

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC  
Monday, August 13, 2021  
Virtual – Zoom Meeting

**Architectural Commission**

---

X	Renee Cheng, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	AnnMarie Borys, Vice Chair	Associate Professor, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	Linda Jewell	Partner, Freeman & Jewell	Voting
X	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Wienzapfel Associates	Voting
X	Cathy Simon	Design Principal	Voting
X	John Syvertsen	Chairman, Board of Regents, American Architectural Foundation	Voting
X	Edwin Harris	Principal & Co-Founder, EVOKE	Voting
X	Bobbie Koch	Student Representative, Architecture	Voting
	Aubree Nichols	Student Representative, Architecture	Voting
X	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Steve Tatge	Associate Vice President, UW Facilities (Interim)	Ex Officio
X	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

---

Minutes by Stephanie Parker, Executive Assistant to UWF Associate Vice President, Asset Management

**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 June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes and current agenda were approved.

**University and Project Update – Lou Cariello and Kristine Kenney**

A brief update was given on the ongoing dispute related to developer selection of Site W27. Lou will communicate with the UWAC if there are any impacts to the current project schedule.

**Site W27 Project Update**

Shane Ruegamer – UW Project Manager

**Project Goals**

The team reviewed the project goals which included:

- Context
- Sustainability
- Coast Salish Culture - Collaboration of ancient and modern co-Salish cultures.
- Public Realm
- Gateway

## Programming

- The team continues to work with the UW on tenancy to help inform total programming.

## Schedule

- Schematic design is trending toward completion by the end of next week. The team will target the November BOR meeting for final approval. Substantial completion of the facility is expected by September 2024.

## Indigenous Heritage Approach

- The design will be a collaboration of ancient and modern Coast Salish cultures, with a strong focus placed on care and stewardship for the environment.

## Ground Floor Activation

- Objectives include:
  - o Entrances on all four faces of the building.
  - o See through spaces - entries are places for meeting up and congregation.
  - o Indoor/outdoor activation with outdoor seating to pull experience through the space.
  - o Central canoe concept – developed as a collaborative area which brings everyone/ideas together.

## Site Plan

The team discussed site plan concepts and early design elements particularly related to landscape sectioning and how it interacts with the building site.

- Greenspace informed by Coast Salish Habitats
  - o Pulling from traditional Salish habitats to connect culture to ecological systems that sustain them. Utilizing 3 specific ideas:
    - Wetland
    - Sloping Stone Meadow – to be used on steepest southern slope
    - Forest Edge – east and west edges.
  - o Roughly 25ft of grade change from Northeast to Southeast corners of site.
- Entrances planned at all 4 building edges with varying accessibility based on grading at each level.
  - o South entry – intended to provide lush landscape with exterior spaces and see through views.
  - o Canoe entry – transparent with views toward lush and lively landscape. Engages boardwalk.
  - o North Entry and Mid-block Corridor – intended to create the “portal of arrival”.
  - o Northeast Podium entry – hopes to re- activate University Way utilizing a retail edge.
- Canoe Section
  - o Transitioned from an all-wood structure seen in initial design, to more concrete base with wood elements.
  - o Accessed from all directions – a space for gathering and sharing of ideas.
  - o Central stair allows for crossover and spill out.
  - o Structure of the space frames the focus on drawing the outside inward.
- Burk Gilman trail creates zone attuned to ease of movement. Meadow and wetland spaces surround the trail, to complete vegetation system.
- Planning for realignment of curbs on Brooklyn and University, to help promote street trees, and revegetate streetscapes.

## Building Massing

- The team focused on simplification of the initial massing. Smaller mid-building blocks helped accentuate the height of the building, helped accentuate the canoe, and allowed maximization of terrace spaces.
- Setbacks
  - o 20ft all around, with secondary at 40ft (along Brooklyn).

- Additional set back on Brooklyn due to it being more of a pedestrian zone.
- Kept SE corner angled to maximize views of Rainier.
- Anticipate that trees along the Southeast and West spaces will help anchor and frame the vertical and help pull focus toward the Canoe gathering space.
- The team reviewed current massing and elevation views from a variety of angles, which conveyed the relationship to the full site, as well as elements of natural habitat spaces highlighted earlier in the presentation.

#### Tower Planning

- The team changed initial notching to help maximize floor layout options.

#### Comments

- *As you present, be sure to point out the evolution of changes from previous iterations.*
- *What is the brown material intended to be on the exterior of the building?*
  - *Not yet determined. May be metallic metal. Looking at natural tones, with material that catches light and shadow in different ways.*
    - *Likely metal - especially at the top of the building. May bring in more natural materials in places that are covered. Natural wood looks good but requires maintenance.*
- *The complexity of the lower level in plan and section provides the greatest opportunity. Many interesting possibilities there.*
  - *In spite of the richness and ramp up of communication – feels like it falls flat as presented.*
    - *All of the spatial richness described inside – via volume and material, from the exterior really feels like a corporate office building rather than a campus building.*
    - *What makes this a university building?*
- *The canoe section developments – especially with the grade difference, is good.*
- *How are these buildings with partnerships still reflecting the University? Don't get lost.*
- *This building is setting a precedent for what it means to have indigenous influence in architecture.*
  - *Are student indigenous communities being engaged? How are you avoiding this being developed into a commoditized space?*
- *Appreciate the elements of the meadow - true to Coastal Salish history.*
- *How can this building also be designed to engage with other plant and animal relatives?*
- *The access from all sides and the way the elevation is navigated throughout the interior is really done well.*
  - *The northeast entry may need a bit more review and consideration.*
- *Having a mid-zone, or a taller base, made this building feel less like an office building, and more like a campus building.*
- *Material can help you distinguish the lower 3<sup>rd</sup> of the building. Could be very distinctively different material from materials constructing the upper tower spaces.*
  - *Choosing those materials carefully to reflect those differences will help keep this from feeling simply like a podium and tower.*
  - *The top of the building feels mechanical.*
- *Might look at the UBER headquarters in SFO as a way of thinking about more wood elements/feel.*
- *The idea of a wetland at the top of perceived site, feels wrong.*
- *Concern expressed over feasibility of scale - it may be too difficult to embrace all three of the habitats. Suggest focusing on Wetlands and Sloping stone meadows, and let the Forest Edge be developed through existing street trees.*
- *Struggle to see the canoe...is it even worth calling it that? Not apparent from an initial perspective.*

- *The lobby crossroads concept is powerful.*
  - o *The communal stair needs to do more. Can it be multi-directional?*
- *Look at ways to bring more landscaping inside the building.*
- *There is so much opportunity in this building and site - material expression, being in a respectful and authentic relationship with Coast Salish people and knowledge, setting a precedent for this relationship for future west campus and campus in general, etc.*
- *If we are going to be in a respectful relationship with Coast Salish people - Mt. Rainier should be referred to as Tahoma or Mt. Tahoma. I have heard so many beautiful origin stories about Tahoma and it would be so great to share that story at the vistas of this building (if Coast Salish peoples approve of course).*

## **CoEng Interdisciplinary Engineering Building (IEB)**

Jennifer Reynolds– UW Project Manager

### **Project Update**

The site sits on the east slope of campus across from the Husky Union Building. The team is coming to the end of the project definition phase.

### Stakeholder and Community Engagement

- The team engaged early on with multiple stakeholders and developed specific engagement framework to promote and realize project goals and shared understandings.
- Framework moved from procurement of high-level insights to specific detailed insights.
  - o Multiple exercises were conducted with all levels of stakeholders to tease out conflict and consensus items.
    - Who is the project for?
    - The IEB will...
- Studies were conducted specifically to understand underrepresented communities within this discipline, with a goal to design interior elements that are centered on inclusivity.
  - o Themes included: Access and Representation

### Campus Adjacencies and Topography

- Site contains exceptional trees and canopies.
- The team is looking at how to connect IEB to existing buildings along each side. These existing facility sites have given clues as to how to best utilize this space and excavations.
- Planning includes consideration for future connections which are expected based on the masterplan, as well as anticipated circulation.

### Site Strategies(134min)

- Design Drivers:
  - o Program, Circulation, and Infrastructure
  - o Ecology and Landscape
  - o Carbon and Energy
  - o Building Cost
- Massing and Program Stacking Strategies
 

The team focused on ways to engage campus circulation and full activation from all directions. Visual representations of two potential strategies for this structure were presented:

  - o Strategy 1 - Courtyard
    - Utilizes established/existing site platforms to help allow for cost savings and to maximize saving established ecology.

- Strategy 2 – Portal
  - Provides a bilevel entry from Stevens. Orientation from Stevens way allows for through views (portals) to a future downslope building.

#### Comments

- *A very thoughtful approach to the many dimensions of this project.*
- *Appreciate that you are utilizing existing buildings as indicators for space utilization and how it saves money and saves ecology.*
- *Appreciate especially what goes on in the portal. Captures the downslope and cross slope movement from Stevens Way. It helps to organize the programs nicely.*
  - *The idea that you see it all or understand it all from Stevens way feels like the inclusivity you are looking for.*
- *Appreciate both strategies. Could appreciate elements of either design. Excellent work engaging process to develop an inclusive building.*
- *The stakeholder engagement framework development was very impressive.*
- *Love the portal scheme – embraces the slope and provides a central focus.*
- *Appreciate how far back the setback from Steven’s way is on both designs.*
- *Give consideration to the courtyard scheme - the central courtyard will likely be a very social area. Could be a real opportunity to direct students into a central location. Can’t be avoided, they will end up there and may promote additional collaboration and conversation.*
- *In the portal, getting down from the main entrance to the lower space needs more thought. Consider something more integrated with the landscape.*
- *A hybrid connecting both versions would be very strong. What do these spaces look like from further away?*
- *The landscaping to the north of the site will be considered heavily once we the know what the intended use of UW Club is.*
- *Applaud the outreach and engagement to date on this project. Will be great to see how/if the goals are realized/achieved upon reflection once the building is complete.*
  - *Space signals power: gives power/takes power. Appreciate the in-depth study of how this space will/needs to incorporate inclusivity objectives.*
- *Analysis related to students comparing different buildings on campus: accessible, inclusive, welcoming, etc., would be fascinating to see if shared/available.*
- *The extended engagement process must be supported by the client and the university. Appreciate that the funding was set aside to ensure this engagement process was a priority. Far more in depth than most programming engagement processes are.*

#### **ICA Basketball and Human Health Performance**

Harry Fuller – UW Project Manager  
Tory Stahlecker, UWF PDG Director

#### **Project Updates**

The project is currently in the process of architect selection, with Mortenson as the selected contractor.

#### **Goals**

- Provide 24/7 practice courts
- Renovate and expand Health and High performance program space
- Consolidate services
- Provide a cost-effective look and feel in alignment with recent capital projects

## Overview

- Kristine and Troy gave a brief overview of the timing of the Architect selection process.
  - o SOQ reviews will be underway through September 5<sup>th</sup>.
  - o Commission Architect Interviews will be held in October 2021.

## Comments

- *Continue to utilize the A3 feedback format. Overall, it's a good tool for getting precise and concise information and providing consistency.*
  - o *Can the commission help inform the "format"?*
    - *Overall, the guidance was just given as an A3 sheet size, and it was up to the firms on how they utilized the space. Could certainly look at creating more parameters to help structure information.*
  - o *Rather than a template, perhaps just focus on the content that is designed. Put parameters on the information that is required and make it consistent across all teams.*
- *Project type experience is not necessarily an indicator of what will be a successful architecture project. Overall competency should be considered over specific experience.*

## Closing Comments

- W27
  - o *Current concepts need full reconsideration – very awkward. The design needs a complete reset.*
  - o *Canoe reference is lost.*
  - o *Feels like it's missing the engagement need that was displayed more effectively by other teams.*
  - o *Can we see the site from pulled back view? Would rather see the massing from a pulled back scale.*
  - o *Are they working off of the masterplan?*
  - o *Is Brooklyn really more pedestrian? Is that just an assumption? Will that be a long-term thing?*
  - o *Is retail viable on the north end along University?*
  - o *The geometry of the whole structure is perplexing.*
  - o *The team does seem to have a very experienced designer on this project. Team needs to go back and reconsider major concepts.*
    - *Perhaps new designers should be brought into the design work.*
    - *Kristine to relay feedback to both Lou and Dan Schwartz to determine communication next steps.*
  - o *A "nicely" dressed office building.*
  - o *Is there a reason to reshape the base - do we assume more University use at the base? Or is it really, ground floor mixed use and then the rest is just an office building?*

The next meeting will be held on October 25 & 26, In Person.

**Meeting Adjourned at 3PM.**