

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC
Monday, October 26, 2020
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
	Bea Badipe	Student Representative, Architecture	Voting
X	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Mike McCormick	Associate Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

Minutes by Stephanie Parker

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 August 10th meeting minutes and current agenda were approved.

UW Updates

- Founders Hall
 - o McKenzie hall is demolished and the new Founders Hall project is moving forward into the construction phase. The project team is working hard to recover budget overages realized by early demolition, but is managing this well so far.

- Site W27
 - o NOAA has been approved to co-locate in Site W27. The RFP process has been reinitiated and will be sent out within the next few weeks. The process will include a series of proprietary meetings on design. Half day charrettes will be used to see how teams work.
 - Additionally teams will be requested to incorporate and consider indigenous peoples heritage in their site design and planning.
 - o The building will be a part of west campus development. Recently, the City of Seattle completed and opened a waterfront park, which sits across the street from this site.

- Interdisciplinary Engineering Building –

- A RFQ was recently released, and interviews for this projects are scheduled to be held with the UWAC in December. Commissioner’s feedback on the received RFQs will be requested.
- The commissioners requested an additional virtual meeting to review and provide feedback for the selection committee.
- Milgard Hall
 - This project is currently undergoing an in-depth review of the budget. Once solidified, which they anticipate in the near future, and they hope to move forward in design process.
- UDSB
 - The City Design Guideline process was recently completed. The project will go on hold until July as financial due diligence is conducted, and will continue the design process once due diligence is confirmed.

Health Science Education Building

Julie Knorr – UW Project Manager

The excavation and shoring process is complete and the project is moving forward on schedule. The current focus has been on the Façade and interior experience. Progress and development of the skin has focused on the details discussed at the last UWAC meeting in June.

- Upper Level Skin Development
 - Based on feedback in June drift joints at floor levels modified to make this joint invisible.
 - The joint is still a part of the system, however it is now masked by a tapered vertical element, which creates a tapered slope allowing cantilevered metal shingles. This process lets the building look like one continuous surface and removes the layered cake look.
 - The blue in punched windows was increased, and the team confirmed that no metal panels will cover those punched windows.
 - Windows are currently 5^{ft}width x 10^{ft}height, and meet floor levels.
 - Picture window on South side provides a look down to terraces as well as look up into building activity on 3rd and 4th floors.
 - Electrochromic glazing used to shade light, rather than curtains. This was part of a student supported project funded by the Campus Sustainability Fund, and allowed for a great learn opportunity for this program.
 - Mock Ups
 - Used a series of mockups to provide data, with each additional mock up playing off of information determined from prior versions.
 - Current mock up details show visibility through perforate panels, vertical straightness of joints, horizontal straightness and joints, shingle depth and coping detail.
 - Perforation and Visibility
 - Made up of 23% and 50% perforated panels.
 - Identified a need to paint substructure black to even out what is visible (especially behind 50%). Will determine if all substructure (behind 23% panels as well) will need to be painted.
 - Sheet material is a black fabric, Revel Shield. It’s designed to be outside of the insulation.
 - Vertical Straightness of Joints
 - Mockups helped identify areas where bowing and vertical alignment didn’t meet expectations. Currently looking closely at additional material thickness etc. Still more

work to ensure a clean read of vertical lines. So far, horizontal straightness is not causing any concern.

- Depth at Shingle Step
 - The team is leading toward the middle dimension, but is still reviewing it under specific lighting conditions.
 - Corner sheet metal panels require angled cuts, which are difficult to achieve, but seem to create the desired effect nicely.
- Coping
 - Details were revised and pulled back to allow for the building to better “meet the sky”.
- Fire Rated Glazing
 - Contingency money now provides fire rated glazing, to improve areas of glazing, particularly in the north stair.
 - The central wall is being developed and explored, and will be seen as a dramatic 4 story element. The team is currently trying to get a macro and micro read on this element, and ensure a color that embodies the spirit and culture of care.

Comments

- *Concern was raised related to water and staining potential on metal design panels. How will this hold up against the wet Pacific Northwest climate?*
 - *Similar construction is seen on the UW PD building, and it seems to wear well.*
- *Does having a difference between the 23% and 50% perforation really matter? Why not just make it all the same? As it looks in the mock ups currently, it doesn't seem to show that much of a distinction between the two.*
 - *It is all light dependent. The team will continue to monitor this, and determine if light truly does reveal the differences the team is desiring.*
 - *This was originally planned as a way to conceal and unify the building as there are many mechanical structures that wrap around the building as well.*
- *Be realistic about the mechanical stuff on the roof. Be exact about what it will look like.*
- *The 3.5" shingle looked chunky on panel variation. Middle ground seemed most appropriated.*
- *Variation in preformation might look more like inconsistency in materials more than intentional variation.*
- *Encourage the team to look at the stairway wall as they look at the other two entrances. Make sure you balance this element with the two entry lobbies. Concern was made over whether the stairwell entrance will overpower and other two entrances and confuse visitors.*

UWMC Northwest Behavioral Health Teaching Facility

Jeannie Natta – UW Project Manager

Project Updates

- Massing
 - Reworked to a 6 Floor option to simplify the building.
 - Reduced overall square footage
 - Preserved bed count
 - Eliminated basement and associated structure utilities
 - Eliminates cost associated with high-rise designation
 - Provides flexibility for grading
 - 6 Story Building Scheme
 - Behavioral Health bed complement was completely revised

- Overall simplification at each level revised massing to smoother more refined lines.
- Drop off zone now more successful with new design. Opens up nicely to lobby space and negated need to realign the existing road.
- Scale of building now aligns more closely with the existing hospital.
- Smaller building allows for more daylight.
- Levels of building
 - Level 1 – Kitchen and dining service, facilities management
 - Level 2 - Med/Surge beds, and will also serve some behavioral health
 - Level 3 – Med Surge beds, recreational outdoor area location
 - Level 4-6 – Behavioral health areas, along with shared support and therapy spaces.
 - Rooftop - houses a mechanical penthouse (partly screened and partly enclosed)
- Landscape Plan
 - Moved toward simplified plantings to ensure minimal maintenance and maintenance cost.
 - Tree replacement considerations are being studied. A 2-1 ratio requirement is required for replacement of any trees removed.
- Arrival/Drop Off
 - The outdoor terrace space was reduced, to allow for better circulation at arrival and drop off area for vehicles.
 - The new arrival allows for better central core access and alignment.
- Loading Dock Concepts
 - Still in development – considerations include maximizing safety and preservation of exceptional trees. This will be an ongoing part of the design phase.
 - Careful consideration has been placed on preserving the tree canopy. Different versions of the loading dock will have varying impacts on trees.
- Rooftop Strategies
 - Outdoor terraces area still provided on upper levels.
 - 3rd floor outdoor activity area will allow for patient therapy and exercise and is planned in a southern location to maximize daylight and sunlight.

Comments –

- *The quality of the experience is falling flat. Outdoor spaces have been reduced to small seemingly insignificant corners, and aren't integrated well to the programming of the floors.*
- *This is still very much a massing proposal. You've done well arranging the parts on a difficult site. Appreciate the simplification of the overall massing. It's a better starting point. The large scale shifts have been good ones. The simplification of the entry is much improved, more graceful and safe.*
- *For the entrance – has the pedestrian entrance experience been considered? Particularly with the existing trees, this should be focused on at the same time as the drive-through entrance.*
- *Seeing some existing images of the existing site in the presentation would be helpful to the Commission.*
- *It isn't clear who the patients are and what they need based on current designs. Feels a bit like a prison? Where else are patients getting exercise? Only the 3rd floor terrace?*
- *Vehicles as drawn are driving right next to dining terrace. Who is using this dining terrace? Visitors? Patients? Are cars providing the best experience?*
- *Continue focusing on knitting into the landscape as you can. Expect that design in future will help connect this massing with landscape harmony.*
- *Continue to work toward making this space a "happier" space. Again hospitals are serious places, how can we make this more hopeful.*
- *Is this program so dense that there is just too much here? This apparent density seems to keep the building from breathing.*

- *Perhaps look differently at the upper two floors... make them different in feeling and lightness from the lower surgical floors. Can we make them lighter, with more green spaces and outdoor areas? Similarly, make that ground floor more porous, and more differentiated from the business of the surgical spaces on 2 and 3.*
 - o *As design evolves you should see many more of these concepts come to light.*

UWB +CC STEM 4

Harry Fuller– UW Project Manager

- Site
 - o Recent site visit observations created impact.
 - Adjacent open spaces
 - Concrete seating spaces and walls – exposed and open.
 - Food forest and landscaping – provides canopy or sheltered experience
 - Site study of the Crescent path
 - o Campus Landscape Typology and topography
 - The building need to engage and thoughtfully consider varying spaces and nest within these.
 - o Circulation
 - Ensure that key pedestrian pathways enable circulation, but also allow for experiential moments for current onsite art and landscaping. Ensure the space will continue to enhance the crescent path.
 - o Site Plan
 - Wrap site landscaping to align to Crescent path.
 - Creates an feeling of enclosure to the building
 - Monumental seat steps on south and west side help set up terracing and outdoor spill out space
 - Larger seat walls on north side will be used to help define and frame in the space.
- Program
 - o Daylight into Public Spaces
 - Determining how to connect the main floor to the entrances on ground and 4th floor. Hope to use daylight light wells to create this connection throughout.
 - Working toward an open stairwells at both west and east entries, depending on glazing opportunities.
 - o Zoning for Informal Student Space
 - Working toward balancing social and individual study spaces.
 - Level 1 – High Ceiling space allows for machine shops, projects labs and material testing.
 - Level 2 – All instructional space. – equally divided between UWB and CC
 - Level 3 and 4 – Science labs, and faculty offices and shared break room. Includes some classroom space. Level 4 includes west entry.
- Design Vernacular
 - o Campus context
 - Currently focusing on the brick academic buildings like Discovery Hall rather than earlier building sets.
 - o Massing and Base Studies
 - Curtin wall windows across building are not within budget. Currently determining alternatives on east side, to help bring some element of curtain wall to the facility while staying in budget.
 - o Wall Section Material Studies
 - Moved foundation walls in line with columns as the building goes below grade, which allowed the upper floor facades to hang over the lower foundation enclosures.

- Allows for rain screen assembly and a more substantial waterproofing system.
 - Allows the base of the building to be expressed differently, and aligned with discovery hall.
 - Brick wrapper around upper used as a veneer. More exploration is underway on material for base.
- Patterning Precedents
 - Reviewing how windows are patterned into the brick veneer and how brick can be used to create texture.
 - Pattern studies are underway to make most effective use of brick wrapper.
- West Entry
 - Bridge provides an experience of floating about the landscaping and being amidst the canopy.
 - Provides opportunity to look down the topography and into the trees.
 - Curtain wall will provide western light expose and daylight to study spaces and entrance.

Comments –

- *Can the ancestors be moved?*
 - *They can, however, removing them will require restoration and an appropriate location that remains a part of the forest.*
 - *Having them so near the building, lessens their impact. As a mysterious and almost magical element. Being right up against the building takes a lot of that away.*
- *Love the idea of high visibility into the construction and work spaces.*
- *More focus on Southside and encompassing the forest. The second floor has a rich connection, but that sense seems to be lost on upper floors. Keep thinking about that inside outside/connection, when thinking about the skin on the south side.*
- *Why does the stair at the west pop above the roof? That end of the building still looks very unresolved.*
 - *Hope to use it for roof access. The team will continue to develop this end.*
- *Could a top to bottom brick wrapper be considered...one that varies from the Northside to the south side? Consider more variation on south side and more patterned and consistent variation on north side. The upper wrapper lifted up over lower glassy space is coming off as awkward for this level of sloped site. Allow the Southside to really embrace the iconic, natural view and experience*
 - *Ensure both institutions have equal access to each side.*
- *The South elevation is very awkward.*
- *The crescent becomes lost in the current design. Feels lost at the southeastern point of the building.*
- *Is there external stair access from the crescent to the upper west entrance?*
 - *No, only emergency access exists. No through transit like discovery hall is currently planned.*
- *Would pulling out the Y, or bending the wing on the south help open up the area and parallel the crescent, while better embracing the tree?.*

UW Tacoma Milgard Hall

Shannon Thompson – UW Project Manager

Project Updates

- Schedule
 - Finishing up an extended project definition, and will be transitioning to design phase in the next few weeks.

- Finalizing project teams.
- Programs
 - 3 primary users: School of Engineering and Technology; School of Business and Global Innovation and Design Lab
 - Working groups have been focusing on developing and determining program priority.
 - Targeted priorities were generated for each school, based on program needs versus. things they would like, but are not essential.
 - Option A was moved forward providing 55,000GSF.
 - Plan identifies shelled spaces, to allow for focus on completed program space ensuring the facility can achieve use on day one staying within its targeted budget.
- Site
 - Cradle lot site established as focus for siting.
 - Strategies include
 - Creating a science court
 - Maximizing parking – utilize remainder of unused site.
 - Allow for future development
 - Circulation
 - Major north-south corridor provides main access to building.
 - Building will need to help students traverse east west. Building design must draw students though to make that connection work.
 - Groundwater
 - Looking to mitigate cost for current and future maintenance of contaminated groundwater issues.
 - Building Height
 - Massing studies are underway for both 3 and 4 story options
 - Currently considering rectangular or slightly notched footprints, as preliminary options.
- TVD Benchmarks
 - 55,000GSF with base target values and shelled space.
 - Centralized mechanical systems
 - High Performance envelope
 - Brick with punched windows and storefront glazing selectively
 - Closed private offices
 - Selective interior glazing to maximize daylight.
 - Sufficient lighting and AV systems for teaching flexibility

Comments-

- *Be cautious with the grossing factor as you move forward. 1.67 is a common factor and can be difficult to achieve.*
 - *The team will need to continue to develop test fits, to determine the correct factor.*
- *Where will be shelled spaces be?*
 - *There is not yet a single strategy aligned to this. May be distributed, or may be singularly spaced.*
- *Volumetric studies seem to show a big difference between them currently. What process will determine the discussion of the 3 versus 4 story building?*
 - *The challenge is going to be in balancing internal relationships. The driver will be the interior planning.*
- *Presentation provided appropriate background and depth.*

- *Budget impacts are creating particular challenges. Perfecting everything at this stage is unrealistic. It will resolve as you go, and the building will be the size that it is and include what it can. It's self-resolving in some ways. Keep moving forward.*
- *Will you be doing mass timber to the ground?*
 - o *They will be doing concrete slab, however, we will use glue laminate throughout down to the concrete footing, although some steel will be used on longer spans.*
- *Concern raised that shelled spaces may not provide as much savings if distributed out though out the building rather than in once central space.*

Closing Comments/Discussion

- *UW Bothell/CC STEM*
 - o *The commission agreed that the design quality was still in need of improvement.*
 - o *Mike and Kristine will follow up with the design team to ensure the message was received and concerns are resolved.*
- *BHTF*
 - o *The commission felt the new design was still lacking a humane and therapeutic essence, and that it seemed to be missing some of the heart and imagination that had been previously presented. They suggested, focusing on improving the experiences that can be improved including therapy spaces, green spaces, welcoming spaces, and the lobby.*
- *HSEB*
 - o *Major concern was expressed related to the exterior skin. This included:*
 - *The moisture barrier solution*
 - *The flat plate at the bottom of the mock up.*
 - *The degree of precision that will be required to ensure perfection*
 - *Weathering and durability, and;*
 - *Over detailing*
 - o *Mike and Kristine will follow up with the project manager promptly to ensure concerns are addressed without impacting the schedule.*
- *Milgard Hall*
 - o *The commission briefly discussed the impacts of the budget which requires shelled spaces. They encourage the design team to look at other opportunities for savings, outside of sustainability aspects, wherever they can.*

UWAC Governance + Long-Term Planning

- *Process and Value of Commission*
 - o *Architect Selection process is moving in the right direction.*
 - o *Longer Term Plan*
 - *Future planning for terms and potential*
 - *With more asks as the process evolves, is this still something that current commissioners can support based on schedules, desires, etc.?*
 - *How do we go about the next recruitment in the long-term?*
 - *Bringing in more varied and minority encompassing firms needs to be a priority.*
 - *What else can we do to push boundaries?*
- *Comments*
 - o *Long term commissioners allow for some continuity and have historical knowledge and experience*

- *Can we broaden our diversity and bring a professional on that comes from a different background and experience than the rest of the commission currently?*
- *Use this commission to aid in how current campus can be named/shaped, encouraged by indigenous peoples, cultures and heritage.*
- *Naming commission used to be active on campus – could this be resurrected?*
- *Longevity vs freshness – always a dilemma.*
 - *Take a look at the nature of the terms and how you stagger but keep continuity.*
 - *Can we establish a way to bring in others Ad-Hoc – to help with the fresh perspective?*
 - *Longevity – it takes a while to get to know the University.*

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30PM