

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Tuesday, **October 21, 2002**, at 2:30 p.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Korshin, Pace and Zuberbuhler;
 ex officio members Chapman, Coulter, Cox, Fales and McCray.
 Guests Doug Jennings, Architect/Senior Project Manager, Capital Projects Office;
 William Renaud, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office;

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Bramhall, Rorabaugh, Souder and Souter;
 ex officio members Jennerich, Martynowych, Pike, Sjavik and Waddell.

Introductory remarks

Schaufelberger welcomed new and returning members to the 2002-03 academic year. Members introduced themselves and identified their departments and disciplines.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of May 23, 2002 were approved as written.

FCUFS Annual Report: 2001-02 – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger distributed a copy of the FCUFS Annual Report for 2001-02 which emphasized the following issues: Coordination Policy for the Placement of Temporary Structures; Classroom Improvements; Campus Energy Use; Classroom scheduling System; Disaster Resistant University Planning; Building Site Approval Process; Office Space Allocation process; Status of Capital Projects; and Environmental Stewardship Policy.

Voting status for FCUFS ex officio members

Schaufelberger said the Senate Executive Committee decided that, for the 2002-03 academic year, each Senate Executive Committee decided that, for the 2002-03 academic year, each council is to determine which non-administrative ex officio members have a vote. (This would include the representatives from the Libraries [ALUW], Retirement [UWRA], and Professional Staff [PSO].) Balick suggested that the council record two votes on any issue to be forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee: one for regular voting faculty, another for representatives of the Libraries, Retirement, and Professional Staff. On all other matters, the non-administrative ex officio members would be considered part of the total voting membership. Receiving no other suggestions, Schaufelberger asked for a vote from the faculty members present. All concurred with Balick's proposal.

Placement of Double-wide, Two-storied Modular Building Further South of University Facilities Building than Originally Planned: an Update –Doug Jennings, Senior Project Manager, Capital Projects Office

Jennings said this was an update of his report to the council on May 23, 2002. He said consideration is now being given to placing the temporary modular building referred to in that report further south of the University Facilities Building than was originally planned.

The new plan would call for placing the modular building farther south of the Faculty Club, and parallel with, and east of, the existing University Facilities and Annex building. Also, the dimensions of the modular building, in the revised plan, are slightly different. Instead of 28' x 46', the trailer would now be 28' x 60'.

Referring to the view-line study of the project, Jennings said, “You don’t see this modular building much, but it is slightly more visible now, in the revised plan, than it was in the original plan.” He said there are a lot of support facilities in the area surrounding the trailer, in addition to the power plant, but no academic buildings. Not many faculty are likely to walk by, or even near, the trailer in its proposed new location.

“You would see the roof and some of the sides and walls from the interior of the Faculty Club. But you wouldn’t see it at all from Fluke Hall, because of the abundant foliage and landscaping around it.

Jennings said there would be a distinct view of the modular building from behind the University Facilities building, in its originally-conceived location, but a far less distinct view in the proposed new location. “One positive result of the move farther south is that the view from a portion of the University Facilities building would be enhanced,” he said. And there would be a distinct view of the modular building from the walkway between Loew Hall and Engineering, and from the stairwell inside Loew Hall.

Overall, however, the views of the modular building would be few, and rarely distinct; and again, the trailer will be located in an area where passers-by are people associated with support services. Few faculty or students will observe the trailer close at hand. The modular building will still be a two-story building, but it will not be an impediment to faculty and student views.

The rationale for moving the modular building further south is that “it does not create such a tight corridor.” It would get more light; and it would be less impacted by trees. William Renaud, of the Capital Projects Office, said the site development cost would be lower with a more southerly location.

Jennings said the main purpose of today’s update was “to keep you [the council] posted.”

As for the removal date, Chapman said, “We can’t be certain at all; it depends on what comes along.” Pace said “a concern of faculty is that temporary buildings not become permanent buildings.” Cox said, “The Policy did stipulate looking for an ‘exit plan.’ It could be tied to an ‘event’ or to something different.”

Chapman said a tentative removal date of 2006 could be suggested, as that is the date the project is expected to be completed.

In the event that an extension beyond 2006 is needed, input will again be sought from the council.

Campus Energy use – Jeraldine McCray, Associate Vice President, Facilities Services

McCray said this is an update to her report to the council on October 16, 2001.

The University’s thermostats were lowered from 72° to 65-68° (most to 65°) during 2001 and 2002, and the result was a significant savings in average daily electricity consumption in kilowatt hours (KWH) per gross square foot (GSF): a savings of \$681,000 from January 2001 to September 2001, and \$714,000 from January 2002 to September 2002.

The University’s average daily fuel consumption per GSF in Therms resulted in a savings of \$615,000 from January 2001 to September 2001, and of \$710,000 from January 2002 to September 2002.

The University’s average daily water consumption in gallons resulted in a savings of \$292,000 from January 2001 to September 2001, and of \$908,000 from January 2002 to September 2002.

The University’s total Utility Savings in 2001-02 was \$828,000 in water conservation savings, \$1,043,900 in gas conservation savings, \$1,068,500 in electricity conservation savings, \$723,000 in “other conservation savings,” and \$1,849,000 in “tailored agreement savings.”

McCray said, “We won’t advertise our plans as much this year. We will simply turn the thermostats to 68°, which will be three degrees higher than last year.” She said, “We have adjusted our operation of the power plant. All that we said we would do, we did.”

As for this year, McCray said, "It looks good, but naturally, much depends on the weather as to how much electricity is needed." She said, "We did conserve energy last year." She added that the University "is doing well in controlling its water consumption."

A Utility Cost Comparison (as of October 2002) distributed by McCray showed the following:

<i>Utility</i>	<i>Pre Energy Crisis (99-00) Cost/Unit</i>	<i>Last Yr Cost/Unit</i>	<i>% Increase</i>	<i>Current Yr Cost/Unit</i>	<i>% Change From 99-00</i>	<i>% Change From Last Year</i>
Electricity (kWh)	\$0.0330	\$0.0550	66.67%	\$0.0550	66.67%	0.00%
Natural Gas (Therm)	\$0.2150	\$0.5930	175.81%	\$0.3950	83.72%	-33.39%
Water (CCF)	\$1.3800	\$1.5900	15.22%	\$1.8200	31.88%	14.47%
Sewer (CCF)	\$4.2100	\$4.4900	6.65%	\$5.1900	23.28%	15.59%

Notes

Figures were arrived at using Financial Reports and average costs, including associated incidental costs. Projections are based on the most current information available from various sources.

Electricity

Rates should remain stable through September 2004 when surcharge is scheduled to be eliminated. Rates stay the same year round (summer/winter adjustments suspended until further notice). October 2001 BPA pass through was 4 mills.

Natural Gas

Rates are expected to decrease by about \$0.08/therm in November 2002. Most recent decrease was implemented in September 2002. Highest rate charged occurred in August 2001 (\$0.689 per Therm).

Water

Rates are projected to increase about 16.5% to \$2.12/CCF in calendar year 2003. Average cost was used to adjust for Winter/Summer rate changes. September 2002 rate adjustment is expected to remain unchanged through December 2003.

Sewer

Rates are projected to increase (per SPU proposal) about 6.55% to \$5.53/CCF in calendar year 2003.

McCray said it is important to bear in mind that "we had to deal with a \$17 million shortfall this year."

Electricity rates "will go up in the future; some of that is built up in our biennial budget for 2003-05," said McCray. "We're the number one water user in the city. We're trying to get to number two, but that's not easy, considering the size of the University."

McCray distributed a list of "activities we continue to engage in, to save water and electricity." The list of activities is a "Status Report for July – September 2002" from the "Conservation Project Development Team."

Under "Water Conservation" are the following activities: Sterilizer Retrofits, Balmer Hall Water Conservation Pilot, Low-Flush Capacity Toilets, I-Wing Vacuum Producers, McMahan Kitchen Refrigeration Conversion, BB High-rise Cooling Tower, and Water-free Urinals.

Under “Electricity Conservation”: Schmitz Hall HVAC (Adjustable Speed Drives), Delta P Valve Pilot – T-Wing (west), Lighting Retrofits/Lighting Reduction, Elevator Solid State Retrofits, Ext Sign Review, and Art Building Occupancy Sensor.

And under “Other Conservation Efforts” is Haggett Hall Renovation.

“We’re continuing our working relationship with Seattle Public Utilities and Seattle City Light,” said McCray. She noted, “We have updated our Web Page, and would like a better spot on the University’s Home Page for ‘Conservation’.” She said “motion sensors” have been placed in the Health Sciences building. “We’re testing a new type of motion sensor. We have fewer custodians working at night in the Health Sciences building – it is the same in other buildings on campus– so there is a real need for the sensors.”

Asked if other “hot spots” on campus have been identified, she said, “We *have* identified them, and have installed motion sensors in upper campus zones as well as in the Health Sciences building.”

Balick said the IMA is a good example of a building that shows no evidence of change either in its showers, which are very old, or its urinals, which also need to be replaced. “If you want people to be aware of energy conservation, you should make your conservation efforts visible,” said Balick. Schaufelberger said the “hallway in the Architecture Building is like noon at midnight; you could reduce the intensity there.”

Balick emphasized, “Overall, you’ve done a marvelous job,” an observation corroborated by Schaufelberger and the rest of the council.” McCray said, “We still need to do more to conserve energy at the University, because prices will continue to go up. And we’ll continue to build new buildings.”

Coulter said, “We’re paying more because the price for everything goes up. We’ll never break even.”

McCray noted that “the savings created by turning off computers in the evening is considerable. It’s in the electricity, and the computers are not adversely affected by turning them off and on each day.”

Fluorescent lighting has replaced incandescent lighting “all over campus,” which everyone has considered a vast improvement.

“We’re doing better than most institutions,” said McCray, “because we started many of our initiatives in 1990, before the energy crisis hit. We are paying ourselves back by our conservation efforts (the money we’ve put in).” She said there are “one- to two-year paybacks on water conservation, and longer paybacks on electrical conservation efforts.” She noted that “we have a group of engineers in all disciplines in new construction and renovations to make our assessments.”

McCray asked that council members “send any ideas via E-mail to me, and I’ll see that they get to the appropriate people.”

Procedures for assessing use of space – Clark Pace

Pace offered an update to his presentation of April 25, 2002, on a “Draft Procedure for Assessing Space Allocation” at the University of Washington.

Pace asked the question: “Where do we go with this [assessment]?” He said the “Draft Procedure gave examples of ways we thought would be useful in looking at space allocation.” He said a major ongoing complaint at the University is that, in a great many instances, “space was allocated years ago, and has remained unchanged.” Pace and Jeff Hagen (the Masters Candidate who assisted him in preparing a “Method for Space Allocation and Performance”) focused on three major aspects of space allocation.

The first aspect concerned the functional requirements of an allocated space: “Is your office space adequate for what your tasks require?” The second aspect concerned the space’s performance: “What are your

feelings about your space's allocated use with respect to your unit's priorities?" The third aspect concerned the benefits achieved from space being used in a particular way: "Is the use made of your space the most beneficial use possible?"

Pace said the functional requirements of space have a lot to do with "job descriptions" and "office capacities." He said that "two of the three office spaces we looked at showed inadequate space."

Pace said that "compared" spaces can lead to a ranking of a dean's space priorities, and to a determination as to whether the ranking of priorities "matches the allocation of actual space."

As for the research benefits of space allocation, Pace's study measured money generated by particular spaces and the actual space allocated to the researchers.

Pace said, "This kind of space study would be done maybe once every five years, or when a new dean came into a department." Asked about other possible models of space allocation, he said his study was chiefly concerned with "functional requirements."

Cox said, "There are guidelines both in the State of Washington and nationally to be applied to newly allocated space. This is really more for reallocations. Different deans do it differently. We work with existing uses."

Schaufelberger said, "Each department has fixed space. But do they use existing space for the highest and best uses? This study of Pace's can help with this and other questions concerning space allocation."

Pace said, "In some cases, there might be nothing you can do [with your existing space], regardless of what an assessment tells you. But what you learn might help you seek more space."

Schaufelberger said, "Where do we go with this?" Balick said the study may be too "abstract" to be of much practical use. Schaufelberger said, "I think the study could provide deans and chairs with this tool, or mechanism, that they could employ if they wanted to." Coulter said, "This study definitely could help; it can be a kind of measure. We'll use it in Health Sciences Administration. I think it's a good tool."

Schaufelberger said, "We'll develop something to send out as a tool, based on the study and the council discussion."

The Rose Report – John Schaufelberger

There is at present a proposal in the Senate Executive Committee to realign faculty councils and current administratively-appointed committees into "University Councils"

The proposal is the work of a committee appointed by 2001-02 Faculty Senate chair Bradley Holt, and chaired by Professor Emeritus Norman Rose, who taught in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program at UW Bothell.

As the letter from the Rose Committee to 2002-03 Faculty Senate chair Sandra Silberstein states, "The heart of our proposal is to replace current Faculty Senate Councils and the Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee with University Councils. These councils are to be focused on the university-wide functions or activities within the purview of the President's portfolio and those of the Provost and the Executive Vice President. On each of these councils an equal number of representatives shall be designated by the Senate on behalf of the faculty and by the President, Provost and Executive Vice President on behalf of the administration."

Schaufelberger said that FCUFS members should provide him with any feedback they may have, once they have had an opportunity to review the Rose Report. (Schaufelberger's E-mail address is jesbcon@u.washington.edu.)

Suzzallo Library Renovation – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger said he would encourage anyone who wants to experience the positive results of work on University facilities to enter Suzzallo Library. The two-year renovation and seismic retrofitting has been completed. The library not only has been made safer than it was; its aesthetic aspect, already impressive prior to the renovation, is yet more impressive now.

Schaufelberger said he will try to bring project managers for the new Bioengineering and Genome Sciences buildings under design for the University to the next FCUFS meeting.

Commendation for FCUFS – John Coulter

FCUFS ex officio member John Coulter, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, said he has recently heard two faculty councils commended as models of effectiveness. One is the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits. The other is the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services. Coulter and the council as a whole concurred that much of the credit for this goes to John Schaufelberger.

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Monday, December 2, 2002, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder