

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **October 29, 2003**, at 8:30 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Devasia, Pace, Ridgway, Rorabaugh and Treser;
 Ex officio members Chamberlin, Chapman, Cox, Fales, McCray, Stygall and Waddell;
 Guests Troy Stahleckher and Randy Everett: West Campus Parking Garage; Andrea A. Lex, Senior Director, Student and Administrative Services, UW Educational Outreach; and Lara Branigan, Capital Projects Office.

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Balick, Korshin, Souders and Souter.

Welcome and Introductions – Chair John Schaufelberger

FCUFS Chair John Schaufelberger welcomed new and returning members of the council, and distributed a copy of his Annual Report for 2002-2003 [describing the council's chief deliberations in the 2002-2003 academic year, and published in this Autumn's Faculty Senate Class "C" Bulletin]. FCUFS members introduced themselves and identified their department or administrative unit.

Voting Privileges for FCUFS non-administrative ex officio members

The council approved voting privileges for non-administrative ex officio members (ALUW, Retirement, PSO, ASUW, and GPSS representatives).

Approval of minutes

The minutes of May 22, 2003 were approved as written.

Removal Plan for Annex 7 – Marilyn Cox

Cox reminded the council that Annex 7 – the two-storey temporary building behind the nuclear reactor building – was relocated from south campus to provide space for campus activities that were displaced by the construction of the new Paul Allen Center. Cox said people in both Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering were upset that they were not consulted about the relocation of the building. This in part triggered the FCUFS discussions that led to the "Policy for Coordination of Placement of Temporary Facilities on the University of Washington Campus," which is contained in the University Handbook (Volume Four, Part VII, Chapter 12: Placement of Buildings).

Cox said the plan was that the occupants of Annex 7 would be moved to Sieg Hall when the Paul Allen Center was completed. That has now happened. But the removal of Annex 7 will be delayed for approximately two years in order to accommodate the Phototonics research program. Phototonics has been awarded major research grants, and needs space that will accommodate wet labs. Off-campus space was not appropriate. Also, Phototonics needs proximity to other programs on campus. CIDR (Center for Instructional Development and Research) will be relocated from the third floor of Bagley Hall to Sieg Hall and the third floor of Bagley will be reconverted to wet lab space (6,000 sq. ft.) for Phototonics.

"We agreed recently to accommodate Phototonics during the next two years to assist their work on the research grants by making space available on campus. And it is this agreement, and the arrangements detailed above, that necessitate the delay in the removal of Annex 7." Cox said the Facilities Services personnel currently in Annex 7 will move to Roberts Annex. "If we can't find a spot in two years, they will go to the fourth floor of Bagley when the Bioengineering people go to the new Bioengineering building. So, in all likelihood, Annex 7 will be removed in 2006."

Pace suggested that, if the Policy [for Coordination of Placement of Temporary Facilities on the University of Washington Campus] had been followed more carefully, there would be far less outcry now than there is. He stressed that there needs to be better communication with faculty and staff. Cox concurred with Pace, and said, “The Policy can be better applied than it has been. And I *do* want this to be communicated well.” She said that, to date, there has been conversation between the dean of Engineering and the department chairs of Mechanical and Civil Engineering, the units most directly affected by the location of Annex 7 – but an open meeting for the faculty could also be helpful. That would provide an opportunity for all interested faculty and staff to make themselves aware of what is taking place now and during the next two years of transition.

Devasia said, “It would be useful for faculty to know *before* decisions are made what the issues are that are being considered. Faculty would like to be part of the process, and not just be informed after the fact. Even if the decision is not the one a particular faculty member would wish, if he or she has been informed, and listened to, the process would be considered satisfactory. One approach is to consult with the faculty and staff in the department’s monthly faculty meetings.” Cox agreed that, in the future, someone from the administration should meet with the affected departments to obtain input before decisions on temporary buildings are made.

Site Planning for UW Educational Outreach – Marilyn Cox and Andrea A. Lex

Cox distributed the “General Site Selection Process [March 21, 2003]” and a description of University of Washington Educational Outreach (UWEO) and its current needs and “latest thinking on which units will be housed together [sharing a single building] and anticipated space needs.”

The description of UWEO states that “for at least the past 10 years, the various units of UWEO have been scattered in several locations. Sharing a single building will enable us to make better use of existing resources, work much more efficiently and provide a single point of contact for many of the students and community members who interact daily with UWEO.”

Cox said, “We need to have discussions and we need to have a full site selection process on a possible new building for Educational Outreach. We intend to consult with FCUFS during this site selection process, which includes today’s discussion.”

Andrea Lex, Senior Director, Student and Administrative Services, UW Educational Outreach, informed the council that “in 1912, UWEO started outreach activities at the University of Washington. UWEO offers a variety of professional development opportunities. It has extensive K-12 programs. It provides alternative access to UW academic programs. Last year, UWEO registered upwards of 35,000 students. It is a large arm of the University of Washington.”

“Space, however,” stressed Lex, “is a precious commodity on the campus. We were moved off-campus ten years ago. That situation helped some of our students, but now we are in several different locations. The main UWEO Building at 5001 25th Avenue N.E. was good for English language programs, being near major English curricula buildings on campus. When the fire destroyed the building, the University acted with amazing speed, and we had new temporary facilities within three days. Our temporary facilities are in the Roosevelt Commons at 4311 11th Ave. N.E. We became further fragmented than we had been previously. We were in the Roosevelt Commons, in the University Plaza, and in downtown Seattle.”

Lex emphasized to the council that UW Educational Outreach “want to come together in one place. It will help us develop synergies within our own program. It will provide better access to students. It will help greatly with partnerships between UW Educational Outreach and more traditional UW programs.”

Cox said, “We have worked with UW Educational Outreach for a viable plan for a new building. Particularly, we are currently considering either the site of the existing Visitors Information Center (behind the Commodore Duchess, bordered by 15th Ave. N.E. and N.E. Campus Parkway), or an off-campus location in the University District. An off-campus site is being considered in part because it could help

invigorate the U-District as well. We are currently doing a geotechnical study of the Visitors Information Center site.”

Schaufelberger said, “There needs to be visitor parking at the new site. Parking is an important issue. That capability is needed at the new site.” Lex agreed with Schaufelberger: “There will be parking requirements at the new site. But we don’t yet know how extensive those requirements will be.” She added: “We just want a building close to campus. We would prefer the Visitor Center site across from Schmitz Hall. If we had our druthers, that would be the location of the new UWEO building.” Asked about the chief usage of the space in a new UWEO building, Lex replied, “It would be primarily office space. There would perhaps be some computer lab space. We would still share instructional space on campus with academic programs.” Cox noted that the Visitors Information Center functions would be incorporated into the new building as well.

Chamberlin said, “I endorse the adjacency issue, the new building being as close to campus as possible; and the proximity to Schmitz Hall would be very beneficial to students.” He also encouraged Lex and others giving presentations to accent the advantages to academic programs in the adjacency issue.

Facility Restoration Plan – Marilyn Cox

Cox distributed several sheets showing the 15 buildings on campus due to be restored through 2017, and their current ranking in the draft study being prepared by the Restoration Planning Committee.

As for the methodology used in prioritizing the buildings, each criterion was weighted based on its importance with the sum of all criteria equaling 100%. Each building was then scored on each criterion from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The ranking of each building was the product of its score times the weighted criterion, and then summed to present an overall prioritization for all buildings.

As for the surge criteria, two criteria were considered in the evaluation process but were not deemed to be of sufficient importance to be included in the weighting methodology; rather, these criteria will be discussed as part of the committee’s deliberations, but are not part of the numeric evaluation.

These surge criteria include “% Area”: This criterion identifies the percentage of Assignable Square Footage required to accommodate each individual building in Condon Hall, the proposed surge space. For example, the Assignable Square Footage of Johnson Hall exceeds the available assignable area of Condon Hall by 4.04%.

Impacts: This criterion has been developed by the consultants to evaluate how well Condon Hall, the proposed surge space, accommodates the uses and spaces of each building. It addresses questions such as whether or not the building house wet labs, or other specialized uses which may not be easily accommodated in the surge space. Another question addressed is whether the building occupant load can be combined with the population from other buildings to permit the renovation of more than one building simultaneously. The ranking methodology for this criterion is as follows, based on Ease of Accommodation: 1) Good; 2) Average; 5) Poor.

Other criteria include Life Safety Criteria and Building Use Conditions Criteria.

Cox said FCUFS Chair John Schaufelberger and FCUFS ex officio member Charles Chamberlin – Deputy Director of University Libraries – are both members of the Academic Advisory Committee on Facilities, and as such are members of the Restoration Planning Committee.

Cox said the committee “takes the 15 worst buildings on campus [that are prized buildings in need of renovation, as opposed to buildings that ought to be demolished and replaced] and makes an index of those facilities’ condition. The buildings in the Restoration Plan are in need of restoration; we definitely don’t want to demolish them.”

Cox said, "Johnson Hall is moving forward. Construction is about to begin. Faculty and staff from Johnson Hall will move to Condon Hall [as already mentioned, the major surge space] for a two-year period, and then return to the fully-renovated Johnson Hall. The Guggenheim and Architecture buildings will follow in the 2005-07 biennium. The remaining 12 buildings on the list will be prioritized. There is a preliminary renovation schedule for these buildings, but the definitive schedule has yet to be determined.

"Some of these buildings have special features such as a swimming pool or a dance floor that cannot be accommodated in Condon Hall, or any other surge space. Also, some programs moving into a surge space have need of a large lecture hall which cannot be accommodated by the available surge space. Arts and Sciences is helping with the Meany Studio Theatre space that accommodates up to 260 seats, and we are working with the HUB as well. These spaces can be used for lectures while Architecture and Guggenheim are under renovation."

Cox told the council, "The committee is discussing tying Lewis Hall renovation to the new Business School, in which case we would not have to surge [the people in Lewis Hall]." Lewis Hall is scheduled for renovation during the 2009-2011 biennium on the Preliminary Renovation Schedule.

Stygall asked, "How does this ranking compare with the JLARC [Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee] ranking? The legislature relies on the JLARC study." Cox replied: "The JLARC ranking does not include infrastructure and modernization factors. But yes, the legislature does rely on the JLARC study. We're trying to crosswalk with JLARC. We're resolving differences with JLARC to be in agreement with their ranking." Stygall said, "It would be useful to update me. JLARC had Johnson Hall listed as a #4 ranking, which I found amazing." Cox agreed that she would schedule a follow-up meeting with Stygall to coordinate regarding the JLARC work in Olympia

Cox noted, "JLARC looks at higher education funding for facilities, and their methodology doesn't always crosswalk with ours. We're looking at righting these differences. We weigh *many* factors in our ranking." Schaufelberger said, "We have a surge space limitation. We can't do two large buildings at once because of the size of Condon Hall." [Whereas the Architecture and Guggenheim buildings will both be able to surge in Condon Hall in the same biennium, since they are smaller buildings, and together they need less surge space than Johnson Hall does by itself.]

Cox said, "We will make the draft report of the Facility Restoration Plan available to FCUFS and to Gail Stygall individually." Lara Branigan of the Capital Projects Office said, "We will have a piece available that will relate our assessment to that of JLARC, that we will give to Gail Stygall, and that Marilyn Cox will be able to give to the legislature." Cox said, "Ultimately, this intertwined list of priorities has to be approved by all of our boards."

West Campus Parking Garage - Troy Stahleckher and Randy Everett

Shahleckher said, "We checked out various possibilities [for the location of the parking garage], including S1 and the Triangle. Parking in this area will get worse because of new construction. The chief problem is that demand exceeds capacity. Several requests we had for possible locations were turned down."

Shahleckher said an LMN feasibility study, or Phase I, was concluded in March 2003. The results of that study were taken to the architectural commission. The commission agreed with the concept of the study. A further six months' review, or Phase II, concluded that the site was a viable option. Now, we are getting this to the University community, part of which process is today's visit to FCUFS." Everett said, "We are now in the process of selecting an architect for the design phase of the project and will evaluate firms who have sent us their statements of qualifications."

Stahleckher said, "The West Campus Parking Garage will give N.E. Pacific a softer look." He noted that University Police "could fit into the site selection scheme, but it is not known at present if that would be financially feasible."

The Campus Master Plan Review showed that the south (110,800 sq. ft.) and east (28,000 sq. ft.) spaces in the selected site together “make a good space” with “mixed use, and parking on the roof, but not underground.”

Waddell said, “This will just a slight help considering the demand [for parking]. But we can’t exceed the 12,300 parking spot limit for the campus. We must stay under that limit because of the need for space for academic programs.” McCray said, “Each time we put up a new building on campus, we *lose* parking space. We lost much parking space because of the new Law School.”

“We’re going around to campus communities, and going ahead with architectural selections,” said Stahleckher. Schaufelberger said, “This issue will be revisited by us later [in the academic year].”

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Wednesday, December 3, 2003, at 8:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder