UW Architectural Commission

Minutes of Meeting
June 29, 2015
Gerberding Hall, Room 142

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; Professor, Landscape Architecture, UC Berkeley	Voting
☑	Andrea Leers	Principal, Leers Weinzapfel 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
☑	Rebecca Barnes	University Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☑	Robert Stickney	Interim Associate Vice President, Capital Projects Office	Ex Officio
☐	Charles Kennedy	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services	Ex Officio
☑	Kristine Kenney	University Landscape Architect, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☐	John Seidelmann	Director, Capital Planning, Ofc of the University Architect	Ex Officio
☐	Paul Jenny	Senior Vice President for Planning & Management	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. The Commissioners unanimously approved the meeting agenda, and the minutes of the March 30, 2015 meeting as submitted. Dean Schaufelberger introduced Robert Stickney, Interim Associate Vice President for Capital Projects. Kristine Kenney provided a detailed report of March 26, 2015 University Landscape Advisory Committee. (See minutes of meeting: http://pm.uw.edu/oua/landscape-advisory-committee-meeting-march-26-2015)

North Campus Housing
Requested Action: Phase IV(a) Schematic Design Update
Jon Lebo, Director, CPO
Victoria Morris, Project Manager
Rob Lubin, Assoc Director, Housing & Food Services
Steve Kieran, Evan Yassky Kieran Timberlake
Laurie Olin, OLIN Studios

Overview:

The North Campus Student Housing, Phase IV(a) replaces McCarty Hall with three new buildings, identified as building B, C and D on the attachment with occupancy planned for the start of Autumn Quarter 2018. The buildings will feature two floors of concrete construction with 5 floors of wood frame construction on top. McCarty Hall currently has a design capacity of 620 beds; the three new buildings will have approximately 1,870 beds.

A new dining facility and catering kitchen in Building D will replace the dining in McMahon Hall and the catering kitchen in Haggett Hall. The new dining facility will support the North Campus area and the new catering kitchen will serve the entire campus. Other amenity program spaces include the regional desk, fitness center and learning resource center. 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 and floors where bathrooms are shared between multiple rooms.

Landscape improvements include new internal courtyards, a central urban plaza, new pedestrian access enhancing circulation between residential buildings, interconnections to the campus community, open spaces for passive and active recreational uses, and the relocation of a portion of Whitman Court road. The changes developed in Phase IV(a) along with Phase IV(b) will create a new character for this part of the campus that retains the woodland nature of the existing area, while better serving connections within and to the broader campus.

DRAFT

This project is funded with Housing & Food Services reserves until the project financing is approved by the Board of Regents late fall.

Budget	
Project Forecasted Cost Phase IV(a)	$230M
Schedule	
Design	March 2015 – November 2016
Construction	February 2016 – July 2018
Occupancy	September 2018

Comments:

- The Commission appreciated the development from a framework to an on-the-ground tapestry, with a rich topographic differentiation which maintains connections to the campus while providing great experiential conditions.
- The horizontal way in which the buildings meet the sky does not provide the same richness as the topography.
- Construction phasing must take into account living conditions for students residing in Buildings B, C, and D., in order not only to maintain access to campus, but to provide a decent living environment during next construction phases. Consider moving Denny Field into Phase 1 to help achieve this goal.
- Provide clearer access to points of entry to the buildings, particularly Building C.
- The service drive need as much thought as the other walks; students will use it and it should be designed with that in mind.
- Consider the function of the view corridor between Buildings B and D as a connector; engage the landscape further and indicate an easy and logical way to progress though it from the Town Square to Building C.
- Material choices in buildings B, C and D might be of a family, albeit with variation, while materials in Buildings A and E could provide a sense of urbanity, allowing them to stand on their own.

Campus Landscape Framework
Requested Action: Update
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect, OUA

Overview:

The Campus Landscape Framework project has resulted in a large, in some ways unwieldy, document. The Office of the University Architect is attempting to format the information in a way that is digestible in many different ways by many different audiences. Section 1 (chapters 1 through 3) explains the campus and the document, Section 2 goes into greater depth regarding the experiential quality of the campus, Section 3 addresses stewardship, providing design guidelines and principles, policies, funding practices to be put into place, and operations and maintenance; section 4, the appendices, explores case studies in greater depth.

The Framework will also encompass, based on data from Grounds and Maintenance, current and standard landscape types, maintenance requirements, and staffing levels.

Comments:

- The University might follow the lead of other public institutions and establish philanthropic endowments for maintenance of iconic landscapes.
- Irrigation and water-usage should be considered in the discussion of converting lawn to natural planting zones
- Publish an overview document, and distinguish the four sections with subheadings.
- Consider how to present the information in a form that can be accessed readily, by various audiences.
- Require all consultants to reference the document, even if challenges are allowed.
- Use the North Campus Housing project as a test case for how the document can be used.

DRAFT

UWMC Front Entry Project
Requested Action: Design Development Approval
Steve Tatge, Director, Major Projects, CPO
Ross Pouley, Project Manager, CPO
Steve Zieneiwicz, Executive Director, UWMC Administration
Helen Shawcroft, Sr. Associate Administrator, UWMC Administration
Mark Reddington, LMN Architects
Barbara Swift, Swift Company

Overview:

The UWMC seeks to upgrade and modernize its main entrance on Pacific Street to create a more welcoming and accessible environment for patients and their families, and to better reflect its status as one of the nation's premiere academic medical centers. Goals for the project include improved visibility from Pacific Street, a lighter, more contemporary look and feel that will complement the new inpatient bed tower, improved pedestrian and vehicular traffic flow and creation of a sense of arrival.

The design effort has been informed by and developed in context with the other developments in the Montlake vicinity, including the Sound Transit station, the renovated Husky Stadium, the SR 520 project, and the Montlake Triangle and Rainier Vista project. The project may be executed in phases, though the first phase is the only one which is scheduled and funded. This phase includes a new entry drive, canopy, lobby, water intrusion membrane repair, and the expansion of the Emergency Department below the new Lobby at Level 2 of the facility. The site, street, and frontage improvements in the Public R.O.W. at Pacific Street have been developed to a concept level of design in this project, but will not be carried further or constructed as a part of the current project due to funding.

- Budget:
  - Estimated Project: $22,300,000
- Schedule:
  - Design Phase January 2015- October 2015
  - Construction schedule December 2015 – March 2017

Major challenges continue to be an expedited design and permitting schedule, and the rapid increase in construction pricing currently impacting the Puget Sound Region. The construction start date is critical to meet the target interface dates with the Montlake Tower Phase II construction and the work must be phased in a manner that maintains acceptable access to UWMC. Skanska was selected as the GC/CM for the project in late May and is working with the Design Team and the University on pricing and sequencing strategies.

Comments:

- Lighting of the canopy, structure, and garden must be carefully considered, given Seattle weather, the intrinsic nighttime activity in the space, the necessity of exposed conduit, and the desired lightness of the ceiling plane.
- Concern was expressed over the hanging signage, and its readability both as one approaches and departs the structure.
- The simplification of the plan was seen as a positive move.
- Pull all bench seating under the cover of the canopy, or create a clearer language to indicate which are under cover.
- Examine the possibility of reducing the height of the planter/wall and moving it down-slope.
- Design of Phase 2 will be important to achieving the goal of creating an identity entrance; and if at all possible, should be built in conjunction with Phase 1.

Action:

A motion was tendered and seconded to approve design development approval. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

Lunch Updates
Requested Action: Information
Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA

Informal, brief presentations were made on three projects, to update Commission members on design responses to previous comments.

West Campus Utility Plant (WCUP)
Located on University Ave NE, north of NE Pacific St and adjacent to the new UW Police Station, the WCUP is a progressive design/build project that will provide chilled water and emergency power to portions of South Campus. Phase 1 will construct an architecturally significant, unmanned, industrial-quality facility, sized to accommodate both initial and future equipment and loads. The Commission previously expressed a preference for a back-lighted polycarbonate material to screen the upper part of the building; investigations into the cost and acoustic requirements for screening the noise of the rooftop equipment have shown the material to be suitable in both regards. Exploration continues into a human-scale interpretive element and the University Environmental Stewardship Office has committed to develop content to be displayed on six large scale LCD video monitors positioned inside the clear glazing of the lower portion of the façade.

Comments:
- Consider some modulation of the planter wall, perhaps echoing the darker color of the adjacent police station, and highlight the storm water infrastructure function
- Insure the life cycle of the polycarbonate material against possible yellowing and cracking.
- The backlighted patterns which change very slowly were appreciated.

New Burke Museum
An architecturally noteworthy new museum facility will be built west of the existing Burke, along 15th Avenue. In response to feedback provided by the commission in March 2015, Olson Kundig Architects developed a proposed modification to the architectural articulation of the building at the south west corner of the building, above the main entry. The Commissioners felt that, with the removal of the "lantern" character due to program function in the building, the sense of welcome and of landmark was lost. The design team proposed a red metal sign installation.

Comments:
- There is no precedent for using super-graphic signage to identify campus buildings, though The Henry Art Gallery has recently begun to display graphic banners.
- The canopy is too high for function and path is ungraciously narrow.
- All edits have reduced the open and welcoming quality of the corner and the most recent diminishes the quality of the building. There was a preference for a clear delineation between upper and lower levels, with no sign, a wide, more friendly approach, and a lower canopy.

UW Tacoma Urban Solutions Center
The UW Tacoma Urban Solutions Center project is a renovation of the Tacoma Paper & Stationery Building, located between the existing UWT Science and Dougan Buildings; built in 1904, it is the last remaining undeveloped warehouse building along the newly redeveloped Prairie Line Trail. To be completed in two phases, this GC/CM project will provide structural and architectural improvements to enable future program activities, as well as replacing and improving existing mechanical and electrical systems and code-required upgrades. Miller Hull has proposed a return to an earlier manifestation of the façade, with dark columnar expressions between large windows which open to at ground level to create indoor/outdoor space along the Prairie Line Trail.

Comments:
- Follow up on the Prairie Line Trail stair connection, as discussed at the December 15, 2014 Commission meeting.

DRAFT

Campus Wayfinding and Signage, Phase 2 & 3
Requested Action: Design Development Update
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect
Karen Cheng, Professor of Design, UW School of Art

Overview:

The Campus Wayfinding and Signage project will develop a new program for contemporary wayfinding throughout the Seattle UW campus. The purpose is to ensure that all campus user's experience is supported with appropriate and well-located navigation information, whether they are first-time or long-time users, as pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and drivers, who may be students, faculty, staff, visitors, neighbors and/or making deliveries.

Phase 2 and 3 of the Campus Wayfinding and Signage will design a detailed UW map, for standardized use across campus and the web, and a family of physical sign structures. Mathews Studio, with collaboration by UW Professor of Design Karen Cheng, has been engaged to build on the framework established in Phase 1 by Applied Information Group.

Comments:

- Strategically locating the signs near light posts would be advantageous.
- The stylized map is far more legible than the current campus map, and makes for effective signage.
- Gold is preferable for the W logo on the signs, differentiating them from event banners and other temporary notices. Purple should be used discretely, perhaps in seams between sections.
- Explore enlarging the sign type size, especially with regard to ADA requirements.

Campus Master Plan
Requested Action: Initial Framework Information
Theresa Doherty, Senior Project Director, Planning and Management
Rebecca Barnes, University Architect, OUA

Overview:

Each of the thirteen major institutions within the City of Seattle are required to have an approved master plan that discloses their long term development plans. The University's current master plan was approved in 2003 and approved the development of 3 million square feet on the Seattle campus. By 2020, we anticipate all but 72,000 square feet will have been constructed or in various stages of the development process.

The authority of the Board of Regents for approval of the Seattle Campus Master Plan is documented in the 1998 City University Agreement:

> *"Section II B. 13. The University's Master Plan will not become final until the ordinance approving it has become law pursuant to the City Charter and the Master Plan has been adopted by the University's Board of Regents."*

The 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan will determine how the Seattle campus can grow over the next ten to twenty years in response to changes in student enrollment and research demands, while preserving the beauty of its physical environment and maximizing positive impacts on our neighbors. The plan will set the framework that the Office of University Architect will use as it continues to manage the development of the most beautiful college campus in the nation. OUA's recent and current planning has been designed to inform the contents of the next CMP, including the West Campus Development Framework, the South Campus Study 2, the recently completed Campus Landscape Framework, and the upcoming Campus Mobility Framework. Additional complementary work will be done to make the best use of these planning efforts in constructing the 2018 Campus Master Plan.

The Office of Planning and Management launched this four year planning effort in January of 2015 by appointing two internal committees. The Advisory Committee and Working Group will advise Senior Vice President Jenny in the formulation of the plan. All consultants will be hired by July of this year and the preliminary draft plan will be complete by December. Another informational briefing will be brought back to you in December before the preliminary draft document is published in January of 2016.

The Draft Plan will be published in mid-2016 with the Final Plan being published in early 2017. Prior to each of these dates the Regents will be briefed on the content and status of the plan.

Comments:

- The Cultural Resources Survey to be conducted on campus by the University, the City and the State, will identify important open spaces, as well as building and cultural resources. Is it appropriate for the plan to specify cultural, iconic and significant sites to be identified as undevelopable?

DRAFT

- It is rare that an institution does not have an academic and growth strategic plan that functions in conjunction with the development master plan. While the Master Plan document may fulfills a regulatory requirement, it does not address planning in a visionary sense.

Life Sciences Building
Requested Action: Schematic Design Information
John Lebo, Director, Major Projects, CPO
Troy Stahlecker, Project Manager, CPO
Doug Streeter, Andy Clinch, Perkins+Will
Jennifer Guthrie, GGN

Overview:

The College of Arts and Sciences Life Sciences Building (LSB) project is a five-story above-grade building with two stories below grade, plus a mechanical penthouse. The site encompasses the existing greenhouses and landscaped area located on the east side of Kincaid Hall. The existing greenhouse and associated buildings will be demolished and an approximately 167,700 gross square foot LSB will replace the existing greenhouse site with a 20,000 gross square foot greenhouse positioned south and east of the LSB. The LSB and Greenhouse are positioned on the site to optimize the building program and minimize the impact to the significant Deodar cedars along Stevens Way, as well as the trees in the woodland grove to the east.

The first floor will have an active open entry to the building at grade with Stevens Way and include 4 research/teaching laboratories. The greenhouse and loading dock are at grade with the Burke Gilman Trail and designated as the Basement 1 level. The upper four floors are modular in design consisting of 10 research labs per floor with procedural programming on the north side, laboratories in the center and offices along the south bay. The Basement 1 and Basement 2 levels house growth chambers, animal housing and research facilities. The greenhouse program is integrated into the LSB and consists of research, teaching and collections.

The new LSB, together with a new, larger greenhouse offers the Department of Biology and its faculty the opportunity to expand its faculty size and take a truly integrated approach to Biology in a highly collaborative atmosphere by bringing together faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and undergraduates with overlapping research interests.

Project Budget	
Life Sciences Building	$160,500,000
Schedule	
Predesign	June 2014 – October 2014
Design	January 2015- June 2016
Construction	July 2016 – June 2018
Occupancy	July 2018 – September 2018

Comments:

- The loading dock should be pulled back from the existing meander path.
- Vertical louvers are appropriate on the south façade, but careful investigation is needed on the effect of depth and spacing of the louvers on the quality of interior light during the day. The perforated fins should create a pleasant, dappled lighting effect.
- The wooden screen of the north façade should be thicker, in order to feel more solid.
- Understand the long-range weathering of the proposed treated composite wood cladding material.
- Reexamine the Burke Gilman Trail edge. A planted buffer would be desirable. The trail width might be reduced along the greenhouses to provide room for modulation or the gravel path might be removed for the length of the site.

Action:
A motion was tendered and seconded that schematic design be approved; the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

DRAFT