

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Monday, **January 29, 2003**, at 8:30 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Korshin, Pace, Rorabaugh, Souders and Souter;
 ex officio members Chapman, Coulter, Cox, Fales and McCray.

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen and Bramhall;
 ex officio members Jennerich, Martynowych, Pike, Sjavik and Waddell.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of December 2, 2002 were approved as written.

Building Restoration Planning – Marilyn Cox

Cox addressed the University's plan for the restoration and renovation of many of its aging facilities.

She distributed a copy of the "University of Washington 2003-2005 Capital Budget Request and 2003-2013 Capital Plan: September 2002."

Cox said, "This document shows how we are viewing our long-range capital planning for the purposes of requests to the state for funding. This is one portion of our capital plan; we have other aspects of the capital plan that provide us with potential for new facilities. But our request for this biennium – and for the next dozen years or more – to the state, will be for funds to maintain what we already have."

"This is essentially the narrative summary from our 2003-2005 request to the state that provides some background on the age of our buildings, the general condition of our buildings, and how we would like to address improving that general condition," said Cox.

"The campus underwent a significant building boom in the early part of the 1900's, primarily under President Suzzallo. And we have a lot of our core campus academic buildings that are in need of significant restoration and renovation. Given the perpetual underfunding of maintenance funds, we've done a good job of keeping our buildings functional, given our resources. But there comes a time when major buildings need more than routine maintenance, but really need a major renovation."

"One of the ways that Jerri McCray's office [Facilities Services] tracks information in terms of our audit of the condition of buildings is a program called FACMAN that records line-item improvement and repair needs in our buildings. In terms of the assessment of a building's general health, we look at the total cost of all of the line-item repairs in that building relative to what it would cost to build a new building."

"So we look at the current replacement value compared to the sum of all of the need repairs, and come up with an index number. That's a benchmark and a method that's used fairly commonly in physical plant management throughout the United States. It's not something that we have invented. It's called the Facilities Condition Index."

"I think about it in the sense that you're trying to determine if your car was totaled. Once it gets to the point where the repairs are more expensive than buying a new car, it's time to buy a new car. The situation that we have, however, is that we have all '57 T-Birds. But we don't intend to go out and buy new cars, and get rid of the old. We need to restore the ones that we have."

"We now have about 15 buildings on the campus that have exceeded the 100% threshold in terms of cost of repairs relative to the cost of a new building. Those buildings are listed on the last page of the document

distributed to the council. It is the Critical Building Summary. You can see that, for the most part, we now have repair totals that equal or exceed the 100% of the cost of a new building, which tells us that we have to think about these in terms of a major renovation, not just a replacement of certain components.”

Cox was asked, “Does this figure include a study of the function of the buildings? Are considerations being made of what functions the buildings may serve other than their present functions? Are considerations being made of what else should be done with the buildings that is different from the use they have at present” Is this just to renovate buildings, and not to change their function?”

Cox said, “That’s a question that is right on target, and prompting quite a lot of discussion in Olympia right now. This is primarily restoration to the original condition. Maybe some minor amounts of what we would think of as modernization. What we will do when we go through and restore these buildings is certainly think about what we need for today’s purposes.”

“So it will be a total renovation that will make sense,” Cox continued. We’re not going to restore a 1930’s chemistry facility to 1930’s condition. We’ll make it work for today’s purposes. But this tracking method really is kind of an indicator, and is primarily for just fixing the facility, and restoring it to full functionality for the purpose for which it was originally designed.”

“One of the things that we think about in terms of the total campus – and this is probably a bit of a broad generalization in terms of using the Facilities Condition Index. If we think of the total campus current replacement value, it’s probably somewhere around \$5 billion. If we take out the enterprise units – the groups that essentially take care of their own facilities – like Athletics, and Housing and Food Services, and Parking, and the hospital for the most part, it’s around \$3 ½ billion. And if we compare our total repair needs, which we believe is somewhere around a billion dollars, we come up with a campus-wide Facilities Condition Index. Right now, we estimate that at about 28%. And that is really quite unacceptable in terms of physical plant management. A target would be somewhere around 4-7%. So we have a long way to go in terms of repairing our existing physical plant and making it functional for our needs.”

“Why is 4-7% your target?” Cox was asked. “Just a general industry acceptance threshold in any facility. There’s always some list of repairs and that is generally considered to be about an acceptable level. If it were a brand-new building you would hope there would be 0%, but on average if you’re in the neighborhood of 4-7% range, that would be considered a good report card for managing the physical plant.”

She was asked, “Is this news to you?” “No,” she replied. “This is not news. This has been a problem that has been recognized for some time. We’re really highlighting and focusing on this more than ever. In this biennium, we didn’t request new facilities in our capital request. In the past we’ve request kind of a balance. We maybe had some new facilities, and then considerable amount of repair and restoration work. The tendency in Olympia has been to choose the new buildings over repairs. And we have been significantly underfunded for years. So we really didn’t offer a choice with this request. Really the only thing on our request in this biennium is maintenance and repair work.”

“Now Johnson Hall renovation is included. And one of the most efficient ways that we can address our backlog of projects is through whole building renovations. So somewhere close to half of the \$1 billion number can be addressed by major building renovations.”

Schaufelberger said, “There’s another issue, and that is: Historically, we have not had the space where we could relocate an academic unit. But with the completion of the new Law School, Condon Hall is available for that purpose. So we now have a place where we could relocate academic units, empty a building, and then renovate. Historically, we haven’t had that opportunity. So that also has allowed us to move forward.”

“That’s absolutely right,” said Cox. “We’ve jealousy guarded that swing space, because it really is seen as a long-term opportunity to renovate major buildings. And we have done the first level of a fit plan to know that Johnson Hall can be effectively surged into Condon Hall. We’ll use some lab space down in

Oceanography and Fisheries, but for the most part the office spaces and other functions in Johnson Hall will go into Condon during that restoration.”

“So, we know quite a bit about the conditions of the buildings. We have the FACMAN – which is a short name for Facilities Management – a software program that Jerri McCray’s office runs. We’ve also done a number of special studies on selected buildings on the campus. About ten years ago we did an earthquake readiness review that studied 11 buildings to assess the seismic upgrade needs. And we have recently updated that study, and also taken that same list of 11 buildings and done a good review of what it would cost to do the seismic improvements and the other repairs for those buildings.”

“So we have a number of these studies that we need to bring together. We have appointed a committee that will start work in February. And it’s primarily the membership of the Academic Advisory Committee on Facilities that JoAnn Taricani has chaired for a number of years. John has graciously agreed to be a member of that group. And we have a student member as well, and representatives from Engineering Services and supporting staff.”

“We will take the studies that we already have about the condition of the facilities, and work with a consulting group,” Cox said. It’s actually two firms: a local architectural firm that we’ve worked with previously, and think very highly of, and a consultant who has done a lot of similar studies in California and on the east coast at a couple of major university systems. So the two firms will be working with the committee to start to bring together some of the criteria that we need to use to prioritize the next building renovations. And this is the time when we will bring in the academic priorities into consideration as well.”

“If you just go by the Facilities Condition, it’s a fairly objective review. You can see which ones are in the worst shape, and you can move forward on that basis. But we want to make sure that, as we prioritize these, we are timing them to also consider academic priorities. The size of the buildings will also allow us to, in some biennia, do more than one major renovation. Our current proposal is to do Johnson Hall in 2003-05, and Guggenheim and Architecture Halls in 2005-07. They’re smaller buildings, and can both surge into Condon Hall.”

“We have started some planning work on all of those projects. Johnson is actually fairly far along in the planning. The pre-design process is completed, and schematic design is now under way. So it will be ready for actual construction at the end of this year.”

Asked how long the surge into Condon Hall would last, Cox said approximately two years. She added, “We’re not providing them with a new space as part of this. In fact, we’ll lose a small amount of space because we’ll have to meet modern building codes and provide for better accessibility. The programming assumption is that the uses that are in Johnson will return to Johnson. And to the extent that we lose space to accessibility and code improvements, that loss is being shared equally by all in the building. And I expect that we’ll find that to be the case in the future with renovation projects.”

“So one of our first tasks will be to determine the right criteria for prioritization, and then to work with the schools and colleges and the campus committees to prioritize the buildings based on academic priority, the severity of the restoration needs, our ability to surge, and available surge space, and make that timing work. And the end result will be a prioritized restoration plan for all of these buildings that we hope to accomplish over the next 15 to 20 years.”

Cox was asked if there is any concern about the disruption of foot traffic on campus during the restorations. “We are really just starting that process. Once we know which buildings will happen when, we’ll get into more detail about routing pedestrian traffic. Another concern that we’re looking at is the availability of classroom spaces. Because it will certainly impact that, particularly if we do Guggenheim and Architecture at the same time. So we have some planning that is much needed. What’s involved are offices, classrooms and library space.”

Pace asked if Condon Hall will accommodate “studios that are like labs” in Architecture, during the surge. Cox said, “We haven’t done the specific fit planning yet, but it might be something that we could

accommodate in the library space, for instance. The library space in Condon is high ceilinged, wide open space that seems like it could lend itself to accommodating Architecture and studios on a short-term basis. We've really only done the detailed fit plan at this point for Johnson, and that actually is working out quite well."

Asked about the potential difficulties of students being able to get to and from classes in Condon Hall in a timely fashion, Cox said, "We're working closely with Classroom Support Services to see if there are a series of classes that could be scheduled together, so that if someone needed to go to Condon, they would go for a block of time. We're sensitive to that, and working with Roberta Hopkins and Tim Washburn to schedule that. But I do think it's important to recognize that this will put pressure on classroom facilities as we go through and do these renovations."

Cox said, "John and I will be back with some updates as we move forward. We're probably going to be doing some review with campus committees later in the spring regarding the prioritization criteria and preliminary recommendations."

Update on University Master Plan – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger said, "I invited Theresa Doherty to come today, but she was unable to attend. She handles communiqués with the community and has been the leader in the coordination of the Campus Master Plan with the City of Seattle. Last Friday the Board of Regents approved the Campus Master Plan, which is the last step. It is a significant change from the way the previous Master Plan was developed. That was called the General Physical Development Plan, I believe, and it had a time period of ten years in which construction was allowed to take place in accordance with that Plan."

"The current Plan has no time associated with it," Schaufelberger said. "We are authorized to construct up to three million square feet. As long as we haven't achieve the three million square feet the Plan is still in effect. It could be 15 years; it could be five years; it could be 20: whatever time it takes for the three million square feet of construction."

"The Plan identifies 68 potential sites. But it does not identify what goes on them. It identifies what could be built, and the maximum characteristics of a facility that could be built on a particular site. But it leaves open the possibility that, as money is available, and programs change, the University needs the flexibility to develop the site to meet its needs. There clearly still would be an Environmental Impact assessment of each construction project as there always is. But it doesn't have to conform to the Master Plan."

"The only major change," said Schaufelberger, "that the University had to make in order to accommodate the wishes of the City of Seattle was to change the height of the fence on the gold driving range. I believe we requested 105 feet, and it ended up being 80 feet, which, to my understanding, they decided they could live within. It does allow the University to acquire additional property. It does provide, however, that there will be no growth in vehicular traffic for the academic part of the University. The City has agreed to not count patients at the Medical Center, so the patients will not be counted in the traffic count, but we are still bound by the agreements that we've had previously to not increase the amount of vehicles coming to the academic side of the University."

"The old plan has been put on the shelf, and this one will be the guide for development in the future. At the last meeting we talked about the Business School, which is being envisioned to be constructed under the new Plan. The new Plan identifies that site. Development of Bioengineering and Genomics is also part of that. I don't know of any other project right now that's really being envisioned under the new Plan. It's always a function of money that's raised as part of the capital campaign."

"There's another issue with respect to the University that I felt was part of the Master Plan, but is not. And that has to do with the limitation on leasing facilities in the University District. It appears the mayor and the City Council, or some members of the City Council, are in favor of increasing the lid to allow us to lease additional space as part of a preservation plan for the University District. But that lid is contained in a City/University agreement. In order to get the lease changed in that agreement, we had to renegotiate it,

and Theresa's indications, in talking with the City, are that the mayor is in favor of it, and he's supposed to announce some kind of initiative some time in the future relative to revitalizing the University District. And our opportunity to participate in some of that new construction may be possible."

"Some of you have been with the council for some time, and have heard several updates on the Master Plan, and others of you are new to the council and have not heard these discussions. I wanted to give you an update as to where we are because a milestone was reached last Friday when the Board of Regents reached their final decision."

Chapman said, "Subsequent to the Regents' meeting, we have a 30-day window to make changes in the Master Plan, if agreed upon with the City. That is being done now. It will be published in final form and out in mid- to late-February. I believe it will be online as well as available in hard copies. One thing that we in Capital Projects have seen, and that Theresa has seen, is that a lot of the schools, colleges, and departments in their long-range planning are talking about the possibility of expansions and new facilities on what looks to them to be open areas. In a couple of instances that planning is focused on sites that are not shown in the new Master Plan as one of the 68 future development sites. So I would just encourage you to get the word out that, if folks are looking at possibilities, to feel free to give my office a call, or to give Theresa's office a call, and we'll be happy to work with you to see if sites that you're looking at are indeed eligible sites to be considered."

McCray said, "I'd like to give just a bit more information regarding traffic. The traffic ceiling counts were established with the City under the old General Physical Development Plan, along with a ceiling on the number of parking spaces that have been allowed at the University of Washington. And it's been seen in negotiations, or discussions in negotiations, that there's no ability to ever reappraise those limits. They're projecting 12,300 parking spaces for this campus no matter how large the campus grows. There seems to be no ability to get beyond the maximum traffic count during peak periods, 7 -9:00 a.m. and 3 -6:00 p.m. in the evenings. This has to do with the streets, not anything in relationship to the growth at the University of Washington."

McCray continued: "So, if it looks like we're at that end point of growth, the City would want to begin to renegotiate our whole transportation planning at the University, which is why reinforce the U-Pass program continually, to get as many people on the bus, and as many opportunities for carpooling and van pooling, as possible. So that we don't get to the point where they want to be involved in major negotiations with us because major negotiations on traffic can affect the University's ability to get a permit to build a building. We thought it was fairly significant to be able to get out of our grounds the patients and visitors. We have to count them, but we can make an adjustment for that number out of this total figure on the street. So that we're not so negatively impacted by that. I don't know exactly the number that we're talking about. It's not enormous. Because patients and visitors come all day long. But in that peak period we'll be able to make that adjustment."

McCray said, "We also have not been able to get any consideration for spreading out the peak, because it's really more than 3-6:00 p.m. On Montlake it's almost 2-2:15 to well beyond 6:00 p.m. And after 6:00 the Montlake Bridge is allowed to open, and that is covered by the Maritime law, and we have asked if the bridge could be kept down until 7:00, so there's not so much congestion. Those are the kind of constraints as well as opportunities with traffic."

It was suggested that innovative ways of improving mass transit will be needed, considering the amount of University-bound traffic there is during peak traffic hours: monorails, dedicated bus lanes, and other innovations, to make the U-Pass system efficient, and add capacity to it, which is obviously needed. McCray was asked if this has been discussed in the Master Plan. After review, McCray advised that there is a separate transportation report for the Master Plan. "There are things in there with respect to improvements in transportation. That is something we talk about all the time internally and all the time with Metro and Community Transit, and the State Transportation Department as they look at, for instance, improvements or expansions to 520. What does that mean in this area for traffic congestion, buses, getting buses here, more capacity, but Metro, quite frankly, has been limited by so many of the initiatives in the

State that have reduced their funding capability, to really make more improvements in the system that they would like to make.”

“So everybody is struggling with the economic aspect,” McCray said. “Actually, the University of Washington, even with its continual expansion, has been very good about its ability to reasonably manage the flow of traffic on the streets. The traffic growth on the streets around the University of Washington proportionately is far greater in the background traffic going to other destinations than it is to the University of Washington. But they don’t have the same kind of constraints with the City that we do. For instance, at University Village – we all like it; its developed wonderfully – they don’t have to do the kind of environmental impact statement that we do. They don’t have to do a transportation management plan at all, not to the extent we do. We are simply so large, and have more complicated relationships with the City and other agencies.”

Schaufelberger said, “The University would like to rent more space in the University District because there’s a perception that people might walk from their office to their research phase as opposed to driving downtown or wherever it is they’re going. So hopefully, if we can have some additional facilities, where we can’t accommodate those people on campus for research activities, that we don’t have to have so many trips back and forth during the day. That’s a part of that strategy, and why the University has said to the City: We would like to have the ability to rent some other space, not to compete with other folks, but to help us manage the traffic between office spaces where faculty members and research people are commuting to do their work.”

Schaufelberger said, “There’s one other piece that relates to parking: that is, as a part of the relationships with the University people, there’s an issue that, when we limit parking and more people park on the streets, as a part of the agreement with the City, the University will fund one parking enforcement person for the areas surrounding the campus. And that’s part of the agreement that we have with the City to help minimize, or reduce, the impact of the campus on the local environment. That’s not public in the newspapers, but that’s a part of the understanding.”

Update on Parking Fees – John Schaufelberger

“The University has looked at parking fees on campus as three-year packages,” Schaufelberger said. “The last package was 2000-2002. And there was a proposal to construct additional parking near the South Campus Activities Center. It was determined that it was too expensive, that there is no way that the parking system could afford that sort of cost. It’s not totally clear that those additional parking places are needed. But there’s another factor in all of that. The suggestion has been made that parking fees will not be increased in this academic year. They will be continued at the same level that they were in 2002. What happens in future years really depends. But as long as we don’t embark on new construction and the transit systems don’t increase the cost of bus service, then maybe the parking fees could stay the way they are, for this year.”

McCray said, “The truth of the matter is that Metro and Community Transit have always had additional costs, and they will continue to increase the cost to us of providing service. So the costs will continue to go up, and we know that, and we have to pay for that out of the parking system revenue, and, besides revenue from people who park their cars and pay, we get revenue from people who buy U-Passes and the other aspects of the program. And we get some central funding, and we get some portion of the parking fine revenue. And we’re in negotiations to capture a larger piece of that financial pool than we presently have in order to help with not having a parking fee increase. We’re also looking at ways to reduce the cost of operating the parking system, so that, when we do come forward, that we have taken all those things in consideration.”

“We are looking at the need to build some more parking,” said McCray. “We’re looking at the southwest campus to see if we should try to expand the southwest campus parking garage. We have a huge demand for parking in the Health Sciences and in the southwest campus, with the plans to build the Genome Sciences Building, and the Bioengineering Sciences Building, and they’re right there on 15th and N.E. Pacific Street, which is across from the west campus garage, which is always full. And all of the parking

at the southwest campus is full every day. When the surgical pavilion is done, the parking associated with that is expected to get to capacity quite quickly. So in that area south of N.E. Pacific Street, the parking demand is decidedly there. Any parking that we build, though, will not be exceeding the 12,300 limit. We are under that. If the Business School builds, one of the sites is the N4 parking lot. That will take out that parking. We are looking at an opportunity to build some parking below that building in conjunction with that project. But they're not expected to get the kind of money they need to go forward with that kind of construction project till much later. But we're looking at additional parking, and we will keep you informed as we move along, and that gets more serious."

Asked how many spaces below the 12,300 limit the University is at present, McCray said, "A few hundred, approximately." And she added that parking difficulty will not be confined to the South Campus. "With the new Law School opening in Autumn 2003, parking on the North Campus will be difficult as well. It's really congested up there now. The Burke Museum wants to grow and expand, which will further affect parking on the North Campus."

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Wednesday, March 5, 2003, at 8:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder