

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Thursday, **May 20, 2004**, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick and Treser;
 Ex officio members Chamberlin, Chapman, Fales, McCray, Pike and Waddell.
 Guests Jan Arntz, Environmental Planner, Capital Projects Office; South Lake Union
 Development – John Pettit, Associate Vice President, Medical Affairs; and John
 Coulter, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration.

ABSENT: **Professors** Devasia, Heerwagen, Korshin, Pace, Rorabaugh, Souders and Souter;
 Ex officio members Geppert and Stygall.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of April 22, 2004 were approved as written.

University 2005-2007 Capital Budget Request – Colleen Pike, Director, Capital and Space Planning Office

Pike said the draft of the 2005-2007 Capital Budget Request would be presented later today to the Board of Regents at the June meeting to get their feedback and suggestions. Then it will be presented at a future meeting for their approval. She divided the discussion into three areas: “Restoring the Core”; “Balancing Renewal and Growth”; and “The Public Baccalaureate Prioritized Capital Project Request.”

The following is taken from the “Draft: 2005-2007 Capital Budget” that Pike distributed to the council.

Restoring the Core: In 2001-2003, the University of Washington requested funding from the State to initiate the major renovation of Johnson Hall, setting in motion a sustainable approach to restore the core campus facilities at the Seattle campus over a ten to fifteen year period. In November 2003, the Provost appointed the ad hoc Restoration Planning Committee to review the fifteen most deteriorated buildings on the Seattle campus and prioritize them for renovation. The work of this committee will be summarized in a report completed in June 2004.

- With the completion of the UW Building Restoration and Renewal Prioritization Study, the University of Washington now has a proposed renovation and renewal schedule for the fifteen most critically deteriorated buildings on the Seattle campus. The approach used in the study will serve as a tool for evaluating additional facilities for future renovation.
- Phase I of the Restoration and Renewal of Seattle campus critical buildings is under way in the 2003-2005 biennium, and includes construction funding for Johnson Hall, incremental funding for H-Wing, and predesign and design funding for Architecture and Guggenheim Halls.
- Restoration Phase II, proposed for funding in the draft 2005-2007 Capital Budget proposal includes construction funds for Architecture and Guggenheim Halls, and predesign and design funds for Savery Hall, Clark Hall, and the Playhouse Theater, as well as another increment of renovation funds for H-Wing.

Balancing Renewal and Growth: The 2005-2007 Capital Budget provides balance between facility renewal and the need for growth.

- Successful integration of a restoration and renewal strategy into the capital plan will ensure the long-term maintenance of the University of Washington’s physical plant assets.
- As we move forward with the staged implementation of the restoration strategy, we can also make way for growth at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, and future new State-funded facilities at the Seattle campus.

- The draft 2005-2007 Capital Budget provides balance between renewal and growth, by making way for future new phases of development at Bothell and Tacoma, and future new academic facilities at the Seattle campus.

The Public Baccalaureate Prioritized Capital Project Request: The 2003 Legislature enacted Engrossed Substitute house Bill 2151, requiring the prioritization of all higher education capital projects.

- ESHB 2151 requires the public four-year institutions, beginning in the 2005-2007 biennium, to prepare, in consultation with the HECB and the Council of Presidents, a single prioritized individual ranking of capital projects being proposed by the institutions. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges will continue to submit a separate prioritized list.
- The four-year institutions, with assistance from the Council of Presidents, have completed a prioritized list that complies with ESHB 2151, is consistent with the HECB guidelines, and meets the priority needs of all six institutions at a State funding level of approximately \$500 million.
- The draft University of Washington 2005-2007 Capital Budget proposal is consistent with the ESHB prioritized list.

Summing up in brief, Pike said that, in restoring the core, “We are continuing an approach started in the last biennium.” In balancing renewal and growth, “We will be considering new academic facilities.” She said that the HEC Board “asked universities and community colleges to prioritize their capital projects.”

Chamberlin said, “An important strategy was to have a blend of new and older buildings.” Pike emphasized, “We are asking to have our most urgent needs tended to first.” Schaufelberger said, “\$2 million is not enough for classroom improvements.” Pike responded: “This is a preliminary draft. We are now working on refining our cost estimates and the numbers will be revised.” [This is the figure given in the “6 Year Plan and Funding Sources” chart for “Total Anticipated Need: 2009-2011.”]

Asked about Preservation Minors “A” and Preservation Minors “B” [\$42 million estimated for Preservation Minors “A” in 2005-2007 in State Funds, and \$17 million for Preservation Minors “B” in the same biennium], Pike said, “We had to split them into separate categories for the HEC Board ranking. Certain thresholds had been set. We anticipate Preservation Minors “A” *will* be funded because they are the first priority. Preservation Minors “B” are lower in the priority list. We also anticipate that Restoration Phase II will be funded.”

Pike said the final version of the 6 Year Plan and Funding Sources will be presented to the Board of Regents for their review in July and, after it is approved, will go to the State in September 2004.

South Lake Union Development – John Pettit, Associate Vice President, Medical Affairs; and John Coulter, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration

Pettit gave some preliminary background on the conception and philosophy behind this project.

“University of Washington Medicine at Lake Union is the reflection of a condition that is five or six years old,” said Pettit. Research space on campus wasn’t working out; it was simply too scarce. And budget levels were high. It became clear that, if we waited [for research space to open up on campus], we would not be able to generate enough space for our [present and ongoing] research activity. Also, we have experienced a dramatic growth in research activity at the University. This led us to look for off-campus space.”

“In 1998-99, South Lake Union was seen as an area of greatest opportunity for desired expansion [of UW Medical research space]. We were looking for space of sufficient size for expansion over time, with an affordable transaction format. It would need to be a process that would take advantage of tax exempt financing and private development opportunities. South Lake Union emerged as the best scenario, being close to the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and the Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, and ‘in the middle’ between the main UW campus and Harborview.”

Pettit turned to the handout that delineates the property involved in the phased development and a map showing the location of the project. The multi-phased project actually began in late-2003. If fully developed, the project could add as much as 800,000 square feet of wet lab and dry lab/administrative office space to UW medical research.

Phase I will involve the renovation of the existing WNG Building (with a 105,000 GSF wet lab by late-2004). The renovation will be carried out by Turner Construction. Phase II will involve the remainder of the WNG site (up to 300,000 SF of additional wet lab *and/or* dry lab). This work will be carried out as early as mid-2006 or as late as late-2007. Phase III will involve the “US Bank property” on an adjacent block (up to 400,000 SF of wet *and/or* dry lab – after 2006/07).

“Mercer Street would become a two-way corridor,” said Pettit, “and would be more pedestrian-friendly too. This will be a good location for long-term use for the University of Washington. The main streetcar would run north on Westlake from downtown to South Lake Union, go on north from there on Eastlake, and come back down Terry to town.”

Pettit said Paul Allen “owns much of the land around these buildings,” and stressed that the project would benefit Allen’s properties as well as the University. Balick said, “There will need to be a very efficient transportation system between the two areas.” Coulter said, “We won’t have faculty down there without a shuttle service. We’re committed to a shuttle. And if there’s a streetcar, *it* needs to connect South Lake Union directly with the Health Sciences complex in order to meet our faculty and staff needs.” McCray said, “It needs the *same* kind of transportation as the Health Sciences shuttle.”

Pettit said the cost of the Phase I wet lab [final costs will be determined by actual tenant improvements, space used and by interest rates] will be approximately \$51.7 million, or \$517/GSF per SF. The annual occupancy cost will be approximately \$5.0 million (total: all inclusive), \$50.15 per GSF, and \$94.66 per ASF (53% of GSF). “We will have to incur land costs; it’s a challenge for us. At the current indirect cost rate, such research facilities can’t pay for themselves. We will need private donations and other SOM sources, federal building grants, and an alternate ICR rate for SLU. We’re hoping the state will see this as something *they* should invest in. We also have the option to go, or not go, on Phase II. We must decide a year from now, by May 1, 2005. If we don’t go ahead with Phase II, it’s gone, and Phase III is gone as well. There will be no cost until July 1, 2005. We have the option of subdividing Phase III into three sub-phases, if we choose. We must exercise our option on the first sub-phase by June 2007.”

Asked if Health Sciences is included in this project in any way, Coulter said, “This is presently only for the School of Medicine. Other schools have the option to be part of this; but they have to have the resources to do that. This project could turn out to be like the new UCSF [University of California at San Francisco] project: a wonderful new research campus. It’s like a new small city, in effect.”

Capital Projects Office Project Outreach Plan – Jan Arntz, Environmental Planner, Capital Projects Office

Arntz said she has been reviewing the Capital Projects Office Outreach procedure with various groups, and has come to FCUFS to discuss the plan and to seek comments and suggestions.

“This policy is for all projects,” she noted. “Our goal is to get information out to people about University projects. Outreach starts early in the process. The Office of Regional Affairs does off-campus outreach. The project manager works with the client, deans, administrators and building managers in the vicinity of a designated project to develop a list of contacts.”

Arntz said the Outreach Plan includes broad notification. Outreach plans consist of the following information:

1. Identification of surrounding uses/buildings and how they might be impacted by the project (i.e., noise traffic, vibration).
2. Identification of contacts including Deans, Chairs and administrators or designated contacts.

3. Dates for meetings/briefings/contacts during the site programming phase.
4. Date and distribution of the site programming document.
5. Dates for meetings/briefings/contacts during the predesign phase.
6. Dates for meetings/briefings/contacts during the design phase.
7. Dates for meetings/briefings with CUCAC and completed CUCAC form.
8. Dates of construction activities.
9. Log of comments and responses from surrounding uses/users.
10. Responses to follow up review.

Arntz said there is a newsletter for the hospital (the hospital's internal newsletter) to communicate about projects within the Medical Center. Schaufelberger said, "We need to know concerns in the predesign stage." Chapman said, "If there's a potential for impact, we will get that information out." Balick said, "This is directly related to the concern I had: that it is not possible for project people to always anticipate impacts. There needs to be a plan in the conceptual development phase for the project manager to 'knock on doors'." Chapman said, "We will have the project manager notify deans and chairs of departments housed in the immediate area. The intent is to get project managers to sit down with Jan Arntz and identify who should be included in the Outreach Plan."

Balick said, "The checklist will be the key to the success of the plan. You need to catch this at the stage of *conceptual* planning (e.g., an adverse effect of light in the building being planned on a building in the immediate area)." Schaufelberger said, "This council would be the proper venue for a campus-wide dialogue. We could have the project manager from the major projects visit FCUFS, when possible." Chapman said, "Let us look at it. A problem is the syncing of all the committees that are involved." Treser suggested, "You could have e-mail notification to FCUFS." Chapman replied: "We have the 'tracking' Website." Schaufelberger said, "If there was a *written* plan for projects of \$5 million and more, you could let the council know and we could look at that written report. We could have the biggest possible population be made aware [of the project]. We can help everyone be notified who *should* be, for possible comment."

Chamberlin said, "Some issues require a 'finer filter' (say, an issue involving asbestos) regardless of the cost of the project." Pike responded: "We need to look at the current communication plan to determine what is already being done and what else may be needed." Chapman said, "I'd like to get this revised policy out, and look at the other separately." Schaufelberger said, "We'll look at it, and give comments within a week. It seems OK to me. And we'll think about the coordination piece."

Environmental Stewardship at UW – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger distributed a three-page document entitled "Environmental Stewardship at the University of Washington."

"This is the final version," he noted. He told the council that "Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig wants us to read this and pass along any comments we may have. Ihrig wants to take it to the Board of Regents at their next meeting. I need to notify the Senate leadership and Ihrig if we have concerns." Schaufelberger said the advisory committee "does not yet exist." He said, "It took widespread faculty involvement to put this together." Asked if the Faculty Senate would be asked to review the document, Schaufelberger said, "This, today, *is* the Faculty Senate vetting of this document."

Hearing no suggestions for emendations in the document, Schaufelberger said, "We think it's all right as it is. I'll send e-mail confirmation of that approval to Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden and Executive Vice President Ihrig."

Next meeting

Schaufelberger thanked council members for their contributions during the 2003-2004 academic year. The council will next meet in October of Autumn Quarter 2004.

Brian Taylor
Recorder