

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services  
November 13, 2014  
10am – 11:30am  
Gerberding 26

**Meeting synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. NanoE (Mole 2) Building
  3. Review of the minutes/notes from October 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>
  4. Major Project Activity Report
  5. West Campus Development Framework
  6. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

The meeting was called to order by Christie at 10am.

**2) NanoE (MoleR2) Building**

Eric K. McArthur (Capital Projects Office) was present to discuss building phase 2 of the MoleR2 building. The building phase will include 78,000 gross square feet with instrumentation space, laboratory research, and instruction/learning spaces. McArthur explained the area of campus is well suited for laboratory use and will be ideal for minimizing vibrations and is part of the university's agreement with Sound Transit to pay for mitigation costs resulting from the light rail expansion project.

McArthur explained the building phase will cost \$53 million with \$34 million from Sound Transit, \$7.1 million from the Office of Planning and Budgeting and \$2.9 million from local funds. McArthur clarified that there is no bond funding associated with this project.

**Project schedule**

- January 2010 – January 2015: Design and building
- January 2015 – September 2016: Phased construction
- September 2016 – December 2016: Commissioning and closeout

McArthur explained that teaching and learning spaces will be available in Fall Quarter 2016 with classrooms located on the first level. McArthur discussed the footprint of the basement level and the emphasis on minimizing vibrations. Discussion ensued about moving traffic in and around the building with specific attention to an increase in pedestrian traffic. McArthur noted that there has been a lot of attention to pedestrian and traffic trends/projections in order to address the increase in traffic around the building. A question was raised about bicyclists. Bike lockers will be provided and pedestrian lanes will be clear to ensure there are no blind corners which may create accidents between bicyclists and pedestrians. Concern was raised about the quality of surfacing to comply with ADA standards and visual cues available for pedestrians. McArthur explained the project is still in the development stages and will

be addressed. Discussion ensued about members' concern towards mixing vehicles and pedestrian travel into a narrow section of the campus.

McArthur discussed the floor plan. The ground level will provide an instrumentation lab which will be shielded in order to conduct research without interferences. The first level will provide two classrooms with informal learning spaces. The classrooms will be general assignment and possibly be similar to the active learning classrooms located in the Odegaard Undergraduate Library. McArthur explained that levels 2-4 will be dedicated to research labs and offices. Members discussed whether it would be more attractive to have a large lecture-size classroom or an active learning classroom. A comment was raised stating that departments are moving towards large lecture classes as a result of activity-based budgeting.

Little moved for the council to formally state that the new classrooms being built in the central part of campus be generally-assigned rooms with priority given to lecturer-style courses with more than 100 seats, with second priority given to active-learning classrooms. Discussion ensued about the availability of classrooms and the possibility of courses being taught from 8am to 6pm. Members discussed teaching times and trends. Concern was raised about the university driving teaching style based on classroom size with a worry that a negative impact may occur without being properly thought out. Discussion ensued about the University Committee on Learning Spaces and a recent report that details the outstanding problems that are impacting the university. Christie tabled the motion for an upcoming meeting in order to discuss the impacts with Roberta Hopkins who can provide more information on the issue.

A question was raised asking about requirements for central campus similarity guidelines. Christie explained that as vice chair of the UW Architectural Commission the group feels that the new wing is consistent with surrounding architecture. Concern was raised about choke points and the concentration of pedestrian traffic during the construction phase. McArthur drew a diagram outlining the construction zone where police officers and signage will be located in order to direct traffic.

A question was raised asking if there will be any new amenities or additions that will create a sense of community amongst student, instructors and researchers. The informal learning spaces on level 1 will create a gathering space with furniture and amenities for grouping and allow for queuing for classes. Upper levels will also have shared breakrooms. McArthur explained that the primary concern from nano-engineering sciences is to provide open lab spaces that are modulated and allow for modifications. Each researcher will be able to modify his/her space which is approximately 1,000 – 1,200 square feet.

### **3) Review of the minutes from October 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>**

The minutes from October 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> were approved.

### **4) Major Project Activity Report**

John Seidelmann (Director of Capital and Space Planning, Office of Planning and Budgeting) was present to discuss The One Capital Plan and the major projects going before the Board of Regents (BoR). Seidelmann explained this presentation is aimed to provide a subset of the One Capital Plan and the current/active projects that are funded, or have partial funding, that are in the planning and design phases.

Each project is grouped by the following phase:

- Planning
- Feasibility
- Predesign
- Design
- Construction
- Closeout

Seidelmann explained that projects in the planning phase are either actively being worked on by a given unit or within the Office of Planning and Budgeting. Projects in the feasibility stage are receiving an internal study or have a consultant fleshing out ideas about program needs and whether funding is available to support it. Once a project reaches the predesign phase a consulting firm is brought in and tasked with developing the initial plans and aligning the project with available support to continue the effort.

Seidelmann pointed out the timelines which each project must go through in order to be approved by the BoR. Depending on the project each proposal must be presented to the BoR and approved based on one or more reviews:

- Architectural review
- Site review
- Budget review
- APW review
- Construction contact review
- Debt review (only if the projects is debt funded)
- Adjustment review (budget adjustments if the project exceeds 10% of the original cost estimate)

A question was raised asking when exactly the decision is made for a project to go through, such as the predesign phase. The decision of whether a project goes through happens fairly early in the process and can be made at, during or after the predesign phase. Seidelmann explained that a project only goes to the BoR for approval if the project costs exceeds \$5 million. Seidelmann will report back to the council every 2 months and will flag any changes to the project status report.

A comment was raised expressing interest in the proposed basketball operations and practice center. Seidelmann explained the center would be financed through debt funding and the proposal will be presented to the BoR with a tentative date in March. Christie noted that he will invite a guest to discuss the project in more detail at an upcoming meeting. A comment was raised expressing interest in the NW hospital. A suggestion was raised to have a detailed conversation once the project is scheduled to be reviewed by the BoR.

## **5) West Campus Development Framework**

Rebecca Barnes (University Architect) and Ronald Sheff (Mahlum Architects) were present to provide an update on the UW West Campus Development Framework. Barnes explained the goal is for UW to develop its own character for the future which can be incorporated into the campus master plan. Barnes explained the current master plan was developed between UW and the City of Seattle which was

approved by the city council and BoR in 2003. The plan identified where new buildings could be built and UW was allotted 3 million gross square feet (gsf) for future planning purposes. UW is currently one third the way through its current allotment and is in the process of thinking about the next campus master plan to identify questions, choices and tradeoffs that may occur. The future of west campus is on top of the university's list and UW is working with the same consulting group that was involved with the planning and implementing of the new student housing projects on west campus.

As UW continues to grow it is important to identify how the university community will be altered, such as the maximum heights of new buildings and the footprint that new sites will create. With its recent growth UW has been feeling squeezed with its limited parcels of land and is reviewing possible sites across campus and determining possible building heights and densities that could be incorporated into future planning. As UW looks into the future there is a sense of follow the trend and excitement from faculty, students and community members have about pedagogy in an urban context and developing a teaching and learning environment that is closely associated with the world around the university. Additionally, it is UW's goal to create a greater sense of community that is reflective of the university.

UW has conducted an extensive analysis of possible scenarios in developing the West Campus Framework. As part of the process UW has met with a variety of university committees, faculty groups, and student organizations dating back to May 2014. Through these conversations UW received feedback on many variables that would define the characteristics of west campus, including:

- Identity
- Program quality
- Density
- Mix use
- Landscape
- Circulation
- Enabling
- Implementation

The important driver in these conversations was to identify the ideal campus-type which would be incorporated as part of the expansion:

- Collegiate (similar to UW's "Quad")
- Urban district
- Research park (similar to South Lake Union campus)

The feedback on the possible options included consistent support for an urban district model with a highly mixed organization of uses. Additionally, there was a desire for a hybrid approach to landscape that reinforces a landscape hierarchy.

Sheff explained that there was strong pushback against the following scenarios:

- Non-growth scenarios
- Extending central campus "character" to west campus
- Corporate research park
- Uniform zones or precincts

- Even density and building heights

The scenarios that will be incorporated in the final plans will likely include 4.35 million gsf, or 75% of UW's anticipated future development over the next 20 years. Additionally, the plans would reinforce Brooklyn as a significant connector while reinforcing east-west and north-south pedestrian connections. Sheff explained that several criteria will be important to consider when building out west campus, including:

- Support the university's educational and research missions
- Accommodate programmatic need
- Facilitate collaboration and innovation
- Create a memorable image and distinct identity for the west campus
- Create a pedestrian-scaled, vibrant, active, safe and livable place
- Create an accessible district that is welcoming to the public
- Create a flexible framework that can accommodate multiple uses over time
- Represent an implementable, realistic plan

Near-term site development will typically include parking lots and smaller structures that will remove 318,000 gsf, with long-term sites requiring surge space strategies removing 938,000 gsf (including 322,000 gsf of housing). Existing parameters includes building height limits (regulated by the 2003 campus master plan), PUDA restrictions requiring the replacement of 60 parking spaces, and shoreline requirements (30 foot height limit within 200 feet of shoreline).

Several options are available, including on option with mixed use with maximum heights between 125-160 feet, midrise multifamily residential units and industrial/commercial use. A second option may include maximum heights between 300-340 feet, neighborhood/commercial use with 85 foot maximum heights, mid-rise and low-rise multifamily residential units, and industrial/commercial use.

Three strategies are being reviewed that could reflect the new West Campus Framework:

- Strong spine (incrementally reinforce Brooklyn as a collaborative corridor)
- Three hearts (celebrating the distinct characters of west campus)
- Campus and city meet the shore (leverage the bluff to link the city and campus with the shoreline)

### ***Strong Spine***

The idea of this strategy is to reinforce Brooklyn and the "Ave" as key organizing elements. The plan would strategically locate building and open spaces along these streets, create east-west links reinforcing campus connections, and create north-south links reinforcing community/public connections. Sheff went into detail about proposed building sites, the circulation network, and public access to buildings that make up the strong spine strategy. Building heights would start at 308 feet (with a landmark building) with a cascading effect down to the waterfront. As a comparison Sheff explained the current UW Tower is 340 feet tall.

### ***Three hearts***

The three hearts plan strategically leverages existing uses and introduces new buildings to reinforce Campus Parkway, the urban plaza and the waterfront park. The plan would create three distinct identities with each anchored by a significant open space. The plan would introduce strong north-south links to connect the neighborhoods, transform Campus Parkway into a cohesive open space by removing 2 lanes of traffic while widening the median, and introduce an urban plaza that connects the Burke Gilman Trail and the north-south links. Sheff discussed the character of the proposed “three hearts” plan, proposed building sites and circulation network.

### ***Campus and city meet the shore***

The emphasis of this plan is to extend the city grid to the south while pulling the waterfront to the north. The city and shore would come together at a stepped terrace at the intersection of the Burke Gillman Trail and Brooklyn, turning Waterfront Park into a significant civic and campus amenity. Boat Street would be removed to allow for a larger, more significant open space while allowing easy public access to the park.

A comment was raised stressing the need for more green space in and around campus. However, it makes sense to create a high-density neighborhood further north were Sound Transit is creating a new light rail station. A question was raised asking why the university feels Brooklyn needs to be reinforced. Barnes explained that the university envisions a different character for the “Ave” with a retail/commercial core while Brooklyn is envisioned as a green street more focused on bicycle and pedestrian traffic connecting to current residential areas.

### **6) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Christie at 11:30 am.

---

*Minutes by Grayson Court, council support analyst, gcourt@uw.edu*

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Rich Christie (chair), Laura Little, Murray Maitland, Ann Mescher, Giovanni Migliaccio, Christopher Ozubko, Bill Rorabaugh, Carrie Sturts Dossick  
**Ex officio representatives:** John Carroll, Chris Byrne  
**Guests:** John Seidelmann, Rebecca Barnes, Eric K. McArthur, Ronald Sheff

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Bruce Balick, Sarah Gates, Gundula Proksch  
**President’s designee:** Charles Kennedy  
**Ex officio representatives:** Steve Goldblatt, Adam Khan, JoAnne Taricani