UW Architectural Commission

Minutes of Meeting
March 30, 2015
University of Washington Club
Lake Washington Room

Architectural Commission

Present			
☑	John Schaufelberger, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Richard Christie, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering	Voting
☑	Linda Jewell	Partner, Freeman & Jewell; Professor, Landscape Architecture, UC Berkeley	Voting
☑	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Weinzapfel Associates	Voting
☑	Cathy Simon	Design Principal, Perkins+Will	Voting
☑	John Syvertsen	Senior Principal, Cannon Design	Voting
☐	Tanya Trongtham	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Rebecca Barnes	University Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Robert Stickney	Interim Associate Vice President, Capital Projects Office	Ex Officio
☑	Charles Kennedy	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services	Ex Officio
☑	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☐	John Seidelmann	Director, Capital Planning, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☐	Paul Jenny	Senior Vice President for Planning & Management	Ex Officio

Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. The Commissioners and Committee members unanimously approved the meeting agenda, the minutes of the December 15, 2014 quarterly meeting, and the February 19, 2015 special session, as submitted. Dean Schaufelberger introduced Robert Stickney, Interim Associate Vice President for Capital Projects. Kristine Kenney provided a detailed report of March 26, 2015 University Landscape Advisory Committee. (See minutes of meeting: http://pm.uw.edu/oua/landscape-advisory-committee-meeting-march-26-2015)

Burke Gilman Trail
Requested Action: Phase 1 Update
Mauricio Villarreal, Place Studio, LLC
Puja Shaw, KPFF

Overview:

This project will develop design and construction documents for the entire length of the University-owned portion of the Burke Gilman Trail Corridor based upon the Burke Gilman Trail Corridor Concept Plan by PLACE Studio, dated November 2012, with intersection components at Pend Oreille Road NE based upon the Pend Oreille Entry Improvement Study by Swift Company dated July 2011 and the value engineered (VE) redesigned trail by PLACE Studio, dated September 24, 2014. Design and construction documents will be developed consistent with Federal Highway Administration standards, as appropriate.

It is anticipated that construction will be accomplished in phases, as funding allows. The redesign of both phases and construction of Phase I is funded, and construction of Phase II is pending funding. Initial estimates indicate a total project cost of $33.8M, though Phase II construction estimates will be reevaluated during the redesign of Phase II.

Currently, the University of Washington Transportation Services Office has received $3.0M funding from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) to be combined with local sources to support the design of the entire University owned BGTC and construction of Phase I Campus Reach, which will improve the BGTC from a point just west of Rainier Vista to the east side of the 15th Avenue NE.

The construction of Phase I, September 2013 - August 2014, was delayed to August 2015 – March 2016 due to several factors:

- The bids received were approximately 70% over budget and were rejected, which necessitated value engineering and re-design.
- Proposed design to move the trail further south from the $161M Life Sciences Building project delayed completion of the value engineering.

DRAFT

The scope of work of Phase II will be construction of the remainder of the trail, excluding the Campus Reach (Phase 1) and the Rainier Vista/Montlake Triangle section (constructed in 2013 – 2015) and will improve the corridor in a similar manner as Phase 1. In addition, an underpass at Pend Oreille Road will provide a grade separation between the BGTC and vehicular traffic on Pend Oreille.

Project Budget:

Overall Budget	$11,370,000

Schedule:

Predesign (Concept Plan)	December 2011 - November 2012
Consultant Selection	November 2012 - December 2012
Design - Phase 1	January 2013 - April 2014
Design - Remaining Phases	January 2013 - September 2014
Redesign - Phase I	January 2015 – May 2015
Redesign – Phase II Remaining Phases	April 2015 - December 2015
Construction - Phase I	August 2015 - February 2016
Construction – Phase II	TBD

The schedule for future construction phases is dependent upon available funding.

Comments:

- The exposed aggregate pavement that serves as a warning of the approach to the mixing zones, particularly at the zone at Hitchcock Hall, seems too small for safety, and should be the same width on both mode lanes.
- The bus plaza at the base of the stair at the Lewis Lane bridge has become far too mean and ungracious to accommodate waiting and debarking bus riders on Pacific Street. Consider expanding the landing and adding a shelter or benches.
- Taking the idea of the vine plantings at the bottom of the Hitchcock retaining wall further to create a green wall would act as a graffiti deterrent. The textured wall will make removal of graffiti difficult.
- A compromise design might be evolved which doesn't provide an underpass at the bridge, but allows the landscape to flow through. The potential may exist to separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic to keep the bridge intact or to push the wall back and provide a cantilevered overhang.
- Design of the stepped top edge of the guard rail should be carefully considered so that it does not prove a liability issue.
- Despite the editing process, and without comparison to the earlier iterations, the value engineered design simplifies some aspects of the design in a positive manner and it remains a viable and safe bike trail solution.
- Improvements north of the trail could still be made, if funding were to become available at a future date. The plaza with bike shelters and enclosures should be designed, as per the original plan.
- The Life Sciences Building has crowded the Trail significantly and will be very prominent along Pacific Street. Five feet is not enough clearance between the walking path and the building.
- The design of the trail and mixing zone at Life Sciences Building will have to be more fully coordinated with the design of the building and plaza.
- Money is being spent to create a permanently negative condition comprising the proximity of the Life Sciences greenhouses, the underpass at Lewis Lane, and the slope to Pacific Street.

West Campus Utility Plant

Requested Action: Design Development Approval
John Palewicz, Director, Strategic Programs, CPO
Steve Harrison, Project Manager, CPO
Rob Warnaca, Mortenson
Scott Wolf, Miller Hull
Peter Alspach, Arup
Jennifer Guthrie, GGN

Overview:

The West Campus Utility Plant (West CUP) will provide chilled water (CW) and emergency power to portions of south and west campus. The building site is adjacent to the University's West Receiving Station (electrical substation) and fronts University Way near Pacific Street just north of the Burke-Gilman Trail. Phase 1 (this project) will include construction of the plant building sized to accommodate both initial and future equipment, installation of chillers, gensets and related equipment required to serve "Day 1" loads, and improvements to chilled water and emergency power distribution systems. The new plant will be an unmanned industrial quality facility designed for very high reliability and long service life.

The West CUP is envisioned to be an architecturally significant building, given its prominent location within west campus. Careful attention is being given to ensuring that the design fits contextually with the surrounding community and is representative of its importance as a gateway building at the southwest approach to the campus. The design will incorporate an interpretive element that will enable access by students and the public to gain an understanding of the University's commitment to the environment and energy conservation.

The project is being delivered through the progressive design-build method. The design-build team was selected largely based on qualifications. A collaborative design process is currently being conducted under a Preliminary Agreement, with a more traditional design-build contract to follow in May 2015. Final scope and other terms of the second (design build) contract will be negotiated with the design-builder in May, when all elements of the project (including the engineering/equipment details) are expected to be at the Design Development stage and vetted by the UW and the Design/Build team.

Design-related issues include:

- The design must satisfy the plant's functional purpose of producing and delivering chilled water and emergency power, while achieving an architectural expression appropriate for the site, within the available budget.
- The combination of site constraints and equipment dimensions influence both maximum utility capacities and massing alternatives.
- Sound attenuation and aesthetic considerations call for a screen surrounding equipment installed on the roof. Due to its scale, the articulation of this screen wall becomes a predominant architectural opportunity for the project.
- The plant must be in service in February 2017.
- The interpretive element must be thoughtfully executed.

Budget:

Project Budget:	$36.2 million*
Design & Construction Budget:	$30 million*

Schedule:

Construction Start:	June 2015
In Service:	February 2017

*Budgets include both the new plant and related distribution-system improvements.

Comments:

- The simplicity of the design was lauded, with the preferred option being the "glowing box," with projection on the ground floor.
- Ground floor projection will require a real commitment on the part of the University to be responsible for curating and maintaining content. The Office of Sustainability has expressed an interest in undertaking this responsibility, which creates a creative opportunity to work with students and faculty to celebrate the University's commitment to sustainability.
- The choice of colors in the building materials, lighting, equipment, and plantings, to metaphorically suggest heat and cold was seen as especially interesting.
- The polycarbonate screen material was preferred, if the acoustical properties prove sufficient to meet code.
- Study daytime and nighttime effects of the screening material and lighting.
- As there is no need to call attention to the northwest corner of the building, and there will be very little equipment near the windows in Phase I, the entire façade should be considered the interpretive element, using projected information or landscape inspired patterning of the glazing to create engagement.
- The opportunity exists to create a unity along the block by echoing the palette of the adjacent University Police Department building in the concrete base of the plant.
- Consider whether the ground floor requires more transparency, to promote the "window into the process," or whether it needs to be transparent at all, and serves as a background for the projected presentation of the processes within.
- The building itself must not be seen to contradict its image; the lighting might operate on a sustainable source, such as solar. The lighting can be seen to serve a security purpose for the building and alley.
- If the polycarbonate cladding is found not to be acoustically appropriate or chemically resistant to the cooling tower plume, a special session of the Commission may be necessary to consider other alternatives.

Action:

A motion was tendered and seconded to approve design development approval. The motion carried unanimously.

The New Burke Museum

Requested Action: Design Development Approval

DRAFT

John Lebo, Director, Major Projects, CPO
Curtis Bain, Project Manager, CPO
Tom Kundig, Stephen Yamada-Heidner, Edward LaLonde, Olson Kundig Architects
Rebecca Fuchs, GGN

Overview:

The New Burke Museum will be an architecturally noteworthy facility that reflects the museum's core institutional values of sustainability, excellence, respect, stewardship, creativity, and community engagement; makes the collections and research accessible and engaging; integrates a cross-disciplinary approach to achieving the museum's vision; and facilitates meaningful visitor engagement with exhibitions, on-site programs, public amenities, and outreach services. The project will also address issues of long-term flexibility in the design of galleries and public spaces and will implement sustainable design practices to achieve a facility that functions efficiently and can be maintained with limited resources.

The building is planned to be approximately 110,000 GSF. The building site is west of the existing Burke Museum along 15th Ave NE. The proposed site plan will permit construction of a future building on the site of the current museum.

Since the September 2014 UWAC meeting, the design team has advanced the design, including:

- Multiple cost reduction efforts to maximize the value of the building design within the project budget.
- Refining and simplifying the Burke Yard concept.
- Confirming the 43rd Street pedestrian corridor as existing to remain at current grade, and adjusting the vehicular entry to the Burke Yard and pedestrian entry to 43rd Street at 15th Ave NE accordingly.
- Selecting Kebony as the primary cladding material.

Project Budget:	
Total Project (forecast)	$75,000,000
Schedule:	
Design	December 2012 to October 2015
Construction	December 2015 to August 2017

Comments:

- The rate of coloration of the wood material will vary with solar gain and lapping; on-site testing of a mock up over a year would give a better idea of actual weathering.
- Given the Museum's prominence on the corner of campus, there was concern that during the weathering process, the wood might give the impression that it needs maintenance. Research into other installations may be needed to determine the materials acceptability. The Burke is willing and able to tell the story of the building and explain its thoughtful design.
- The angle of the parapet, as long as it's sufficient to screen the roof-top mechanical, need not be tied directly to the slope of 15th Ave NE.
- The previous design, with open glazed corners, was more welcoming and inviting than the current design with signage at the upper corners, which conveys less the sense that the building section is a three-dimensional experience and more that it is one floor stacked atop the other. The building must serve as a visible beacon to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic up 15th Ave NE and NE 43rd Street, and the open corners creating that impression.
- The courtyard is an amazing space, which will be used for gatherings, festivals and other uses aside from parking, and which would be made much nicer with a paving other than asphalt. It must be differentiated from the local suburban mall parking lot.
- Visual clues will be important to indicate that the sidewalk is the most direct path to the entry of the museum from the southwest corner of the site, to keep pedestrian traffic off the driveway.

Action:

A motion was tendered and seconded that design development be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Mackenzie Hall Replacement Feasibility Study
Requested Action: Information
Bob Puzauskie, Sr. Planner, OUA
Mark Reddington, LMN Architects

Overview:

DRAFT

The Mackenzie Hall Replacement Feasibility Study considers not only the remaining programmable needs of the Foster School of Business but also the potential of its Mackenzie Hall site. The process included a review of Foster's needs, an analysis of site conditions present and future, and a series of workshops with stakeholders. The team of LMN and OLIN identified criteria for evaluating siting, phasing and other potential options. It demonstrated alternative scenarios, evaluated these options and made recommendations regarding a preferred building program and site development. The resulting study includes not only scenarios involving the Foster School's anticipated needs, but also the potential for a maximum build-out of the site, likely to occur in at least two phases: the first of which addresses the Foster the building program for replacing Mackenzie, the second of which will complete the site's build-out at some later date. It includes the protection and enhancement of iconic landscapes around the site, future scenarios assuming new populations around the site, use of existing artwork (currently in the Mackenzie Hall courtyard) and improved accessibility strategies throughout. After creating several phased scenarios, the team focused on a preferred scheme to illustrate for potential donors.

The Study exists because the Michael G. Foster School of Business, long recognized as one of the top business schools in the nation, wants to be the best public school in the nation. The school's current vision of building upon a legacy of entrepreneurial innovation, strategic research and business leadership, began in 2008, when it broke ground on new, state-of-the-art facilities. Paccar Hall, the first building of the new complex, opened in 2010 and added more than 125,000 square feet to the school. It allowed unparalleled collaboration among student teams, faculty members and business leaders, as did the second new building, Dempsey Hall, opened in the summer of 2012. Dempsey Hall houses the Dean's Office, both Graduate and Undergraduate Program offices, Career Center suites for graduate and undergraduate students, and the Arthur W. Buerk Center for Entrepreneurship. The transformation improved recruitment of students and faculty across programs markedly but did not completely satisfy Foster School's needs, at least those defined in its 2001 needs assessment study. Phase I and II of the Foster School's construction left Mackenzie Hall as a "footprint for future Business School growth." The Foster School today actually has fewer classrooms than were available before Dempsey Hall replaced Balmer Hall, though the new classrooms are larger on average than its predecessors.

Mackenzie Hall, designed by Decker & Christenson and Paul Hayden Kirk and completed in 1960, is 43,000 GSF in three stories and ringing an interior courtyard, featuring a bronze fountain, originally shown at the Seattle World's Fair of 1962, by George Tsutakawa, noted sculptor and faculty member. With the move of many Business School administration and faculty offices to the School's new facilities, Mackenzie now houses the Foster School's Consulting & Business Development Center, the School's Global Business Center, the Center for Leadership and Strategic Thinking, the Foster School Advancement and Alumni teams and the Minority Business Hall of Fame. Mackenzie faces extensive structural issues, upkeep costs, and seismic stress cracks, while providing less-than optimal office space and no classrooms. Mackenzie needs a roof replacement, window, replacement of vinyl composition tiles with asbestos adhesive, and an elevator upgrade to current standards; other findings could add much more significant costs to maintaining this 40,000 square foot office space.

The Foster School needs assume the following: the addition of 50-100 freshmen each year, growing the undergraduate program by 200-400 students and requiring several (2-4) additional classrooms in addition to the 28 available in PACCAR and Dempsey Halls. An additional lecture hall (seating 250) is needed, as is a communal/lobby space for receptions and pre-function events. The Mackenzie Replacement Building will rehouse the following programs: Consulting and Business Development Center, Global Business Center and Center for Leadership and Strategic Thinking. The Buerk Center for Entrepreneurship and its innovation lab in Dempsey Hall are already beyond capacity and will require space in the new facility. The Sales Program in PACCAR Hall will be relocated to leverage shared collaboration space. A new sales and marketing strategy research center, a business communications center and distance learning studio will expand academic programs and career services. While the number of team rooms grew from three to thirty with the additions of PACCAR and Dempsey, demands of more than 2,500 students continues to exceed supply for projects and studying. Twenty additional team rooms could be filled easily. A designated lounge space for Master of Accounting students will be added, as will an additional computer lab. Office space for the PhD program (80-100 candidates each year), Advancement (including Philanthropy, Alumni Engagement, Corporate Relations and MarCom), Registered Student Organizations and doctoral students would be housed here: 100 offices overall. These offices will require shared conference rooms.

With this study the Foster School will continue moving forward, capitalizing not only on its recent, successful building program but also on Mackenzie Hall's unparalleled location. Its site plays a pivotal role on the University of Washington's campus. Mackenzie Hall fronts on both historic Denny Yard (the UW Campus's original green) and arterial Stevens Way. It also fronts two crucial pedestrian paths, Klickitat Lane to the north and Chelan Lane to the south. Klickitat, a well-used existing pedestrian thoroughfare for students arriving from the north, will soon rivaled by Chelan, with the completion of the North Campus Housing Project to the east, adding 2000 student-beds, by 2020. The Foster School would like to use the Mackenzie Hall site, with a maximum height of 105 feet and listed for Academic use in the 2003 UW Campus Master Plan, to satisfy its unmet needs from 2004 and develop learning spaces to serve world-class business education in the future. In addition to greater efficiency in utilizing limited campus real estate and razing an outdated, unattractive and potential unsafe structure, the Foster School envisions new learning and collaboration spaces that deliver unsurpassed experiential learning and growth opportunities, along with the flexibility to support program priorities for decades to come. The Study not only includes the Foster School's vision but also the potential vision for a future, full build-out of the site.

DRAFT

Comments:

- The Commission applauded a thoughtful and useful study.
- Shadow studies to determine the amount of sunlight received by the courtyard will be necessary as the project proceeds through predesign.
- Section plans would be useful in understanding the new building's relation to Paccar Hall and the Art Building.
- A narrower, taller massing on Denny Yard would feel less enclosing.
- The special event spaces might be better located on the top floor, giving opportunities for views and terraces.

Commissioner Cathy Simon recused herself at this point, to avoid possible conflict of interest during the last two presentations by Perkins+Will, of which she is a principal.

South Campus Study Phase II
Requested Action: Scenario Development Information
Lyndsey Cameron, Principal Architectural Associate
Brodie Bain, Jaclynn Treat, Perkins+Will
Rachel Gleason, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates

Overview:

The South Campus Study II (SCSII) will build on past planning, and integrate and respond to other recently completed and ongoing campus project and planning initiatives, exploring options for modernization, expansion and future development to achieve the shared and individual goals of the Health Science schools and others in this vicinity. It will advance recent planning to the next level of detail regarding phasing, shared facilities and amenities, site capacity, and connectivity internally and within the broader campus context. It will accomplish this through a space and program assessment and the development of a set of underlying principles and guidelines that will guide the creation of several strategic scenarios for growth and development of the south campus. Development principles will embody sustainable best practices, and explore physical variables such as height, land use, density, massing, phasing, circulation, infrastructure, built character and the creation of memorable open spaces and landscape features. Funded by the School of Public Health (SPH) and the Office of the University Architect, the resultant framework will be a road map that defines a phased, flexible and strategic vision for growth and expansion south of Pacific for the next twenty years.

A preliminary concept plan for South Campus, known as the Health Sciences Precinct Plan, was developed during 2012 with participation of the Health Science Board of Deans. This study speculated what might be possible in terms of density, place-making and improvements in the quality of the south campus environment and connections to the shoreline and Central Campus. Focusing on the long term vision, however, the work was not informed by comprehensive assessments of space needs or the detailed analysis required to identify phasing of near term needs while moving toward the long term vision. Specific near-term projects and costs, required to plan for funding and identify priorities, were not included, either.

Over a six-month period, the consultant will provide a fact-based understanding of the dynamic planning and programming needs, opportunities and strategies for the South Campus area, specifically the Health Science Schools (HSS) of Dentistry, Nursing, Medicine, Public Health, Pharmacy, Social Work and the Health Sciences Administration as well as the Colleges of Engineering, and the Environment and Arts and Sciences. As a result of analysis of several combinations of right-sizing, growth, growth-in-place, and physical expansion, the study will provide realistic scenarios for the UW and the HSS to consider, recognizing constraints on the limited availability of land, space and financial resources in relation to programmatic growth needs and other campus goals.

Comments:

- All three scenarios are quite dense, perhaps begging the question is such density necessary; and if it is, indeed, necessary, for a contiguous relationship between elements of Health Sciences professional education, would it be better placed in West Campus, leaving a more gracious access to the waterfront?
- Big-picture questions must be examined and decisions made as to the future build out and density increases, over 25 – 50 years, of West Campus, South Campus and East Campus.
- Would the first phases of any of the scenarios, or a hybrid thereof, address current issues of Health Sciences faculty and student recruitment and retention?
- A north-south oriented scheme will feel less like a barrier to the waterfront than a scheme in which the buildings are aligned east-west.
- Phasing and feasibility should be presented to the Commission at the June meeting for further discussion.

DRAFT

Life Sciences Building
Requested Action: Schematic Design Information
John Lebo, Director, Major Projects, CPO
Troy Stahlecker, Project Manager, CPO
Doug Streeter, Andy Clinch, Perkins+Will
Jennifer Guthrie, GGN

Overview:

The College of Arts and Sciences Life Sciences Building (LSB) project is a five story above grade building, plus a mechanical penthouse, with two stories below grade. The site encompasses the existing greenhouses and landscaped area located on the east side of Kincaid Hall. The existing greenhouse and associated buildings will be demolished and an approximately 167,700 gross square foot LSB will replace the existing greenhouse site with a 20,000 gross square foot greenhouse positioned south and east of the LSB. Both the LSB and Greenhouse are positioned on the site to optimize with the building program and minimize the impact to significant Deodar cedars along Stevens Way and trees in the woodland grove to the east.

The first floor will have an active open entry to the building, at grade with Stevens Way, and will include four research/teaching laboratories. The greenhouse and loading dock will be at grade with the Burke Gilman Trail (designated as the basement 1 level). The upper four floors are modular in design consisting of 10 research labs per floor with procedural program on the north side, laboratories in the center, and offices along the south bay. The basement 1 and basement 2 levels house growth chambers, animal housing and research facilities. The greenhouse program is integrated into the LSB and consists of research, teaching and collections.

The new LSB, together with a new, larger greenhouse offers the Department of Biology and its faculty the opportunity to expand its faculty size and take a truly integrated approach to Biology in a highly collaborative atmosphere by bringing together faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and undergraduates with overlapping research interests.

Project Budget

Life Sciences Building	$160,500,000

Schedule

Predesign	June 2014 – October 2014
Design	January 2015- June 2016
Construction	July 2016 – June 2018
Occupancy	July 2018 – September 2018

Comments:

- The modulation of the building massing, routing ADA access through the building to avoiding a switchback ramp, and the development of the passage between the Life Sciences Building and Kincaid Hall, were all seen as a very positive moves.
- Coordination between the Life Sciences Building and the Burke Gilman Trail design teams has become very important, as present designs vary significantly.
- The Lewis Lane passage, as shown, is very narrow, but the potential exists for a generous gesture adjacent to the Burke Gilman Trail.
- Sightlines between Stevens Way and the Burke Gilman Trail should be carefully considered, so that the access between the two evident.
- Scheme 1, “Campus Wildlife Corridor,” was preferred to Scheme 2, “The Watering Hole,” however locating the entry to the building at the 89 foot elevation, across from Kincaid, would preclude confusion over ADA access to the trail or bridge.
- The five foot clearance between the Burke Gilman Trail and the greenhouses is untenable and feels precarious. Eight to ten feet would allow comfort and safety, and perhaps a planted buffer.
- Sun shading options for exterior materials include louvers (those which do not allow bird roosting) or high performance glass (which would compensate for heat transfer, but not glare.)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

DRAFT