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Project Description
The Department of Finance and Administrative Services (FAS) is developing a master plan for it’s Cedar Falls Watershed Headquarters located in North Bend, WA. The project consists of two phases; only Phase 1 is part of this review.

Phase 1 includes:
- Complete the master plan for the facility
- Develop a 14,500 square foot administration facility to replace the existing facility
- Partially decommission the existing Watershed Administration building and demolish the Snoqualmie and Cascade modular buildings
- Close off and maintain Thompson and Harman Houses – two historic structures

Phase 2 includes:
- Develop a 27,500 square foot shop facility to consolidate existing uses
- Demolish obsolete structures and revegetate site

The administration building will be approximately 14,500 square feet and accommodate up to 49 staff members. It will contain administrative offices and support, such as private and open offices, conference rooms, a break/lunch room, fitness room, storage, server room, reception. It will also house support spaces for field crews, such as shower and locker rooms, mud/drying room, and dispatch room. Specialty support spaces will also be provided, such as a wet and dry lab for cataloguing and storing field samples and specimens.

Meeting Summary
The Seattle Design Commission (SDC) reviewed and approved the master plan and schematic design of the administration building with a vote of 7 to 0. At a previous meeting, on May 21, 2015, the SDC approved the pre design of the plan. The SDC will review Phase 2 when funding has been secured.

Recusals and Disclosures
There were no recusals or disclosures.
Summary of Presentation

Andy Ishizaki provided an introduction to the project. JC Letourneau explained the scope of the master plan and each phase of the overall project at Cedar Falls (Fig. 1). He oriented the commissioners to the site location near the Cedar Falls Education Center in North Bend, WA.

Mr. Letourneau explained the principles guiding the design of the administration building, in particular the concept of resiliency. He explained that operations staff makes up half of the people working for the City in the watershed. In addition to housing the operations staff, the new operations building would also house the staff of the natural resources, watershed protection, and public and cultural resources groups. Mr. Letourneau presented a break down showing how many of the staff work indoors primarily vs outdoors.

Mr. Letourneau presented historic plans of the Cedar Falls town site and its historic structures. He explained that in Phase I the only building that would be demolished was the modular structures, which were intended for temporary use when constructed. He presented the vehicular circulation patterns of the overall Cedar Falls site.

The overall changes to building coverage were shown for the master plan area. A plan showing decommissioned, demolished, and new buildings in Phases I and II was shown.

Mr. Letourneau next described the schematic design of the administration building (Figures 2 and 3). He presented the layout of the building and described the sustainable features. The materials where presented (Figure 4). Mr. Letourneau described sight lines and how the relationship between building and landscape. Perspectives of the
building showed how it would be seen from roads and adjacent areas.

Mark Tilbe described the landscape characteristics in the area where the new building would be placed (Fig. 5). He noted historic landscape elements including walls, a cabin, split rail fences and lighting. He explained that the site experiences high amounts of precipitation. He drew attention to the large lawns that contrast with the dense northwest forest and form a distinctive characteristic of the site.

Mr. Tilbe went on to present the landscape concept plan. He explained that a connection would be made from the visitor parking at the south of the site to the new building, creating a new entry experience for the Cedar Falls facility. Landscaping along the building would be used to manage storm water and provide an extension of the common spaces to the outdoors. With Phases I and II, the intention was to create a new outdoor gathering space by framing it with new buildings. A goal of the master plan was to reduce maintenance, so lawn will be removed in areas east of the new building and converted to native plantings. This renaturalization will occur primarily in phase II.
The approach for incorporating art into the plan were explained briefly. An artist will be selected this year. The initial idea is for the artist to create a site specific piece using salvages materials from the facility. The location might be at the southwestern corner of the building in the entry landscape area. The project team is also interested in commissioning functional pieces for the lobby waiting area or large conference room.

Agency Comments
None

Public Comments
None

Summary of Discussion
The commission focused their discussion around four topics: Site and landscape, architecture massing and materiality, sustainability, art integration and lighting.

Site and landscape
First the commissioners discussed the site and landscape. They supported the proposed configuration of the building with the site. Retaining the existing main road and trees was seen as an asset to the site design. Commissioners appreciated the provision of social space between the future buildings. There was talk of the need for permanent seating, not just movable furniture. Commissioners understood the challenge of incorporating a new building into this well established site, appreciating how the proposed building was designed in context with the site and the natural landscape. There was discussion about the lack of windows along the northwestern facades of the ground floor, labeled 5 in the site plan (Figure 4). Ultimately the group decided that because people would be walking from the entry to the parking lot along the outside of the building here, it was a functional passageway and did not need the activation windows could provide.

Architectural massing and materiality
Commissioners agreed the choice of contemporary architecture, breakdown of the massing, and use of materials would be a valuable addition in this historic, work-oriented mountain site. The shed roof and system for capturing rainwater were particularly noted as responsive to the setting.

Sustainability
The SDC was glad to see that attention had been payed to retaining the large old existing trees, existing roads and driveways, and minimizing new paving areas. They also expressed appreciation for the sustainable features of the building.

Art integration and lighting
As there was little information about the art at the time of the review, the commissioners did not discuss it at length. There was general approval of the approach to use salvaged materials and relating the art to the working history of the site. They agreed it would depend on the artist who was selected.

Action
The commission thanked FAS and the designers for the presentation of the Cedar Falls master plan and administration building design. They complemented the team on the contemporary solution within this rural setting. The scale and vocabulary of the site and building elements were seen as contextually appropriate. Tree retention and sensitivity to the history of the site were noted. The SDC especially appreciated the goals for net zero energy use and resiliency.

With a vote of 7 to 0 the SDC approved the schematic design of the Cedar Falls administration building. The commission had one recommendation:

1. In keeping with the nature of the watershed facility and sustainability goals, consider using pervious surface materials on driveways and pedestrian pathways.

The commission expects to review the Cedar Falls project when phase II moves forward. If any significant changes to the building or site design of phase I are made, or any of the fundamental sustainability components is found to be infeasible, the commission requests that the project return for another review.