

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Friday, **May 16, 2005**, at 11:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Korshin, Rorabaugh and Treser;
Ex officio members Jan Arntz, Environmental Planner, Capital Projects Office,
University Facilities Building (for Chapman), Chamberlin, Fales, McCray and Pike;
Guests Brian Fabien, Professor, Mechanical Engineering; Everett Spring, Project
Manager, Capital Projects Office; and Steve Tatge, Project Manager, Capital Projects
Office.

ABSENT: **Professor** Heerwagen and Souter;
Ex officio members Chapman (Arntz represented Chapman), Liias, Stygall and
Waddell.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 18, 2005 were approved as written.

Update on University Capital Budget – Colleen Pike, Acting Director, Capital and Space Planning Office

Colleen Pike, Acting Director, Capital and Space Planning Office, said the Legislative session in Olympia has been concluded. The Fiscal Year 2006 Operating and Capital Budgets are being presented as an information item at the May 2005 Finance, Audit and Facilities Committee meeting of the Board of Regents. These budgets will be presented for action at the June 2005 Board of Regents meeting.

Preview of the June 2005 Action Item

The June 2005 Action Item adopting the Fiscal Year 2006 Operating and Capital Budgets will ask the Board to do five things:

- adopt a Fiscal Year 2006 operating budget;
- adopt a Fiscal Year 2006 capital budget;
- raise undergraduate resident tuition for the 2005-06 academic year by 7% (from \$4,770 to \$5,103 – an increase of \$333 for the 2005-06 academic year);
- increase the undergraduate application fee from \$38 to \$50; and
- adopt a new graduate and professional non-resident tuition waiver under which most graduate and professional students would be eligible for the resident tuition rate after having lived in the state for one year (this will be a separate action item).

Pike pointed out that proposed projects to be approved FY06 include: \$21,850,000 funding for construction in Architecture Hall; \$24,500,000 for construction in Guggenheim Hall; \$5,000,000 for construction in the HSC H Wing; \$6,600,000 for planning and design in Savery Hall; \$2,500,000 for planning and design in Clark Hall; and \$1,000,000 for planning and design in the Playhouse Theater; \$7,500,000 for the UW Tacoma Assembly Hall. And \$18,000,000 in construction funding for the UW Bothell/Cascadia Community College South Campus access project was provided through the 2005-07 State transportation budget, with a commitment for an additional \$8,000,000 in 2007-09.

Chamberlin, noting that budget funding requests are at best partially realized, asked if the FY 2006 President Proposed Budget contained “enough to do what [the University] hopes to do”. Pike responded that the budget generally allows the University to proceed with critical major projects. She said that cuts were made in many requests. The budget for Architecture Hall was cut by \$1 million. The budget for the Guggenheim project was cut by \$500,000. Pike told the council the Legislature denied the surge costs to

move Guggenheim and Architecture occupants to Condon Hall. “We will have to pay that from University funds,” she noted.)

She said the H Wing in Health Sciences was funded per the full request to continue the next phase of renovation. And the projects in Savery Hall, Clark Hall and the Playhouse Theater will go forward as planned. Pike said there is no funding “as a line-item” for emergency power, classroom improvements, and other projects, but added: “These projects – including safety and other projects, such as classroom improvements – that were not funded will be considered in the allocation process for minor repair funding.”

Asked about the difference between the two columns in the table she distributed, Pike said the “FY 2006 President Proposed Budget” represents the budget proposal whose approval (from the Board of Regents) will be requested in 2006; the “FY 2007 President Planned Budget” is the budget proposal whose approval will be requested in 2007.

Asked about legislative rationales for decisions on budget cuts for the University capital projects, Pike suggested that the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and Legislature “think some project costs are too high [the amount requested]”. And McCray said, “They look at square footage as a key criterion, which is not, however, always an accurate indicator, and is sometimes given more weight than it merits.” Pike said, “Costs can vary depending on the age of a building and the quality and life of construction. University buildings are usually constructed or renovated to last longer than many other buildings. The University has explained this and reviewed project budgets in detail with OFM and legislative staff as well as other aspects of our capital planning.” Schaufelberger asked, “Is there no budget now to continue classroom upgrades like the work being done in Kane Hall this summer?” Pike said, “We *will* complete the work in Kane Hall (which has already been funded by the supplemental budget) and consider requests for instructional spaces in the allocation process for minor repair funds, but it’s just not part of the state line-item listing.” McCray said, “The completion of the emergency power work will now take somewhat longer.”

Mechanical Engineering Building Feasibility Study – Everett Spring, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office; and Brian Fabien, Professor, Mechanical Engineering

Everett Spring, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office, and Brian Fabien, Professor, Mechanical Engineering, discussed the Mechanical Engineering Building Feasibility Study.

Project Description

Spring said the College of Engineering proposes to construct a new Mechanical Engineering Building (MEB). The Capital Projects Office conducted a feasibility study to evaluate two sites, 14C (Capital Projects Office / Facilities Services, referred to as “CPO”) and 16C (More Hall Annex), for a potential new MEB. The proposed MEB would provide for faculty and staff offices, research and instructional laboratories, student project space, computer labs, shops, lounges and storage. Meeting rooms are also to be included in the new building. Existing research labs will be retained on the ground floor of the existing MEB. Selected College of Engineering departments will backfill the existing MEB. A potential donor may contribute a substantial donation to the project provided the building is located on a publicly visible site.

The project budget estimate is \$60,000,000. The estimated construction cost is \$49,800,000. If fund raising is successful and pre-design is approved to start sometime this year, then construction could commence in 2008 and project occupancy could be anticipated for spring 2010.

Relationship to Campus Master Plan

Development of the building at both sites is consistent with the intent of the Campus Master Plan, and both sites honor the potential donor’s request for the building to have a presence on Stevens Way. While there is not yet a formal decision, there is a slight preference for the More Annex site because it is the less expensive option and it fits well within the campus master plan limits.

Both sites are designated in the campus master plan for potential development of academic facilities (the CPO site is also designated for transportation). The buildings on both sites front Stevens Way; have modest intrusion on small, existing open spaces, but would retain open space and landscaping; eliminate some existing pedestrian pathways but enhance others; displace modest amounts of surface permitted or service parking (but the CPO site retains the Master Plan for a parking structure in future development of the remaining site); fit within the master plan limits for height, number of stories, and site area; have little to no effect on vehicular traffic; and are located and massed to have minimal effects on existing views.

The Master Plan for the More Annex site allows 100,000 gross square feet, up to five stories, and 65 feet in height. The proposed building would have four full floors, three of which would face Stevens Way, and a partial ground floor for a total of 100,000 gross square feet.

Spring said further FCUFS presentations will be scheduled as appropriate when the project moves forward. Public outreach will also begin with a presentation to CUCAC and other University groups.

Asked about possible impingement on open spaces, Spring said both sites would intrude slightly on open spaces, but would also create open spaces. Fabien said, “We will retain the ground floor of the existing MEB with either new site. That space will predominantly be used for classrooms.” Asked about his and the rest of the faculty’s preference, Fabien said, “Most of all, faculty want a new building. Beyond that, the largest and best space possible is the natural preference.” Asked about discussions with potential neighbors of the proposed sites, Fabien said, “We have had discussions with people in Computer Science, and they would feel comfortable with a new building next to theirs. The proposed new building would block a very slight portion of their view, but nothing they will not be all right with.” CPO representatives said they plan to inform occupants of the surrounding buildings and get their input before they complete the predesign of the building and present it to FCUFS.

Fabien pointed out that Sound Transit will be putting an underground tunnel directly under the existing Mechanical Engineering Building. “The vibrations from the underground tunnel will be a problem. The Sound Transit project *will* affect us. The train emissions *will* affect us.”

Pike said the College of Engineering has asked for University approval to go ahead with fund raising. Asked if the donor will have a presence in the project, Fabien referred to Spring’s statement that the donor preferred that the new building be on Stevens Way, and that both sites meet that objective. And Fabien emphasized that Site 14C will have space for an eventual second building – whether Mechanical Engineering or not – that would meet the Master Plan’s requirement for maximizing the site’s potential.

Finally, Fabien said: “This new building is critical for Mechanical Engineering. We are using more ‘wet labs’ all the time, and are desperately in need of space for such labs. We need to move aggressively. New faculty need new building spaces. This project is essential for Mechanical Engineering’s success and growth as a department.”

Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities Study – Steve Tatge, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office

Steve Tatge, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office, discussed the Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities Study and gave a “preview of what’s coming”.

As for the Study Scope, Tatge highlighted the following areas: 1) Athletic Complex Detailed Planning; 2) Husky Stadium Improvements; 3) Graves Annex Modifications; and 4) Landscaping, Signage, Graphics, Lighting and Circulation.

Balick asked at the outset about the “function” of the projects in question. (Balick said he knows of several academic facilities in dire need of renovation and upgrade. He wished to know what was particularly urgent, especially from a functional point of view, about the possible renovation of these Athletics facilities.) Tatge said, “This part of the campus does not provide the same qualitative experience for student-athletes, other students, faculty and staff, and visitors to the University, as does the upper campus.

Part of Husky Stadium is 85 years old. The south grandstand is 55 years old. The stadium is *not* the kind of facility that fans today have come to expect. Intercollegiate Athletics is self-sustaining, and the stadium does not generate the income it could if it *were* acceptable by today's standards."

Asked about the Tubby Graves Building, Tatge said, "It *will* be looked at." As for the study overall, eight firms have submitted qualifications. An architectural commission has recommended HOK S+V+E with Weinstein A/U. He said HOK has done "many projects like this one".

Tatge said Recreation Sports operates the IMA, Waterfront Activities, and other complexes. ICA has the stadium, Hec Ed Pavilion, and other major facilities.

Tatge said the East Campus portion of the Master Plan stresses reinforcement of the Walla Walla Road spine. "It should be green, and conducive to pedestrian traffic," he emphasized. "It should lead to a 'village' of athletic and recreational uses," he suggested. "Planting should be designed to define open spaces in the 'village'. And we need to address the proposed Sound Transit station, which will be situated in this area. We also need to address entrances, edges, parking, and other aspects of the Campus Plan. We want to make the E9 parking lot much more pedestrian-oriented than it is now, as it is adjacent to the new Conibear Shellhouse, which has academic and dining facilities for student-athletes."

As for potentially "risky" spaces, Tatge said, "ICA is aware of risky spaces for pedestrians, bikers and drivers in this area. This will be part of the design effort as the study goes forward."

Tatge said there are plans for Interstate 520 to have a new section cutting into the area under discussion. FCUFS will be informed as more is learned of this possible project.

Asked to discuss the Graves Annex in greater detail, Tatge said, "A feasibility study will be carried out concurrent with the overall study. We are seeking ways to improve the Graves Annex, particularly to provide increased visibility and convey the Husky athletic tradition. As prospective recruits walk into the lobby of the Annex, nothing inviting or positive is conveyed to them. There is nothing interesting or exciting for recruits to see there." There are no plans at present to expand the upper floors of Graves Annex.

Returning to the discussion of Husky Stadium, Tatge said, "The amenities in the stadium are not up-to-date. There is little premium seating. All the newer stadiums have substantial premium seating. Restrooms and concessions facilities are also inadequate. And significantly, we will be looking to introduce new uses for the facility, such as a Sports Medicine Clinic which also would serve the public. Non-athletic uses will also be considered" Tatge said a complex question is where to locate the track in the renovated stadium. In most newer stadiums, having no track allows seating to be significantly closer to the field. This will be studied along with the other issues related to upgrading the stadium.

Regarding the process of the ICA Facilities Study, Tatge said the important steps are: 1) the market study; 2) a review of existing facilities and basic infrastructure condition; 3) programming; 4) conceptual design and estimate; 5) concurrent Graves Annex Pre-design (three months); and 6) Graves Annex full design, bid, and construction (+/- 20 mos). There will be a design phase oversight; this phase will be taken to CUCAC, which, in Tatge's words, "is our mechanism with the City". This is the process that will be carried out.

Next meeting

This was the final FCUFS meeting of the 2004-2005 academic year. The next FCUFS meeting will take place in October 2005. FCUFS Chair John Schaufelberger thanked all council members for their participation this academic year, and looked forward to seeing many of them in Autumn Quarter 2005. Schaufelberger will chair the council in 2005-2006.

Brian Taylor
Recorder