

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC
Monday, August 10, 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 June 8th meeting minutes and current agenda were approved.

UW Updates

- The University has moved more than 90% of classes online for the fall. Many students will still be on campus, as residence halls are expecting 6000-8000 residents to live on campus despite remote learning.
- After initially being put on pause due to COVID impacts, the Site W27 project is again moving forward, and will be sending out requests for information within the next few months.
- Early indications show that State funding impacts due to COVID will hit the operating side of the University hard, although, capital projects may continue to move forward, as an economic stimulus to the state. Currently only one project remains on hold at the UW; ICA Basketball Training/Operations Facility and Health & High Performance Center.

UW Tacoma Milgard Hall

Shannon Thompson – UW PM

Project Updates

- Project Goals –The team continues to meet and collaborate with campus partners to align project goals. Current goals include:

- Innovate
 - Promote interdisciplinary innovation
 - Encourage Design Thinking
- Educate
 - Provide a flexible environment
 - Integrate ambitious sustainable strategies
- Engage
 - Establish a student-oriented hub
 - Create a welcoming building
- Project Schedule
 - Project definition is expected to wrap up in August 2020.
 - Long-term schedules anticipate mass-timber construction and will plan appropriately for potential weather constraints.
- Site
 - The evolution of site selection shows the current Cradle parking lot on campus as the preferred site.
 - Topography and adjacency to existing programs and campus circulation were key components in this site selection.
 - The site integrates the axis on campus well.
 - Circulation and connections through campus were considered and evaluated.
 - The overall footprint allows for future campus planning.
 - General massing studies have allowed the team to visualize scale, and aided in structure and budgeting strategies.
- Program
 - Collaboration with school working groups has helped develop and understanding of the importance of programming.
 - Determined footprint needs of each school.
 - Discussion continues to determine the must haves from the want to haves (classroom quantities, sizes and needs, lab space need, etc.)
- Process
 - The team continues to expand and solidify project teams, including sustainability and trade partners.
 - A mass timber tour in Oregon was scheduled and proved useful in providing visual possibilities to collaborating partners.

Comments-

- *The word “iconic” came up in initial goal discussions. Has that remained as a goal? Has there been more specific understanding of what that means to various stakeholders?*
 - *Many buildings on campus already educate very well. So don’t let that overshadow the ability for the building to also be iconic and to add to the campus.*
 - *Iconic should resonate the industrial nature and feel/rich history of timber in the Tacoma area.*
- *What are the advantages vs disadvantages of 3 to 4 stories?*
 - *3 stories is more cost effective. Will continue to test fit.*
 - *Once out of the ground, the economy and speed of erection can be an advantage with the timber construction, especially for a smaller project. Don’t discount a 4 story building.*
- *A master plan for the entire site should be determined, if only half the site is used.*
 - *Stay away from a feeling of “leftover” space.*

- *Check in with code inspectors early, related to mass timber. Code and code interpretations can vary quite a bit from state to state.*
 - o *Initial discussions of this sort have been very positive and indicate that mass timber is not a new idea in this region/area.*

UWMC Northwest Behavioral Health Teaching Facility

Jeannie Natta – UW PM

Project Updates

- Project Goals
 - o Innovative and Comprehensive Care
 - o Alternate to Existing Long Term Civil Commitment
 - o Training Site for the Next Generation
 - o 24/7 Telehealth Program
 - o Ensure a Safe Environment
- Program
 - o This project encompasses a fairly complex program including med/surge beds to serve physical and mental health conditions, behavioral health beds, outpatient specialty services, and training and education spaces.
- Site
 - o Campus design drivers include:
 - Flow, circulation, adjacency and connection
 - Setbacks and height limits, create an unusual space and size
 - o Program design drivers
 - Need for patient rooms (require windows and exterior space)
 - Circulation and patient access
 - Program and building connection (drives stacking configurations)
 - o Early massing studies brought an understanding of light and shadow as well as overall circulation and function of levels. These highlight the importance of pulling back columns from the existing building to enable maximum views and patient privacy.
 - Level one – maximize program availability. Will include outpatient, dining, and facilities management.
 - Level two – med/surge unit and connections to main hospital
 - Level three – med/surge and therapy
 - Level four-seven – behavioral health units
 - Organized around a central spine, with flexibility to partition off floors to specific patient populations, as needed.
- Landscape Design Objectives
 - o Fit the building into the campus; utilize and save existing tree groves; consider parking needs and reinforce welcoming principle; ensure ADA access; and understand vehicular and pedestrian framework.
 - o Aid in creating a more cohesive framework on campus through landscape.
 - o Landscape opportunities include multiple zones
 - Arrival and drop off
 - Dining Terrace and Garden Walk
 - Roof Terraces

- Existing tree groves and exceptional trees are noted and efforts will be made to transplant current courtyard plantings.
- External patio and green walk includes a mild elevation change, providing a sunken patio feel.
- Unit outdoor terraces provide therapeutic direct views to terraces from indoor cores.
 - Brings daylight into indoor spaces, and the feeling of outdoors inside without compromising safety and visibility.
- Green heart and spine option was shown as potential additive concept, and would provide east/west connection.

Comments –

- *Explain more about the courtyard spaces and sun accesses. Entrance court yard light conditions?*
 - *Entry lobby is facing east – morning sun. It will need to be shade loving plants. Therapy space in the SW corner – will get the most access to the sun.*
- *Patient care outdoor space – some concern about maintenance – how will it be managed?*
 - *Safety is paramount, so the space must include built in planters and be anti-ligature. Plants likely to be low plants in planters. Issues of patients eating plants – cannot have trees due to anti-ligature.*
- *Viewing gardens may have small trees. Dependent upon integration with the building.*
- *Outdoor space is primarily for exercise – adjacent to the indoor exercise space.*
- *Not a horticultural therapy program.*
- *Complemented the team on doing very thoughtful work on the blocking and stacking for complex program relationships. Managing them on the odd shaped parcel – graceful approach. Thinking is very sound.*
- *Concern - visibility and sense of welcome of the arrival point from the ground. Pedestrian bridge may obscure view of entrance. Arrival that is clear and welcoming is essential. Looking forward to seeing more as it is developed.*
- *Refining massing and set back and wings. It may be able to be simplified and not have as many setbacks. Simple is better.*
- *Envelope of the building will be essential. How will patient windows be managed and varied by solar exposure? Careful considerations will be required.*
 - *Design team developed an 11' module with a 30% glazing. We will share further at upcoming meeting.*
- *Complements to the team on solving complex issues. Agree that the team may need to simplify massing.*
- *Ensure that the green spaces are integrated and optimized. Compliments on the energy and effort being put into green spaces.*
- *Concern expressed over material and color of the building. Materials and color need to make the small bits of green space more comfortable. Make the building fit into the context quietly with low visual profile despite its mass.*
 - *Important that the exterior respond to the campus. The MIMP suggests brick. The desire is to make the building feel lighter.*
- *Porches on upper floors will only get morning light and will be shaded by the building. Sun and health go together.*
- *Very different type of hospital. How do we make a building that is green, close to nature – or a building “of nature”, especially with a building of this size? Need to think about the ways we develop a hospital.*
- *What is the expression of a building serving this population?*
- *Hospitals tend to be serious. Could it be a happier place than a traditional hospital to support mental healing?*
 - *Also keep in mind that much of the year has rain, so an exterior space, even in the rain, is beneficial and part of the Pacific Northwest.*

UWB +CC STEM 4

Harry Fuller– UW PM

Project Updates

- Target Scope & Budget
 - o Benchmarks from local construction and designs (WSU Everett, Shoreline CC) used to consider all building aspects (overall, interior, exterior, design etc.) for build system targets.
 - o To align scope and budget, a smaller than anticipated building is being planned.
- Vision and Goals
 - o Program Growth
 - o Flexible Learning Environments
 - o Foster Collaboration
 - o STEM Presence
- Site
 - o Test fits for grading and service access as well as the scale of space needs, which has allowed a better understanding of site opportunities.
 - o Considering incorporation into the hillside.
 - o Opportunities considered on ways to enhance connection to existing UW campus and to Cascadia College.
- Building
 - o Focuses include Façade, knitting construction into the space, and circulation through and around the space.
 - o Planned as a 4 story building, designed to maximize daylight on each level.
 - Still determining ways to bring in daylight on west end of building lower levels which otherwise feel like a “dead end”.
- Planning and initial design
 - o Considering movement around and through the building, as topography creates challenges.
 - o Primary entrance anticipated from the southwestern corridor.
 - Initial views will be of forest.
 - o Eastern entrance established as an active façade with public space; west entrance/exit space would include service entrances
 - o Faculty offices mixed between the two schools.
 - Slight variation between I, Y and D shaped buildings
 - I Floor Plan
 - Level 1 – Entry plaza, lab and mechanical shop space. Outdoor project and learning space. (18ft ceiling height allows this)
 - Level 2 - Lab, study and classroom space. Where connections between institutions and disciplines happen.
 - o The “living room” of the building.
 - Level 3 – Lab, classroom, outdoor learning and faculty offices.
 - o Determining how to utilize light wells to increase daylight to these offices and spaces.
 - Level 4 – West Access entry and overlook to forest. Includes service entry and lab/classroom and faculty offices.
 - Y- Floor Plan
 - Puts circulation emphasis on a more centralized staircase.
 - D- Floor Plan

- Very similar to I-scheme (as far as stair and entry locations)

Comments -

- *Can you provide clarity on how faculty offices and spaces will be shared?*
 - *The design process hopes to pair like programs to share adjacent spaces. The goal is to create a blended environment, without a definitive feel of “UW” space vs “CC” space.*
 - *Be sure the communication to clients clearly calls out the advantages and disadvantages throughout the process.*
 - *Ensure a potential for flexibility in the future.*
- *The higher ceilings on the ground floor make the building feel more accessible and welcoming.*
- *Y shape design given unanimous support. It better engages the crescent path, and is more inviting than a convex design.*
 - *Creates the best chance for entry and established vertical connection in correspondence with the light well.*
 - *Could the Y shape be wider? Keep exploring options within this design.*
- *The stair at the end of the D scheme entrance was compelling. Perhaps utilize the quieter spaces at the west end of the building for a special kind of study space.*

UW Husky Village Redevelopment

Tracey Andres- UW Account Manager

Summary

This project replaces aging housing at UW Bothell. The project includes a ground lease to a Developer, who will come with their own architect due to razor thin margins. Contract negotiations are underway and are still being solidified.

Project Update

- Priorities
 - Gateway to Campus
 - Create student housing with traditional residence hall and apartment style units
 - Include auxiliary functions like dining and food service and leased office space.
 - Integrate with campus transit
 - Have no impact to the UW balance sheet.
- Selection Process
 - 4 developers were engaged in selection. Capstone selected as preferred developer based on:
 - Lowest student rents
 - Design of dining hall
 - Storm water and parking solutions
 - Potential redevelopment of adjacent property
 - Phased implementation of bed capacity increases
 - Thoughtful engagement with the UW
- Imagery
 - Shows a new campus gateway along Beardsley and a continuation of the promenade throughout the campus. Promenade intended to draw the public through the campus and complies with ADA access requirements. Design enables food area to be accessible to the entire campus community and not just exclusively to residence halls.
 - Focal element centered on the “Food Barn” related to the design of the quad space in the center of the residences.
 - Landscape Concepts

- Wetland forest to the east and coniferous forest to the west, with a mix of the two in-between.
- The Food Barn
 - Truly a barn feel with use of heavy timber to pay homage to the local industry and past use of the space (formerly Truly Farm).
 - Includes potential event space that can be blocked off on an upper level.
- Student Support Services
 - Includes collaboration and student office spaces, with “commuter lounges” adjacent to transit.
- Residential Communities
 - Tucked back into the wooded spaces to help knit the buildings into the current landscape.
- Community/Outdoor Spaces
 - Open lawns around and through the Barn. The transparency of the Barn would allow see through visibility creating an additional sense of community.
- Campus Growth
 - Expansion potential concepts provide a continuation/ extension of the existing design.
- Exterior/Interior Materials
 - Strong brick exteriors being considered, which fits nicely with the rest of campus. Interior spaces likely warmer, timber experience, more inviting and comforting.
- Continued Project Developments
 - Regional Storm water system
 - Regional parking plan
 - Site plan modifications
 - Distributions of ground floor uses
 - Distribution of transit center and Beardsley expansion
 - Exterior development

Comments –

- *Where is the project at in terms of schedule?*
 - *Working toward finalizing deal negotiations and then planning for Regent approval in November, with construction to start in late summer 2021.*
- *Be cautious about student housing rates. Ensure that rates are low enough to support the current populations (Bothell campus currently has the highest population of homeless students). If certain criteria’s are not met, will the cost be driven up to high?*
- *The evolution of the site plan has come along nicely. The definition along Beardsley and the distinct community/social spaces created by the food barn provide private spaces.*
 - *Note the latest shift of the D building may work against that. Having the D building remain more perpendicular creates more definitive space between the residence hall areas and the Apartment buildings.*

Interdisciplinary Engineering Building

Jennifer Reynolds – UW PM

Summary

Project is currently planned as a 75,000GSF building budgeted at approximately \$75M.

Project Update

- Goals
 - Educational Experience

- Diversity and Access
- Accommodate growth
- Build Interdisciplinary Collaboration
- Program
 - Alleviates space deficiencies within the College of Engineering
 - Intended to provide a home base for freshman and sophomore students
 - Collaborative space
- Timeline
 - Currently engaged in Builder Selection Process, with the final 4
- Site
 - Site C11 selected due to convenient adjacencies to other Engineering buildings.
 - Close to core engineering buildings
 - Challenges include significant topographic change (overall 50ft of grade change), and sensitivity to site placement due to view corridors from the UW Club.
 - Pedestrian access prioritized, with limited vehicular access, to promote pedestrian experience.
- Budget
 - Currently \$75,070,000, however \$8M of that will be for relocation of current occupants.
 - Benchmarks mostly coming in around \$1000/GSF
- Next Steps
 - Builder Selection – In process
 - Architect selection – (December UWAC meeting)
 - Project Definition

Architect Short List Review

- The commission reviewed and refined the short list of architects that was developed by the current selection committee as well as made recommendations for potential additions.

Comments –

- *What is currently happening with the Faculty Club?*
 - *The Faculty Club has been permanently closed as a faculty club due to COVID. It's use is being re-evaluated.*
- *Is \$1000/gsf too low?*
- *While budget is a factor, do be sure you are preserving as much of the square footage as you can with regard to the site. Once a building is in place, there's not a lot of opportunity to change it..*
- *The social experience of this building and the degree of difficulty of the site topography should be considered when filtering architects. Ensure a balance between the technical space design needs and these other experiences.*
- *Transparency/Science on display was an important factor in guiding this project.*

Closing Comments/Discussion

Architect Selection Process –Interdisciplinary Engineering Building

- *Concern expressed that some on the list may be over qualified.*
 - *Must they have STEM experience? Should that be a filter? Would work on other complex sites, make up for lack of STEM experience?*
 - *It should be a lesser criterion, then design excellence/thoughtful design.*
- *A local and a non-local pairing, would provide and excellent message to the local architect community*
- *If design quality is top priority, ensure that we have appropriate filters and a strong understanding of order.*

- *Don't box firms into the dichotomy of equating design quality and overall experience.*
- *Keep in mind the ability of firms to add to the campus. What will they bring to and for the campus? Will they strengthen the campus will simultaneous fulfilling program needs?*
- *Be intentional about reviewing specific minority and women owned designers during the initial process. How can we help change the industry?*

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30PM