

February 25, 1999

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Buildings and Grounds Committee:

Albert H. Small, Chair  
J. Michael Allen  
William G. Crutchfield, Jr.  
William H. Goodwin, Jr.  
Terence P. Ross  
Benjamin P.A. Warthen  
James C. Wheat, III  
John P. Ackerly, III, Ex Officio

and

The Remaining Members of the Board:

Charles M. Caravati, Jr., M.D.	Timothy B. Robertson
Champ Clark	Elizabeth A. Twohy
T. Keister Greer	Henry L. Valentine, II
Elsie Goodwyn Holland	Walter F. Walker
Joseph E. Wolfe	

FROM: Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr.

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Meeting of the Buildings and Grounds  
Committee on February 25, 1999

The Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia met, in Open Session, at 10:10 a.m., Thursday, February 25, 1999, in the Lower West Oval Room of the Rotunda; Albert H. Small, Chair, presided. J. Michael Allen, William G. Crutchfield, Jr., William H. Goodwin, Jr., Benjamin P.A. Warthen, James C. Wheat, III, and John P. Ackerly, III, Rector, were present. Also present were Leonard W. Sandridge, Jr., Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr., Ms.

Colette Capone, Peter W. Low, Robert Dillman, Samuel A. Anderson, III, Ms. Shirley Menaker, Jules S. Levine, Ms. Mary Hughes, Tom Leback, Ms. Luanne Greene, Rick Borkowicz, Tom Massey, Ms. Debbie Phillips, and Ms. Jeanne F. Bailes.

The Chair asked Ms. Capone, Vice President for Management and Budget, to present the Agenda.

Ms. Capone presented the Consent Agenda with one change: she asked permission, which was granted, to move the first item, Architect Selection for the Darden School Expansion, to the Report section of the Agenda.

The two remaining items were resolutions authorizing the demolition of a storage shed in the Facilities Management complex on Alderman Road and the architectural design guidelines for the Observatory Hill Dining Hall renovation. The shed was damaged by an act of vandalism on February 6<sup>th</sup> and is not deemed worth repairing. The Dining Hall project includes renovations and the building of an addition which will raise its seating capacity from 635 to 920. The architectural design guidelines were prepared by the MMM Design Group and the Architect for the University.

The motions adopting the resolutions were approved and the resolutions were recommended to the full Board for approval.

APPROVAL TO REMOVE FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SHED #2

The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the University owns a small, one-story shed located behind the Leake Building in the Facilities Management complex on the west side of Alderman Road; and

WHEREAS, the structure was recently damaged by vandalism and is unstable; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of Virginia delegated to the Board of Visitors, pursuant to Executive Order Number Thirty-Four (98), dated November 10, 1998, the authority of the Governor to approve the removal of buildings on state property, with the advice and counsel of the Art and Architectural Review Board, and the review of the Department of Historic Resources;

RESOLVED that the removal of the Facilities Management Shed #2 is approved by the Board of Visitors pending approval of its removal by the Art and Architectural Review Board and the Department of Historic Resources; and

RESOLVED FURTHER that the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer is authorized to execute any and all documents pertaining to the removal of the aforementioned building, and that the said officer ensure that the required report regarding the building removal is sent to the Department of General Services.

APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE OBSERVATORY HILL DINING RENOVATION PROJECT

The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED that the architectural design guidelines, dated February 25, 1999, prepared by the MMM Design Group and the Architect for the University, for the Observatory Hill Dining Renovation are approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER that the project will be presented for further review at the schematic design level of development.

- - - - -

Moving to the Action Agenda, Ms. Capone asked Mr. Anderson to introduce the architects and lead the discussion.

Mr. Anderson noted the first project, the East Precinct Chiller Plant, and asked Mr. Dillman, Chief Facilities Officer, to describe it. As the project's name implies, the Chiller Plant will provide an additional 6,000 tons of chilled water for the East Precinct of the Health Sciences Center, including service to the new Biomedical Research Building, construction of which will begin in the summer. The new Chiller Plant would provide redundant service to the Hospital and would permit the retirement of old, inefficient chillers in existing buildings.

There were a number of questions, principally from Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Wheat and the Chair, about the economies that might derive from the new Chiller Plant, as well as the general fiscal impact of the project. Mr. Sandridge outlined

the new policies, which are in the process of being implemented, that will insure studies of costs and fiscal impact before projects of this sort are presented to the Board. Fiscal impact studies in fact were done on this project.

Mr. Anderson then introduced Mr. Tom Massey of HLM Design, who reviewed the design plans for the project. Mr. Wheat had questions about the suitability of the site. Mr. Massey, Mr. Dillman and Mr. Borkowicz of RMF Engineering explained the reasons for the choice of the site, reasons which had to do both with the terrain and the constraints imposed by existing buildings and the Norfolk Southern Railroad tracks.

There were questions, too, about the fenestration in the design.

Mr. Anderson next introduced Ms. Debbie Phillips of RTKL of Baltimore, who made a presentation on an addition to MR4, the Medical Research Building, which is to house three nuclear magnetic resonance units. The addition is being designed carefully to meld with MR4.

On motion, the Committee adopted resolutions approving the schematic design for the East Precinct Chiller Plant and the schematic design for the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Units, and recommended both to the full Board for approval.

APPROVAL OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR THE EAST PRECINCT CHILLER PLANT

The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED that the schematic design, dated February 25, 1999, and prepared by RMF Engineering of Baltimore, Maryland, for the East Precinct Chiller Plant, is approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER that the project shall be presented for further review at the preliminary design level of development.

APPROVAL OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR THE NUCLEAR MAGNETIC  
RESONANCE UNITS

The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED that the schematic design, dated February 25, 1999, and prepared by RTKL of Baltimore, Maryland, for the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Units, is approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER that the project shall be presented for further review at the preliminary design level of development.

- - - - -

Ms. Capone commented that the instructions given to the architects on both of these projects took into account that both buildings will be utilitarian. It was clear to her, though, that the Committee believes that aesthetics are important; this will be taken into account on future projects.

Mr. Crutchfield suggested that alternatives be presented to the Committee: Design A will cost so much, while Design B will cost significantly more, etc.

Ms. Capone asked Mr. Anderson and Ms. Luanne Green of Ayers/Saint/Gross to begin a discussion of the Groundswalk.

Mr. Anderson and Ms. Green, using maps, sketches and elevations, discussed the Groundswalk in some detail, focussing on the section between University Hall and Rugby Road. For this section, a bridge over Emmet Street is planned and the discussion centered on this. It was proposed that a lane for buses be built along side the pedestrian and bicycle walk; Members, however, objected to this. There was debate, too, about the kind of bridge or bridges proposed.

In the end, three points were agreed to: On the section of the Groundswalk between University Hall and Rugby Road, the pedestrian and bicycle walks must be separated from any transit lanes. For the time being, the bridge over Emmet St. should be an attractive but low cost design. If there is a demonstrable need for a transit system between University Hall and Rugby Road, then a transit only system should be devised to meet that need. In any case, the bridge over Emmet Street

is a very important link in the Groundswalk which should be built as soon as possible.

The second point agreed to by the Committee is that costs should be kept down but not at the expense of aesthetics. Aesthetics should be the overriding consideration in the design of the Groundswalk, but for the moment, at any rate, cost should be the determining factor for the bridge. The Committee asked that it be given design options for the bridge.

Finally, the Committee asked for clean sketches for the Groundswalk. They suggested that a sketch be made of a 100 ft. section with all of the plantings, tributaries, lamps, etc. included. These sketches should include options for the Committee to consider.

The Committee recessed for lunch at 12:15 p.m. and resumed in Open Session at 1:10 p.m.

On resuming after lunch, Ms. Capone gave a presentation on the Six-Year Capital Outlay Plan, explaining that her presentation was for information only, not action by the Committee. The building projects envisioned in the Plan vary from those where funds are, or very likely will be available, to wish lists. Ms. Capone told the Committee she would seek authorization for the Plan at the March meetings of the Committee and the full Board.

There was discussion about several of the projects. Mr. Goodwin expressed a general concern about listing proposed projects before ascertaining financial justifications for them, even though the State's Capital Outlay process requires that projects be proposed six years in advance, whether or not questions of financial justification have been resolved.

Ms. Capone then asked Mr. Anderson to lead a discussion of the proposed Admission Building. Referring to the discussion at the last meeting of the Committee (see Minutes of the meeting of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, January 30, 1999), he listed the eleven possible alternative sites considered for the Office of Admission: Brooks Hall, East McCormick Road, Garrett Hall, Hotel E, Madison Hall, a Madison Hall Addition, Miller Hall, Minor Hall, the Newcomb Hall

Plaza, Peabody Hall and the Rotunda. He then listed the criteria his office has used in studying each of these sites: Image, proximity to the historic core of the University, proximity to parking, easy to find, proximity to student traffic, historic building, handicap accessibility, suitability of interior spaces, outdoor gathering space, and displacement of current occupants.

Using these criteria, all but four of the possible sites were eliminated: Garrett Hall, Madison Hall, the Newcomb Hall Plaza, and Peabody Hall. Discussing each of these, Mr. Anderson said his study had concluded that Peabody Hall and the Newcomb Hall Plaza were the best sites. Mr. Blackburn, the Undergraduate Dean of Admission, was in the room at this point and was asked his opinion. He told the Committee he prefers Peabody Hall. Questions were raised about the Office of the Dean of Students and about the offices of various student organizations which are now in the building. There was talk of putting up an addition to Newcomb Hall to house them, or perhaps using the building on Newcomb Hall Plaza originally proposed for this purpose. Peabody Hall will require some renovation for use by the Admission Office who more than likely would not need the whole building. Mr. Goodwin suggested renovating Peabody Hall and putting the Dean of Students and the student organizations back temporarily in the building, along with the Office of Admission, until a permanent solution can be found.

It was suggested that the Admission application fee be raised to \$60 from the current \$45 to pay for the necessary work, but Mr. Blackburn expressed unease about the wisdom of this.

Finally, Mr. Goodwin proposed - and the Committee agreed - to move ahead with deliberate speed on renovating Peabody Hall for use as the Office of Admission, and that the Chair of the Buildings and Grounds Committee be authorized to approve the hiring of any help that might be needed for this.

Ms. Capone told the Committee that it was not being asked to approve the selection of an architect for the Darden School expansion project because the work will be done not by the

University but by the Darden School Foundation. Darden has chosen the Baltimore firm of Ayers/Saint/Gross, with the understanding that the Board of Visitors will review and approve the designs for the project.

On motion, the Committee adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

- - - - -

AGG:lah

- Copies to: Mr. John T. Casteen, III  
Mr. Gene D. Block  
Dr. Robert W. Cantrell  
Ms. Colette Capone  
Ms. Louise Dudley  
Mr. Ernest H. Ern  
Mr. Paul J. Forch  
Mr. William W. Harmon  
Mr. Terry Holland  
Mr. L. Jay Lemons  
Mr. Peter W. Low  
Ms. Polley Ann McClure  
Mr. Leonard W. Sandridge, Jr.  
Mr. Robert D. Sweeney  
Mr. Samuel A. Anderson