Strengthen the Institutional Ethos and Fortify the Campus Landscape for the Enjoyment of Future Generations
A COMMUNITY OF STEWARDS
Although the task of tending the campus grounds is in the hands of a relatively few dedicated individuals, the responsibility of stewarding the UW landscape is shared by the entire UW community. Landscape stewardship comes in many forms: from careful maintenance to the design and construction of new places; the preservation of views and open space; the creation of new connections; and the oversight of the ecological health of campus systems. An early tradition of the UW was “Campus Day”, a work party where students volunteered their time to making improvements to the campus. Although this particular tradition ceased in the 1930s, it is important the community continue to share a landscape ethos that guides the protection and development of the campus landscape.

EMBRACING POSITIVE CHANGE
The campus landscape will continue to transform and develop along with the University. As change comes about, the stewards of the campus landscape need to guard against changes that threaten iconic moments or important landscape systems on campus, but there should also be a willingness to embrace the potential for positive landscape change. For all of its clear strengths, the existing UW landscape has places that are substandard either in their character or function. These shortcomings are not systemic, nor campus-wide, but are in specific locations and are often related to places that have been overlooked but play an important role in the campus mosaic. Often places lack connectivity or accessibility, which can easily translate into a perceived lack of welcome. Other places serve a certain function to the detriment of other campus functions and could be altered to be more multifaceted in the way they work. Although it would be impossible, and probably inadvisable, to address all of these conditions at once, greater efforts need to be made in the direction of catalyzing positive landscape changes, and fixing the places on campus that are not working to their full potential.

IDENTIFYING LANDSCAPE PRIORITIES
Strategic use of resources will be key to achieving the greatest landscape benefits over the long term. This means that landscape priorities will frequently be impacted by their ability to be combined with other developments on the campus, rather than simply their stand-alone merits. As case studies and priorities projects are established in this document, a degree of flexibility should be preserved to continue to fine-tune landscape initiatives to be integrated with other changes underway. At the same time, however, there are landscape conditions that are of a sufficiently poor quality that their resolution should not be postponed.

AID FOR CAPITAL PLANNING
Currently, most landscape projects at the UW are funded as part of architectural projects and there is no clear mechanism for raising landscape-specific funds. This frequently puts the needs of a shared campus asset in tension with the needs of individual departments or user groups. Clear parameters for appropriate capital planning and budgeting mechanisms for this important “infrastructure” element of the University’s “common good” is required, much like the utility and circulation infrastructure, or the computer systems needed to operate the University’s human and financial resources, or general purpose classrooms funded by the central administration rather than a specific school or unit. New protocols are needed to support this approach, including processes for establishing landscape capital projects and budgets, from scoping to identifying budget resources and priorities.

CREATING A WELCOMING ENVIRONMENT
The University of Washington is vast, with over 650 contiguous acres and four major points of arrival, it’s often overwhelming for first time visitors to understand where to go to get started. On top of this, the sequence of arrival and the quality of that experience is often understated, with an uncertainty of where the University and surrounding community intersect. Some of this is intentional, as the lines between the University and UDistrict are blurred to create a more seamless urban experience, but at other times is simply a result of unplanned growth. Efforts to improve the welcome experience both on and adjacent to campus require a variety of tactics that encompass signage, wayfinding, parking, transit, lighting, pathways, and visitor amenities.
**Observations**

Most building and infrastructure projects require the repair or change of landscape systems, but often the aspirations for this work is very narrowly defined.

The high value the community places on the UW landscape as a shared asset of university life is not reflected in a funding structure that is focused on the needs of individual schools.

The iconic landscapes on the UW campus all started as strongly figured spaces that were developed as landscapes in their own right. They did not come about through the accretion of smaller landscapes associated with buildings.

The landscape is a major contributor to the quality of life at the UW. The identity of the UW is inextricably tied to its landscape quality, influencing the institution's ability to attract and retain students and faculty.

The landscape is used by the entire campus community and many others, and is not the domain of just one school.

Although they usually represent a small portion of the overall budget, and they are a larger amenity that serves the entire university, landscape improvements are often the first to be value-engineered to help building projects stay on budget during design and construction.

**Strategies**

A multifaceted understanding of the role that even small landscapes play in larger campus-wide systems and goals should guide every project.

A cohesive approach to landscape planning and the funding of important landscape projects will protect the integrity of the landscape experience at the UW.

When considering district or neighborhood planning, look for opportunities to create strong landscape centers that can anchor a variety of architectural programs.

Do not rely on piggyback projects as the primary means of funding major landscape improvements. Initiate a capital fund for landscape projects that are vital to the future expansion and excellence of the campus.

Funding that is specific to landscape improvements should be made available, either to fund stand-alone repairs or improvements or to create the capacity to add landscape scope to capital projects in ways that benefit the campus as a whole.

Fix the landscape budget after schematic design approval and then treat the two budgets as separate projects moving forward.
Observations

New landscapes at the UW should always be of a quality that is consistent with the rest of the campus, providing a landscape that will stand the test of time while also being flexible enough to adapt as needed over time.

The problems that need to be fixed in the Central Campus tend to be episodic rather than systemic.

The challenges that face the East and West neighborhoods tend to be underutilization.

South Campus has landscape range and unique landscape spaces along the waterfront, but the architectural structure feels impenetrable, discouraging exploration beyond Pacific.

The UW has a phenomenal range of ecosystems on campus, many notable for their generous size, all of which are under stress and are not well connected to each other.

Standard guidelines for new landscapes, including scope and quality of site improvements is inconsistent and often underfunded.

Strategies

When setting preliminary budgets, be realistic about the needs of landscape improvements, assuming plantings, materials and other design elements that are consistent with the desired landscape quality of the UW campus.

Focus on how localized changes to the campus mosaic can create widespread and multifaceted benefits.

Look for opportunities to form meaningful programmatic, experiential, and physical bridges between Central Campus and the East and West neighborhoods.

Create landscapes where wayfinding is intuitive that help facilitate a greater sense of openness and a welcoming environment for moving through South Campus.

Ecological principles and zone connectivity need to guide all decision-making regarding land use, construction, and maintenance, so the campus ecology can thrive.

Develop guidelines for design standards and policy regarding scope and budget standards for landscape improvements.
CASE STUDIES: TESTING A RANGE OF STRATEGIES THROUGH DESIGN
THE CASE STUDY APPROACH
The UW campus is remarkable in its complexity and richness, and also in the fact that it has a very robust structure that has developed over more than 100 years, with very few systemic campus-wide flaws. The over-arching goal, for example, to better connect the major campus neighborhoods and to ease the pressures on Central Campus by further developing the peripheral neighborhoods, can only be effectively addressed at the scale of the landscape mosaic by operating on specific sites. Looking more closely at questions of orientation, navigation, accessibility, and identity, the same appears to be true: changes to individual mosaic pieces are the key to unlocking campus potential. The CLF adopts a Case Study approach for testing how the campus landscape can be improved in character and function through transformations of specific pieces of the mosaic. The Case Study sites were chosen for a variety of reasons; some because they are places that are under immediate pressure; they represent immediate opportunities because they are under consideration for development; because they represent examples of problematic conditions found in multiple locations across campus; and because they represent strategic moves that could have profound effects on the way the campus develops over time.

PROOF OF CONCEPT
The Case Studies serve a “proof-of-concept” role. They establish the issues that need to be resolved in a particular part of campus and demonstrate that these issues can be solved in ways that yield particular benefits to the campus landscape, both at the immediate site, and to wider landscape systems. As general problems were considered, for instance a lack of connection along the eastern slope of the campus, a case study would be undertaken to see what possible solutions might exist in which potential locations. Establishing that it was physically possible to achieve certain goals such as accessible slopes or continuous connections is a proof-of-concept that supports a general idea, without limiting a wider range of possible outcomes. In many cases, for example in solutions to accessibility issues, bicycle parking, or stormwater strategies, the case studies serve to give examples of approaches that could be adopted in multiple locations across campus.

AN AID TO DECISION-MAKING
The Case Studies suggest locations on campus that are deserving of particular attention, and approaches to landscape improvements that are tangible, but open to multiple design solutions. In this way the CLF creates an action-oriented tool that will be useful to decision-makers when considering capital projects and planning initiatives. The CLF, by establishing both an understanding of campus-wide systems and a site-specific approach to individual mosaic pieces, has a dual lens useful to decision making. No one part of the campus landscape should be considered as separate from its role in campus-wide systems, and no system should be considered without an understanding of how it will impact individual places on campus. This parts-to-whole and whole-to-parts methodology is a useful means of guiding future landscape decision-making, both as a required step for future design consultants, and also as a general philosophy that guides landscape stewardship.
CASE STUDIES: GENERAL ORGANIZING STRUCTURE

REINFORCING THE HISTORIC CORE
- Red Square and Thresholds
- Stevens Way Reorganization
- N22 Parking Lot
- Denny Field and North Campus Housing

IMPROVING CAMPUS CONNECTIVITY
- Olympic Vista
- Portage Bay Connection
- Waterfront Trail
- Lake Washington Connection
- Union Bay Natural Area Connection

TRANSFORMING 15TH AVE TO A CONNECTOR
- Burke Museum and 43rd Street Entrance
- Parrington Lawn
- Asotin Place and NE Grant Lane

WEST CAMPUS & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
- University Bridge Landing
- West Campus Streetscape
- Burke Gilman Trail Stormwater
CASE STUDIES
The campus contains vastly different academic, urban, natural, and recreational areas within its borders, its diversity is its strength. In the course of a single day, a student might study in a courtyard at Hansee Hall, meet a friend in the large Arts Quad, stop to admire a view down the long Rainier Vista, go to an event in the Sylvan Grove, and take a canoe out from the Waterfront Activities Center. The complementary range of daily life experience these spaces provide can be replicated in very few other environments that a person will encounter in their lives.

The Case Studies showcase the diversity of the campus and demonstrate the full spectrum of approaches that need to be taken to preserve and enhance that diversity. From the conception of the North Campus Housing as an extension of the historic campus core, to 15th Avenue as a connector rather than a divider, to the planting of individual thresholds, the Case Studies create a framework vision for the campus that is simultaneously ambitious and achievable in small increments. The individual case studies, in detail, can be found in Appendix B of this document.

POTENTIAL FOR ENHANCED CONNECTIONS
Possible enhanced connections are highlighted across campus to illustrate the importance of strengthening the pedestrian network. Of particular note are connections between neighborhoods, but also the creation of accessible routes within the Central Campus. Some connections are long term visions, and extensive in nature, for example the system of pathways between the North Campus Housing and the Union Bay Natural Area as a way of opening up the East Campus for development, and some are immediate priorities, modest in scale, for example the accessible thresholds at Red Square.

POTENTIAL UW DEVELOPMENT SITES
The Central Campus has a finely tuned interaction between open space and built structures, and is close to development capacity. The character of Central Campus could easily be thrown out of balance by new building program, but the CLF identifies sites where development is planned, and shows how that development can be used to improve the campus landscape. By comparision, other neighborhoods, such as West Campus and East Campus, would benefit from an increase in academic program, or other types of new architectural development.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES BY OTHERS
At the west end of the Olympic Vista there are three potential development sites, whose development by others will improve the urban environment and sense of arrival at the university.

A RANGE OF SCALES, A RANGE OF APPROACHES
The case studies have been organized in a way that highlights the range of issues relative to the aesthetic and functional role of the campus landscape. These are intended to be illustrative of the many opportunities to be found for improving the campus experience, but are by no means a complete inventory of the only areas requiring attention. They are also not intended to be conceived of as a set of priorities for improvement projects. Rather, the priorities should be evaluated based on current projects, available funding sources, and immediate need.

The organizing structure for presenting the case studies closely follows the analysis of the campus environment and aligns with the strategies associated with operating on the campus mosaic and systems. In general, the greatest needs and design explorations were focused on the following issues:

- Reinforce the Historic Core
- Improve Campus Connections
- Transform 15th Ave from and Edge to a Connector
- Define the West Campus Landscape Character
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REINFORCING THE HISTORIC CORE
The landscape spaces most closely identified with the history of the UW, including the Quad, Denny Yard, the HUB Yard, and Rainier Vista, are all strong contributors to the current campus experience. Direct improvements are not necessary to these iconic landscapes, but indirect improvements can help reinforce their function and the contributions they make to the experience of the campus. The top priorities for this area include providing better services for cyclists, improving accessibility for the mobility impaired, and creating landscape connections that support residential life on campus.

RED SQUARE AND THRESHOLDS
The construction of the multilevel Central Parking Garage, with the Red Square Plaza above it, was hugely successful in reducing the need for surface parking in the core campus, but also created complex accessibility challenges due to the inflexible grade datum set by the top of the garage structure. Furthermore, the relative lack of planting or shaded seating in Red Square makes the space feel less than welcoming for studying or social use. The scale of the square and its centrality to campus life is sufficient to warrant accessibility and environmental improvements in a few key locations.

DENNY FIELD AND NORTH CAMPUS HOUSING
Denny Field is the oldest recreational landscape on campus, and it continues to be popular, but it is currently in a poor physical condition, with compacted soils and a threadbare lawn. Furthermore, Denny Field feels disconnected, almost hidden from its surroundings, with many edges that are obscured by extensive chainlink fencing around its tennis courts. As the North Campus Housing is reconsidered, Denny Field should play a more prominent role in supporting the daily lives of on-campus housing by providing a welcoming space for relaxation and socializing, and continue to play its role as a location for intramural sports. Stronger and more visible accessible connections between Denny Yard and the major campus axes also need to be developed.

STEVEN'S WAY REORGANIZATION
As the sole remaining loop road through a largely pedestrianized campus, Stevens Way is an access route, service route, pedestrian route, and campus drive all rolled into one. The narrowness of the roadway in certain areas, combined with steep grades in parts, currently make it an unappealing route for bicyclists so long as there is two-way vehicular traffic along its length. A reconsideration of bus routes, the introduction of a bicycle track, and ample high quality bicycle parking, have the potential to make Stevens Way more pedestrian friendly, and the engine for increased bicycle commuting onto the campus, while still fulfilling all of the important roles it already performs for the campus.

HUB PARKING LOT
The N22 Parking lot is a major entry point onto campus from the Padelford Parking Garage. While retaining the capacity of the parking lot, which is a vital location for disabled parking on campus, the space could be rearranged to provide a major bike parking facility, and a safe and vegetated pedestrian route rather than the current crosswalk through the lot.
IMPROVING CAMPUS CONNECTIVITY
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IMPROVING CAMPUS CONNECTIVITY
As demonstrated by feedback from the My Places survey, navigation challenges exist throughout campus, with some areas of particular concern. In general, connections between Central Campus and the other neighborhoods need to be improved. Connections across NE Pacific between South and Central Campus are thought to be highly difficult to navigate in a very concentrated area. Connection challenges between the Central Campus and neighborhoods to the East and West areas are spread across a wider area.

OLYMPIC VISTA CONNECTION
Olympic Vista provides some visual connection between the Central and West Campus neighborhoods, but all types of pedestrian connections, including pedestrian, accessible, bicycle, and automobile, are difficult to navigate.

PORTAGE BAY CONNECTION
The Portage Bay waterfront is a major untapped resource. Although more inviting for recreational use than the majority of the Union Bay Natural Area, Portage Bay is relatively under utilized. A stronger connection from Central Campus and West Campus would help to open this area up to more people.

WATERFRONT TRAIL
The University’s engagement and attitude toward the waterfront has evolved and changed over the many years since the University located on this site. The rich and diverse setting that exists today is a testament to demands for waterfront access, maritime transport, recreation, leveraging acres of flat land, and reclamation of brownfield sites that spans the spectrum of naturalized to structured edge conditions. Although points of access are provided, experiencing the 2.75 miles of waterfront continuously is challenging.

LAKE WASHINGTON CONNECTION
There is not currently a direct, well-marked route, from Stevens Way to East Campus, despite the heavy flow of students from north campus traveling in the direction of the IMA and the other athletic facilities in this neighborhood.

EAST CAMPUS / UNION BAY NATURAL AREA CONNECTION
Union Bay Natural area is currently accessed by means of a circuitous path system down the east slope, crossing the Burke Gilman trail, across a bridge, terminating with a flight of steps into a vast parking lot. From there, pedestrians weave across the parking lot to discover the one or two pathways into the natural area trails. The development and recreational potential of East Campus can be unlocked with an accessible connection here.
TRANSFORMING 15TH AVENUE FROM AN EDGE TO A CONNECTOR
Within the realm of campus connections, the 15th Ave NE boundary between Central and West Campus is unique in that there is a relatively manageable grade difference and important program on both sides. The experience of UW as an urban campus will be improved by strategically eroding the concrete wall along 15th Ave NE, diversifying the edge experience along 15th, and opening up the possibility of multiple welcoming connections.

15th Ave NE has always been an important edge to the campus, both as a link to regional transportation and as a route to the restaurants and shops in the U District. Connections into campus along this edge are already too few and too small, and will become only more so as the pressure to connect becomes greater, with the development of West Campus and the opening of the new light rail station on Brooklyn Avenue. In general, a strategy of the CLF is to make this edge more porous and open to use.

BURKE MUSEUM & 43RD STREET ENTRANCE
Currently the UW has a very subdued presence at the 45th Street corner: a veil of woodland faces 15th Ave NE, partially obscuring a wall that lifts the campus landscape from the sidewalk, providing level ground for a parking lot between NE 45th and NE 43rd.

The 43rd Street pedestrian entrance onto campus leads to the key intersection between Memorial Way and Stevens Way. The importance of this entrance will be transformed by the light rail transit station currently under construction.

PARRINGTON LAWN
After the wooded edge along the Law School, Parrington opens up into a canopied lawn. Except for where the lawn slopes down toward 42nd, most of this landscape is elevated above street level and so the street side experience is dominated by a concrete wall.

ASOTIN PLACE & NE GRANT LANE
Along this stretch of 15th Avenue, only service docks and steep staircases connect campus level with sidewalk level below. Existing connections into campus do not provide universal access and the congestion created by the Metro bus stop adjacent to the gatehouse create unsafe conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing Stevens Way.

The corner of Stevens Way and 15th Avenue provides a significant development opportunity for a gateway building that can anchor the corner and provided much needed universal access into campus.
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WEST CAMPUS & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
West campus isn’t defined by a singular character, but is a composition of the urbanized man-made grid of the University District, the grand gesture of the Camus Parkway median, the active pedestrian and bicycle use of the Burke Gilman Trail, and the lower and more open waterfront edge. The desire for this part of campus to develop as a vibrant, creative, and active neighborhood, anchored around ideas of innovation, will distinguish it from central campus. Providing thoughtful connections and public realm improvements will be imperative to its seamless integration as part of campus and as part of the University District. Innovative strategies for stormwater, roadways, pathways, planting, research, etc. have the opportunity to express the forward-looking character through the built environment.

UNIVERSITY BRIDGE
The current terminus of Campus Parkway offers an unfriendly pedestrian experience at both at the level of the University Bridge and at the level of the east-west roadway as it passes under the bridge. Multiple comments in the campus survey speak to pedestrians feeling unsafe in this area. A reorganization and normalization of this intersection, adjusting grades to bring bridge traffic and campus traffic together, would help to overcome a sense of a barrier to the west of Campus Parkway. Additional improvements, including a rethinking of the number of lanes dedicated to vehicular traffic on Campus Parkway itself could help to overcome this area’s current state of dereliction. These pedestrian and vehicular realm improvements could also be achieved in such a way to create a new building site for the University or City and provide an opportunity to create an identity gateway for both.

WEST CAMPUS STREETSCAPE
Recognizing the West Campus Framework Study was already underway to help define a new character for this currently underutilized campus precinct, the CLF team worked with the West Campus planning team to explore the various opportunities to create new development opportunities for the UW that extend into the urban fabric. The larger goal would be to have UW’s urban precinct mix the best of city and campus, with reconfigured sidewalks and new landscape program to improve the pedestrian environment. In some places this would include re-establishing an urban grid, in other areas pedestrian realm improvements might include new crosswalks across the Campus Parkway median, accessible pathways that provide access within the median, and improved pedestrian and accessibility connections to Central Campus, by means of an additional or replacement skybridge, from Campus Parkway to George Washington Lane.

BURKE GILMAN TRAIL STORMWATER
Wet bioswales connected along the shoulder of the Burke Gilman Trail or below the paved surface could provide for conveyance, limited flow control and water quality treatment of stormwater flows collected from elsewhere on campus. The facility that ultimately receives this flow would be sized for water quality using the Department of Ecology and City of Seattle standards, hopefully through a strategy of banking stormwater mitigation for future projects that would trigger stormwater management requirements. In addition to conveyance along the Burke Gilman trail, areas that might serve well for bioretention include parking lot N25 off Pend Oreille Place, landscape strips in parking lot E1, and in the vicinity of San Juan Road.
PRIORITY PROJECTS

As illustrated though the case studies, in addition to exploring design solutions for what were current projects, there are a number of projects that have been highlighted for future consideration to support emergent issues. These are by no means meant to presume a complete inventory of landscape improvements needed on campus, which also include restoration of existing cherished open spaces and areas of campus that are under performing or are anticipated to change in use.

Priorities for the next ten years for stand-alone landscape improvements should include the projects listed below (in no particular order). Concept plans and estimates for improvements should be developed for each of these projects, if not already available, and a plan for funding and implementation should be developed.

CASE STUDIES
- Red Square Universal Access Connections
- Stevens Way Reorganization
- Olympic Vista/Campus Parkway Improvements
- Montlake Cut Connection and Waterfront Trail
- 43rd Street Entrance

ADDITIONAL PRIORITY PROJECTS
- Rainier Vista
- The Quad
- Denny Yard, Parrington Lawn, and Memorial Way
- Pend Oreille Entrance
RAINIER VISTA
The improvements to the southern end of Rainier Vista have transformed a formerly underutilized part of campus into a grand entrance in anticipation of the Sound Transit link light rail opening in early 2016. The improvements implemented a significant portion of the 2008 Rainier Vista Concept Plan, which conceptualized the vista for modern day use by simplifying the disparate parts and enhancing the core asset, the view of the mountain.

While these improvements are significant, the portion of the vista between Red Square and Stevens Way is in need of upgrades that continue the aesthetic and functional qualities found below, providing universal access to the heart of campus and a vista landscape that is worthy of this cherished space.

THE QUAD
The quad is by far one of the most photographed iconic open spaces on campus and the spring flush of cherry blossoms draws thousands of visitors annually. In 2009, the fifty-year reunion class of 1959 provided a one hundred thousand dollar endowed fund for the preservation of the cherry trees in the quad. The endowment has been unspent, but an initiative to grow replacement trees was undertaken with a local nursery using scions from the existing trees, in anticipation of replacing any trees that are lost due to health issues. There was also an initiative to improve the health of the trees by aerating the soils and applying a foliar spray annually.

Although the improvements initially helped improve the health of the cherry trees, the amount of use the quad experiences throughout the year is substantial and the effects are expressed in poorly draining soils, which reduces the availability of oxygen and nutrients to the trees. The resulting stress on the trees is noticeable and in recent years, younger trees have declined in health and have required removal. Given the reverence for the cherry trees, a plan needs to be developed to improve the conditions in the quad that are lasting, while also improving the access in and around by resetting the heaved brick paved pathways.

DENNY YARD, PARRINGTON LAWN & MEMORIAL WAY
Denny Yard has been surrounded by new construction and renovation projects for over ten years, but has only seen minimal restoration of the yard itself. Additionally, Parrington Lawn and Memorial Way have had small areas restored, but a comprehensive overhaul of these three major open spaces as one continuous landscape has never been performed.

The importance of these large open spaces in greeting visitors and providing a first impression is significant and care should be taken to ensure they represent the values of the University through the quality of the landscape and accessible to all. Upgrades to plantings, irrigation, pathways, lighting and gestures such as removing the wall along 15th Ave NW and the bus layover on Memorial Way should be incorporated into a comprehensive renovation of these areas. A concept plan was developed in 2015 that provides a vision for these improvements, but requires a detailed estimate and phasing plan to identify costs.

PEND OREILLE ENTRANCE
Pend Oreille has often been referred to as a back door to campus given the utilitarian expression of parking lots, minimal sidewalks, no signage, a lackluster landscape, and expanse of asphalt. The growth of University Village across the street and the high quality landscape they maintain further emphasizes the need to bring this entrance to campus up to a higher standard.

A concept plan for Pend Oreille was completed in 2011. The plan looked at a realignment of the road to create a better functioning intersection at NE 25th Street, adding bike lanes and sidewalks along Pend Oreille, removing the visible parking lots, and celebrating the sense of arrival with landscaping and signage. The goals developed from the concept plan are still relevant, but the plan itself should be updated to reflect current conditions and initiatives with new cost estimates provided to reflect those changes.
LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENT FUNDING STRATEGIES

Peer institutions were consulted as part of the CLF, to see what other funding strategies might be available. Strategic landscape plans, similar to the CLF, were frequently cited as opportunities for funding integrated landscape improvements over the course of several years. After an assessment of 26 peer institutes, 14 public and 12 private, as well as assessing not-for-profit organizations that help build and maintain public parks within major cities, the recommendation for appropriate funding mechanisms is varied and wide reaching to cover the range of needs found at the UW.

The following strategies require further investigation into the feasibility and applicability for the UW and should be looked at with both an eye toward major capital projects as well as minor renewal of existing landscapes to bring them up to current standards functionally, aesthetically, and ecologically. It is increasingly important to find mechanisms to combine funding sources to make more meaningful impacts and to strategically look into synergies that can be created by combining the wide range of projects initiated by all departments and units that may be interrelated or impact one another in order to minimize the amount of disturbance and redundancy of construction activity, and leverage funding through more effective deployment of projects.

CAPITAL PROJECT INFRASTRUCTURE/IMPACT TAX

Many Universities and Colleges have initiated a construction assessment infrastructure tax of 1-5% levied on all construction projects. The revenue from this tax is used primarily for maintaining the quality of the broader campus civic environment through minor projects or supplements to capital projects to improve quality or increase scope to economize construction opportunities. This is in addition to site improvements typically required by the project. To implement this type of funding source, it will require developing policy and protocol for contributions and allocation of funds.

Examples:
- University of North Carolina requires a 1% tax of all construction budgets to fund a landscape improvement fund.
- Stanford University requires a 4.6% construction assessment to fund the Stanford Infrastructure Program.
- University of British Columbia requires an Infrastructure Impact Charge on all new development, with market housing projects paying a higher rate than student housing or academic projects.
- Ohio State University requires 2% of construction costs for projects over $1.5 million to fund the Civic Structure.
- Johns Hopkins University has an Infrastructure Tax component of their annual space rate charge to all occupants. Spending of these funds requires a lot of negotiation and prioritization.

MINOR PROJECT ALLOCATION

Regular, ongoing investment cycle to provide necessary stand-alone infrastructure upgrades to the campus landscape including universal access, irrigation upgrades, pathway/plaza improvements, planting, and seating. Source of funding could be provided by minor State allocations or Provost funds. To implement this type of funding source, it should require a complete list of potential projects under $2 million for a 10-year cycle and an annual/biennial assessment of project costs for funding.

Examples:
- Duke University initiated landscape projects as a top priority during the 2008 economic slowdown, spearheaded by the Facilities & Environment Committee.
- Princeton University has a ten-year plan that allocates $19M from the capital plan and is supplemented by special donor funding. These funds are used for all of the landscape projects that are not identified as part of capital projects. They have a separate landscape master plan that identifies the projects and they tackle two to three annually.
- Wellesley College has an established annual facilities budget that is used to fund small projects or supplement larger projects.
- Dartmouth College funds small stand-alone landscape projects as part of their annual capital budget.
MAJOR PROJECT ALLOCATION
Projects like the Rainier Vista/Montlake Triangle can’t happen without a commitment of funds that exceed the minor allocation limit of $2 million, even when combined with other funding sources. Major infrastructure projects, or large scale landscape renovation projects are vital and necessary for the University to steward in order to preserve some of its most cherished spaces or to create new major open spaces or networks. These projects should be incorporated into the One Capital Plan as stand-alone major landscape/infrastructure improvement projects. To implement this type of funding strategy, it requires a 10-year plan of major projects with concept level documentation with relevant cost estimates and time lines for implementation.

Examples:
• University of Chicago separates funding requests for buildings from the associated landscapes and projects are managed by separate project management teams. While this at times creates a few minor turf and money skirmishes when the boundaries of projects overlap and scopes of work require close coordination, it also detaches the improvements for the outdoor environment from program related improvements, reducing inherent conflicts.
• Purdue University puts forth all future capital projects as coordinated plans established by their Physical and Capital Planning offices, be they buildings, infrastructure, or landscape. The information is shared with the Treasurer to secure funding in a timely manner so all projects stay on schedule and the upper administration is not surprised by unforeseen prerequisite or associated projects.

CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING
The typical method for funding landscape improvements is done via capital projects that are directly related to program enhancement. The concern with relying solely on this method of funding landscape change is the inherent conflict it creates between the greater campus needs and the program needs. Additionally, depending on the source of funding, whether State allocated or donor funded, there’s an increased attitude of ownership of the funds and with it comes the perception of decision-making authority to define the boundary of improvements and quality of materials. This approach to improvements also has the tendency to create landscape “islands” of improvements with little funding to improve the areas between, creating a discrepancy in the level of care and consistent quality of the outdoor environment.

Alternatively, some colleges and universities have removed the installation of landscaping from the bid contracts and has their in-house grounds staff perform the work. The advantage of this is a high quality landscape planted at a great value.

To better utilize this method of funding, a clear policy and process of defining the project boundaries, taking into consideration the construction laydown and access areas, and providing a budget line for landscape improvements is necessary prior to establishing a project cost to be submitted for funding. Breaking out the plant installation from the contractor’s scope requires a policy that clearly establishes the roles and responsibilities of all parties, as well as in increase in the grounds staff to manage such projects.

Examples:
• University of Texas in San Antonio primarily relies on capital projects to improve the outdoor environment. The result has been the creation of a series of landscape “islands” with little funding available for the spaces between. A 2007 plan proposed a sweeping project intended to rectify this island effect along two key pathways in the center of campus, but the project continues to remain one of their most important unfunded projects.
• College at Brockport, SUNY mentioned LEED certification has effectively expanded the scope of landscape improvements and been a useful proponent in retaining funding during value engineering exercises.
• University of North Carolina and University of Georgia utilizes their in-house grounds staff to install plant material for all of their capital projects.
PHILANTHROPY

Donor funding at the University of Washington is department focused and there currently is no mechanism for soliciting donations for landscape improvements. This is a missed opportunity to garner support from many individuals who value the outdoor environment and would greatly support projects that improve the experiential and physical qualities.

To implement a program for philanthropy targeted to improving the campus landscape, a few dozen specific priority projects of a range of scales needs to be developed with associated cost estimates, supporting graphics, and project descriptions that can be shared with potential donors. Additionally, advancement staff personnel will need to be assigned to Capital Planning and Development Office of the University Architect to develop a program of philanthropy and investigate potential donors.

Examples:
- Wellesley College undertook a major capital campaign following the completion of their master plan, which funded major landscape improvement projects across the campus.
- The University of Chicago received a large Botanic Garden Endowment donation in 2001 which has funded the design, installation, and maintenance of many major landscape restoration projects around campus. The maintenance of these gardens is outsources to local companies and the design of the projects are required to use small, local landscape design firms.
- Johns Hopkins University received a large donation from a trustee after the 2000 master plan was presented, suggesting they could transform the campus by eliminating roads, parking, and loading docks from the campus interior while restoring the neglected landscape and unifying the site materials and furnishings. There was no endowment established to maintain these new landscapes, which has been an increasing problem and has resulted in increased staff.
- Harvard University often targets donation throughout a project and in amounts that exceed the cost of the project. The money is put into a general fund that can be used for multiple projects.

MEMORIAL DONATIONS

The University currently supports memorial donations for outdoor improvements in the form of memorial benches and trees, and in specialized circumstances, memorial gardens. Private funds are given to the University specifically for these elements via the Gift Transmittal Form processed by University Advancement. Location of benches and trees are coordinated through the Office of the University Architect with support from the Grounds Shop for installation. There is currently a policy for both benches and trees, but a new policy related to memorial gardens should be prepared.

REUNION AND CLASS GIFTS

There are a handful of small landscape improvements that are the result of reunion and class gifts distributed throughout the campus. This is potentially a valuable source of supplemental funding to initiate a project, or implement a portion of a larger project. On average, annual class gifts range between $25-50 thousand and fifty-year reunion gifts range between $100-150 thousand. To rely more heavily on this type of funding, a list of small scale projects, similar to those created for a philanthropy program are required.

SPONSORSHIP DONATIONS

There’s an increased intensity around soliciting sponsorship donations from local corporations for various programs and related projects. This could be expanded to improving the outdoor environment, similar to other donor gifts, but possibly at a larger scale. Recognition is often a component of large donations and care must be taken to ensure the University’s policy regarding corporate logo use on campus is upheld. There have been a few small corporate donations used for annual tree planting associated with the Tree Campus USA certification that have provided funds for volunteer tree planting, but these typically result in under $5 thousand.

To implement a sponsorship program will require a selection of priority projects for donors, and coordination with the sponsorship team in University Advancement.
GRANTS
The University often seeks grants for program research and facilities, but rarely seeks grants for landscape improvement. The PSRC grant for the Phase 1 of the Burke Gilman Trail was the University’s first multi-million dollar grant. Research into the stipulations behind the grant funding should be fully understood before a project begins design and should also be assessed to understand the commitments the University is required to agree to in order to comply with the regulations. The project type and funding source should be adequately paired to ensure the highest and best value. To pursue this type of funding, a dedicated staff person should be responsible for researching funding opportunities and a review group should be established to assess project compatibility.

PARTNERSHIPS
The integration of the University into the University District and surrounding neighborhoods, as well as the integration of regional transit services onto and around campus has brought with it a multitude of partnership opportunities. Leveraging these partnerships to combine funding sources, as was done with the Rainier Vista/Montlake Triangle project, which used funding from the University, Sound Transit, SDOT, and WSDOT is a great opportunity to achieve large scale projects that benefit a broader constituency.

REPLACEMENT FUND
While this has been loosely applied to tree removal, the practice could be expanded to require all projects to provide replacement funds for the removal of significant landscape elements (trees, benches, plaza, art, etc.) to be combined in a separate fund used to restore these elements elsewhere on campus. Annually or biannually these funds could be used for projects that enhance the campus experience. To implement this type of funding, a policy is required that will

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FUND
Revenue collected from parking violations could be used more centrally to provide improvements to active transportation systems, with a particular emphasis on bicycle infrastructure and pedestrian enhancements. Implementing this type of project funding requires developing a policy for collecting and allocating the funds, and active transportation improvement project plan with associated cost estimates.

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT ASSESSMENT
Creating a District Improvement Fund to provide landscape improvements and maintenance & operation expenses within certain defined districts of campus could use a process similar to what cities do for open spaces like Bryant Park, Brooklyn Bridge Park, and Post Office Square. This might be a way to generate revenue to construct the park in west campus or other open spaces that would be defined by multi projects. Typically the funding for these parks are managed by a not-for-profit organization through a long-term lease arrangement.
PLANNING POLICIES TO SUPPORT A ROBUST STEWARDSHIP ETHOS
The university should consider broadening the number of ways it initiates landscape projects. For instance, rather than only being a part of major capital projects, consideration should be given to stand-alone renewal projects and new landscapes considered on their own merits. Moreover, when landscape projects are triggered by architectural or infrastructural projects, they should be undertaken with an understanding of their impact on the continuous landscape systems of the campus.

The need for policy development that includes protocol as it relates to improvements has been expressed throughout this document. Policies related to scope definition, budget allocation, funding requirements, and decision-making are all required to ensure the stewardship of this campus asset is viewed and managed holistically, with an equal eye on the future and a nod to the past.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE OUTDOOR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT SHOULD CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING, SUMMARIZED IN A SITE PROGRAM

1. THE CAMPUS MOSAIC
   OPEN SPACE TYPE
   PUBLIC TO PRIVATE TRANSITIONS
   CONNECTIONS TO ADJACENT OPEN SPACES

2. MATERIALS
   DURABILITY
   TIMELESS DETAILING
   SUSTAINABLE ASPECTS - CONTENT OR RECYCLABILITY
   EASE OF REPAIR/REPLACEMENT
   CAMPUS STANDARDS (LIGHTING, BENCHES, BIKE)

3. HISTORIC QUALITY AND CHARACTER OF THE CAMPUS
   CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE
   ACADEMIC SIGNIFICANCE
   ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

4. TREES & VEGETATION
   DIVERSITY OF SPECIES
   PRESERVATION OF MATURE SPECIMENS
   URBAN FOREST GOALS & CAMPUS CHARACTER
   EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
   WATER CONSCIOUS

5. MOBILITY
   CAMPUS CONNECTIONS & ADA
   SITE SPECIFIC CONNECTIONS
   PEDESTRIAN - MINIMUM WIDTH?
   BICYCLE - CONVENIENT BUT OUT OF HEAVY PED AREAS
   VEHICULAR - SECONDARY TO THE BIKE ENVIRONMENT
   PARKING FOR BICYCLES & CARS
   SERVICE ACCESS
   TRANSIT

6. MAINTENANCE
   LEVEL OF CARE - VISIBILITY AND USE
   ACCESS FOR STAFF & EQUIPMENT
   IRRIGATION & WATER

7. INFRASTRUCTURE
   STORMWATER OPPORTUNITIES
   SITE WALLS
PERMANENT WAYFINDING & SIGNAGE
The University is comprised of a complex network of streets and pathways that traverse campus. The organizational structure of central campus, with paths radiating outward from Red Square, is often difficult to comprehend for the first time visitor. Additionally, the scale and vastness of buildings in east and south campus create physical barriers to views and knowledge of what’s beyond, as much as they impede passage through.

With all of these challenges, wayfinding is a critical need to assist in navigating the campus environment and make it a more welcoming experience for visitors. In tandem with the CLF, a Wayfinding & Signage study was developed that recommends a map-based approach to wayfinding and strategically locates signage at critical, decision-making intersections on campus. This system is designed to be minimal in both quantity and appearance, while providing the necessary support for understanding the layout and physical assets of the campus environment.

Additional permanent signage on campus consists of a collection of regulatory, identification, informational, and a handful of old maps and ADA signage. Much of this is has been added over time and is inconsistent in character, messaging, and placement.

There is currently no guideline for permanent signage on campus, but the desire and will to create guidelines and templates is great and necessary to preserve the integrity of the campus environment from an unnecessary proliferation of signs, rather a deliberate approach to incorporating useful wayfinding guidance while systematically eliminating outdated signage on campus.
TEMPORARY SIGNAGE AND IDENTITY MARKING

The identity and recognition of the University to visitors coming to campus or those just passing through should be celebrated. Likewise, the entrances to campus should be clearly visible and identifiable, and provide a sense of welcome and arrival to enhance the campus experience for all. Permanent signage and markings can contribute to this, but in some circumstances, temporary graphics can be utilized to keep the messaging fresh and current.

Examples of this are the vinyl banners that have been installed along many of the arterial streets around the campus and along the streets within the campus boundaries. These banners provide awareness of being on or near the campus, but could also be more strategic in their use and location to clearly identify and celebrate campus entrances. The construction graphics program, which is designed to provide a consistent appearance to construction sites and provide a bit of useful information about the project by installing large vinyl mesh banners on construction fences, is another example of a longer duration temporary signage system.

Other temporary signage on campus is often installed to announce events, organizations, department identity, wayfinding for events, parking, construction detours, subtle messaging, etc. There are some existing policies related to Registered Student Office use on Kane Hall and sandwich board permitting, but in general, temporary signage is not currently regulated. In recent years, the use of yard signs and building mounted signs promoting departments and campaigns has increased, somewhat unregulated, yielding inconsistent and often visually distracting messaging that verges on advertisement rather than guidance or University identity.

The need for guidelines, templates, and policies related to temporary signage is significant and should be addressed holistically from appropriate use of temporary signage, design approval, duration, and placement.

EXISTING TEMPORARY BANNER ON KANE HALL

RECOMMENDED TEMPORARY BANNER SYSTEM
CAMPUS LIGHTING
As is typical at most universities, exterior lighting on campus has evolved in both physical form and performance as technological advances in lighting systems and styles become available. The University of Washington is no exception and based on a current inventory of lighting elements, the University hosts over seven different lamp types housed in forty plus different luminaire styles. This eclectic mix of fixtures provides an equally challenging mix of architectural styles, maintenance needs, perception of safety and light quality, resulting in a disjointed experience when traveling through campus.

With a twenty-four hour, seven days a week campus environment, the role campus lighting plays in providing a safe environment for students, faculty and staff is significant. There are many pathways, open spaces, and parking facilities that are poorly lit and in need of upgrades. A comprehensive campus-wide lighting assessment has never been performed and is recommended to fully understand the current state of lighting on campus. There is significant opportunity to develop a lighting strategy and guidelines for campus that integrates and enhances the campus mosaic concept and range of campus experiences, with improved energy efficiency, and reduced maintenance.
PARKING, TRANSIT AND VISITOR AMENITIES
The experience of welcoming visitors to campus starts well before they arrive on campus. However, once here, the University has the opportunity to make that experience as pleasant or challenging as possible. Currently, most visitors arrive by car and are directed to park in the Central Parking Garage (CPG) for general visits, or are notified to request a permit from one of the campus gatehouses to place them closer to their destination if it's known. In both circumstances, a gatehouse attendant becomes an essential component in welcoming visitors, however, the concern is, after they leave the gatehouse, they're on their own to find their way out of the garage and onto their destination. In return, after their visit, they need to find their way back to where they parked. Both of these tasks can be challenging for those that come here every day given the configuration of the CPG, and is exaggerated for first time visitors.

A strategy that's been well received from a visitor experience perspective is to direct visitors to a limited number of parking lots rather than the CPG, while assuring the distance of travel to final destinations are no greater than five minutes for the average person. In addition, these lots could be renamed to better correspond to their surroundings (such as Memorial Way Parking Lot) in lieu of the current numeric code, giving the visitor a sense of place specific to the University setting.

The future potential for campus visitors to choose the Sound Transit Link Light Rail as a means of accessing campus, with connections from SeaTac Airport and destinations south in 2016, and future connections north in 2021, presents a new challenge. The location of the stations will shift the point of arrival to campus significantly with one located at the lower end of Rainier Vista and the other along the 43rd Street corridor. The recent improvements to the lower portion of Rainier Vista were designed to provide a grand sense of arrival, but only extend to Stevens Way. Continuing this language of design and intent further up the vista to Red Square is essential to provide universal access to the heart of the campus. Additionally, the entrance at 43rd Street and 15th Ave will see some upgrades with the construction of the Burke Museum along 15th Ave, but has potential to be more continuous and welcoming as one moves from the station at Brooklyn Ave into the campus to Memorial Way.

The synergies that could be realized through combining the inter-related goals of initiatives relative to improving signage, wayfinding, parking, lighting, and primary universal routes of travel could be leveraged to combine sources of funding and help prioritize projects over the next five to ten years that accomplish multiple objectives as expressed by many units and departments across campus.
SITE FURNISHINGS AND PAVEMENTS
The campus landscape has the unique ability to seamlessly coordinate disparate parts of the campus aesthetic into a cohesive experience that exemplifies the sense of place. Modern and classic architectural style buildings sit adjacent to one another; occasionally engaging in a harmonious dialogue relative to scale and proportion, articulation of fenestration, or materiality. The way in which these buildings sit within the landscape differs as some form figured formal greens, others are nestled into the woods, and others seem to float within an open setting. With all of the variables related to the architectural expression of the physical setting, as one travels through the campus, the consistency of site elements is critical to reduce the sense of visual clutter and create a continuous experience that provides a backdrop in which the diversity of architectural expression and landscape typologies can be fully appreciated. The landscape plantings, displayed as forested groves, canopied lawns, ornate beds, and allées provide the structure and character of the outdoor environment, but the role of site furnishings and paved surfaces is also critical in providing continuity at the human scale. Site furnishings include benches, tables, lighting, site walls, signage, bollards, bike racks, bike shelters, bike enclosures, handrails, guardrails, fences, gateways, bus stops, and other site elements that are found throughout the outdoor environment. The University has guidelines relative to some of these elements based on time-tested, functional qualities desired, such as standard benches, bike racks, lighting, and bollards. In other circumstances, precedents found around campus, such as site walls, guardrails, and fences serve as unspoken guidelines for new developments.

More attention and study relative to seating, bicycle facilities, and outdoor lighting is needed in the form of guidelines to be used both internally by campus staff and externally by design teams retrofitting or creating new landscaped spaces.

OUTDOOR SEATING
The University has a variety of outdoor seating scattered throughout campus in the form of seatwalls, benches, and tables with chairs that provide areas to rest, places to study, enjoy a meal, or catch up with a colleague. From the quiet bench in a secluded garden to the steps that front Kane Hall, each of these types of invited or opportunistic perches nurture the well-being of those who spend a moment out of doors, immersed in the social or planted enclaves of campus life. Expanding the options for seating throughout campus, with an emphasis on creating social hubs associated with building entrances or at major crossroads is encouraged. Additionally, provided opportunities for resting or quiet study in more remote areas of campus is also encouraged.

MEMORIAL BENCH
BICYCLE FACILITIES
An increase in bicycle use on campus as a means of commuting to and from work or school, or to move about campus throughout the day has resulted in an increased demand for bicycle parking facilities. In the past, simple galvanized racks called “toast racks” were placed near entrances and on any paved surface in close proximity to where the demand centered. Although these were somewhat haphazardly placed when first used, the current model for major capital projects requires teams to calculate the demand for bicycle parking based on anticipated occupancy and replacement of any racks displaced by construction. The siting of these racks as part of a project results in more intentional placement, allowing ease of access balanced with other modes of mobility.

The desire to provide more secure bicycle storage resulted in an influx of bicycle lockers that have been located throughout campus in loading areas, parking lots, landscape nooks, and plazas. While the lockers provide more secure bicycle storage, the footprint per bike exceeds the carrying capacity of many outdoor areas, resulting in double stacked lockers and courtyards filled with lockers. As part of constructing Paccar Hall, the University built its first bike house, a secure, limited access, multi-bike storage enclosure that dramatically reduces the square footage per bike, but are more challenging to locate in the campus setting.

Moving forward, the desire to phase out existing bike lockers and incorporate additional covered open racks and where possible, secure bike houses will require careful siting and design. The optimal location for these types of facilities are close to final destinations, but with access primarily supported through the network of shared roads, minimizing the use of bicycles on major pedestrian pathways.

Further development of a bicycle storage plan that identifies areas of campus currently underserved, areas of potential growth, and opportunities for improvements that can be phased in over time through a variety of funding models is recommended to ensure this mode of travel is adequately supported.
**CAMPUS CONSTRUCTION**
The University of Washington is in a constant state of development, with an average annual growth of 290,000 GSF of new construction and demolition of approximately 40,000 GSF annually over the past twenty years. This translates to approximately four acres of new landscapes annually. While much of the recent development has occurred in west campus, where the impact on existing landscapes is minimal, a significant amount of development has, or is planned within the historic core, in which the iconic landscaped open spaces are much more sensitive.

The impacts of construction activities can be lasting and are often not visible in the landscape until years after as the effects of soil compaction, resulting in storm water runoff and lack of oxygen to existing trees, materializes with plant health decline. Additionally, the quality of landscape construction is inconsistent and is often compromised to meet project schedule and budget constraints, despite the effort to provide robust specifications and documents to ensure quality.

Given the majority of landscape improvements consists of living materials, the need for quality construction, warrantee follow-through, and heightened maintenance during the plant establishment period is essential. Considerations to minimize disturbance during construction activities is also critical and includes care and protection of mature landscapes; adequate detours for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle travel; access to vegetated areas to be preserved within project limits for maintenance staff; and construction access for large vehicles to be carefully coordinated.

**MEMORIALS & ART**
Honoring individuals associated with the University who have provided significant contributions, were tragically lost, or are revered by their peers is a time honored tradition. Physical monuments are often sought to memorialize individuals or events and are frequently requested within the campus setting.

The University provides a variety of options that create a consistent approach to memorials without over burdening the landscape environment with a proliferation of markers and plaques. Instead, memorials contribute to the aesthetic and functional needs of the University, primarily with benches and trees, and in special approved circumstances, small gardens and monuments. Plaques are kept to a minimum and are typically standardized in size, material and mounting, which all help to reduce clutter and maintenance needs.

There is a limited amount of outdoor public art scattered across campus, primarily sponsored by the state required one half of one percent for art program. Commissions, donations, and maintenance of outdoor sculpture are managed by the Public Arts Coordinator and are scrutinized on how they contribute to the value of the overall art collection through artist recognition and notoriety.