

November 15, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Buildings and Grounds Committee:

The Honorable Lewis F. Payne, Chair  
Stewart H. Ackerly  
Hunter E. Craig  
The Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein  
Susan Y. Dorsey  
Helen E. Dragas  
W. Heywood Fralin  
Robert D. Hardie  
Mark J. Kington  
John O. Wynne, Ex Officio  
Bradley H. Gunter, Consulting Member

and

The Remaining Members of the Board:

A. Macdonald Caputo            Glynn D. Key  
Marvin W. Gilliam Jr.        Randal J. Kirk  
Sheila C. Johnson            Austin Ligon  
   Vincent J. Mastracco Jr.

FROM: Susan G. Harris

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Meeting of the Buildings and Grounds  
Committee on November 15, 2010

The Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia met, in Open Session, at 2:15 p.m., on Monday, November 15, 2010, in the Board Room of the Rotunda; The Honorable Lewis F. Payne, Chair, presided.

Stewart H. Ackerly, Hunter E. Craig, The Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein, Ms. Susan Y. Dorsey, Ms. Helen E. Dragas, W. Heywood Fralin, Robert D. Hardie, Mark J. Kington, and John O. Wynne, Rector, were present.

Also present were A. Macdonald Caputo, Marvin W. Gilliam Jr., Ms. Sheila C. Johnson, Ms. Glynn D. Key, Randal J. Kirk, Austin Ligon, and Vincent J. Mastracco Jr.

Bradley H. Gunter, the Consulting Member from the Council of Foundations, was present.

Present as well were Ms. Teresa A. Sullivan, Leonard W. Sandridge, Ms. Susan G. Harris, Paul J. Forch, Arthur Garson Jr., M.D., Ms. Susan A. Carkeek, Steven T. DeKosky, M.D., James L. Hilton, R. Edward Howell, Ms. Patricia M. Lampkin, Marcus L. Martin, M.D., David J. Prior, Ms. Yoke San L. Reynolds, Ms. Colette Sheehy, Thomas C. Skalak, Robert D. Sweeney, David J. Neuman, Ms. Cheryl Gomez, and Ms. Jeanne Flippo Bailes.

The Chair opened the meeting by asking Ms. Sheehy to present the Consent Agenda. Ms. Sheehy said they try to work with Virginia architects and engineers and pointed out a report in the committee book on the selection of Virginia architects and engineers. On two of the three current projects, they are recommending out-of-state firms.

The helicopter pad relocation will take the pad off the ground and put two pads on top of the hospital on the east and west towers. The pad should be moved for two reasons: the crane for the chiller plant work would be in the flight path of the helicopter, and there is consideration of expanding the Emergency Room toward the current helicopter pad location.

The track facility must be modified to host the 2012 ACC championship in track. Some basic changes are required and more will be done if Athletics is able to raise additional funds.

Mr. Diamonstein expressed concerns about using out-of-state architects and builders rather than Virginia firms. He said the University has an obligation as a Virginia institution to bring in Virginia builders and developers. He said the University is not being fair to Virginia taxpayers unless we can truthfully say there is no one qualified in Virginia to do the work. The Chair asked the Committee to look at the report in the committee book. He commented that the University has made good progress. Virginia fees exceeded out-of-state this year. The Chair commended the staff for their work on this issue.

On motion, the Committee approved the following resolutions and recommended them to the full Board:

APPROVAL OF EASEMENT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA TO APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY

RESOLVED, the grant of a permanent easement on property owned by The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to Appalachian Power Company, in the approximate location shown on that certain plan entitled "Proposed Right Of Way on The Property of The Rector and Visitors of The University of Virginia" dated July 16, 2010, and

prepared by Appalachian Power Company (the "Plan"), to facilitate the installation of underground electrical facilities, is approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer is authorized, on behalf of the University, to approve and execute a deed of easement and related documents, to approve revisions to the Plan (including, without limitation, revisions to change the location of the permanent easement), to incur reasonable and customary expenses, and to take such other actions as deemed necessary and appropriate to grant such permanent easement; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, all prior acts performed by the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, and other officers and agents of the University, in connection with the grant of such permanent easement, are in all respects approved, ratified and confirmed.

APPROVAL OF EASEMENT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE TO FACILITATE THE INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES

RESOLVED, the grant of a permanent easement on property owned by The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the City of Charlottesville, in the approximate location shown on that certain plat entitled "Permanent Easement for Traffic Control Facilities To Be Acquired By The City of Charlottesville, VA. from The Rector & Visitors of The University of Virginia" dated August 25, 2010, and prepared by Neighborhood Development Services, Engineering Division (the "Plat"), to facilitate the installation of traffic control facilities, is approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer is authorized, on behalf of the University, to approve and execute a deed of easement and related documents, to approve revisions to the Plat (including, without limitation, revisions to change the location of the permanent easement), to incur reasonable and customary expenses, and to take such other actions as deemed necessary and appropriate to grant such permanent easement; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, all prior acts performed by the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, and other officers and agents of the University, in connection with the grant of such permanent easement, are in all respects approved, ratified and confirmed.

- - - - -

The following three resolutions approving the selection of an architect/engineer for the East Chiller Plant, the Helicopter Pad Relocation, and a project upgrading the track facilities, do not need full Board approval:

APPROVAL OF ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION, EAST CHILLER PLANT

RESOLVED, Affiliated Engineers, Inc. of Chapel Hill, North Carolina is approved for performance of architectural and engineering services for the East Chiller Plant at the University of Virginia.

APPROVAL OF ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION, HELICOPTER PAD RELOCATION

RESOLVED, the Smith Group Inc. of Washington, D.C. is approved for performance of architectural and engineering services for the Helicopter Pad Relocation at the University of Virginia.

APPROVAL OF ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SELECTION, UPGRADE TRACK FACILITIES, PHASE I

RESOLVED, VMDO of Charlottesville, Virginia is approved for performance of architectural and engineering services for the Upgrade Track Facilities, Phase I.

- - - - -

Action Item: Program of Infrastructure Projects for the 2011 Update of the Major Capital Projects Program

The Chair said the Committee has the responsibility to approve infrastructure projects. Ms. Sheehy said there are nine projects in the program. There are some on the list that are required because the equipment is getting old, however, other projects are driven by projected future growth. If the growth does not go forward, then these projects will not be needed. Ms. Sheehy introduced Ms. Cheryl Gomez, Director of Energy and Utilities, who summarized the infrastructure projects which include chiller plants, heat plants, and electrical substations. The infrastructure projects for 2012 through 2022 add up to \$289,910,000.

On motion, the Committee approved the following resolution:

APPROVAL OF PROGRAM OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FOR THE 2011 UPDATE OF THE MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS PROGRAM

RESOLVED, the infrastructure projects proposed for the 2011 Update of the Major Capital Projects Program are appropriate for inclusion in the plan.

- - - - -

Action Item: Additions to the Major Capital Projects Program

Ms. Sheehy described five new capital projects the University is proposing to add to the Major Capital Projects Program: 1) Blandy

Farm/State Arboretum research laboratory; 2) North Grounds Recreation Center expansion to a full-service recreation center; 3) track facilities Phase I upgrade; 4) Lee Street realignment; and 5) helicopter pad relocation.

On motion, the following resolution was approved by the Committee and recommended for approval by the Finance Committee and the Board of Visitors:

APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS TO THE MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the University proposes five new capital projects: a \$1.45 million Research Lab at the State Arboretum at Blandy Farm; a \$15.2-\$17.2 million expansion of the North Grounds Recreation Center; a \$5.0-\$7.0 million upgrade to the Track Facilities; a \$2.4-\$2.7 million realignment of Lee Street; and a \$6.0-\$6.7 million relocation of the University Hospital's helicopter pad;

RESOLVED, the Buildings and Grounds Committee approves the addition of these projects to the University's Major Capital Projects Program.

- - - - -

Action Item: Project Budget and Scope Reviews

Ms. Sheehy outlined two capital projects requiring budget and scope increases.

On motion, the following resolution was approved by the Committee and recommended for approval by the Finance Committee and the Board of Visitors:

APPROVAL OF PROJECT BUDGET AND SCOPE REVIEW, JORDAN HALL HVAC UPGRADE AND LEE STREET CONNECTIVE ELEMENTS

RESOLVED, a \$4,115,500 increase to the Jordan Hall HVAC Upgrade to \$33,000,000 and a \$5,026,500 increase in the Lee Street Connective Elements project to \$29,216,500, is approved.

- - - - -

Action Item: Schematic Design Approval, Thrust Theatre and Arts Commons Landscape Master Plan

Ms. Sheehy introduced David J. Neuman, Architect for the University, to report on the schematic design for the Thrust Theatre and the Arts Commons Master Plan.

On motion, the Committee approved the following resolution:

SCHEMATIC DESIGN APPROVAL, THRUST THEATRE, AND DESIGN APPROVAL, 2010 ARTS COMMONS LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN

RESOLVED, the schematic design for the Thrust Theatre, dated November 15, 2010, and prepared by William Rawn Associates, and the Arts Commons Landscape Master Plan, dated October 29, 2010, and prepared by Olin in conjunction with the Architect for the University and others, is approved for further development and construction.

- - - - -

Action Item: Concept, Site, and Design Guidelines

Mr. Neuman reviewed with the Committee the concept, site, and design guidelines for the East Chiller Plant and Lee Street Realignment and the Blandy Farm/State Arboretum Research Laboratory.

On motion, the Committee approved the following resolutions:

APPROVAL OF CONCEPT, SITE, AND DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE EAST CHILLER PLANT AND LEE STREET REALIGNMENT

RESOLVED, the concept, site, and design guidelines, dated November 15, 2010, prepared by the Architect for the University for the East Chiller Plant and Lee Street Realignment, are approved; and

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

APPROVAL OF CONCEPT, SITE, AND DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE BLANDY FARM/STATE ARBORETUM RESEARCH LABORATORY

RESOLVED, the concept, site, and design guidelines, dated November 15, 2010, prepared by the Architect for the University for the Blandy Farm/State Arboretum Research Laboratory, are approved; and

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

- - - - -

Report by the Architect for the University

The Chair asked Mr. Neuman to review the agenda items from the October meeting of the Buildings and Grounds Committee. Mr. Neuman spoke about the 2010 Sustainability Assessment and the Precinct Planning Report as well as the preservation process for the Academical Village, which will include a historic preservation colloquium scheduled for April 7 and 8, 2011. He said there are three primary historic periods of significance for the exteriors of the buildings in

the Academical Village and another fourth, later, period of significance for the interior of the Rotunda and the landscape. A document distributed to the Committee, *Guidelines for the Treatment of the Academical Village*, is appended to these Minutes.

The Chair adjourned the Committee meeting at 3:15 p.m.

- - - - -

SGH:lah

These minutes have been posted to the University of Virginia's Board of Visitors website.

<http://www.virginia.edu/bov/buildingsgroundsminutes.html>

Guidelines for the Treatment of the Academical Village  
A Framework for Planning Work in the Core of the University of Virginia

Thomas Jefferson's design for the University of Virginia integrated the academic and personal lives of students and faculty in a setting whose architecture was intended to inspire and instruct. Its success is reflected in listings on the Virginia and National Registers, and, with Monticello, as a UNESCO World Heritage site. The Academical Village is routinely cited as the greatest example of architecture in America. Jefferson's buildings represent the institution, and are remarkable for the preservation of not only their original design, but much of their function. In contrast to many historical sites, Jefferson's buildings continue to serve as places to work, live and to teach. Varying degrees of evolution in the buildings reflect the extent of the change of use and differences in the history of the distinct portions of the Academical Village. The pavilions, colonnades and dormitory rooms facing the Lawn retain the greatest amount of material original to the Jefferson period. Half of the hotels along the Ranges have large additions dating from just before or shortly after the Civil War. These additions show changes in Jefferson's original program for the hotels in response to the University's significant success and growth by the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The 1895 fire and Stanford White's subsequent reconstruction define the Rotunda's exterior. The 1970s interior renovation evokes the appearance of Jefferson's original design. Stanford White's 1898 buildings at the south and of the Lawn are the most noticeable additions to the Jefferson design, and are evidence of another significant moment in the University's history. The landscape, too, has evolved to reflect changing patterns of use and activity and, as with the buildings, it has multiple periods of significance. Despite these changes and additions, the buildings and their settings present a unified whole. Preservation and enhanced interpretation of the ensemble is fundamental to this proposed approach to work in the Academical Village.

The buildings on the Lawn best represent Jefferson's original designs. The pavilion facades, colonnades and dormitories are largely intact. Habitable additions to the rear of many pavilions do not change the relationship between the buildings along and across the Lawn. Missing or altered features and historic finishes have been documented and can be recreated. Aside from the rear additions, which are essential to the pavilions' continued use, added elements are expedient rather than significant pieces of design and can be removed without diminishing the historic significance or integrity of the buildings. The period of significance for these buildings is 1825, the year that classes began and the buildings were occupied.

Alterations to the Ranges have been more substantial. Three hotels have large additions which affect their facades. Hotels E and F were enlarged in the mid-1850s by William Pratt, a significant figure in the early growth and evolution of the University. These additions covered the south elevations and eliminated portions of the gardens between the hotels and the pavilions. The additions to Hotel F also covered part of the north elevation and demolished a dormitory room. Hotel B was enlarged in the 1880s with an extension to the north which created a new primary building entrance. These additions, particularly those by Pratt, are deliberate, designed alterations to the Jefferson plan which reflect the University's growth and evolution, and their construction establishes a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century period of significance for these parts of the Academical Village.

The Historic Structure Report for the Rotunda documents how little of Jefferson's building survived the 1895 fire, an event unique to this building that differentiates its history from that of the rest of the Academical Village. Most of the exterior dates from the Stanford White renovation and it has accrued significance in its own right as a skillful evocation of Jefferson's design. The post-fire work enlarged the building, adding wings and a portico to create a north elevation that recognized how the University and the Charlottesville grew through the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The period of significance for the exterior of the Rotunda is 1898. The HSR also describes the interior renovation from the 1970s, and identifies its evocation of Jefferson's design as significant independent of the exterior.

Stanford White's Cabell, Cocke and Rouss Halls are contemporary with his work at the Rotunda, and their facades remain substantially intact from that time. No other addition or alteration had as great an effect on Jefferson's design as the construction of these buildings at the south end of the Lawn, so their 1898 completion is their period of significance.

Just as with the buildings, areas of the landscape have changed in response to evolving expectations and patterns of use and can be seen to reflect the same periods of significance as the buildings. The topography and proportional relationships of the Upper Lawn terraces continue to reflect Jefferson's original design intent. The 1820's tree planting on the Lawn, double rows of black locusts, were in decline by the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century and were replaced by the mixed species of ash and maple trees that stand in the area today. The Lower Lawn's topography, circulation and plantings are associated with the McKim, Mead and White construction of Cabell, Rouss and Cocke Halls. Behind the expanded Pavilions, the ten gardens are significant as designed landscapes representing the Colonial Revival aesthetic resulting from the Garden Club of Virginia's mid-twentieth century renovations. The landscape north of the Rotunda still reflects the park-like character established by the path layouts and mature trees in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, while the terrace and courtyards immediately adjacent to the Rotunda Annex achieved their current form in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, shortly after the completion of the White Rotunda restoration.

There are three primary periods of significance for the building exteriors in the Academical Village, with the interior of the Rotunda and the landscape of the Rotunda and Pavilion Gardens sharing a fourth, somewhat later period. Within these time frames, the goal of any work undertaken must be to preserve the appearance of the buildings and their settings as an evolved ensemble. Especially with the Lawn and Ranges, calling out one building as distinct from the rest would undermine the principles of the place and detract from the appearance of the whole. The physical separation of the Ranges and the Lawn, and the generally sympathetic design of the Stanford White work at the Rotunda and South Lawn make this possible. The buildings were designed as places to live and to learn; perpetuation of these functions is essential to the character of the Jefferson design. Planning and programming renovations to preserve and expand the building's uses will ensure that they remain integral to the lives of students, faculty and staff. Detailed analyses and additional studies will continue to be conducted on all buildings and landscapes that will inform future restoration work. All work conducted on the buildings will adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

This approach is conservative. It retains historic fabric and builds upon decades of research and thought about the Academical Village and its character. The removals will be relatively modest, leaving sufficient evidence for our successors to review and use to evaluate our work. Little that would be done is irreversible, so the work could be refined and, if necessary, corrected. On the Lawn, this approach would recreate the original appearance of the pavilions and colonnades while recognizing the singular event of the Rotunda fire and the related additions to the south. On the Ranges, it would acknowledge the first great period of the University's growth. In the landscape, the settings which developed in response to the buildings will be conserved and enhanced. Ultimately, Jefferson's vision for both the design and the functions of the Academical Village would be celebrated and the significant changes would be preserved and interpreted.