

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Friday, **March 4, 2005**, at 3:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Heerwagen, Rorabaugh and Treser;  
**Ex officio members** Chamberlin, Chapman, Fales, McCray, Pike and Waddell;  
**Guests** Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs, Office of Regional Affairs; Bryan Hall, Manager of Prog. Ops., Capital Projects South, University Facilities Services; Samuel Miller, Professor, Medicine/Division of Infectious Diseases; Karen VanDusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety; Carol Zuiches, Assistant Vice Provost for Research, Office of Sponsored Programs.

**ABSENT:**     **Professor** Korshin and Souter;  
**Ex officio members** Lias and Stygall.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of January 14, 2005 were approved as written.

**Brief overview of proposed addition to Henderson Hall – Colleen Pike, Acting Director, Capital and Space Planning Office**

Pike notified the council that the Capital Projects Office has prepared a cost estimate in response to a request by the Department of Applied Physics in the College of Ocean and Fish Sciences for an addition to the west side of Henderson Hall, located on development area 40W in the UW Seattle Campus Master Plan. CPO contracted with M.A. Mortenson Company who prepared construction estimates for three alternative size additions: 8-stories, 6-stories, and 4-stories. CPO incorporated Mortenson's estimate into the *C-100 Preliminary Project Cost Estimate*.

The 8-story addition would be a 48,400 GSF office tower addition to Henderson Hall, with a total project cost of \$26,450,920, and a total construction cost of \$20,955,342. The 6-story addition would be a 36,000 GSF office tower addition, with a total project cost of \$21,616,255, and a total construction cost of \$16,507,826. The 4-story addition would be a 24,200 GSF office tower addition, with a total project cost of \$16,830,580, and a total construction cost of \$12,117,068.

Pike said that the proposal is currently being evaluated and a business analysis will be completed in a month or two. After the proposal is approved by the Provost, then CPO will begin the predesign phase. Schaufelberger said, "If we hear early [in the process], we can find out about possible issues." Pike pointed out that the Capital and Space Planning Office "does not have much specific information yet," but that the office wanted to come to FCUFS as early as possible. Devasia stated the importance of including the immediate neighbors of the site of the project as early as possible in the initial design process.

**Overview of Regional Biocontainment Facility – Kathryn Waddell, Director, Budget and Administration, Health Sciences Administration (for full list of guests and their positions, see the "Guests" list above)**

Waddell said, "We have not had a free-standing federal research building at the University of Washington in over forty years. Essentially, we didn't have months of preparation time. The RFP was issued in the summer and there was a delay in pursuing the grant due to funding concerns. In October 2004, EH&S contracted with a private certification firm to look at the current RCE lab. The consultants strongly encouraged the UW to pursue the application. The message was clear: submit the building grant or the chances of a renewal on the current RCE work would be limited. The application content was written in December 2004."

Waddell briefly reviewed the current evaluation process set up by the President and Provost, and said that Steve Olswang “will report in April to President Emmert on the public forum aspects of the project.” Devasia asked: “Since the research involved in this project is different from the research currently being done [at the University], is there a higher level of security [at the proposed building]?” Samuel Miller replied that the facility will have a high level of security, but “will not provide a higher level of security than the current facilities. The building won’t define what’s going to be done there. There are some increased capabilities in the proposed facility. The important thing is to have the new facility: The T-wing space is inadequate.”

Karen VanDusen said, “Asbestos is a problem in the current Health Sciences facilities, and it is much more difficult to renovate the existing facilities to meet all the safety and security requirements mandated for research. A new facility provides all of the appropriate and updated facilities. While we have space nearly ready to go for the existing research under the RCE, we need greater capacity for additional work that may be proposed in future grants dealing with select agent or other infectious disease research.” Miller said, “The Patriot Act and the enhanced national level of security as a result of the anthrax attacks and of 9/11 necessitated increased security measures. The national assessment is done; every possibility has been accounted for.”

Balick said, “With respect to the impacts on people outside the new facilities, if something [harmful] should happen, what have you done to prepare for this?” VanDusen said, “Virtually nothing would happen to the public as a result of the research in the new facilities because of the significant number of redundancies planned for the facility. This [aspect of the project] has had a lot of work. This building is one in which, if something happened, such as a spill or breakage, the concern would be for the people inside the building. They will have extensive training, personal protective equipment, and there is an Emergency plan that assures they could be treated fully and immediately. In the extremely rare event that the researchers sustain a potential exposure, they would not be contagious to other members of the public.

Again, these laboratories will be level 2 and level 3 labs only [not the much more dangerous level 4 labs]. While there is a high perceptual risk on the part of the public, the actual risk to the public is minimal.” Devasia said, “But with respect to the community perception, the building is seen as a potential target. If there are *many* of these facilities all over, it is disturbing to the community at large. If the community *knew* that there is no actual risk, that would help to allay its fears.”

Pike distributed “Responses to Opening Remarks from the Chair: Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: January 10, 2005.” Pike turned the council’s attention to page two, #2.

[THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE]: “I was surprised because, despite an RFA date of 6/29/04, a letter of intent date of 11/29/04, and an application date of 12/29/04, a number of key people on campus (including members of cognizant faculty councils) were unaware, or only marginally aware, of the full implications of the proposal.”

[Excerpt from the RESPONSE]: “In early September it was determined that there was interest in applying for the grant and at that time the Dean of the School of Medicine informed the Provost. The site selection process was initiated by the Provost when he wrote a letter, appointing a committee. The committee reported back to the Provost on September 28, 2005. On November 2<sup>nd</sup> the administration gave the School of Medicine (SOM) the approval to begin writing the grant. So shortly thereafter, in early November, members of the SOM faculty began work on the grant application. The letter of intent was submitted on November 29<sup>th</sup> and the full grant (approximately 300 pages) was submitted on December 29<sup>th</sup>.”

Pike said that the evaluation of the feasibility continued as the grant proposal was completed with the expectation that the site process would continue early in 2005.

Pike said the Provost has appointed a committee to address the site issues. The report on the site selection will be complete by June 1<sup>st</sup> and the President will use it in making recommendations to the Board of Regents regarding whether or not the University should proceed with the building grant.

NIH will be reviewing grant applications in May of 2005 and will make their decision in September of 2005.

### **Central Administration Review and Approval of Building Grant Proposal – Carol Zuiches, Assistant Vice Provost for Research; Kathryn Waddell, Director, Budget and Administration, Health Sciences Administration**

Waddell briefly described the grant submission process: “The grant proposal is written by a faculty member. It is then reviewed by his or her departmental administrator or designee, who crosses the t’s and dots the i’s. If necessary, it can get reviewed by a departmental facilities person. The grant is then routed to the chair of the department and then to the dean. Some grants require additional review by Human Subjects, IACUC and/or EH&S, and from there to Carol Zuiches [Assistant Vice Provost for Research].”

Zuiches said, “We received it on December 21<sup>st</sup>. There were cost-sharing discussions. The dean understood the commitment. We got it out on December 23<sup>rd</sup>. At that time it was flown to Washington, D.C.” Schaufelberger asked, “Where is the decision [where does it derive from] to make the decision to build a new building?” Miller said, “This was for construction management only. We receive the grant in stages. The NIH process will be two years for the full design process.” VanDusen said, “Regarding funding the research itself, we were the only RCE funded on the west coast, but at that time, we did not apply for the construction grants that were also available for regional biocontainment facilities. *This* is another round for construction grants, and it is my understanding that this will be the last opportunity to get federal construction dollars for such facilities, which, if constructed, will have enhanced capacity and capability (for robotics, etc.) that *couldn’t* be done in the current facilities.” Miller said, “This RFA was carefully crafted; a free-standing building was required for this work: various requirements, such as structural integrity, were accounted for in this round that *weren’t* in the earlier round.”

Treser said, “There is a perception that the University is being underhanded, and that it needs to rebuild its credibility.” Schaufelberger asked, “Would all level three activity be consolidated?” VanDusen responded: “No. The type of research needing BSL-3 protection is diverse on campus, and only a very small percentage of that research requires additional security as well. Only the BSL-3 research that requires enhanced security would be good candidates for this facility, and the RCE research is one good example of that type of research. We won’t want to be using the limited capacity even in the new facility for all BSL-3 research unless other facilities are not available. Miller said, “Respiratory diseases also would be researched in this facility (aids research would *not* have to be conducted there).”

Chamberlin said, “The process is what we need to understand, not the research’s merit.”

### **Site Options Analysis for the Grant Application – Bryan Hall, Capital Projects Office**

Hall distributed a “Site Matrix” detailing the four major potential site selections for the proposed new facility. Site 45S, south of the west campus garage, was chosen as the best possible available site. “We pulled criteria for the site from the Master Plan,” stressed Hall. “We knew what size we needed [for the facility]; we needed a 25,000 sq. ft. footprint. 45S, with a 27,700 sq. Ft. footprint matched up very well, and was the closest to what we needed. It also is well-located near the Health Sciences complex. The committee wanted the site to be south of N.E. Pacific Street, and adjacent, or as nearly adjacent as possible, to Health Sciences. The Master Plan envisioned a footprint compatible with the capability of 45S. (The three other sites were: 20C, adjacent to Bloedel and Winkenwerder Halls; 47S, north of Oceanography, west of Hitchcock Hall; and 41W, south of Gould Hall.)

### **Communications Plan Overview – Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs**

Theresa Doherty said there have been two public forums thus far: February 23<sup>rd</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. There have been advertisements in eight newspapers, so 16 ads in all. “There is a lot of press about the [discussions at the] forums,” she noted. She said ASUW, GPSS, the Board of Regents, CUCAC, the “Ave Group”, and Northeast District Council, have all been informed and involved in the communications process, as has the

University District Chamber Board. A third public forum will be held on April 11<sup>th</sup> for faculty, staff and students, at 4:00 p.m., in the HUB.

Doherty said postcards containing information about the project and the first two public meetings were sent out or distributed “to some 2,000 folks” in the community. She said there is a Website containing a great deal of pertinent information about the project and the site includes the communications plan. A broadcast E-mail from President Emmert to 60,000 faculty, staff and students was sent out advertising the two public forums.

Doherty said Steve Olswang will report to the President in April on the public forums. The Site Selection Committee will issue a report on June 1, 2005.

Waddell said the grant application is posted on the Web. She noted that this is a most unusual step, as grant applications are considered confidential until funded. In this case, President Emmert thought it advisable to make it available on the Web. Schaufelberger said the President said there were three possible charges with respect to the proposed biocontainment lab: 1) Do nothing; 2) Build the lab, but not at the University of Washington; 3) Build the lab on the University of Washington campus.

Doherty noted in response to a question from the Chair that the response to the Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath’s questions about the RBL were sent to Professor Heath, Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn, Faculty Senate Vice Chair Ashley Emery, John Schaufelberger, Sarena Seifer, Chair of the Faculty Council on University Relations, and NEDC as well as others.

#### **Background on Current Facilities and Response to Safety Concerns raised by Chair, Faculty Senate - Karen VanDusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety**

VanDusen said a large biosafety program is in place, and that there are additional safety features, and additional security requirements. All of this comes under federal mandates. “Research cannot be done until all of these measures are in place,” she stressed.

She distributed a detailed account of “Specific Oversight with RCE Research”. She pointed out that EH&S (Environmental Health and Safety) works with many partners to assure lab safety, and that EH&S operations focus on several risks and hazards, including: physical, chemical, radiological, biological/infections agents, and biological and chemical waste.

Key functions in the Biosafety Program include a review of research protocols and identification of hazards; providing training/clearances and setting OH program requirements; working with CHS to provide necessary clinical services; site assessments/inspections; development of health and safety manuals and policies targeted to labs; BSC requirements/standards and certification; and PPE/training.

#### **Discussion of Site Approval Process – Colleen Pike and John Schaufelberger**

Proposals for new buildings are submitted to the Provost. The first step in the process is an evaluation of the proposal and potential site options. It can take several months to complete the feasibility analysis and funding plan. Pike said, “When we agree on scope, funding and other terms, we have an agreement on the project concept and move to an early sharing and consulting phase.” Schaufelberger said, “Our responsibility [FCUFS’s responsibility in being included in the early sharing phase] is to ensure on-campus consultation.” Pike said, “This usually happens when the project proceeds through the pre-design phase.” Devasia said, “At the end of the pre-design phase, there should be a consultation with the nearby [and contiguous] buildings [and programs].” Pike said, “CPO is responsible for notifying campus neighbors and has presented an outreach plan to FCUFS. At the conclusion of the pre-design study, the Provost and the Executive Vice President consider all of the information and committee comments and recommend the preferred site to the President and then to the Regents.”

Schaufelberger said the grant application process for a building needs to be clarified. Balick asked, “What is the information people need to know? And how does the facility work?” VanDusen said, “The council

could look at the Rosen facility, as an example.” Schaufelberger said, “We need to diffuse public perceptions.” Miller said, “To say we don’t want this kind of work [of research] would be most unusual.” Balick asserted: “We *want* it [this kind of research], but we need to know more *about* it.”

Treser said, “The problem, as I see it, is that something went off the track *before* the communication process went into effect.” Balick added: “Next time, follow the process.” Schaufelberger asked: “Can an organization on campus apply for a grant for a new building without going through your office [Capital and Space Planning]?” Pike said, “No.” Schaufelberger said, “Then, if your office represents the Provost, you need to consult with us.” Pike said that CASPO would inform FCUFS of proposals for new construction projects on the Seattle campus. Miller said, “The President still hasn’t decided on this grant. It’s true, we did not start our public relations as early as we might have.” Schaufelberger said, “The issue is making the decision-making process *transparent*.”

Treser said, “I can arrange for the council to go to the DEOHS Roosevelt facility.” Devasia suggested putting information about these projects on the Web. Balick insisted: “The process must be more active.” Schaufelberger said, “Our role is to make sure that proponents of such projects talk to the right people. We need to be aware of possible areas of sensitivity. And we need an early fact sheet.” Pike agreed that the Capital and Space Planning Office would provide early notification to FCUFS of any proposed major construction projects on campus, irrespective of funding source.

#### **Next meeting**

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Monday, April 18, 2005, at 11:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder