

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **October 16, 2001**, at 10:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Gates, Gill, Pace, Rutherford and Zuberbuhler;
 ex officio members Chapman, Coulter, Cox, Fales, Ludwig, Sjavik, Martynowych, McCray and Jost;
 Guests Roberta Hopkins, Manager, Classroom Support Services; Jon Lebo, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office.

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Bramhall, Kasprisin and Souders;
 ex officio members Christoserdova.

Welcome to and Introduction of New and Returning Members – Chair John Schaufelberger

New and returning FCUFS members introduced themselves and identified their departments and units in the University.

FCUFS representative on the University Facilities Committee – Sarah Gates

Sarah Gates generously consented to serve for another academic year as FCUFS representative on the University Facilities Committee.

Voting Memberships for Association of UW Librarians representative Richard Jost and retired faculty representative Martha Fales

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) decided this year to let faculty councils determine if the Librarians' representative and the retired faculty representative are to be voting or non-voting members of the councils on which they serve. By a unanimous council vote, Jost and Fales were made voting members of FCUFS.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 23, 2001 were approved as written.

Coordination Policy for Placement of Temporary Facilities – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger distributed the following draft of a new Coordination Policy for Placement of Temporary Facilities:

“Before any temporary facility is placed on campus, the office or activity proposing placement of the facility will coordinate its siting with neighboring units and with the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services. This is to ensure that faculty and staff are notified of the proposed temporary facility and given an opportunity to provide input to the University Administration prior to a decision being made regarding the facility's placement.

The coordination procedures to be followed are:

- 1) The office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will provide a description of the proposed facility and a diagram depicting its proposed location to neighboring units occupying space near the proposed facility site.
- 2) Once these units have been given an opportunity to provide input, the office or activity proposing

placement of the temporary facility will provide a description of the proposed facility, a diagram depicting its proposed location, and the comments of affected neighboring units to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.

- 3) The council will review the proposal and provide written comments to the proposing office or activity and the University Administration.”

Schaufelberger asked for council response to the draft. Balick and Ludwig both said the policy should contain a definition of a temporary building. Most council members agreed that the crux of the policy is the issue of tenure. How long will temporary buildings be in place? When will they be removed?

As an instance, it was noted that, when the renovation of Sieg Hall is completed, all activities currently being conducted in the temporary building placed along the Burke-Gilman trail near the nuclear reactor building will be moved to Sieg Hall, and the temporary building will be removed. Schaufelberger said an important procedural step will be the notification of the appropriate people in any building affected by the placement of a temporary facility.

“The administration does not want to produce temporary facilities, but sometimes they must be put up,” said Schaufelberger. Cox said that, with respect to an “exit plan,” the tenure of a temporary building “is often tagged to the completion of a project,” as is the case with the much-discussed “green building.”

McCray said sometimes trailers must be brought in rapidly, without adequate time to go through the entire approval process. An example is the necessity for additional temporary trailers at the site of the Urban Horticulture Center, where three temporary trailers were not enough, and the number had to be augmented. “These contingencies need to be taken into account in the policy being drafted,” said McCray. Chapman said it is important that whatever approval is deemed necessary be readily available so as not to delay the renovation process. Schaufelberger said, “The issue is that FCUFS needs to act as a kind of ‘police force’ to assure that people who will be affected by temporary facilities will be properly notified.” Such people have not always been notified, and they ought to be. Chapman said Capital Projects “would comply with these interfaces and checkpoints.”

Schaufelberger said it was clear from the council’s discussion that a definition of a temporary building is needed in the policy, as well as a clarification regarding notice sent to affected buildings of the placement of temporary facilities, and the projected tenure of the projects in question. He said he will address these issues in his revision of the draft.

He said he would try to determine ahead of time whether the council should be convened for an ad hoc meeting whenever he learns of a project involving temporary facilities. Chapman said his concern would be “with the smaller projects, where we will want to be moving as fast as possible.” It was suggested that the FCUFS chair’s discretion could be counted on to decide whether ad hoc meetings are necessary in the approval process. This discretion would be exercised on a case-by-case basis. Schaufelberger said this would include “any facility whatsoever [that may or may not be a building].”

Building site Approval Process – Marilyn Cox

Cox said the Capital and Space Planning Office is pulling together existing information regarding UW processes for building site approvals. This information will be updated to reflect a site approval process under the new Master Plan which is much more flexible in terms of which buildings would go on which sites. The prior “General Physical Development Plan” was much more specific about the building program for new facilities, whereas the Master Plan identifies building sites without being specific as to program. The Capital and Space Planning Office would like to review the updated site approval process with FCUFS at its next meeting.

Temporary Buildings for the Center for Urban Horticulture – Marilyn Cox and Jeraldine McCray

McCray said all the temporary facilities at the Center for Urban Horticulture – trailers on tires – will be removed as soon as the new structure is completed. McCray reiterated the crucial point; the people at the Center said the trailers were needed as soon as possible. As to their siting, there was only one logical place to put them. Tom Hinckley has visited Laurelhurst to apprise members of the community of the process involved in the construction of the new Center.

Schaufelberger said someone has to approve any placement of temporary facilities on campus, and asked what is to be done when people say they need immediate facilities. Cox said the case involving the Center for Urban Horticulture was an “extraordinary situation,” and was treated as such. Also, the fact that the Urban Horticulture building is relatively isolated from other campus facilities made this a somewhat unusual situation. Schaufelberger’s question, however, still remained to be answered: Whether extraordinary or not, any sudden placements of temporary facilities must be approved by someone. Cox said that, normally, approval for placement comes through Capital and Space Planning, and implementation is provided by Facilities Services and the Capital Projects Office. “This was an anomaly,” Cox stressed. Coulter said a plan is needed in which possible placements of temporary facilities are anticipated. “This should be part of the emergency response planning process for our ‘Disaster Resistant University’ committee,” he noted.

Temporary Facilities at the IMA Expansion Site – Jon Lebo

John Lebo, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office, is in charge of the IMA expansion, a two-year project scheduled for completion in July or August 2003. Mr. Lebo said the “owner’s trailers” will be located on the east side of the IMA facility adjacent to Walla Walla Road. There will be two (2) 12 X 60 foot trailers. There will be no impact on parking for University employees. Additional temporary contractor facilities known as “dry shacks” (small trailers on wheels) will be installed under the IMA Building overhang on the N.E. corner as necessary to support the work. The trailers will not impact the large oak trees, and no trees will be removed. The roots of trees in the area will be protected. “Everything will fit under the eaves of the buildings,” Mr. Lebo stressed. The contractors will park in E5, which is set up for construction workers. Mr. Lebo said if anyone has concerns about this project, they should call or E-mail him.

Schaufelberger asked if any council member had any concerns regarding the placement of these temporary facilities. There being none, the council approved the plan.

Update on Classroom Renovation Project – Roberta Hopkins

Hopkins said that, 1 ½ years ago, nine million dollars was allocated to Classroom Support Services for the Classroom Renovation Project (on upper campus and in the Health Sciences). A stipulation accompanying the allocation was that none of the money was to be used for technological improvements.

Former Dean of Undergraduate Education Fred Campbell chaired the committee that shaped the policy directing the priorities of the project.

Cox reported that \$400,000 was added to the project to implement acoustical upgrades as prioritized by the University’s Standing Committee on Accessibility. In all, \$600,000 (including the \$400,000) went towards much-needed classroom acoustical improvements.

Hopkins said she is “very satisfied” with the improvements made possible by the Classroom Renovation Project.

As to the process used in selecting the classrooms to be renovated, Hopkins said an internal survey of the University’s classrooms was conducted four years ago. The survey targeted classrooms with peeling paint, window shades in disrepair, acoustical breakdown, and other signs of corrosion over time. There were 175 classrooms on the original list. Architects reviewed the list and made suggestions and recommendations. Hopkins said that some classrooms on the list could not be chosen because of funding limitations. “We tried to spread the priorities around,” she emphasized. Three large classrooms were chosen; the others were smaller rooms of 40 seats or so.

Buildings whose classrooms were featured in the Renovation Project included Denny Hall, the campus's original building from the last decade of the 19th century (new floors, dropped ceilings, new furniture, new acoustical properties); the Mechanical Engineering Building (new furniture, lighting, chalkboards); Thompson Hall (new color palettes among other improvements); Kane Hall (rooms 110 and 130; the décor in these rooms has been vastly changed; the bricks have been covered; new ceilings and new lighting have been put in place; new chairs have been placed in room 130; audio-visual features in room 130 have been significantly improved); and Smith Hall (replaced old chairs with moveable chairs).

Hopkins said "putting students' consensus at the forefront of the vision behind the Classroom Renovation Project" was a tenet adhered to throughout the process.

Balick said that, as a member of the teaching faculty, he and his colleagues need to have writing implements available in the classrooms they use, and that often he has walked into a classroom that had no such implements. Also, the boards on which faculty write while lecturing need to be kept clean. Hopkins said classrooms are supposed to have writing implements and clean boards; she will see that this is reiterated to those who are responsible for classroom maintenance.

Hopkins said that, in addition to improvements provided by the \$9 million renovation project, 33 classrooms are now equipped with Dell computers. Hopefully other classrooms will also be equipped with computers, and bad projectors will be replaced.

Revised Parking and Traffic Rules – Jeraldine McCray

McCray distributed the "Adoption of Amendments to Chapter 478-116 Washington Administrative Code, Parking and Traffic Rules of the University of Washington, Seattle." She said the proposed changes went to the Board of Regents in September 2001. "This is mostly housekeeping," she stressed, "to make the regulations clearer to the public." Two important goals of the proposed changes are: (1) to better control parking at load and unload parking zones; and (2) to significantly increase particular motor vehicle fines and penalties to conform with comparable fines and penalties assessed by Seattle.

McCray pointed out two examples in the list of motor vehicle fines and penalties: #13: "Parking at expired meter," the fine for which will increase from \$16 to \$25, and #23: "Parking in space designated for disability or wheelchair," the fine for which will increase from \$50 to \$250. The latter increase is steep for an obvious reason: vehicles inappropriately parked in space set aside for those in wheelchairs, and for the disabled generally, must be strongly discouraged from doing so again.

Recreational Skateboarding Signage – Jeraldine McCray

McCray said recreational skateboarding signage is still being developed in conjunction with the campus Police Department. She said a WAC Code (Washington Administrative Code) regulation is in place which authorizes using skateboards as a method of transportation.

McCray said people who work in Gerberding Hall are sometimes annoyed with the noise made by zealous skateboarders in Red Square. And walking through the square when skateboarders are out in force can be dangerous; the skateboarders sometimes come perilously close to pedestrians. And, as McCray noted, it is difficult to control the skateboarders.

McCray showed the council two possibilities of signage meant to deter skateboarders from using Red Square. The wording is: "Recreational Skateboarding Prohibited: Skateboards may be impounded." They both have similar wording, but one is muted. The council much prefers the signage that is not muted. "It's best to have a sign that can be seen," said one council member. The signage would be placed between Suzzallo Library and Kane Hall, between Suzzallo Library and Gerberding Hall, at Meany Hall, between Odegaard Undergraduate Library and Kane Hall, at the entrance to the Parking Garage, and at Hall Health Center.

When a council member said he did not want to become the oppressive authoritarian he dreaded when he was the age of the skateboarders, McCray said the campus police have made a significant compromise with the skateboarders in one very crucial respect: They do not bother them, unless complaints are received or they are damaging University property.

Campus Energy Usage – Jeraldine McCray

McCray discussed several energy and water reduction measures implemented at the UW since January 2001.

Natural gas and electrical conservations measures: lowered heating thermostats in most buildings to 65-68 degrees (except patient care areas or vivariums); lowered water heating thermostats in campus buildings; minimized production of steam at the Power plant during Spring, Summer and Fall; minimized redundant systems in the Power Plant during Spring, Summer and Fall; raised cooling thermostats in most air conditioned buildings to 78 degrees; de-activated light fixtures in 38 campus buildings which will reduce annual kWh per year by 4,290,445; avoided costs to date \$214,500 yr; adjusted building ventilation systems to operate at lower speeds in 40 campus buildings; adjusted building chillers, sterilizers and air compressors in the UW Medical Center; installing “Vending Miser” devices on vending machines and de-activating lighting from vending machines: reduces consumption by 40%; operating Husky Stadium lighting @25% of capacity; adjusted Allen/Suzzallo Library lighting shutdown hours; adjusted voltage taps on sub-station transformers; installing Conserve Energy placards over light switches in common areas and classrooms in major campus buildings; monitoring energy consumption, utility costs and energy conservation information and communicating with the campus on same; established Energy Conservation Team to review conservation measures and develop projects to conserve: exchange ideas: communicate with campus; alerted Housing and Food Service residents and staff of energy costs and conservation steps to reduce consumption; published “Guidelines To Follow” to save energy for UW Medical Center staff and faculty; requested all UW leased facilities to conserve; continuing efforts under a long-term partnership with Seattle City Light (SCL) to identify cost effective conservation measures that result in SCL rebates: projects identified to date: 1) install Occupancy Sensors in Art, Loew, Kincaid and Thompson Halls as a pilot project: 2) install Lighting Control System in West Campus Garage: 3) install Lighting Control System in Central Plaza Garage: 4) Install Variable Speed Drives on supply and return fans on Schmitz Hall HVAS system (saves 495,500 kWh/yr.): 5) install Compressed Air booster Pump in Power Plant.

Water conservation: computerized campus irrigation systems and installed flow sensors to monitor use; eliminated daytime landscape watering; installed low flow showerheads in residence halls; reduced power washing of building and surfaces to only remove graffiti and slippery material; curtailed car washing at the Motor Pool; removed and replaced single pass chillers with water conserving systems at the HUB, Tubby Graves, Physical Plant Building, UWMC; replacing two water-cooled compressors with two air-cooled units in McCarty Hall; repaired Pavilion Pool which was leaking 100,000 gallons of water per month, with new technology (inflatable plug); developing a pilot project in Balmer Hall to install flow restrictors and water conserving toilets and urinals; continuing ongoing informal partnership with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to jointly audit water usage in campus buildings to develop water conservation projects that will result in SPU rebates: projects identified to date: 1) replace BB Tower Cooling Tower: 2) replace T-Wing Cooling Tower: 3) Johnson Hall Electronic Microscope Cooling: 4) replace Gerberding Hall Cooling Tower: 5) replace Quaternary Research/Johnson Hall Cooling Tower.

McCray also noted Energy and Water Reduction measures taken prior to January 2001:

On the basis of an Energy Audit conducted in 1994, the UW entered into an Agreement with SCL to implement energy conservation measures (ECMs). In addition to ECMs in existing buildings, the Agreement included financial incentives to save energy in new construction design and systems. This combination saves about 47.7 million kWh per year and avoids about \$1.7 million in electricity costs.

Installed an enlarged gas pipeline in summer 1996 to reduce number of cold weather gas curtailment periods which saves in excess of \$200,000 annually.

Converted cooling of Power Plant equipment from City water to the use of cooling tower water in a loop system which reduced water consumption in first year of operation by 13 million cubic feet and saved \$400,000/yr.

McCray said the total saving in electricity and natural gas from January 2001 to August 2001 is \$1,114,300.

The total combined savings from all conservation programs and utility projects for 2000-2001 is projected to be \$2,198,080.

With respect to “the bottom line,” McCray said, “Along with everything we’ve been engaged in (and the decrease in the price of natural gas, which won’t take effect until June 2002), the University’s utility budget shortfall, once projected to be \$33 million, is now down to \$17 million. “And it is expected that this number will come down even more.”

McCray said her office is developing, with the Capital Projects office, a template for effective management of energy and water conservation elements in new construction at the University. The source of the template is the construction of the new Computer Science Building. All aspects of conservation elements in that building are being carefully scrutinized.

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 10:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder