Meeting Synopsis
1. Approval of Minutes for Feb. 17, 2011 Meeting
2. Intellectual House plan (30 min.)
   John Wetzel, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office
   Jon Lebo, Interim Director, Student Life
3. Bicycle/pedestrian pathway issues (30 min.)
   Joshua Kavanagh, Director, Transportation Services
4. New Business
5. Adjournment

Call to Order
Council chair Bill Rorabaugh called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the February 17, 2011 meeting were approved as written.

2. Intellectual House plan (30 min.)
   John Wetzel, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office

Wetzel gave a presentation on the recent updates to the Intellectual House plan, including the mission statement, project funding, project timeline, and key design elements. [Presentation Attached – Appendix A.] He specified that the schematic design could continue if 50% of the fundraising goal of $5 million is met. If that mark isn’t met by the end of 2011, they will revisit where they are at with the project. The OMA, President Wise, and others are currently pushing for donations, including with local tribes.

A question was asked about the politics of donating and a sense of ownership, but Wetzel said he couldn’t really speak to the subject. He added that there is a potential that tribes or other donors could commit to give over a series of years, and that they’re looking for financial commitment.

Wetzel also brought up the cultural resource survey that will be conducted by the state department of archeology and historical preservation. It will establish a baseline level of what might be uncovered during construction and start looking at construction techniques. The survey will be combined with the one for Lewis Hall.

While showing renderings of the project design, Wetzel mentioned that parking issues still need to get settled at a higher level, as well as move in/out logistics at the nearby dorms; the possibility of moving the project to the southeast to make wider access between Lewis Hall and the Intellectual House; redesigning one building to make it work better with the Lewis Hall extension and courtyard; and bringing water from Lewis Hall through the site in a way that relates to the planned central circle.

Council members then shared a number of concerns and suggestions, including:
• The parking issue is a big one, with the school of music having many events a year attended by donors, faculty in the school of art who need to park nearby due to teaching responsibilities in multiple locations, and lot use by the school of drama. Some of these populations tend toward the elderly side and mobility is a concern.
• It is still unclear how access to the facility will be for performances and instruction, and who will control access.
• The project could include a green roof and a solar panel roof, which could open up the project to another group of donors.

In response, Wetzel said that the issues of building oversight and budget management were still being discussed by the OMA and the deans. He added that another issue in general is whether the funding is going to come through. Finally, he added that the issue of mechanical equipment and systems for two buildings is interesting, and they are looking at what kinds of things can be done to tie them together.

4. Bicycle/pedestrian pathway issues (30 min.)

Joshua Kavanagh, Director, Transportation Services
David Amiton, Commuter Services (primary planner on cycling)

Kavanagh spoke about cycling and what it means to the UW. Among the key points were that the bicycle mode share of trips to campus is about 8% and has been at that rate for a while. This rate is good, but not great, and falls short of both UW and city goals. The transit program is extraordinarily expensive and costs have doubled in the last four years, and there isn’t room for additional growth from a cost perspective. The question is how much room for growth there is from a behavior-change perspective. UW has done about all it can to make transit work on campus, and the next step in terms of shifting to less impactful modes is increasing active transportation modes such as bicycling and walking, which make sense from a cost and carbon standpoint. The aspirational goal for 2020 is a 20% mode split for cycling, which will require significant investment in programming and infrastructure. Amiton’s hiring is part of the first commitment to change in the area of cycling, and he has overseen a study of the Burke-Gilman trail and capacity issues.

Amiton said he’s a transportation analyst working first and foremost on bike and pedestrian issues, with a focus on cycling because of its larger catchment area. However, he noted that treatments that improve conditions for cycling usually increase safety for all modes.

Amiton talked about a corridor study being conducted on the Burke Gilman trail in recognition of less-than-ideal current functioning and anticipation of future use. After working to develop evaluation standards and collecting data, they have found that the level of service of the trail, comfort, and safety degrade as users are added to the trail, and they are using this data to inform a concept of how to start planning for the future of the trail. They’ve started looking at mode separation.

The council and guests then discussed other ideas and opportunities. Suggestions included looking at Danish bicycle infrastructure design standards, adding other bicycle pathways to the university, especially from the west of campus, and integrating bike parking at the light rail station. Kavanagh added that UW Transportation is focusing on interagency relationships, particularly on east-west connections (such as 43rd St NE) leading to the campus and on the Montlake triangle area. He also said that UW is trying to press bike accessibility issues with SoundTransit right now, but another effort Amiton is leading is looking at bike parking on campus and enhanced security, and the possibility of adding more secured bike lots.
Little brought up two points as a biking faculty member: (1) it would be great to have secured bike parking in the central garage, despite previous concerns that it isn’t a safe place for cyclists, and (2) plans should be developed about what can be done to get to far-flung classes, especially as faculty get pushed all over campus. Kavanagh said that there are concerns with bikes and cars interacting in parking garages, as they are not a place with an expectation of shared use, but they are doing a study of demand across campus to program a system of secured bike parking. If the study supports it, he’d have no problem supporting a bike cage in the central garage, as long as it was sited somewhere safe. Amiton added that they’re not just looking at secured bike parking but covered parking as well.

4. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.
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Mission Statement

“To provide a multi-service learning and gathering space for Native American students, faculty and staff, and others of various cultures and communities to come together in a supporting and welcoming educational environment to share their knowledge and their cultures with one another.”
Quick Project Facts

- Site is the Southern Half of Development Site 7C (N6 Parking Lot, +/- 1.7 acres)
- Current Project MOU was signed in October 2009
- Coast Salish Architectural Style
- 16,000 – 19,000 GSF (currently 18,810 GSF)
  - Student Building
  - Gathering Building
- Jones & Jones Architects and Landscape Architects
Project Funding

• Project Budget $10.6M
• $300K from State Appropriations (used for Predesign)
• $5M from the Provost
  – $2.7M from UW Building Funds
  – $2.3M from Provost Discretionary Funds
• $5M from Philanthropy (deadline of December 2011)
• $300K To Be Determined

• $246K has been raised to date from private parties and local tribes
• Some material donations have been made by local tribes
Project Timeline

- Project Initiation – 35 Year Vision
- First Tribal Summit - 2007
- Architects Selected – September 2009
- Predesign Completed – June 2010
- Building Renaming – September 2010
- Board of Regents Presentation – January 2011
- Cultural Resource Survey – Spring 2011
- Deadline for Raising Philanthropic Funds – December 2011
- Design – July 2011 thru December 2012
- Construction – 2013 - 2014
Key Design Elements

- Coast Salish Architectural Style
  - Exposed peeled poles
  - Wood exterior walls
  - Generous glazing
- Contemporary expression of “longhouse” culture
- Large interior gathering space
- Outdoor teaching and gathering spaces (circle is important)
- Ceremonial spaces (interior and exterior)
- Multipurpose Meeting Spaces
- Native Arts Lab and Elder’s Lounge
- Water
- Honor the site
Circulation Patterns
Proposed Site Plan
View from Stevens Way Towards Gathering Circle
View Looking Northwest Towards Student Building from Whitman Court
View to North from Stevens Way & Whitman Court
Model View Looking North
Model View Looking Northeast
Thank you for your time.