

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **March 5, 2003**, at 8:30 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

**PRESENT:**       **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Korshin, Pace and Rorabaugh;  
                  **Ex officio members** Chapman, Coulter, Cox, Jennerich and Waddell;  
                  **Guests** Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs: Office of  
                  Regional Affairs; Roberta Hopkins, Director, Classroom Support Services; Elenka  
                  Jarolimek, Hazard Mitigation Planning Coordinator; and Sandra Lier, Associate Vice  
                  President for Business Services.

**ABSENT:**       **Professors** Andersen, Bramhall, Souders and Souter;  
                  **ex officio members** Fales, Martynowych, McCray, Pike, Sjavik and Stygall.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of January 29, 2003 were approved as written.

**General Assignment Classrooms: update – Roberta Hopkins, Director, Classroom Support Services**

Hopkins distributed a chart showing the “Five Largest Auditoria Usage and Enrollments” at the University of Washington in Autumn Quarter 2002. Contrary to assertions made in Olympia by state legislators, the chart shows that these classrooms are indeed used, and used heavily, in the afternoon hours, or the non-prime time hours. (Prime time hours for classroom usage are considered to be from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., which includes any class whose starting time is 1:30 p.m.)

Hopkins said the provost has asked departments to move classrooms beyond the prime time hours. Specifically, departments have been informed that 20% of all undergraduate classes are expected to be taught outside the prime time parameter. Certain disciplines, such as math and engineering, are making considerable use of the non-prime time hours for classroom instruction.

A significant impact is made on classroom availability by renovation projects. Architecture and Guggenheim halls, for instance, will be under construction and renovation from October 2005 to October 2007. (Though the state has yet to confer the money needed to undertake these renovation projects.)

A “major problem” for classroom scheduling is created when a large number of classrooms are simultaneously out of service. Marilyn Cox, Director, Capital and Space Planning Office, has an informal group looking at this problem now. Cox said, “One thing the group is trying to do is to determine how surge space needs will be met. A significant part of the surge issue is that there are going to be some crunches with respect to classroom space, and some difficult decisions to make.”

Schaufelberger asked, “How many general assignment classrooms will there be in Condon Hall when the Law School vacates the building?” Hopkins said, “There are ten general assignment classrooms in Condon Hall. There are 11 classrooms being constructed in the new Law School building. It’s not known if any of those classrooms will be available for non-Law School classes. There are some spaces in Condon Hall that could be used for architectural studio space. But that won’t be known for some time.”

Asked about Meany Hall as a potential classroom or lecture space, Hopkins said, “Meany is not an option. It is specifically a performance space.” Meany has long-established relationships – in which trust has been steadily built up – with performers who regularly return to the hall (the Emerson String Quartet is a notable example). These relationships, Hopkins stressed, would be seriously impaired if the performers were suddenly told that the hall was not available. Additionally, rehearsals are frequently held in Meany during the daytime. Hopkins said the HUB auditorium, and possibly the HUB ballroom, may be available on a limited basis for classroom purposes. But that too is tentative at this point.

Hopkins said evening classes are “more difficult.” None of the classrooms in Kane Hall are available in the evening, even though they are not always being used. Cox agreed with Balick that faculty *should* be able to use some of the rooms in Kane Hall in the evening. Though Chapman pointed out that Kane Hall *has* to be available for revenue.

Schaufelberger asked if classroom technology is “secure.” Hopkins said, “No matter *what* we do, we can’t prevent all thievery and vandalism. We *have* secured the doors on many buildings with electronic locks, at a cost of \$1500 per door. We also have installed secret surveillance devices in many classrooms. And much classroom equipment has been heavily marked with University of Washington identification, which will help deter potential thievery.”

“We will work on the Electrical Engineering building next, and then on Parrington Hall. We have 41 classrooms with installed computers. We’ve been lucky with respect to major thefts. The expansion of technology to classrooms has not been as far-reaching as I had hoped,” said Hopkins. “I’m hoping for program renewal money, though, as is widely known, the state legislature has not been helpful.” Cox said, “We *do* have accessibility accommodation money for individual specialized needs.”

### **Hazard Mitigation Planning – Sandra Lier, Associate Vice President for Business Services**

The University of Washington has joined the Washington State Emergency Management Division in preparing an Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). State agencies will be required to have a Hazard Mitigation Plan in effect, which meet minimum requirements of Section 322, Mitigation Planning, of the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, enacted by Section 104 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, as a condition of receiving mitigation assistance after November 1, 2003.

Lier distributed a chart showing four phases of the “University of Washington Hazard Mitigation Plan Timeline” [3-4-03]. The four phases are: 1) organizing resources; 2) hazard identification and risk assessment; 3) developing the mitigation plan; and 4) adoption and implementation.

In the first phase (Organizing resources) a project coordinator has been identified, a work group has been formed; and the next task after meeting today with FCUFS is to set up formal meetings with UW leadership for approval (CFC, Board of Deans, and Regents).

A major task in the second phase that has been completed is the Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment (HIVA). By May 15<sup>th</sup> an inventory of all university facilities will be submitted to the Washington State Emergency Management Division (EMD).

In the third phase a draft of the annex containing the University’s hazard mitigation goals and strategies will be turned in to the State EMD by July 31<sup>st</sup>. During August 1-29 the EMD will incorporate the University’s submission into the state plan. During Sept. 2-19 the EMD will review the Draft HMP. By the end of October a letter from the Board of Regents would officially adopt the plan. The state plan would be adopted on October 30<sup>th</sup>. And on October 31<sup>st</sup> the state would submit the plan to FEMA for review and approval.

Lier told the council, “I have responsibility [in Business Services], for publication services, risk management, and emergency planning, among other responsibilities. And I am now responsible for the Hazard Mitigation Plan for the University of Washington.”

“We prepared a HIVA last year,” said Lier. “It will take six to eight months to complete the timeline for the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Going through this process, and gaining approval for the plan, will allow us to apply for disaster funds.”

Lier mentioned four elements crucial to the process: 1) Mitigation; 2) Preparedness; 3) Response; and 4) Recovery.

Lier noted that, whereas Cox's office [Capital and Space Planning] is concerned with structural safety, her own group is concerned with non-structural safety.

Lier introduced Elenka Jarolimek, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Coordinator. Jarolimek said a workgroup has been appointed from various UW administrative departments to assist in identifying critical facilities and to develop goals and strategies that will become part of the "UW Annex" to the State's Enhanced Plan. "The critical facilities identified will be used for an internal assessment only," said Jarolimek, "and will not be included in the state plan. However, we will provide the state general information about our facilities in order to assist them in conducting a regional loss estimation study. After formal adoption in November the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) will be updated every three years. Eventually, we hope to integrate it with other University planning processes, such as connecting it with the Campus Master Plan."

Lier said, "The HMP is an overview. Our goal is to have it approved by the state, and by the federal government. Of course it must be approved by the president of the University before going elsewhere. Lier said the University wants to do the HMP "in conjunction with the state because that will give us a chance for grants and allocations from federal programs that otherwise would not be available to us."

Lier said, "We'll be going to many different groups across the campus, but wanted FCUFS to be the first to learn of our strategy."

Balick said, "In my department, I'm appalled at our level of emergency preparedness. And I can't help but ask: Are we typical?" Lier said, "It's very uneven. The hospitals and the health sciences are very prepared because they're regularly checked for this kind of preparedness." Coulter said, "It's the most difficult problem I've had since I've been here. Every department now *does* have an emergency preparedness plan. We've stressed this to every department. It's a hard problem to solve in a University of this size." Lier said, "We have a group – a central core – that does review this. It's hard to get people to deal with emergency preparedness until a crisis occurs."

Looking beyond the campus, Lier said, "We need to maintain our connection with the community: with the City, with the police, and with other communal agencies, many of which will converge on the campus in a crisis. We're not an island."

Lier said, "Emergency preparedness is something that has to be explained to chairs and to others." But, as Balick observed, "Chairs have no *training* in this." He said Lier might want to visit chairs meetings. Lier said she would be happy to do so, and would contact departments to that end.

Lier said careful attention must be given to priorities of action with regard to emergency preparedness. "The Hazard Mitigation Plan is one thing; establishing priorities for action in an actual crisis is another," she stressed. "What to do first in an actual emergency: this priority must be firmly established."

Jarolimek said, "In order for the Hazard Mitigation Plan to be successful and to enable us to reduce the risks to natural- and human-caused hazards, we need to integrate mitigation into the everyday decision-making at this University." Balick said, "It doesn't work like this, in everyday reality. We're not *aware* of these things every day." Schaufelberger said it would be helpful to address emergency preparedness at the Autumn Administrators' Workshop run by Vice Provost Steven Olswang and Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning. "It would increase the visibility of this awareness if you got on the agenda of the workshop," said Schaufelberger.

Lier said, "The Red Cross checklist is invaluable. I recommend it to anyone who is interested in safety and emergency preparedness issues." The Red Cross Web site is: [www.redcross.org/](http://www.redcross.org/). I also recommend the Web site of the new Office of Homeland Security. That Web site is [www.ready.gov/](http://www.ready.gov/).

"Still," said Lier, "much is up to individuals." "Yes," Coulter corroborated. "How to get individuals to be aware of all this: it's difficult. We do a lot at the institutional level, but individuals need to do much."

Waddell said, “And a watch group is crucial: people who check and cite people if they fail to comply with necessary preparedness.”

**General Site Selection Process – Marilyn Cox, Director, Capital and Space Planning Office; and Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs**

Cox said the new Campus Master Plan gives enhanced flexibility to the site selection process. “It allows us to be much more open to what the new buildings might be.”

Cox distributed a summary of the “General Site Selection Process: February 18, 2003.” She said there will be extensive communication with the campus community about the site selection process. She went through some of the main points of the summary with the council.

*Project Siting Proposal.* Proposals for major new buildings may be submitted to the Provost for consideration. The Capital and Space Planning Office (CASPO), the Capital Projects Office (CPO), and the proponent will then collaboratively evaluate the proposal and recommend an initial list of site options to the Provost. The site options identified for further consideration should be those building sites in the Master Plan which generally meet the size, configuration and adjacency needs of the proposed new building, and which have not been committed or reserved for another project.

*Early Faculty and Community Consultation.* Initial responses from faculty will be sought through discussions with the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS). FCUFS will be asked to provide early comments on the list of sites to be considered, either prior to the initiation of predesign, or during the early stages of predesign. For academic facilities, the Academic Advisory Committee on Facilities (AACF) will also be asked to review the proposal from the academic programming perspective. Siting options and recommendations for new facilities will also be presented to the City University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) during this early feasibility study and predesign phase. Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs, will take the recommendations to CUCAC.

Schaufelberger said, “The Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR) needs to know what is going on when the outside community is considered. In FCUFS, we are primarily concerned with internal issues.

During this study phase, a preferred project site may be reserved by the Provost for a defined period of time, usually not more than two years, to allow for completion of predesign, confirmation of funding, and approval to proceed to design.

*Architectural Commission.* In most cases, in conjunction with the selection of an architectural consulting firm for the predesign study, an Architectural Opportunities Report (AOR) will be issued by the Architectural Commission. This will allow for the AOR to provide important siting context to inform the more detailed consideration of siting options during predesign. Schaufelberger said, “The Landscape Advisory Committee should be shown as collaborating with the Architectural Commission in the development of the AOR.”

*Semi-Annual Report to the Regents, FCUFS and CUCAC.* A semi-annual report of major capital projects is currently provided to the Regents, FCUFS and CUCAC. This report will be expanded to include projects for which it is anticipated that predesign will start in the ensuing six months, and for which a list of site alternatives will be studied. Doherty said, “We also do an annual report that we send to CUCAC. We could send that report to FCUFS as well.”

*Site Approval.* At the conclusion of the predesign study the Provost and the Executive Vice President will jointly evaluate the project information and siting recommendation developed through the predesign. This review should include information about the advantages and disadvantages of each site, and should take into consideration the comments received from FCUFS, CUCAC and AACF. The Provost and the Executive Vice President will then recommend a preferred site to the Regents for final approval. The Regents would have authority for final site approval and this will occur prior to the initiation of design.

The council agreed that the process was consistent with the earlier draft, and no further comments or questions were offered at this time.

**Next meeting**

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Thursday, April 17, 2003, at 9:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder