UW Architectural Commission
&
University Landscape Advisory Committee

Minutes of Joint Meeting
September 26, 2016
UW Bothell Campus
UW1-280, Rose Room

DRAFT

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;	Voting
☑	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Wienzapfel Associates	Voting
☑	Cathy Simon	Design Principal, Perkins+Will	Voting
☑	John Syvertsen	Senior Principal, Cannon Design	Voting
☐	Riley Coghlan	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Rebecca Barnes	University Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Charles Kennedy	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services	Ex Officio
☑	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Mike McCormick	Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development	Ex Officio

Landscape Advisory Committee

Present			
☑	Margaret Johnson, Chair	Principal, Johnson Southerland	Voting
☐	Vacant (Position #2)	Professor, Environmental & Forest Sciences;	
☐	Thaisa Way, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Nancy Rottle	Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
☑	Jennifer Jones	Principal, Carol R. Johnson Associates	Voting
☐	Grayson Morris	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Damon Fetters (Position #11)	Director, Facilities Maintenance & Construction	Voting
☑	Howard Nakase (Position # 12)	Manager of Campus Grounds Operations, Maintenance & Alterations	Voting
☑	Rebecca Barnes (Position #13)	University Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Kristine Kenney (Position #14)	University Landscape Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☐	Vacant (Position #15)		Ex Officio

Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. The meeting agenda was approved unanimously, as were the minutes of the June 17, 2016 Joint UWAC and ULAC meeting and the minutes of the August 30, 2016 Joint special session. The Chair made Commissioners aware that the regular December meeting would be postponed and extended to a day a half, Sunday and Monday, January 22nd and 23rd, in order to accommodate regular commission business, as well as design/build team selection for the Population Health Facility project.

North Campus Housing Phase IV(b): Oak and Haggett Halls
Requested Action: Predesign Update
Jon Lebo, Director, Major Capital Projects, CPD
Shane Ruegamer, Project Manager, CPD
Pam Schreiber, Director, Housing & Food Services
Rob Lubin, Associate Director, Housing & Food Services

Overview:

North Campus Student Housing Phase IV(b) proposes to demolish existing Haggett Hall and construct two new buildings, identified as Oak and Haggett Halls. The project will reconstruct Denny Field as an artificial surface all-season field with lights. As in Phase IV(a), the new student residence halls will feature 1-3 floors of concrete construction with 4-5 floors of wood frame construction above. Combined the new buildings will have approximately 1,050 beds.

The buildings will include lounges, community space, study rooms, and regional amenities including games areas, student services, and a great room with 300-person banquet capacity. Between fifty and seventy-two parking spaces will be located below Haggett Hall. Other work includes landscape, underground utilities and street improvements to Whitman Lane. The new resident halls in the North Campus will have a variety of room types for 2, 3, and 4 persons, with en suite bathrooms.

Budget	
Project (Forecasted)	$140 million
Schedule	
Design	May 2016 – July 2018
Construction	July 2018 – June 2019 (Oak Hall)
	April 2019 – August 2019 (Denny Field)
	July 2018 – June 2020 (Haggett Hall))
Occupancy	August 2019 (Oak Hall)
	August 2019 (Denny Field)
	July 2020 (Haggett Hall)

Comments:

- The Commission lauded a set of well-considered solution to a series of difficult challenges.
- The problem of ADA access from Mason Place must be solved.
- A principal entrance to Haggett on Whitman Way would give the building more presence on the public way. The main entrance to Oak Hall wants to be more welcoming toward Stevens Way. All entries should be well-announced and easy to locate.
- Public access must be allowed to the Great Room, while maintaining secure access to the rest of the building.
- Consider developing functional and architectural interaction with McMahon as the fourth wall defining the Haggett courtyard.
- Architectural expression, especially in articulating and modulating the long building facades, will be of great importance in the design phases.
- Explore the possible uses of the synthetic turf product called Forever Lawn for Denny Field. Forever Lawn is installed over a pad, rather than infill, and may provide the resiliency required.
- The understructure of Denny Field might act as storm water holding area, slowing and cleaning run-off. Consider recent storm water projects at Magnuson Park and Rainier Beach Field for inspiration.
- Reconsider the willows around Denny Field; they will shade the grass underneath and may not have the correct association for the space.

Capital Plan Overview
Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, CPD
Steve Kennard, Director Capital & Space Management, CPD
Information

Overview:

The One Capital Plan identifies projects, acquisitions, and major leases that will be pursued over the next three biennia. These capital expenses are intended to further the strategic initiatives outlined by President Ana Mari Cauce, accommodate projected

DRAFT

growth, and address the most pressing infrastructure needs. The plan will be developed on a two-year cycle corresponding with the State Capital Budget Request, but it will be re-evaluated annually by the Regents as the State funding is allotted.

A variety of funding sources will be utilized to accomplish the capital projects, and overall targets have been established for each potential source. Planning targets are set by examining historical funding trends for both total value and intended use. The One Capital Plan will be adjusted as these targets shift based on a variety of variables (state funding, debt calculations, economic conditions, etc.). The intent is to manage the plan as a portfolio.

In addition to achieving these targets, the projects in the One Capital Plan were selected because they are in keeping with the implementation strategies that will help us achieve the specific objectives outlined below and the President's strategic initiatives. This creates a framework for the individual projects and ensures alignment with the Campus Master Plan, the One Capital Plan, and the Capital Campaign.

The One Capital Plan is intended to represent a balanced strategy that leverages all potential (but realistic) fund sources to further the strategic initiatives outlined by President Ana Mari Cauce, accommodate projected growth, and address the most pressing infrastructure needs. The plan represents a balance of between growth and reinvestment with an emphasis on impact. The overall plan will continue to be managed toward the funding targets as each individual project is further developed and more is learned about the funding targets themselves.

The Capital Plan also addresses the University's deferred maintenance backlog, currently estimated to be over $1B. In order to maintain this level of backlog, the University should reinvest $100-130 million per year in its existing facilities (1.5% of the $6.4B Current Replacement Value) – including capital projects, minor modifications and preventive maintenance.

Comments:

- Demand for housing exceeds the University's debt capacity, though private and public/private options are being explored at the Tacoma and Bothell campuses, the private sector provides a great deal of housing options in the University District, and regional transit has recently connected the Seattle campus to other affordable neighborhoods.

Projects in Progress

Updates on the following projects, were presented to the Commission in brief:

U District Station Building

Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, CPD

The Sound Transit Light Rail U District Station is currently under construction on Brooklyn Ave NE between NE 45th and NE 43rd streets. Through a series of complicated real estate negotiations, the University owns the air rights over the U-District Station. The site measures 37,050 square feet. The sub-structure, being constructed by Sound Transit, is designed to support a mid-rise commercial building. The City is currently considering a re-zone for this site and the larger U-District. The University is studying the possibilities for a commercial or mixed occupancy building on this site in anticipation of that re-zone. The University has agreed to make best efforts to complete a building simultaneous with the station, opening in early 2021.

Comments:

- Parking should not be considered in a building over a transit station.
- As the West Campus goes down the path of public/private partnership, take care that the public realm does not become secondary to developer goals of larger floorplates.

UW Seattle Campus Master Plan

Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA

The 2018 Seattle CMP will become the regulatory vehicle for the University's future development, defining both the square footage to be constructed and the geographic location of such development. The draft CMP and EIS documents will be published October 7, 2016, and will be followed by on-line and live Open Houses and drop in "Office Hours" around the University District; City Council will consider the draft, as well. The goal is to release the final draft before March 2017.

College of Engineering Strategic Facilities Plan

Bob Puzauskie, Sr. Planner, OUA

The College of Engineering Space Assessment and Academic Facilities Plan is a phased and prioritized program of feasible strategic opportunities for the College to address its cultural, facility and future programmatic growth issues over the next five to twenty years.

DRAFT

The College faces continued growth and new initiatives, existing space deficits, and critically dwindling space. In the very near future, the College of Engineering will need not only new facilities, but also an array of flexible, well-equipped and communal spaces throughout its existing facilities.

This assessment and academic facilities plan was conducted at a very high level. Its recommendations identify not only major and minor capital projects, but also maintenance and re-purposing projects, all subjects for future in-depth studies. Its suggested solution also identifies several new projects along the traditional 'spine' of the core College of Engineering facilities.

Comments:

- The study should take into account the effect of regional transit tunnel vibrations and electromagnetic radiation on research functions in facilities being suggested.
- The impetus to create a campus within a campus is not appropriate, given the trend toward interdisciplinary collaboration in education and research. More emphasis should be placed on new sites and major moves. At the same time, incremental improvements can have a large impact, for a much smaller investment.
- Include general assignment classrooms in the plan, to place some of the prerequisite education of the CoE admitted freshman in the Engineering environment.

Population Health Facility

Jeannie Natta, Project Manager, CPD

The purpose of the Population Health Facility is to create a new nexus for Population Health research, teaching, and innovation in the region and globally. The facility will serve as a powerful catalyst for the University's new Population Health Initiative, announced by President Ana Mari Cauce on May 3, 2016. It will house the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), the Department of Global Health (DGH), and selected portions of the School of Public Health (SPH). By bringing these three units together, and in closer proximity to the UW's core campus and health sciences facilities, we will create stronger links with other schools, colleges, and academic units across campus that are central to realizing the vision, including but not limited to Education, Law, Computer Science, Engineering, Environment, Information, Arts and Sciences, Public Policy and Governance, and Business, as well as programs in the Health Sciences. One of the UW's great strengths is the breadth of educational opportunities and research across campus. The Population Health Initiative, buttressed by this new facility, will benefit from and, in turn, deepen this exceptional breadth of education and research.

The project provides an opportunity to improve the University's process for selecting Design-Build teams, and development of that process for this project is intended to result in a model for the University's upcoming Design-Build projects.

Comments:

- All three proposed sites have challenges as well as benefits. Creative thinking can overcome the challenges and maximize the benefits, for instance, incorporating a multi-use theater into the design on Site A, which would replace the Ethnic Cultural Theater providing presentation space for many users.
- The challenges inherent in the selected site might become a defining criterion to design/build team selection.
- An activity-dense building will be essential for the program, and building core and shell, while it allows for future flexibility, can result in a lost opportunity for designing creative collaborative spaces.
- Replacing the Guthrie Annexes on Site B would result in significant savings to the University operating budget.

UW Bothell/Cascadia Community College Campus Master Plan

Kristine Kenney, Project Manager, CPD

This new initiative will direct future growth of the UW Bothell and Cascadia College campus. In order to allow for student housing on campus, future parking, phase two of the student recreation center, and other proposed projects, a new land use code for City of Bothell will be developed in the same timeline, to amend the City development section of the Bothell City code, which will define development standards for campus and the City. The process will include approval from the UW Board of Regents, Cascadia College governance, and the City of Bothell.

The Master Plan will begin with a robust goal envisioning session to encompass growth capacity of UW Bothell and Cascadia, including academic, research, and library needs, housing and dining requirements, parking, transportation and mobility issues, infrastructure and utilities, as well as landscape, ecology and hydrology.

Kristine Kenney led a tour of the UW Bothell campus, joined by Associate VC for Facilities Services and Campus Operations, Tony Guerrero.

DRAFT

Design/Build Process
Steve Tatge, Executive Director, Major Projects, CPD
Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA

The University has well-established and efficient processes in place for selection of architects and general contractor/construction management firms, but does not have the mature process for the selecting design build teams necessary given that many future projects will be delivered using progressive design/build. As noted above, development of that process for the Population Health Facility project will provide a proving ground for a University model for future Design-Build projects.

Statutory requirements dictate a request for qualifications (RFQ), to be reviewed by a project executive committee (PEC). Price factor, which comprises architect and consultant fees, must be taken into account, and the University requires that a business equity score be developed for each team. The points from the RFQ scoring do not carry forward into the next stage of selection.

A request for proposals (RFP) will then be issued to the short-listed firms, which, again, must fulfill certain statutory requirements. The Architectural Commission will score the RFPs. The process suggested would see the Commissioners review and draft-score the RFPs prior to team interviews, which are being seen as an expanded, two-hour collaborative process, at which the Commission would be joined by carefully-selected multi-disciplinary advisors to bring outside expertise to deliberations. At the conclusion of the interviews, deliberations will precede final scoring and recommendation of a team.

- Obtain a commitment that the teams will remain intact as the project progresses and that any substitution of personnel be approved by the project governance.
- The new design/build contract, currently under development should be shared with the Commissioners prior to interviews.
- Project governance must ensure that the University's architectural standards are upheld and that the process does not result in a cheapening of the final product.
- The criteria for the scoring system must be weighted to ensure that the selected team is led by a firm of architectural and landscape architectural quality. Draft criteria should be provided to the Commissioners in advance of the next meeting.
- Requiring the interviewed teams to include a landscape architect creates an integrated team and emphasizes the environment and sustainability. The personal dynamics of the teams can be very telling. Bringing in the landscape architect after team selection allows the University greater influence in the decision and can result in a more effective team. As such, the interview process must balance understanding the core team and how they work together with the opportunity to influence some of the team selection later in the process. Carefully craft the interview guidelines to require key people on each team, allowing the option to bring in select others, to gain insight into the team values.
- Setting the challenge of the highest level of sustainable design for the workshop interviews, will also provide valuable insight into the teams' processes.
- The successful team will have knowledge of academic buildings and programming and be able to effectively react to, and stimulate change in, the culture of the disciplines involved.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

DRAFT