

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC
Monday, May 6th, 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
	Karisa Choi	Student Member	Voting
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.

Discussion

Impact of the War in Gaza: across the campus. Currently have a large Pro-Palestinian encampment in the quad, has been very peaceful and students are working with Provost and President's offices. Have had some less than peaceful issues, was a sleep-in at HUB that led to vandalism at the HUB and President's office. Have had an ongoing series of lectures/discussions happening at UW as well (course work).

Campus Landscape: Provost Tricia Servio has been in support of plan to not increase net footprint, 2050 Strategic Renewal Plan. Assessment tool to visually show over 25 years how the campus may change to inform annual capital planning. UW will be focused on renovations and tearing down/rebuilding antiquated buildings (renewal and removal). Difficult to measure impact of social feel, leveraging data is how we get to that answer, some subjectivity involved. Discussion of Campus Landscape Framework (2015) is still current, was a precursor to the Campus Master Plan. Is still basis of many things. Advisory council is not currently meeting. Can we review this document at an upcoming meeting?

Architectural value, spatial quality, academic and research value

- UW Club
 - Example of a building that won't score well
 - Building intellectual and social community
- Programs
 - Building envelope
 - Roofing
 - Lighting
 - Mechanical
- Power plan recapitalize, new, decarbonize

- Electrification & capacity
- Data & stormwater
- Campus Landscape Framework - 2015 - refresher on this at next meeting
 - More formal reference to this
 - Update the campus map
- Integrate the Landscape Advisory Committee into the UWAC
 - Social equity, belonging, etc.
 - How have teams addressed this in design?
 - Integrated into the capital plan guidelines

Approval of Past Minutes and Current Agenda

The February 5th, 2024 meeting minutes and current agenda were approved. Cathy Simon moved to approve; Andrea Leers seconded.

Haggett Hall

Progressing very smoothly, submitted 50% budget and are a bit over. Brick team has been put together. Great team, lots of solutions. CPL was structural Engineering, very collaborative. Lots of trades are doing annual inflation now, more difficult to budget for but still feeling on track. Abatement completed 2 weeks ago.

- Increased Labor - carpenters 5% annually for 3 years (other trades following)
- Completed abatement & started demolition - precast panels with asbestos mastic
- On schedule and on budget

Project snapshot:

25% design:	11/15/23
UWAC 2:	12/4/23
25% design pricing	
Abatement of Haggett Hall began:	11/02/23
Tower Demolition began:	1/15/24
UWAC 3:	5/6/24
Then 70% Design/GMP:	6/28/24
Demolition complete:	4/15/25
Mass Excavation begins:	4/15/25
Expected Building Completion:	April 2027

Project Snapshot: Design strategies

- 1) Residence hall that supports a student community
- 2) Facilities that support campus fitness and wellness
- 3) Site design, landscape design and sustainable construction that nurture an ethos of well-being

Massing Concept

- Floating boxes (smooth) over forest floor (texture)
- A building that looks back - "peeks" that peel away the smooth façade and provide an opportunity for alternative views

Project Update: Design evolution

Budget realignment: goals and outcomes

- Needed to reduce square footage. Structural engineers assisted in finding the space in a cost-effective way. Parking was reduced.
- Needed to reduce number of floors, used to have a mixture. They are all now Type IIIA to allow for an extra wood floor.

Making the building as space efficient as possible

Moved Back of House spaces below grade. RD apartments are moved to lowest level, making the perch interior space to connect both residential wings, expand primary terrace at portal and right size mid-level cardio terrace.

Significantly reduce cost of envelope: removed pleated brick base with textured and scored concrete block. Used larger econ sized brick for install savings, Simplified brickwork to produce more natural light.

Overview: East-West Section through Courtyard

Still have generous stair that comes through. Housing comes down to the courtyard level on the east wing.

Diagram of basement, level 1 and level 2 of Residential Communities. Consolidation of service functions/BOH.

Residential amenities: Terrace level 175', residential life office, open kitchen, lounge, bike hub, work station/lounge, meeting room → entered off the portal

Moving up, Level 185': gaming, laundry, music, animal care, meeting room, allergy kitchen

Diagram of view from Midslope path, connects to Little Canoe

Diagram of view from Willow dining, main entry and perch

Health, Fitness and Wellness: Terrace Level 175': sky space, reflection/awe space, care specialist, reception lobby, office, wellness rooms... across the portal/stairs we have work station/lounge and bike hub

Health Fitness and wellness: level 160', yoga/dance, cardio, terrace. Will focus into the courtyard.

Health Fitness and wellness: level 145', strength training, weights

Diagram: view of portal from Health/Fitness/Wellness

- View of HFW entry/Mount Tahoma.
- View of bike hub entry/towards Willow
- Prioritizing community function

Diagram: photos of HFW, including a garden

Site, Siting and Landscape: Rendered plan (diagram)

Bio frame Rendering of 50% design

- Retains grade beyond bioretention
- Frames and focuses view into forest clearing and bioretention zone
- Provides secondary path of circulation and smaller scale seating
- Not an inexpensive element
- Courtyard could just be flat but we want to feel it as a part of the landscape
- Structure has been revised to geosynthetic structure in place of concrete

Bio Frame Cladding

- Salvaged concrete panels (preferred) vs Stone Slabs, more refined version of existing rockery, more natural, could be split from rockery boulders, 6"-1' thickness

Forest seating: working with Anderson to salvage wood

Existing North Campus materials:

- Pedestrian paths: exposed aggregate concrete, crushed stone at base of rockeries

Proposed materials: had some budget issues

Façade details: detailing was simplified, reads well into adjacent buildings, should read as a residential building very clearly. Exterior:

- Cast in place concrete
- CMU scored block in charcoal lower levels
- Windsor Rusticated brick on upper levels—Norman Scale Brick
- Dark accent brick at windows

Next steps: Toward 70% GMP

Budget realignment: goals and outcomes

Site elements: Courtyard stair material characteristics, development, and detailing

- Bio frame pricing and detailing
- Site stair detailing to match courtyard stair

Comments:

- Want to hear more about the staircase, as we discussed it previously but didn't hear much this round. The staircase is a very central piece of the courtyard. Response: it will be structural, likely columns holding it up.
- Big change with the perch being enclosed, will create a lot more usage. 2 entries into complex (portal and perch).
- Amazing job, organic clarity. Cost-cutting decisions do not look ad hoc, replanning economies in the spirit and detail. Think the perch looks cooler as an enclosed space. Response: want to think about how we would want to live in this space, as designers. Wellness should be available right at the front door. Supporting that wellness for students is very important.
- Wellness space does a great job of being a private space but also welcoming. Need to continue that theme with furniture and signage. Putting mental health right at the front door sends an important message, some of the cues around signage and furniture is also important. Acoustic separation between active wellness and mental wellness.
- Concerned about the sound of the staircase leading into the wellness area. Response: doing best to incorporate the flow of the room but there will be some noise overlap.
- Requested additional understanding of where everything is from the courtyard view. The wellness pathway seems so stark compared to everything else from this view. Response: explanation of upcoming landscape conversation with UW Campus. Plan to use trellis to integrate it further.
- Missing more of the outdoor space now that the perch is enclosed. Response: only gets used in the summer and not the academic year but agree that the change is a little sad (but necessary).
- Student Commissioner Comments:
 - The main lounge is probably less activated than the more private living rooms on each level so I don't mind the perch being fully enclosed plus I think there's plenty of personal outdoor space.
 - I really appreciate the carved entries with the wood wrapping through both the exterior and interior.
 - Super excited to see the lit handrail on the stairs, safety is a big concern for students.

- I'd hope to see more wood, especially being intertwined with the forest, but I understand the cost savings
- I think the wellness sky space is successful, and the private reservable rooms.
- I wouldn't mind seeing the solar panels on the roof, I would just be proud that my building has them.

Anderson Hall

Construction June 2024-Dec 2025

Occupancy in January 2026

Project Discussion:

Have engaged landmark approvals, permit submissions, GMP

Prior Feedback:

- Consider creating visual connections from the north building entry to the new south building entry and review the entry sequence for building users who enter through the north building entry and how they might make their way to the south building entry. Important that there is a clear route to the new south entry from Steven's Way, and there is a sectional connection between the 2 entries.
- Consider activation around the historic north building entry to foreshadow activity in the SEFS Courtyard and present as a gateway.

Conceptual Framework:

- Analogy between old growth forests and new growth forests
- Historic spaces and renovated spaces:
 - Historic: Preservation and partial restoration
 - Renovated: preservation and partial restoration, new & complementary to historic, new, and differentiated.
 - Front side is collegiate gothic and the back is more modern

Historic character defining features:

- Orthogonal orientation aligned to Bloedel and Winkerwerder Halls
- Square concrete exposed aggravated pavement
- Wooden site furnishings aligned to courtyard grid
- Modern globe light fixtures (do not meet UW standard fixture or dark sky requirements)

Diagram: singular plan for restoration to the front, back side becomes more diverse and complex.

-Spatial experience in the 3 south side is more varied and flexible

Images of other similar buildings on campus with this updated renovation approach

Site plan/site concept

- Accessibility route, ADA focused. Across multiple larger buildings
- Universal accessibility
- Eliminated 2 ramps from previous design to create a more sweeping pathway
- South terrace is a larger, singular piece
- Working on how to transition the geometrics between

Materiality and Site Lighting:

Lighting considerations – exterior and site lighting to address code requirements and safety concerns

- dark sky compliant
- reduce the types of light poles used in this area of campus and utilize the UW light pole
- refurbish historic exterior light fixtures at north building entry
- where they plan to use stone, they will and ensure that it is integrated into the regenerative

landscape

Current site concept- planting

North Meadow: native meadow plants

Wet/East Woodland and forest floor: native and adapted forest understory

North understory foundation: replanting trees where we can, evergreen forest understory groundcovers and low shrubs that ground the building

Proposed trees: working with lead area gardener and campus arborist to decide

South entry context: used to have a south entry & arcade (1940-1950), removed as part of the 1970s construction

Diagram of Existing North Entry and Elevation

-Developing that rounded façade for south entry to announce itself

- Currently cannot see Anderson Hall well from the south courtyard, due to vegetation
- SEFS Commons as a gathering area
- Adding an inspiration wall to SEFS common, relating it to the forest club area with tree bark texture. Wood panel feature wall. Reviewing woods that are representative of the Pack forests.
- Originally the building had a lot of display cases. New content or more modern display case. Also a prime location for artwork.

North entry:

- Want to ensure that the innovation from the south end is brought through the building to the north side. Window to the SEFS courtyard, with seating to allow for viewing.

Forest Club Room:

- Mostly used for students to work in space, some presentations and events occurring. Staircase to the right of the room leading up to Mezzanine, currently restricted due to lack of safety. Mezzanine is an unusable space, potentially looking at removing it.
- Changing furniture to be more mobile and including some lounge areas.
- Painting the wood paneling.
- Still working through light approach to room. Looking at custom fabricator so that it looks more in line with the history. Historic light fixture at entry as a basis, original lighting is too dense.

Next steps:

- Further development of site planning and details
- Development of other interior historic spaces (auditorium and stairs)
 - Lighting
- Development of other public spaces (SEFS commons)
- Further discussions with DON (Department of Neighborhoods)

Discussion:

- Is the meadow part of the Campus Landscape Framework plan - isolated here, does it make sense? Much of the landscape along Stevens Way is woodland in feel but we don't have trees here.

- The drive along Stevens Way, unless there's a comprehensive approach with other buildings and arbor care it feels a bit disjointed. Response: Stevens Way doesn't have much lawn, meadow should tuck in nicely. Haven't determined exactly what meadow will be. Considering lighting as well.
- Very engaging presentation, this is a hard project.
- Concerned about recessed lighting that might shine into eyes with the proposed south entry. South entrance - tend to lean toward the 2nd option in diagram, the violation of the horizontal band but really want to understanding the lighting so it doesn't glare at you as you enter.
- North entry, might be letting the program get in the way. Doesn't feel wonderful on the interior yet. Response: some programming and politics. Need more feedback from students within Anderson.
- Crux of the issue is the connection of the north entry to the south entry - finding your way down is important - clear away everything that is not the elevator and provide some open to below space. No program in here until we figure out how to connect the north entry to the south.
- Student Commissioner: South entry, would like to see some dappled light because that's what the students are used to. Can there be a pergola or something similar added? Response: may be an issue with cost but that has come up.
- Transition of tree canopy: we hear about what types but not where. Can we bring some of them to the south side? Response: several of the larger trees will be preserved. Newer ones are indicated on Planting graphic with little yellow circles. 10' away from south entry, not closer. Narrow planting bands.
- Enjoy how the ceilings pop up and visual continues throughout space. Still concerned about how they connect. Response: still working on this. Programmatic limitations.
- Two big beautiful spaces but the rest of the building feels mean. Agree with taking out the Mezzanine. Connectivity between north and south and adding volume to the south entry is going to be critical. Create a two-story commons.
- The building has some beautiful gracious spaces, but the rest of the building is somewhat mean in the generosity of space.
- Lighting in the forest room - the right fixture may be something you want to look at but you could also consider indirect uplighting that is not seen. Splitting the job may be the right answer. Consider additional forms of indirect lighting, multiple systems.

UH4: Laurel Village Concept Review

Refresh of constructive guidance as paraphrased from UWAC Discussion in February meeting:
 Better integrate the entry conditions of all buildings into the concept of an interior street
 Interior street

Updated Site Plan:

- Building A has been redesigned into a bar shape instead of an L-shape
- Building A's new shape and orientation also avoids a liquefaction-prone area in the NW portion of the site
- Building A has been rotated to provide more space between Buildings A & B
- Both buildings incorporate façade articulation in the form of deep bays along the Village Street and Gateway
- Cottages/town houses with sloped roofs and garden entries, smaller scale and texture
- Massing of building B with bays that are more in the scale of the cottages/town homes

Nature:

- Site is lucky to be so nature adjacent with the Union Bay Natural Area
- SOEST garden herbaceous display garden

- Village connections: lots of cross connections into nearby areas
- Gathering spaces: variety and appeal to multiple groups
- Daycare/Play: daycare playground, community play areas
- Water: taking advantage of the larger site, expressive with stormwater, holistic approach from the roofs to the building face to the landscape as a grounding element
- Landscape Typologies that speak to language and character of the site
- Gathering, Lawn, Play, Loop, Garden walk, Forest edge
- Planting typologies
- Forest edge, lawn, garden, stormwater, trails, site boundary,
- All this creates the updated landscape plan

Village Green/Village Street, as seen from Building A (graphic) to demonstrate how large these spaces are

- Centralized gathering space, creates a strong nexus at center of site. Benefits from morning/early daylight
- Important to be thoughtful about lighting as place making.
- Building B Lobby adjacent to village green. Residents will share amenities.
- Building C typologies at eastern portion of site. 2 types: the broken barn and the pair of pitched roofs. 2-3 bedrooms.
- Pulling the garden toward the streetscape (diagram)
- Sloped site that provides connections without having lots of switchbacks and rails.
- Natural tones

Urban Street from NE Clark Road

- Strong connection from 45th to Clark Road, priority in UW Master Plan
- Plaza at building A lobby, will have primary leasing and mail function (western edge)
- North side of urban street will cater to pedestrians
- Building B focuses on amenities, creating something nice for study spaces to look out onto
- Childcare façade at Mary Gates Memorial Drive, looked at multiple locations with traffic consultants and civil engineers because of pick/drop off times as well as limiting the vehicular access to the village street.
 - Want it to be fun but work within design language
 - Material pallet working with warm, natural tones

Diagram of overall material palette, building by building

Building B: brick, driftwood woodgrain, metal panel with varied pattern- champagne “party wall”, warm grays

Building A: walnut palette, warm grays

Building C: light wood plank, dark wood plank, warm grays

Landscape & Planting Typologies

- Urban Street & Village Street
- Community open lawn
- Garden walk along village street
- Forest
- Stormwater

Discussion:

- Where are the stoops? Wanted to see entries from the streets, could’ve had stoops. Feels like a suburban development adjacent to UW. Response: Generally in the townhouse area, chose to treat

them more as patios. Have a little handrail, activation without the physical access of the stoop. Made more sense with the grade relationship.

- Is parking mandated by the number of units? Response: no, trying to support the specific group of families. Dropped from 212 to 181 between UWAC meetings, .5 parking ratio. Also a major bus line. There are more/enough parking spaces along C building. A lot due to zoning.
- Have we achieved a net gain for the pedestrian experience? This feels like a suburban development, The buildings are floating in space with cars at the front doors.
- What determined the angles of the C Building? Response: Trying to define the street walls and working with the landscape constraints. Wanted to build in enough room for circulation, more usable space in front of buildings.
- Like the idea of Building A as a bar, think that was smart. Like the through lobby in Building B.
- Also feels like there are one urban street and one suburban street. Has made it unusually widely made street. Wants to make those 2 sides more different. Is there an alternative to the 2 sides: the same one with more greenery or one with more parking? Response: Took a lot to process last comments about this, landed on more standardized version rather than intentional asymmetry.
- Likes Buildings A & B, just concerned about C. Wants clarity, hard to understand topography and that must be very challenging with the grade issues. C building location could be more rigorous (Salt Lake "The Avenues"). Embrace asymmetry, large line of trees, buffer between buildings and street.
- Concerns about Building A, would like to see an A-bend, wants to ensure there's enough natural lighting through there. See the plane change but wants to see it but more intense. Response: utilized space on the corner as the building shapes change. But we could look at the drawing you (Edwin) made.
- Magic will be in the resolution of the street and landscape. Design this as more episodic rather than a row of trees. Incorporate easter edge of building, placement of the building, and asymmetric street. Another open space at the south end of the site to reward you.
- Difference of opinion on the shared staircase entrance.
- Wonderful collection of perspectives provided, so we can see how the buildings are set there and how the topography issues are being addressed. Beautiful space at the urban corner, can we create another at the south end as a reward of beautiful landscape.
- Enjoys the materiality and the roofing of the C Building. Doesn't mind shared staircase, not a huge fan of ground flooring with a second entry because of safety concerns
- Student Commissioner: Likes shed roof best for cottages/town houses, should have lots of variety with materiality.

UH4: Blakeley Concept Review

Programmatic Goals:

- Affordable
- Maximize allowable area of 460k square ft

Design Goals:

- An energetic undergraduate living experience, set within a natural urban oasis

Concept of 3 Slices:

- Bounded by Burke-Gilman, the Agora through the center of the site and the forest
- Southern border of parking garage, want to maintain that and enhance it.
- Lush trail, urban energy and quiet forest

Design Advancement, where we were and where we are:

- 4 buildings along central spine, reoriented entry and adjusted spine

- Not entering from 30th avenue, embracing the trail
- Centralizing key spaces
 - Ground floor common room for each building
 - Second and Third Floor Communities
 - Vertical slices, open interior spaces to outside, peekaboo views
- Programming the Central Spine with key spaces, community spaces and circulation
- Light and shadow updates from last conversation:
 - Trying to be more thoughtful about opening up space and maintain bits of mystery as you walk through
 - Tall buildings cast shadows but it allows for other spaces on site to be opened up
 - Southern facing walls receive significant amount of light
- Site Design: existing landform, dropping 20-30 feet on north. Dropping 65' to 29' at its biggest drop in slope across property but none of it is level. Important to engage topography to integrate into neighborhood surrounding streets and trail.
- Landscape Hierarchy diagram, categorized by forest, plaza, forest courtyard, hill climb
 - Maintain investment in surrounding areas, especially the trees.
- Continuation through Nordheim Court with established pedestrian way

Colors & Materials

- Simplify: along the trail and forest, we let the landscape shine and the building recede, strengthening the contrast with what lies beyond
- Dynamic: simple materials, heterogenous colors that accentuate movement and change along the length of the Agora.
- Punctuate: to add connectivity to the ground level common spaces and the ground plan, simple colors and timeless materials
 - References: connected project, Nordheim Court has strong coloration, old mural across the trail from Blakeley Village. Overall sense of trail side is being kept simple with brighter colors within the community. Blues and warm yellows.

Experiencing the site:

- Arrival: transparency hint of what is happening within housing area, very clean with an additional path parallel to Burke-Gilman
- Entry: Strong urban influence, game den at same level of trail "see but don't touch" feel for those walking through.

Hill Climb

- Diagrams for the various areas
- Accommodating pedestrians and cyclists, high vertical change. Combination of stairs and landings, ramps that have built in landings for gatherings.
- Storm water planters, benches to hangout and transition of colors
- Arriving to plaza spaces, trying to activate them in the center and around the edges. Outdoor ping pong, pop-ups, a space that is adaptable for various activities.
- Move in day and fire access will be only time there are vehicles within the space.

Courtyard

- Multiuse space. Distinct outdoor room, to compliment indoor amenities
- Creative use of stepping down, occasional stair used to move the grass down

Forest

- Understanding the understory to meet those functional leads around the perimeter
- Special moments of open space juxtaposed to creative, pseudo retail spaces

Discussion:

- The bends and progression through the site seems to work. Let the site push the buildings.
 - Concern about the same materiality in a bunch of different colors (metal panel upper levels), like an Italian street, you let the site dictate the building and activation. Still going to be difficult but your solutions are economical.
- Gradation of the façade may work. Think about this in section too with more saturation at the base and lighter at the tops. Color scheme is fairly subtle, could be more saturated. You want to know there's a difference but don't want to be clubbed over the head with it.
- Massing has improved since last presentation.
- What about vehicle delivery? Response: Showed maintenance path. Delivery vehicles went bottom out but it's going to be a steep grade.
- Massing looks a lot better than it did in previous design. Small shift in floor plan, would help animate elevations. Gradient is a nice idea, have you thought about it in sections? More saturated at the base, gets lighter as you move up. Response: large formal landscape design elements are locked in.
- Not sure we love the Nordheim approach to color but like the approach to muted colors. Response: Yes, have been playing with that. Have gone super saturated to losing the color and trying to find something in the middle.
- Elevations of the buildings - are they finalized at this point? They seem relentless and could benefit from some small shifts in planes.
- Crammed dorms, how do they approach other amenities? All common on first 2 floors? Response: Each unit functions as an apartment: studio to 4 bedroom, function like apartment, have kitchens, in-unit laundry and bathrooms.
- Trying to understand identity of location. Feels disconnected from city, can't see it from public view. Internal street changes from very urban to forested. Don't recognize the internal street. Where does my Uber drop me off? Want more of an entry than what we have. Design opportunity to create a welcoming feel at one end or the other. Feels hidden and mysterious, concerned about public presence. Response: Not enough space in those access areas (30th Ave NE is beautiful and scary). Have created a transit lounge to assist with things like food delivery, pick up and drop offs. Why does it need a public presence?
- Don't love metal façade material.

End Discussion

- Anderson Hall – being a bit tentative with the programming, we want to see architects push back to make the building what it needs to be now and in the future.
 - South Entry further discussion about pushing it out and coming with bold ideas
- UH4:
 - Laurel – Edwin's suggestion about getting more light into it was great. Still want to see more. Seemed to be fascinated with the geometry.
 - Don't want to accept it for what it is because it can be better
 - Massing today is where it should have been last round
 - Important to provide positive feedback too
 - Blakely – could easily feel sterile and cold in what they're trying to make into an exciting area
 - Swapped architects
 - If UWAC is not involved in choosing the architect, all we are able to provide very specific feedback to the individual issues. It's the risk that is run.
 - UH4 is paying for Haggett Hall, might be easiest to think about it that way.

- General concern about architect being selected and whether they should come from an approved list. Sound Transit has a rotation, perhaps UWAC should approach it more like that? For the smaller renovations and renewals. Opposite of a fresh selection.
- Alternatively, if IRP is written to the site and their priorities. Then we know that they have to hit these points in their selection.
- Another option P3 projects, maybe we need to be doing feasibility studies. UWAC reviewing the studies to call out the important characteristics of each site. Want UWAC to be involved earlier in the process.

Commission Members:

- Cathy Simon and Andrea Leers, leaving the Commission to bring some new members and vision.
- Would like to have all, including new Commissioners, here for the in-person October meeting.
 - Farewell to include mapping out projects that each retiring Commissioner has been apart of on UW campus
- Linda Jewell also needs to make 2024 her last year.
- Balance with understanding that Commissioner continuity is important
 - Ex. Edwin feels like he just now understands the breadth of the campus in context, after 3 years on UWAC.
- Also want to bring the Landscape Commission brought into this group.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15PM

The next meeting will be held online on Monday, August 12th, 2024.