UW Architectural Commission
&
University Landscape Advisory Committee

Minutes of Joint Meeting
June 17, 2016
Maple Hall 217
APPROVED 09/26/2016

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
☑	Ezekiel Jones	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	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
☑	LuAnn Stokke	Director of Strategic Planning and Chief of Staff, Facilities Services	Guest

Landscape Advisory Committee

Present			
☑	Margaret Johnson, Chair (Position #6)	Principal, Johnson Southerland College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Jeff Hou (Position #1)	Professor and Chair, Landscape Architecture, College of Built Environments	Voting
☑	Sarah Reichard (Position #2)	Professor, Environmental & Forest Sciences; Director, UW Botanic Gardens, Center for Urban Horticulture,	Voting
☐	Thaisa Way, Vice Chair (Position #3)	Associate Professor, College of Built Environments	Voting
☐	Nancy Rottle (Position #4)	Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
☐	Daniel Winterbottom (Position #5)	Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture	Voting
☑	Jennifer Jones (Position #7)	Principal, Carol R. Johnson Associates	Voting
☐	Grayson Morris (Position #9)	Student Representative, College of Built Environments	Voting
☐	Vacant (Position #10)	Campus Art Administrator	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
☐	Vacant (Position #16)		Ex Officio

Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m. and introduced incoming student representative Riley Coghlan and thanked outgoing student representative Zeke Jones for his year of service. The meeting agenda was approved unanimously, as were the minutes of the March 28th UWAC meeting.

Computer Science and Engineering II
Requested Action: Design Development Update
Steve Tatge, Exec Director, Major Capital Projects CPD
Kurtis Jensen, Sr Project Manager, CPD
Hank Levy, Chair, Tracy Erbeck, Facilities Manager, Computer Science & Engineering
Greg Miller, Prof, Civil and Environment Engineering
Mark Reddington, Stephen Van Dyke, Julie Adams, LMN

Overview:

The project has several primary objectives, all in support of ensuring the Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) department is able to meet the growing demand for education in this field, while also maintaining its national leading position. These objectives include providing a welcoming environment and qualitative parity between the new and existing facilities; creating a unified complex for the CSE program; fostering collaboration among faculty, students, and staff; and achieving a cost-effective project that enhances campus connections and landscape.

The Computer Science Engineering Phase II building will construct a new 135,000 GSF building to provide the added capacity required to support the anticipated growth in the College of Engineering's Computer Science program for the next 10 years. The program includes a 240 seat lecture hall, an event space, classrooms, research space, offices for faculty and graduate students, an advising suite, coffee shop and other associated support spaces. The facility is four stories on the Stevens Way side with two below grade levels that daylight as the site slopes to the East.

The site development plan will realign and enhance Snohomish Lane to improve the connection from upper campus to the athletic complex and make pedestrian routes more accessible. The landscape design will complement the surrounding campus environment and provide a natural setting for informal interactions. The building will support bicycle friendly commuting with safe and secure bicycle storage both inside and outside the building.

The building massing curves along the north and south facades reducing the width at the constrained east and west ends of the building. The building exterior has been reconsidered from an all-metal panel system to a more varied material palette, including, glass, metal panels, and terracotta. Daylight, transparency, and a forward-looking quality are important elements for the enclosure to demonstrate.

PROJECT FORECASTED COST	$104.6 Million
SCHEDULE:	
Design:	July 2015 – November 2016
Construction:	January 2017 – December 2018
Occupancy:	January 2019

Comments:

- The expression in the façade of the interior program solved the problem of the difficult relationship between the interior and the exterior.
- The design creates a commons space, linking all four buildings in the vicinity.
- Carefully consider plaza and street paving details, including relief, expansion joints, wear pattern, integral coloring, and bollards, to ensure safety and durability.
- Ensure clear visual cues to pedestrians and vehicular traffic at Stevens Way crossing.
- Define the rooftop terrace space more clearly, and expand the usable space to the maximum allowable; perhaps incorporating a narrow linear promenade. Consider using roof water for irrigation. Budgetary constraints might be overcome by creating donor naming opportunities.
- Continue to refine the design language of the sequential landscapes the lengths of the building.
- Allow plaza event space for all neighboring departments.

Action:

A motion was tendered and seconded to approve design development for the building, and to approve schematic design for the landscape, with the proviso that an interim on-line review be held for landscape design development, to include the rooftop terrace. A vote was unanimous, in favor.

North Campus Housing Phase IV(b): Oak and Haggett Halls
Requested Action: Architect Selection
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:

The 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 is also proposing to reconstruct Denny Field as an artificial surface all-season field with lights. See the attached site plan for reference. Oak Hall is expected to begin construction in the summer of 2018 with occupancy for the start of Autumn Quarter 2019. Denny Field will begin construction April 2019 and be completed by Autumn Quarter 2019. The demolition of the existing Haggett Hall and replacement with a new Haggett residence hall is expected to begin construction in the summer of 2018 with occupancy for the start of Autumn Quarter 2020. The buildings will feature two floors of concrete construction with 5 floors of wood frame construction on top. The two new buildings will have approximately 1,100 beds.

The buildings will include lounges, community space, utility and street improvements, and regional amenity spaces as well as parking below Haggett. The new resident halls in the North Campus will have a variety of room types for 2, 3, and 4 persons as well as suites with private 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:

- Reconsider the scale and geometry of the Oak Hall café pavilion.
- The pass-through Oak Hall between Denny Field and Denny Grove could be more generously scaled and combined with other moves to create more porosity in the ground floor of the building.
- New Haggett should be sited to take advantage of the Portage Bay and Cascade Range views.
- New Haggett should move as far up-slope as possible for ease of access; it should reinforce the sense of student community at the top of the plateau, continue the sense of woodland landscape, and contribute to a pedestrian connection which navigates the slope from Whitman Way toward University Village.
- A design placing Haggett wings perpendicular to Whitman Way were preferred.
- The value of the placing the Great Room at the top of the building to take advantage of the sweeping view outweighs the circulation challenges posed.

UW Police Department Facility
Jon Lebo, Director, Major Capital Projects, CPD
Ken Kubota, Project Manager, CPD
Chief John Vision, UW Police Department
Craig Kurtis, Ryan Drake, Miller Hull Architects

During the lunch break, the Commissioners and Committee Members were given tour of the newly completed UW Police Department Facility.

One Capital Plan & Project Delivery
Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, CPD

Overview:

The One Capital Plan is a widely vetted plan that represents the University's priorities as we work to achieve the strategic initiatives outlined by the President - a balanced portfolio of projects, leases, and acquisitions that we will strive to complete within the next six years. The 2017 – 2023 Capital Plan will be presented to the Board of Regents for approval in September, and updated quarterly. An approach was developed to balance project funding with funding source target numbers, resulting in an execution plan for the long range vision represented by the Campus Master Plan.

Project Delivery: In order to have a significant impact on the cost of building projects and the value they provide to the university, a paradigm shift is required in the way university buildings are conceived, planned, and executed. Higher education capital project delivery can - and must- become a leader in efficient and value-added planning, design, construction, and operations and maintenance.

To help seed this effort, the State of Washington's two research universities are collaborating to find more effective ways to maximize the value of their buildings. With state funding for capital projects declining sharply, and NIH funding also dropping, it is absolutely critical that the value of construction be maximized. In a series of roundtables with local industry leaders, best practices were identified and a model for more effective project delivery was developed.

The group divided the conversation and recommendations into two segments, *what we build* and *how we build*. Drawing on both experience from actual projects and a number of research studies, conversations focused on the choices that are made during the process and how they can affect the overall value of the project.

Recommendations included new project governance bodies, developing budgets rather than cost estimates, and separating building shell and core from fit-out.

Comments:

- Separating program and shell designs will result in larger buildings, as they require higher ceilings, greater floor-to-floor clearance, and more capacity for mechanical equipment change.
- Realize that the exterior expression of program function often results in a unique, well-designed façade; find other ways of designing quality buildings to avoid creating uniform, homogenous shells.
- Landscape budget cannot be viewed as expendable in the later stages of design/build.
- Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) involves a single contract between owner, builder and contractors and a project governance meeting structure which allows critical decisions to be made earlier in the project timeline, resulting in greater collaboration, more efficient delivery and financial savings. IPD can pose a challenge in a University setting in balancing maximum value with required esthetics, durability and functionality.
- IPD would work best in building such as a large research facility, given to modular and repetitive functions, rather than a building such a library, which is not highly repetitive or modular in its uses.

PROJECTS IN PROGRESS

The following projects, with a funding from a variety of sources, are in predesign to develop them into projects with target budgets. They were presented to the Commission in brief:

Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Testing
Eric McArthur, Project Manager, CPD

CAMCET will advance the University's leadership role in clean technologies, by being an ecosystem for catalyzing multi-disciplinary solutions to the greatest environmental challenges facing our planet. This ecosystem is a multi-disciplinary environment of academic research, teaching, commercial and other government agencies exploring clean energy technology. CAMCET will achieve this by being a hub for learning, researching, prototyping and driving clean technology ideas to market. The predesign will develop the unique DNA of the facility through highly intense workshops with the diverse clean tech community. In addition to facility definition, the predesign team is working with University leaders to address facility governance, operations and site location.

The building will focus on a new pedagogy which incorporates research and commercial involvement in academic instruction through public-private partnerships, and will include instructional classrooms and labs, , a regional test bed facility

that will assist in the scale-up, prototyping, testing, and validating of clean energy innovations, as well as lounges, community space, utility and street improvements, and regional amenity spaces.

The predesign assumes this is embedded in the emerging Innovation District in West Campus and will be delivered as part of the larger development.

Comments:

- Consider carefully before putting active-learning classrooms west of 15th.
- Be fluid in designing labs spaces, moving office spaces to a mezzanine level, leaving some high-bay maker spaces.
- The geometry of the preferred site is restrictive, and the goals of the program would be better served by a flexible, loose-fit, rectangular shell with the largest floor plate possible.
- Project goals should be organized by an internal logic. As goals evolve during design phases, include further discussion of the campus context and site goals.
- The program should be reflected in the design of the building; it should be a model of energy efficiency.

Population Health Facility

Lyndsey Cameron, Project Manager, OUA

The University of Washington is requesting $10,000,000 in design funding in the 2017-2019 biennium for a new Population Health Education Facility. Formerly known as the Health Science Education Phase I/T-Wing Renovation, the project was renamed "Population Health Education Facility" to more accurately reflect evolving team-based cross disciplinary pedagogies being adopted in the Health Sciences schools in order to achieve the Triple Aim of Population Health: Improving the Care of individuals, the health of populations, and reducing per-capita costs.

In the 2015-17 biennium the State Legislature appropriated, and the Board of Regents approved, the expenditure of $623,000 in the UW Capital Budget to complete the predesign for Phase I, a new Health Sciences Education facility/addition, of a proposed multi-phased renovation of T-Wing. This predesign document serves as the basis to confirm the program, scope, and the project budget for the design and construction funding request over the 2017-19 and 2019-21 biennia. The total project cost for the Population Health Education Facility is $94,000,000 and includes design and construction funding.

Comments:

- Be sure that facility program and outcomes are directly tied to stated project goals.
- The most important goal of the project should be to support the South Campus master planning.
- Another stated goal should deal with sustainability issues, as well as healthy building challenges.

UW Bothell Phase 4 STEM Building

Jeannie Natta, Project Manager, CPD

The new proposed Phase 4 facility focuses on expanding engineering and computer science degree programs. The building is estimated to be 76,668 SF and includes 35% active learning classrooms, 53% experiential learning labs, 15% collaborative faculty office spaces and 7% student collaboration spaces. Experiential learning labs differ from classroom labs by accommodating on-going research projects conducted by undergraduate and graduate students collaborating with faculty. Student research and hands-on learning is essential to UW Bothell's mission and teaching pedagogy.

The proposed STEM building has a close programmatic relationship with Discovery Hall. The UW Bothell master plan identified the adjacent site for a future building. This site is the preferred preliminary project site because of the utility infrastructure installed during the construction of Discovery Hall. Two other sites were also considered and the analysis is included in the report.

Comments:

- The Commission appreciated the clearly articulated and well-thought out goals, as well as the way the project complements the neighboring Discovery Hall.

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 libraries needs, housing and dining requirements, parking, transportation and mobility issues, infrastructure and utilities, as well as landscape, ecology and hydrology.

UW Seattle Campus Master Plan

Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA

A major change since the Campus Master Plan was last brought before the Commission is the reduction of requested growth allowance from 8 million gsf to 6 million, due in part to a decision to reduced heights in West Campus to encourage wider floor plates, as well as the desire to produce a realistic package for the City's requested 10 year timeframe while allowing the University flexibility in site development. A preliminary draft plan will be released on June 20 for internal City review. The University will respond to issues raised and release a public draft at the beginning of October.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.