REQUEST FOR REVIEW FORM

San Francisco Arts Commission

Civic Design Review

P	R	O.	JE	CT	IN	IFO	RN	ИΑ	TIC	NC
---	---	----	----	----	----	------------	----	----	-----	----

CLIENT DEPARTMENT: San Francisco International Airport					
PROJECT ADDRESS Terminal 2, 780 S Airport Blvd, San Francisco,	CA 94128 DISTRICT NUMBER:				
Is this part of a multi-site project, bond or capital improved	ment program? If yes, which program?				
PROJECT TEAM					
PROJECT DESIGNER: Carsten Voecker	Email: carsten.voecker@woodsbagot.com				
PROJECT MANAGER: Mark Costanzo					
ARCHITECT: Valentino Del Rio, Woods Bagot Architects	Email: valentino.delrio@woodsbagot.com				
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:	Email:				
DATES OF REVIEW	PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD				
× Conceptual/Informational Presentation April 17, 2017	Design, Bid Build (traditional)				
× PHASE 1: Schematic Design April 17, 2017	Fast Track				
× PHASE 2: Design Development July 17, 2017	× Design-Build				
× PHASE 3: Construction Documents September 18, 2017	Bridging				
Other:	Other				
Small Project Review	× Construction Commencement: October 2017				
Plaque Review	× Construction Completion: January 2019				
	Structure size (SQ FT): 32,000 approximate				
BUDGET					
Total Construction Cost: \$18,000,000					
Art Enrichment Budget: \$360,000					
Please attach the official line item construction budget for the project 2% of the total construction cost including above and below ground of the total construction cost including above and below ground of the construction cost including above and below ground of the construction cost including above and below ground of the construction cost including above and below ground of the construction budget for the project construction budget for the budget for the project construction budget for the project construction budget for the budget for th					
DESIGN CONCEPT Please provide a succinct description of the design concept or	idea (not the functional goals). Attach additional page if need				
Please see attached.	aca (not the ranctional goals). Attach additional page if fice a				
riease see allached.					

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Is this project on a City designated landmark or in a City designated historic district? If yes, have you contacted staff of the Historic Preservation Commission to determine whether a certificate of appropriateness is required?

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

It is your obligation to notify the community (by mail or email) that there is opportunity for public comment at the Civic **Design Review Meeting.** This is an important part of the public process. What has been done in this regard?

FEES

Effective July 1, 2014: \$10,220

Projects will now be charged on a per project basis. The Base Fee per project will be \$10,220, however, complex projects or projects involving more than one building may be charged a higher fee.

Journal Entry should be paid to:
Index code: 28CIVDESIGN_PAR516
Write check to: San Francisco Arts Commission

Request for Review Form – Supplemental Sheet

Project Title: T2 Air Traffic Control Tower Demolition & Office Tower Modifications

Design Concept:

The demolition of the old SFO Air Traffic Control Tower to be replaced by the T2 Buildback will create an unparalleled user experience at SFO. Located at the geographic center of SFO, the Buildback will provide roughly 18,000sf of leasable office space over two floors with an additional 5,000 sf Cafe and associated 2,000 sf Observation Deck open to the public and accessible on the pre-secure side of the terminal.

The building façade will highlight the one of a kind views to the North and South of the site. It consists of a simple punched opening window wall that reads as a modular system of solid and vision panels. The central portion of the building with the least desirable views is predominantly solid with natural light filtering into the office spaces through clerestory windows. The vision area expands incrementally to the Northern and Southern ends of the building allowing more light into the most desirable spaces with the most commanding views. In this way the team was able to achieve a design with a dynamic appearance that is still cost effective and meets baseline Title 24 requirements for energy efficiency.