

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Friday, **February 20, 2004**, at 8:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia and Pace;
 Ex officio members Chapman, McCray and Pike.
 Guests Bob Dillon, Construction Manager, Johnson Hall Renovation; Carl Root,
 Manager, Parking Services.

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Heerwagen, Korshin, Rorabaugh, Souders, Souter and Treser;
 Ex officio members Chamberlin, Fales, Geppert, Stygall and Waddell.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of January 16, 2004 were approved as written.

Johnson Hall Temporary Facilities – Bob Dillon, Construction Manager, Johnson Hall Renovation

Bob Dillon, Construction Manager, Johnson Hall renovation, presented a plan for the installation of temporary facilities to support the renovation of Johnson Hall. He said it will now be possible for the equipment involved in the renovation to “stay inside the fence line.” He said the fence line “goes halfway into Rainer Vista, but there will be enough space (15 feet) for pedestrian traffic. And people have been hired to help direct traffic on Stevens Way. We won’t allow construction traffic on Stevens Way at class change, between 15 and 30 minutes after the hour.”

Schaufelberger said, “You’ll want to be aware of morning traffic.” Dillon concurred: “Yes. Regular University functions take priority.” Schaufelberger asked: “Have you talked with people in adjacent buildings? Cunningham Hall, for instance? And the Chemistry Building?” Dillon replied: “Jon Lebo has talked to the people in Atmospheric Sciences/Geophysics, Quaternary Research and the Johnson Annex. But I have not yet made calls on Cunningham Hall, Bagley Hall, and Mary Gates Hall. I will be doing this in the near future.”

Balick said, “I am concerned about fencing off *half* of Rainer Vista. There is far too much pedestrian traffic there. Pedestrians need at least one-half – and not one-third – of that space.” Dillon said, “We can revisit this, but we spent a lot of time [making this decision].” McCray said, “They spent time with Peter Dewey from Transportation, too.” Balick persevered: “I don’t agree. Rainier Vista is *the* critical walkway for *many* pedestrians on campus.” The question was asked: Why could the laydown not be expanded in the courtyard? Dillon said, “The other half of the courtyard is off-limits to our equipment, due to the Quaternary Research offices below. We’ll have a crane or a forklift continually circling the building. We’ll need access to the perimeter of the building.”

Schaufelberger said, “You also need to talk to the people at Mary Gates Hall. And I agree with Bruce [Balick]. There are a lot of people who walk on Rainier Vista, and a lot of bicyclists.” Dillon said, “We will save all the vegetation [in the area] that we can.” Balick said, “You could put planking over the grassy area.” Schaufelberger suggested: “If the walkway could be expanded, it would accommodate pedestrians, bikers, and skateboarders, and there are many of them. Could the trailers be separated more, to better minimize the construction traffic on Rainier Vista?” Balick added: “The real estate on Rainier Vista is so valuable, also.” Chapman said, “The difficulty is our constrained budget and schedule. Every penny we spend in temporary facilities takes away from [money we can devote to] permanent facilities.”

Balick said, “We’re being consulted too late. This has already been decided. This problem has come up before.” Chapman said, “The design development was just completed. We signed the contract yesterday.” Balick said, “Our advice is too often sought *after* the contract is signed. *My* advice on the Biophysics Building was sought *after* the contract was signed.” Schaufelberger said, “My concern is that our policy

said that adjacent buildings [to buildings being newly constructed or renovated] would be consulted *before* any contract was signed. The people in Cunningham Hall *need* to be consulted, in this instance. People who live and work in those buildings should be informed and spoken with.”

Chapman said, “A temporary walkway, if wider, needs to be continuous.” Balick observed: When trucks go over the asphalt in this area, it’s a lot of stress.” Schaufelberger said, “The issue is Rainier Vista access. Let me know what you decide, and I’ll let the council know. If you send me a drawing, I’ll get it to the council.” The council provided suggestions on how the problem on Rainier Vista access could be resolved. In particular, Schaufelberger suggested that the temporary construction buildings could be rearranged such that the amount of Rainier Vista that needs to be blocked could be reduced. Devasia suggested that portions of the Mary Gates lawn can be used to temporarily enlarge the Rainier Vista for pedestrians during the construction phase.

[Note: Dillon later returned to the meeting and told the council, “I can get 3 ½ feet more feet by expanding into the Mary Gates lawn, all the way down to the fountain, as suggested by the council. [This would address the issue raised by Balick about the need for more space for pedestrian traffic in Rainier Vista.] I will talk with Bill Talley and the people in Mary Gates Hall. There are two small rows of shrubs that could be removed to facilitate this expansion [of pedestrian space].”

New Facility Design Coordination – Richard Chapman, Associate Vice President for Capital Projects

Chapman said, “We’re in the process of change in the design coordination for new facilities. We have guidelines we must adhere to in expanding buildings on campus. We must live within the constraints of the Master Plan on building sites. We must abide by the General Site Selection Process, and make the appropriate use of sites designated in the Master Plan. There is, for instance, a maximum size for buildings on particular sites.” [Chapman distributed copies of the General Site Selection Process as well as copies of SEPA notice provisions, the CPO Outreach Procedure requirements, and the Off Campus Outreach required by the City University Agreement.]

“This is the policy we use, with the notification process,” said Chapman. “When we have identified a new facility, or a renovation project of an existing facility, we go to the SEPA process. This happens *after* the site selection.” Chapman pointed out that “SEPA has two paths: one for significant impact; one for other projects [without significant impact].”

Balick said, “With the Bioengineering Building, a lot of problems would have been solved if we [in Astronomy] were consulted *earlier in the process*.” Chapman responded: “We have to do a SEPA analysis *after* the site selection (which has to be in accord with the Master Plan, which has upwards of 90 sites already defined, stipulating what kind of buildings can be constructed on them). We are matching the requirements of a new facility with the space that best suits it.”

Schaufelberger said, “An issue here is that an EIS was developed to support the Master Plan. The SEPA process occurs *later* in the design process. It should be possible to have the *neighbors*, and not just the *users*, of a new or renovated facility hear the presentation of the EIS. That would allow people with concerns to have an impact *early* in the process.” Balick observed: “Part of our observatory has a blocked sky. This could possibly have been avoided *if* we had been consulted *early* in the process. This is just one of the many issues we had. You *need* to contact the *neighbors* of new projects *early*. These are functional, *not* aesthetic issues!” Schaufelberger added: “And it wouldn’t cost anyone any extra money to do this. It would be a much more inclusive process.” Balick noted that “Jan Arndt promised to do a new design policy; I haven’t seen anything yet.”

Chapman distributed a document from the Capital Projects Office entitled “Policies and Procedures.” He said, “*This* tries to address these issues. It tries to address issues involving neighbors of a proposed project.” Schaufelberger said, “The project manager needs to identify who might be affected [by a proposed project], and invite them to the architectural commission design presentations.” Pace said, “We need *faculty* representation in this process.” Schaufelberger said, “Department chairs are the people to

consult. They represent the faculty. But you definitely need to have the *neighbors* included in the process. The *chairs* of the departments in the neighboring buildings should be invited to the presentation.”

Balick said, “People can only plan if they know early. And the SEPA process, as it occurs now, happens way too late in the design process. It should happen when the architects are getting their information. These are crucial *functional* issues. Architects need to be informed of these issues in the conceptual design phase, *not* after the building envelope is fixed.” Schaufelberger said, “The committee would have an outreach part of the process in which chairs could voice their concerns, and be apprised of what’s occurring. The project manager could find out who would be interested, among the neighbors, and have them come and speak with them.”

Chapman said, “Yes, we could do that; we could put that in our process.” He noted, however, that “a lot of people have trouble following these issues [when they are] in the conceptual phase: the pre-model phase. But we’ll certainly try this, and put it in the process.” Schaufelberger said, “The new Business School will be the next large case.”

Schaufelberger recommended that Colleen Pike [Acting Director, Capital and Space Planning Office] and Chapman draft a document incorporating the changes in the policy suggested in today’s discussion, and bring the draft to the next council meeting. “We need a *record* of it. We could also have Jan Arndt come to an FCUFS meeting.”

Parking Fee Proposals – Carl Root, Manager, Parking Services

Carl Root, Manager, Parking Services, distributed documents and displayed two charts: “Possible Fee Increase Schedule”, “Net Income”, and “Fund Balance”; and “Proposed Changes to Transportation Fees and Summary of Proposed Transportation Fee Changes.”

Root gave a brief overview of the parking fee proposals. “There is a significant educational awareness component [to take place] between now and the hearing,” he pointed out. “Our job is to manage the University’s resources of some 11,000 parking spaces (there is a cap of 12,000 spaces), and meet the needs of the campus community while anticipating the growth and parking needs on campus. Parking Services is a self-sustaining operation. Parking fees are meant both to serve as a motivator for faculty, staff and others to use alternative modes of transportation whenever possible, and to fund the parking system.”

“In the last ten years,” said Root, “we have gone on a three-year schedule for parking: on the 2000-2002 schedule; last year was skipped. We now want to change the fee schedule to be effective in July; previously, fees became effective in September. We have had several meetings with the University Transportation Committee, which includes student representatives and representatives from all sectors of campus. We will present to ASUW, GPSS, the Faculty Council on University Relations, and the University Budget Committee. Peter Dewey, Assistant Director of Transportation Services, directs this process.”

Root said there will be a public hearing about the parking fee proposals in April. The Board of Regents will consider the proposal in May.

Root said there will be two changes this year. Car pool fees will be added, and the complimentary UPASS with parking permits will be eliminated. The proposal adds a fee for UPASSes when purchased with SOV permits. “Transit costs are going up a lot,” he noted. “Transit and capital costs are the driving force behind these raises; as it is, we only break even at present. Currently, just under \$5 million in parking revenues go to pay for the UPASS program. Transit costs are expected to increase approximately 50% from 2002-03 – 2006-07. Annual parking permits for SOV’s will be up 12% per year over the next three years.”

While reviewing the pie charts showing the Transportation systems’ funding and expenditures, Root said that parking generates \$10 million in fees. The section showing “Other UW Sources” was explained as a transit subsidy of \$875,000. A question was raised about enforcement: that it might be questioned that enforcement doesn’t pay for itself. McCray said, “You need enforcement [of parking fees] or people would

ignore permits altogether. You need a fine process. That money supports parking for the disabled and other services.” Discussion followed about parking fine funds.

“Transit costs are now over \$14 million,” Root noted. “We started 1998 at just over \$6 million.” He said, “The UPASS has been very successful. It has allowed us to have 12,000 parking spaces. Ridership has gone up. The cost of service – the cost of operating parking services – is very high. The value of a parking space continues to rise.”

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Thursday, April 22, 2004, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder