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Todays Challenges to Human Health

- A lack of access to health care aggravates health disparities globally — and locally.
- Children are dying of disease and malnutrition, with effective interventions just out of reach.
- A changing climate is escalating occurrences of crippling droughts and devastating storms.
- Refugees are fleeing war and political extremism.
- These challenges — and countless others — demand significant knowledge of the factors impacting health outcomes, including multifaceted environmental, social, and economic forces.
Vision

The facility will serve as a powerful catalyst for the University’s new Population Health Initiative and be an idea laboratory and collaboration incubator.

It will house the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, the Department of Global Health, and elements of the School of Public Health, all of which will greatly benefit from close proximity. The facility will also provide central gathering spaces for faculty, students, staff, partners, and visitors from a wide range of disciplines across campus, the region, the nation, and the world to address important global health concerns.

https://youtu.be/zCq4hIro7Zc
Goals

- Foster collaboration and connectivity amongst those working within the facility, with other programs and with researchers at the UW, local and global partners, and students;
- Promote healthy living within and around the new facility;
- Design space that is flexible and adaptable to meet the evolving needs of IHME, DGH, and SPH;
- Employ best practices in sustainable building to reduce energy and water use, lower life cycle costs, and improve occupant satisfaction and health; and
- Support and further the institution-wide Population Health Vision.
Scope

Estimated building size: 300,000 SF

Anticipated Program

- Offices: single & multiple occupancy, open work stations
- Collaborative group work areas
- Conference / meeting spaces
- Active learning environments
- Computing laboratories
- Possible street facing community-oriented destinations that help activate the neighborhood.

*Research wet laboratories are not part of the scope.*
Schedule & Budget

Anticipated Schedule

- EIS  September 2016 – April 2017
- Site Selection  September 2016 – April 2017
- Team Development  February 2017 – March 2017
- Design  April 2017 – June 2018
- Construction  May 2018 – May 2020
- Closeout  May 2020 – October 2020

Project Budget

$230 million
Site Selection Process

Regents select a site for the Population Health Facility based on recommendations from the President and Provost.

A summary document on all site options is forwarded to the President and Provost for review. They will select a preferred site which is then shared with the Regents.

Thorough review and discussion on all site option documentation including EIS Public Comments due on January 20th, 2017.

Gather and format information on each site option into a comprehensive, objective Site Review Document. Forward to Project Executive Committee for review and comments.

The Project Executive Committee identified three candidate sites capable of housing a 300K gsf building. They then proceeded to establish criteria based on the goals for the facility.
Alternative Site Options
All Sites – Existing Condition

2003 Massing

2018 Massing
Site A – Future Campus Buildout

Option A1
2003 Massing

Option A2
2018 Massing
Site B – Future Campus Buildout

Future Campus Buildout – 2003 Massing
Site C – Future Campus Buildout

Option C1
2003 Massing

Option C2
2018 Massing
Site A.1 (37W)  Existing Conditions Photos
Site A.1 (37W)
Existing Conditions
Site A.1 (37W)

Per 2003 CMP:
Allowable Building Area (above grade) 309,000 SF
Maximum Height 65’
Number of Floors 4/5
Max Floorplates 1 @ 52,000 SF
3 @ 72,000 SF
1 @ 32,000 SF
Floor-to-Floor Height 14’
Site Scheme A.1 (37W)

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition.
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing.

Site Section – looking east
massing shown: 300,000 GSF
Site Scheme A.1 (37W)

Site Section – looking north
massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme A.1 (37W)

Looking East towards the Central Campus
Option A1 – Footprint Comparison

- NJB-16th floor
  - 223’ X 114’
  - GSF/Floor: 25,000

- IHME
  - 334’ X 96’
  - GSF/Floor: 27,000

- Foege
  - 478’ X 105’
  - GSF/Floor: 43,326

- Burke
  - 290’ X 102’
  - GSF/Floor: 29,500

- Life Sciences
  - 255’ X 102’
  - GSF/Floor: 25,000

- Option A1
  - 342’ X 210’
  - GSF/Floor: 72,000

72,000 gsf
Site A.2 (W29) Existing Conditions Photos
Site A.2 (W29)
Existing Conditions
Site A.2 (W29)

Per 2018 Draft CMP:

Allowable Building Area (above grade) 305,000 SF
Maximum Height 200’
Number of Floors 9/10 floors @ 150’
Max Floorplates 6 @ 25,300 SF
4 @ 37,000 SF
Floor-to-Floor Height 14’
Scheme A.2 (W29)

Site Section – Looking east

Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Scheme A.2 (W29)

Site Section – Looking north
Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme A.2 (W29)

Looking east towards the Central Campus
Option A2 – Footprint Comparison

NJB-16th floor
223’ X 114’
GSF/Floor: 25,000

IHME
334’ X 96’
GSF/Floor: 27,000

Foege
478’ X 105’
GSF/Floor: 43,326

Burke
290’ X 102’
GSF/Floor: 29,500

Life Sciences
255’ X 102’
GSF/Floor: 25,000

Option A2
210’ X __’
GSF/Floor: 37,000
Site B (22C/C19) Existing Conditions Photos
Site B (22C/C19)
Existing Conditions
Site B (22C/C19)

Per 2003 CMP:
Allowable Building Area (above grade) 292,000 SF
Maximum Height 105’
Number of Floors 5/6
Max Floorplates 1 @ 30,000 SF
4 @ 65,000 SF
1 @ 10,000 SF
Floor-to-Floor Height 14’
Site Scheme B (22C/C19)

Site Section – looking east
Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme B (22C/C19)

Site Section – Looking north
Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme B (22C/C19)

Looking southeast towards Central Campus
Option B – Footprint Comparison

NJB-16th floor
223' X 114'
GSF/Floor: 25,000

IHME
334' X 96'
GSF/Floor: 27,000

Foege
478' X 105'
GSF/Floor: 43,326

Burke
290' X 102'
GSF/Floor: 29,500

Life Sciences
255' X 102'
GSF/Floor: 25,000

Site B
464' X 140'
GSF/Floor: 65,000
Site C.1 (50S + 51S) Existing Conditions Photos
Site C.1 (50S + 51S) Existing Conditions
Site C.1 (50S + 51S)

Per 2003 CMP:

Allowable Building Area (above grade) 315,000 SF
Maximum Height 65’
Number of Floors 5
Max Floorplates 1 @ 67,000 SF
3 @ 61,000 SF
1 @ 50,000 SF

Floor-to-Floor Heights 14’ (building)
10’ (new garage)
Site Scheme C.1 (50S + 51S)

Existing Parking: 869 Stalls   Replacement Parking: TBD

Site Section – Looking northeast
Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme C.1 (50S + 51S)

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition

2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing

Site Section – Looking northwest
Massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme C.1 (50S + 51S)

Looking north towards Central Campus
Option C1 – Footprint Comparison

- NJB-16th floor
  - Dimensions: 223' X 114'
  - GSF/Floor: 25,000

- IHME
  - Dimensions: 334' X 96'
  - GSF/Floor: 27,000

- Foege
  - Dimensions: 478' X 105'
  - GSF/Floor: 43,326

- Burke
  - Dimensions: 290' X 102'
  - GSF/Floor: 29,500

- Life Sciences
  - Dimensions: 255' X 102'
  - GSF/Floor: 25,000

- Option C1
  - Dimensions: 434' X 136'
  - GSF/Floor: 67,000

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
Site C.2 (S53) Existing Conditions Photos
Site C.2 (S53) Existing Conditions
Site C.2 (S53)

Per 2018 Draft CMP:
Allowable Building Area (above grade) 315,000 SF
Maximum Height 105’
Number of Floors 8
Max Floorplates 4 @ 43,000 SF
4 @ 32,000 SF
Floor-to-Floor Height 14’ (building)
Height 10’ (new garage)
Site Scheme C.2 (S53)

Existing Parking: 869 Stalls  (Replacement Parking: TBD)

Site Section – looking northeast
massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme C.2 (S53)

Site Section – looking northeast
massing shown: 300,000 GSF

2003 CMP limit based on Seattle Zoning Code and average grade definition
2018 Draft CMP redefines building height to allow for stepped massing
Site Scheme C.2 (S53)

Looking north towards the Central Campus
Option C2 – Footprint Comparison

NJB-16th floor
223’ X 114’
GSF/Floor: 25,000

IHME
334’ X 96’
GSF/Floor: 27,000

Foege
478’ X 105’
GSF/Floor: 43,326

Burke
290’ X 102’
GSF/Floor: 29,500

Life Sciences
255’ X 102’
GSF/Floor: 25,000

Option C2
408’ x 116’
GSF/Floor: 43,000
Integrated Design Build

• Belief that Together Everyone Achieves More.

• University desires an active role in project definition, design and construction decisions.

• Positively impact cost, schedule, building performance and quality, and maximize value by incorporating value added incentive items to the base program.

• Increase predictability and manage expectations.
Best Practices

- Clear project governance
- Clear goals and objectives
- Project Charter
- Co-location of the project team – Big Room
- Target Value Design (TVD)
- Risk register and value-add list
- Incentives through shared risk and reward
- Integrated Building Information Modeling (BIM), BIM execution plan and transition to operations.
Design Builder Selection Process
Project Executive Committee (PEC) & Project Managers.

- Shortlist Finalists based upon their scoring of submittal of qualifications (SOQ). Scores based upon written SOQ, group discussion and references.

- Meetings at each of the Finalists’ offices. Insights from these meetings will be shared with the UW Architectural Commission before the Finalist interviews.

- Review proposals, attend the Finalists interviews and participate in group discussion following the interviews.
Design Build Contract

Initial Contract – Project Definition Phase
Compensation: agreed stipulated sum

- Target Program
- Base Target Cost
- Value Added Incentive Items
- Task Matrix
- Milestones
- Incentive Distribution