Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, John Schaufelberger, called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. The Commissioners unanimously approved the agenda for the day’s meeting. University Architect Rebecca Barnes gave a succinct update on design development, to date, on the UW Bothell Student Activities Center in response to Commission comments at the January 27, 2014 interim review special session.

The Commission voted unanimously to approve, as submitted, the minutes of the December 9, 2013 Architectural Commission regular meeting, the January 27, 2014 special session and the March 10, 2014 interim review of the UW Police Department Building special session.

University Landscape Architect Kristine Kenney gave a brief report of the April 7, 2014 Landscape Advisory Committee meeting (appended).

**College of Arts & Sciences Life Sciences Building**

**Requested Action: Architect Selection**

Jon Lebo, Director, Special Projects, CPO

Bob Stacey, Dean, and Steve Majeski, Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences Life Sciences Building (LSB) project site is a combination of the existing greenhouses and landscaped area located on the east side of Kincaid Hall. The LSB will accommodate new laboratory and office space to allow the Department of Biology to increase its faculty size to meet major increases in undergraduate student demand. A new greenhouse of approximately 25,000 gross square feet will be constructed as part of the LSB project. The existing greenhouse and associated buildings will be demolished and the LSB of approximately 148,000 gross square feet will be built on the existing greenhouse site to the east of Kincaid Hall. It is anticipated that the LSB will consist of five floors and a basement to house 15-16 research labs, associated offices and conference spaces, 2-3 authentic undergraduate research/teaching laboratories, growth chambers, and imaging facilities.

The new LSB and a larger greenhouse will allow the Department of Biology to hire 10-12 new faculty members and to strengthen key areas of interdisciplinary research by bringing together faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and undergraduates with overlapping research interests, permitting the Department and its faculty a truly integrated approach to Biology and allowing it to take a highly collaborative culture to a new level.
The preliminary project estimate is $140 - $180 million. This is consistent with the $160 million rough-order-of-magnitude cost represented in the One Capital Plan for the combined Life Sciences Building and Greenhouse. The project budget will be determined during the predesign phase.

Project Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$140,000,000 - $180,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect Selection</td>
<td>February 2014 - May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predesign</td>
<td>June 2014 – October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>November 2014 - June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Greenhouse</td>
<td>October 2015 – May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction LSB</td>
<td>July 2016 – June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>July 2018 – September 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A request for qualifications (RFQ) was issued by the Capital Projects Office in March 2014 and three of the eleven responding firms were selected to present proposals to the Architectural Commission: ZGF Architects, Perkins + Will, and THA/HDR. The firms were asked to present illustrative materials of their choice, including models, drawings, and electronic media to convey their approach to the design challenges and to supplement their statements of qualification.

Action:

After due deliberation by the Commissioners, a motion was tendered, seconded, and approved, to recommend to the Board of Regents that a contract be awarded to the top ranked team, with a second firm recommended, should the first be unable or unwilling to fulfill the contract. The recommendations cannot be reported as of the date of these minutes, not having been acted upon by the Board of Regents, but will become part of the record of the Board of Regents May meeting minutes. The Commission went on record as strongly suggesting that the project landscape architect and contractor teams be brought on board as early in the process as is practicable.

West Campus Utility Plant

Requested Action: Information – Introduction to Two-Part Design/Build

Steve Harrison, Project Manager, CPO
David Strauss, SHKS Architects

The West Campus Utility Plant (UWCUP) will reliably provide cooling and emergency power to the Animal Research and Care Facility, serve other campus demands, and enhance public perception of the UW campus and the University’s sustainability profile. The project will build a 20,000 SF Utility Plant, which will produce approximately 3000 tons of chilled water and approximately 6MW of emergency power; included in the project scope are improvements to the existing tunnel distribution system and interpretive public communication feature regarding the University’s sustainability profile. Design concerns include and emphasis on architectural expression due to the prominent campus gateway location of the site and the interpretive sustainability component.

The project will be built using a two-part (or “progressive”) design/build process, specifying a separate contract period for each of the two phases – design and construction, and a qualifications-based selection (as differentiated from the traditional design/build project-proposal-based selection).

Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$22 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant design-build</td>
<td>$22 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution system improvements</td>
<td>$2+ million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project budget</td>
<td>$30.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design-Build Team Selection</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design</td>
<td>4th quarter 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Architectural Commission will have the opportunity for substantial input in the architect selection process at the June 23, 2014 meeting, prior to which, a document entitled Goals and Guidance for Architecture, Landscape, and Campus Character, currently being developed by SHKS Architects with input from the Office of the University Architect as part of the Request for Proposals (RFP), will be made available to the Commission. A week prior to the meeting, the shortlisted firms’ responses to RFP design criterion #3, Approach to Building Architecture and Urban Design will be distributed to the Commissioner with a scoring sheet; criterion 3 will be worth 40 points of the possible 200 for each firm, with 40 points attributable to approach to engineering and the remaining distributed among design/build issues. Architect interviews and selection will be held at the June 23rd Commission meeting, where all RFP criteria will be discussed and scored. Commission members’ scores will be averaged and used in the Selection Committee’s final scoring the following day. The selected team will return to the Commission in the course of the design/build process for conceptual design approval.

David Strauss of SHKS gave the Commission a brief preview of his Goals and Guidance document, displaying a wide variety of architecturally significant precedents for the project.

Comments:
• The issues which may arise if one design/build team’s design done under the first contract is handed to a second team in a new contract for implementation are not insignificant. It is recommended that the university retain the ability to continue the originally selected architect with a new builder partner in the event the builder is replaced for any reason.
• Design and architectural concerns must inform scoring of all criteria and not merely the criterion which specifically addresses the approach to architecture. This is intended in the inclusion of the University Architect and the University Landscape Architect as members of the selection committee.
• The opportunity to play into and off of the nature of the urban fabric of the site should be implicit in the prefatory document.

Campus Landscape Framework
Requested Action: Update – Preview of Final Report
Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect
Chris Mathews and Rachel Gleeson, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates

Overview:
The Campus Landscape Framework (CLF) project is developing a document that is not a traditional master plan, but rather a series of strategic, action-based tools for the ongoing planning, design and stewardship of the UW Seattle campus landscape. The overarching goal of the CLF is to define and communicate the value of the campus landscape and to guide its development and stewardship over the next approximately 20 years. In addition, the Campus Landscape Framework will provide specific tools that can be used in future development projects on campus, and can be used as the basis for the landscape component of the next Campus Master Plan.

The Campus Landscape Framework (CLF) initiative is intended to articulate a clear vision for the UW Seattle campus landscape. It will do so by reviewing existing policies, practices and tools, as well as developing additional policies, practices and tools. It will reflect on the historic intent of the designed landscapes on campus, collect data on current uses, identify best practices, and project a future that demonstrates the values of the institution.

Through multiple conversations with a broad cross-section of members of the campus community, site walks, web surveys and other methodologies, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates has gained an in depth understanding of campus landscape character, typologies, ecologies, history, current issues, entries and edges, as well as the social landscape, from which they have worked to develop a Framework, organized around five guiding principles, for use as a resource by campus constituents, consultants, architects and project managers which stresses the value of the campus landscape. They shared a preview of the final Campus Landscape Framework document for comment.

Comments:
• The Commission lauded the Framework as an extraordinary, comprehensive achievement.
• Various means and formats for dissemination of the Framework should be investigated, including web presence and interactive visual media, as well as print reference versions, and might inform various curricula and pedagogies. A website is in development and will be publicized in the fall with the release of the document.
A strategic, campus-wide approach to stormwater management is a necessary and logical outgrowth of the Framework, and should explore regulatory dispensations for historic nature of campus, and harvesting and storage for uses other than irrigation.

The Landscape Framework, along with the West Campus Development Framework and North Campus Housing Study, is intended as a preparatory study, in advance of the formal Campus Master Plan effort which will commence in 2016.

North Campus Housing Site Study
Requested Action: Information – Initial Concepts
Jon Lebo, Director, Special Projects, CPO
Pam Schreiber, Director, and J. R. Fulton, Capital Planning and Sustainability Manager, Housing & Food Services
Steven Kieran, Kieran Timberlake

Overview:
The North Campus Student Housing site study, one component of the North Campus Student Housing project pre-design, is intended to investigate options for siting student housing uses, redeveloping the campus landscape in the surrounding area, and organizing the North Campus study area for future development.

This study will test a range of housing siting development scenarios and site planning that will achieve a goal of a total of 3160 to 3224 beds, including keeping Hansee Hall in all scenarios. The study will explore options for configuring and siting the housing in the study area that will accomplish several goals in addition to density: the creation of a unique, cohesive and attractive student housing village characterized by the wooded context, historic building neighbors, the central open space of Denny Field, and excellent connectivity from this new “village” area to surrounding campus areas, including the Kincaid Ravine, the housing north of 45th, the Denny Yard and Fine Arts Quad section of the historic core campus. One of the many challenges with this project will be fitting the desired student housing program density onto the existing sites and creating a sense of place, an appropriate landscape character, and appropriate connectivity with the surrounding campus and local areas. Additional challenges include determining the cost-benefits of removing versus reusing McMahon Hall and the relocation of all or part of the tennis courts.

The Commission selected the team of Kieran Timberlake Architects and landscape architect firm OLIN to undertake the study in September 2013. The project is funded through the pre-design phase only at this time.

Project Budget:
North Campus Student Housing Site Study $420,000

Schedule:
North Campus Student Housing Site Study March 2014 - August 2014
Architectural Commission Presentation June 23, 2014

The Kieran Timberlake/OLIN team presented initial planning and massing studies to the Commission remotely, from their Philadelphia offices, via web-based conferencing software, with real time discussion via telephone.

Comments:
• The schemes presented in which the buildings follow the slope with less massing at the plateau and taller buildings down-slope allow lighter, less-shadowed courtyard open spaces above, while the schemes which suggest taller buildings up slope allow a higher percentage of the rooms to enjoy a view across the ravine and have less impact on the view upslope from the bottom of the hill.
• The relative benefits of renovating McMahon as opposed to repurposing as academic space remain to be discovered as the study progresses.
• The implications of the dual nature of the flat and sloped section of the site must be carefully considered in the building massing, including the nature of the more formally defined courtyards between uphill groupings and the interstices between buildings running parallel to the slope, and landscape issues created by various massing options.
• An appropriate gesture to unite building groupings across Whitman Court should be explored further.
Burke Gilman Trail
Requested Action: Design Development Approval for Phase 2
Randy Everett, Project Manager, CPO
Josh Kavanagh, Director, Transportation Services
Mauricio Villarreal and Eric Bode, Place Studio, LLC

Overview:
This project will develop design documents for the entire length of the University-owned portion of the Burke Gilman Trail Corridor (BGTC) and construct the Phase 1, Campus Reach, portion of the trail. The design of the trail is based upon the BGTC Concept Plan by PLACE Studio, dated November 2012, with intersection components at Pend Oreille Road NE based upon the Pend Oreille Entry Improvement Study by Swift Company dated July 2011. Design documents will be developed consistent with Federal Highway Administration standards, as appropriate. It is anticipated that construction projects to improve the BGTC will be accomplished in phases, as funding allows. Current total project estimate for the combined Phases 1 and 2 is approximately $28 million.

Phase 1 – The Campus Reach trail portion is between the east side 15th Ave NE and the west edge of the Rainier Vista. The University of Washington Transportation Services Office has received $3M funding from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and when combined with local sources, is sufficient to support the design of the entire University owned BGTC and construction of Phase 1, Campus Reach.

Phase 2 - The Forest and Western Reaches will improve the remaining portions of the BGTC within the University from the east edge of the Rainier Vista to the north edge of campus and from the west side of 15th Avenue NE to the west edge of campus respectively.

Project Budget:
Overall Budget (Phase 1 and design Phase 2) $7,681,000

Schedule:
- Predesign (Concept Plan) December 2011 - November 2012
- Consultant Selection November 2012 - December 2012
- Design - Phase 1 January 2013 - April 2014
- Design - Remaining Phases January 2013 - September 2014
- Construction - Phase 1 June 2014 - March 2015
- Construction – Phase 2 Dependent upon available funding

Comments:
- The placement of larger new plantings should be carefully considered in the Forest Reach, where many existing trees are slated to be removed; relocating or protecting and retaining certain trees may be possible on a case-by-case basis.
- The architecture of the tunnel under Pend Oreille Road needs further consideration to create an elegant undercrossing that does not feel utilitarian.
- The board-formed concrete walls might take on individual characters and could even create a sense of discovery and place, imparting location or historic information.
- Seating elements should be inviting and attractive and impart a sense of character to the mixing zones, perhaps each being distinctive variations within a set pallet of materials.
- An open, transparent, and proactive program of public information around the construction phases will be critical in generating and retaining goodwill for the project, particularly in minimizing acrimony over removal of trees.
- A visit for the Commission to the test site and planned pocket park would be desirable.

Action:
A motion was tendered and seconded that design development of Phase 2 be approved, with the proviso that further development be demonstrated at scheduled interim meetings with the Office of the University Architect. The motion carried unanimously. (Note that an interim presentation has been made to ULAC as follow-up to their comments, but has not occurred at the time of the writing of these minutes, to Architectural Commission members.)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.
NOTE: Projects below are limited to those also being presented to the Architectural Commission for approval. Other projects discussed include Bike Share and West Campus Development Framework.

**Burke Gilman Trail – Committee Comments**

1. Retain the character of the northwest, particularly in the Forest Reach
   a. Loss of significant tree canopy and installation of retaining walls with guardrails will change the existing character of the trail.
   b. Encourage a more naturalist character of the forested environment through canopy of trees, sense of enclosure, and diverse understory.
   c. Encourage a rustic quality to the walls, with character, texture and moss.
2. Explore options to preserve more existing trees
   a. What is the percentage of trees to remain vs. removed?
   b. Explore curving the path or tapering of trail to retain significant trees.
   c. Explore width of path and impact to existing trees, how much impact would narrowing of path 1-2 ft have on efficiency of travel vs. tree preservation?
3. Pocket Park between Brooklyn and University requires more design, very conceptual in nature. Define if this is part of the trail vs. part of the street environment.
4. Intersection at Pend Oreille and associated parking north and south require further study.
5. Quantitatively define new requirements for maintenance – amount of new pavement, furnishings, walls, etc.

**MOTION:** Postpone approval of Phase 2 Design Development pending a follow-up meeting to address the following issues:

   a. Define tree removal and replanting in greater detail pending new tree assessment. Re-evaluate trail width, with considerations to tapering (narrowing at points) and curving to preserve existing trees.
   b. Reconsider mixing zone at Cowlitz Lane to ensure pedestrian safety
   c. Pocket park between Brooklyn and University needs further study
   d. Parking and resulting impact to trail experience north and south of Pend Oreille needs definition
   e. Define character of walls to fit with rustic character of the trail

**Campus Landscape Framework – Committee Comments**

1. Include a principle about the beauty of the landscape
2. How do these relate to the mission of the University?
3. How will these be used? By departments, for budget consideration, for the Board of Deans or Regents?
4. What is the ethos of the obvious? What do we have today? What are the current pressures and the fragility of existing conditions? Get everyone on the same page. How do we become good stewards, to move beyond generalities and into specifics?
5. Preface document with the overall purpose – why does this matter? Connection to mission, principles supported by projects, strategies to illustrate each principle and strategy to a greater depth.

**No Motion Requested**

**North Campus Housing Study**

1. The goals for the project are very well thought through and appropriate for such a complex project.
2. Unify and maximize Denny Field on one side and forest character on the other with varying scales and placement of structures (mosaic concepts may enhance these qualities more than axial concepts).
3. Pull proposed buildings along 45th back from street. Caution regarding overall height relative to neighborhood scale to the north.
4. Question whether placing 3,200 beds in this part of campus is appropriate or if it’s too much for this site to handle, with or without McMahon. Look for this study to define the appropriate site capacity.

**No Motion Requested**