate access to exterior. Create roll up or vertically stacked roll up door. Does it need to be a built deck at all? What about terrace/landscaping?
- (Andrea) Inside, clever use of elevator. Do wonder about the mezzanine as an element in the space. Made use of it as an exhibit area. Needs to be looked at more, the dialogue isn't balanced yet. Seems additive instead of purposeful.
 - Cannot get elevator into back area due to infrastructure. Will continue to review.

- (Linda) not convinced by the curtain wall, please consider the roll up doors to give more expression. Doesn't connect to the historical look.
 - Doors can only be open for 2-3 months of the year, need to also consider the other 9-10 months of the year.
- (Gundula) What kind of events will be happening? Is it during the academic year? Reinforce colleagues' comments about the deck. Currently not a well-used corner of campus, it is a place where students can come. New Fred Hutch waterway is very active. Setting up the Shell House as
- (Valerie) Agree with Gundula regarding the exterior building into the landscape. Personally visits the Fred Hutch Waterway park weekly.
- (Valerie) Walk in, would be more inviting if Mezzanine wrapped around. Recommends more glazing between shop and platform, feels very private. Open it up.
- (Renee) Would love to meet with the landscape architect next time ASUW Shellhouse come to UWAC.
- (Cathy) Would love to see a master plan around the waterfront.
 - Do have something for the shoreline, will bring it next time.

Chemical Sciences Building

Welcome

Introductions

Problem Statement

Project parameters

Target program

Designer selection and guidance

Problem Statement delivered by Munira Khalil

3 parts of chemistry were siloed originally

UW Chemistry dept faces serious limitations due to aging facilities that cannot keep pace with the demands of modern scientific practice:

- Dispersed program model limits collaboration opportunities
- Small lab configurations + constrained wet-lab instruction lack HVAC control flexible interdisciplinary lab space
- Aging infrastructure pose critical safety and security issues
- Bagley Hall (1937) and Chemistry Library (1957) do not meet requirement for cutting edge research in chemical sciences limiting new discoveries and training opportunities for students. Limited in doing what they are getting funding to do.

Project Goals

Student/faculty growth and retention

Interdisciplinary colocation and collaboration

Modernization/optimizing

Synergy/Independence

Project Scope

Enable a new mode of science where fundamental chemical research can be transformed into real world applications in real time

Recruitment of faculty and students

New Chemical Sciences Building will replace the Chemistry Library Building

Requires proximity to the existing Chemistry Building and Bagley Hall with nearby interdisciplinary research centers such as MoIES and NanoES

Project Budget and Schedule

Predesign expenses

Owner soft costs

Design build budget

Total 191 million

Board of Regence approved project and budget in June

Have commenced design build search

Start of design in early 2025

Program

Target size 100k-110k gross sf

Campus Integration

Preserving and Strengthening the Historic core of campus

Creating Connections and amplify connections across campus

Prioritize a Campus-First Design by prioritizing the pedestrian experience

Embodying PNW character

Lead on sustainability

Cluster of excellence

Exemplary Project Benchmarks

Frick Chemistry Laboratory: Princeton 265000 gsf, lost a huge number of faculty and students due to lack of cutting edge facilities prior to building. Was opened in 2011.

New Chemistry Building: University of Maryland (opened 2024)

Most similar to scope

105,000 gsf, 34 research labs

Purposely built for faculty and students to share ideas

Interdisciplinary building with high-performance labs for quantum information science & flexible space for analytical and chemical biology research

Heathcock Hall: Berkeley in construction (80,000 gsf)

Designed to promote advanced research and education

Attract rising leaders in chemistry

Design-Build Team Selection

Started in June 2024

Have narrowed selection process for designer down to 3

Architect selection process will be lead by design builder, Architect Selection begins in October 2024, whole team assembled by March 2025.

1a) develop long list of architects

1b) SOQ Evaluations Committee - invited solicitation via D-B: Design Build Members, Kristine Kenney, Steve Majeski, Paul Miller, Jeannie Natta Sydney Thiel

2a) Interview Phase: slating committee (all of the above minus Paul Miller, plus Munira Khalil and Dan Pollock)

2b) UWAC recommendation issued from VP of Facilities

Project Goals & Basics for Architect Qualifications

Student/faculty growth and retention: a portfolio of design excellence that demonstrates a strong visual presence, ability to integrate campus connection

Interdisciplinary colocation and collaboration: Higher Ed, complex lab experiences

Modernization/optimizing: experience creating welcome and equitable learning environments

Synergy/Independence: Design build experience & team fit

Architecture Firms Interest to Date: 23 have expressed interest

UWAC feedback by 8/21: top 10 firm recs, cautionary guidance if there is any

Chemical Sciences Discussion

Can Commission members add to firm list?

Yes.

- (Andrea) A very large building, seen from the core of campus. Ability to work in context is very important.
- (Gundula) Giving a new face to aggregate of buildings, emphasis of innovating thinking and approaches are important for contextualism.
- (Cathy) Fast forward to office visits, not enough design representatives listed for SOQ Eval Committee or Slating Committee. Great representatives but need more of that design voice represented.
- (Steve Majeski) Have spent a lot of time in predesign at the campus connections. It's a very important location and how it fits into the rest of campus. Focused on ensuring project that the campus will be very proud of, in addition to the Chemistry needs.
- (Linda) Makeup of Selection Committee, hard for staff members because they're focused on the campus overall design vs project that is focused on just the design quality of building/immediate landscaping. Focus of the Commission is very project based.
- (Cathy) UW has been really great at meeting program and providing more. UW process provides more and it creates a sense of confidence. Academic needs are first and foremost.
- (Lou) Ensuring design excellence is why we have the Commission. It has served us wonderfully well. Appreciated the citing of additional university Chemical buildings.
- (Kristine) Discussed the upcoming process for firm selection process. Looking to finish this week, will process the following week.

End Discussion

Chemical Sciences Building:

- (Cathy) Do we want to propose changes to Slating Committee or provide more weight to design team members?
- (John) Can the RFQ put firms on the spot re: how they have approached campuses with integration in their new buildings?
 - Other members agreed, great point.
- (John) Easy for big firms to meet this but want to ensure they have a sophisticated process and skill to approach this.
- (Gundula) Many teams on current list with partnerships, obligation to know how they have worked together before. Understanding how much each partnership is contributing. (Kristine) Referenced Haggett Hall and how those architecture teams have worked together once before and have done a fantastic job.
- (Andrea) RFP needs to be done well. Makeup of the Slating Committee, agree about additional design weight.
- (Kristine) could bring an Architecture Commission in, have done so far
- (Linda Jewell) want it to be an innovative, special building but contribute to the quality of campus and its memorable nature.
- (Gundula) Future of chemistry, the needs as well. In a position on campus, more so on the side. Needs to be the lead innovator for integration for the surrounding buildings. More building inclusive than NanoES building.
- (Andrea) Should we ask for building ensemble examples in RFQ? Yes.
- (Kristine) Yes, want to ensure we are getting both design experiences (chemistry and integration). Have done this before in the interview process, sounds like UWAC would like it sooner.
- (Cathy) Do we want to diversify by picking firms that don't have a lot of UW projects? Also worth considering.
- (John) important for each team to have a strong, collaborative leaders, hard to find "the person" who is the strong, effective design leader and doesn't allow project to be watered down by programmatic issues.
- (Lou) Has been burned before in applications and interviews when they will do a lot of really good homework. Ensure not just what you can tell us about UW.
- (Linda) Looking for a building that will make a special campus even more special. Hard to communicate that into something tangible.
- (Cathy) Have to be aware of which office is doing the design work for bigger firms, often a satellite office with not enough support. Need them to specify where the design is taking places/who is the design leader?
- (Elena) Project is advertised openly for application, will broaden outreach as well. Lot of firms have reached out independently on this project.
- (Kristine) Will follow up with more information, please let us know if you're interested in participating on the Slating Committee. It's going to be a complex, fun project!

Meeting adjourned at 11:15am.

The next meeting will be held in-person on Monday, October 21st, 2024.

*****The plan was later changed to have the October 21st meeting online rather than in-person*****