

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Tuesday, **January 17, 2002**, at 12:30 p.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Rutherford and Souders;
 ex officio members Cox, Fales, Jost, Martynowych, Pike and Schulz;
 Guests Sandra Lier, Associate Vice President for Business Services; and Theresa
 Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs.

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Battaglia, Bramhall, Gates, Gill, Kasprisin, Pace and Zuberbuhler;
 ex officio members Christoserdova, Chapman, Coulter, Chapman, Ludwig, McCray and
 Sjavik.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of November 13, 2001 were approved as written.

Coordination Policy for Placement of Temporary Facilities – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger distributed the “Policy for Coordination of Placement of Temporary Facilities on the University of Washington Seattle Campus.” He said the policy contains the modifications agreed upon by the council. The policy is now formally approved, has been added to the University Handbook as Volume IV, Part VII, Chapter 12, and reads as follows:

Policy for Coordination of Placement of Temporary Facilities on the University of Washington Seattle Campus

Temporary facilities may be placed on the campus to meet short-term University needs for space. The siting of these facilities often does not conform to the University Master Plan for the development of permanent facilities and is not subject to the normal coordination procedures used for permanent construction. Therefore, before any temporary facility is placed on campus, the office or activity proposing placement of the facility will coordinate its siting with appropriate University offices, neighboring units, and with the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services. This is to ensure that faculty and staff are notified of the proposed temporary facility and the anticipated removal date, and are given an opportunity to provide input to the University Administration prior to a decision being made regarding the facility’s placement.

The coordination procedures to be followed are:

- The office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will first coordinate its placement with the Capital and Space Planning Office, the Capital Projects Office, and the Facilities Services Office.
- Once the above coordination has been completed, the office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will provide a description of the proposed facility and its anticipated impact on the surrounding environment, an anticipated date for its removal, and a diagram depicting its proposed location to neighboring units occupying space near the proposed facility site.
- Once these units have been given an opportunity to provide input, the office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will provide the same information and the comments of affected neighboring units to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
- The council will review the proposal and provide written comments to the proposing office or activity and to the University Administration. In emergency situations, the Council Chair may

elect to review the proposal and provide comments rather than convene a special Council meeting.

AI, November 16, 2001

Disaster Resistant University Planning – Sandra Lier, Associate Vice President for Business Services

Lier distributed three double-sided “Disaster Resistant UW” informational sheets: “The 5 Things – Staff”; “The 5 Things – Visitors”; and “The 5 Things – Academic & Research.” These sheets are available to faculty, staff and researchers throughout the campus, as well as to visitors to the University.

Lier said that the University of Washington’s emergency preparedness is significantly further along than it was 18 months ago. There is still important work to be done, however, and input from the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services can help in that process. “We are going down the final road,” she said, noting that many superb volunteers have helped along the way, including FCUFS’s Marilyn Cox and Colleen Pike, who helped create an extraordinary map that delineates soil vulnerability, gives building viability, locates potential student presence in particular buildings, and notes equipment availability. Lier said Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig and President McCormick both are supportive of emergency planning.

The University of Washington is one of five universities to receive a FEMA grant to support emergency preparedness; the others are the universities of Alaska-Fairbanks, Tulane, North Carolina at Wilmington, and the University of Miami.

The charge of the work made possible by the FEMA grant is to “achieve full business recovery.”

Lier said Disaster Resistant University Planning is a multi-leveled effort. For business recovery, which is crucial after an emergency, preparation “up front” is indispensable. An important question to ask, said Lier, is: How do we leverage our resources with other local resources?”

Lier said over 200 sites on campus now have posters entitled “Emergency Procedures” directing people to emergency exits. If they are located near elevators, they are meant to direct people away from the elevators and toward the nearest emergency exits. Lier said she needs to have people’s review of the sites chosen, and recommendations for other sites.

“Emergency preparedness starts at home,” said Lier. “As for emergency preparation at the University, make certain that all your work is backed up and stored somewhere off campus, away from your laboratory or office.” Ultimately, she stressed, “You have to find the right solution for *your* office and department,” Schulz, the ASUW representative to the council, said it would be helpful if faculty were to notify students of these measures on the first day of class. Lier said she would be glad to pass that request on to departments and faculty. She said an excellent time and place to remind departments of this faculty responsibility would be in the fall at the departmental introductory meetings.

Another key part of emergency preparedness, Lier emphasized, “is to focus on what exactly you would do when an emergency occurs. How would you notify those people you would most need to contact? How would you contact the media, triage, parents? Do you have an out-of-state phone number you can call; if possible, you should have one.” Lier noted that there is an Emergency Plan and an Emergency Operations Center (or Communication and Coordination Center) for the University. “But we have not conducted a drill to practice our emergency responses, and that drill should take place. You need to practice what you would be doing,” she stressed.

Lier has a draft of the revised Emergency Plan. It has all tasks and procedures listed: to check labs, to coordinate with triage centers, to coordinate with volunteers, and other tasks. The Emergency Plan will undergo a revision in the near future. It will then be sent out to schools to assist them in creating their own preparedness plan.

Lier said, “We have to have an excellent communications system in place for an emergency. What will work (or what at least are more likely to work) are the Internet, ham radios, E-mail, and the like. What will not work are mobile phones. And we must know how to establish emergency connections with our greater community, especially with the state.”

“We must preserve ourselves,” Lier said emphatically. “How long can we be down and still be the University of Washington? (UC Berkeley said it can be down no more than 30 days and still be UC Berkeley.) Everyone should be prepared for 72 hours *away from home*.”

Lier said buildings on campus are being retrofitted to better withstand an emergency such as the earthquake that stunned Seattle last year. (The largest retrofitting project by far is the two-year renovation of Suzzallo Library, well over halfway completed. If last year’s earthquake had erupted six weeks sooner, significantly greater damage would have befallen the library.) Fourteen buildings are currently targeted for retrofitting.

Lier said, “These plans will eventually apply to all three campuses.”

Cox added that a two-phase project is under way to get emergency back-up power for 62 buildings on campus.

Schufelberger said there should be a checklist for identifying everything in an office or a lab that one should take care of now to minimize the potential for injury and/or damage in the event of an emergency. Lier agreed, and said there will be such a checklist. But she reminded the council once again, “You have to find the right solution for *your* office and department.”

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

Cox said that under the Master Plan, sites for new facilities were identified, but the specific building to be placed on the site is left open and flexible to a great degree. “We wanted more flexibility so as not to have to amend the plan as more specific information was known about new buildings.”

Cox said there is a movement “away from easily defined academic programs.” This is due in great part to the fact that there are far more interdisciplinary programs now. “We are trying to allow for development of this kind of building, not specifically identified as a ‘Geology building’ or ‘English building’.”

She said there is also a decline in state funding which is projected to continue over the next several years and that makes it difficult to anticipate when specific buildings might be implemented based on a long-term plan. “We need to be more entrepreneurial in developing funding strategies for our facilities, and this will require us to be more flexible about which buildings are built when,” she stressed.

Cox distributed a “General Site Approval Process” showing the progression from “Schools, Colleges, and Units” (the origin of a proposal for a major new building) to the final site approval and approval to proceed with design by the Board of Regents. Cox and the council then discussed the entire approval process as delineated in the chart.

Cox said the General Site Approval Process builds on existing authority, with the Board of Regents having final site approval authority. Academic units come forward first, with a new proposal. The proposal is then submitted to the provost for site assessment. Under “Provost,” it was decided to change “Site Assessment Initiated” to “Site Alternatives Assessment Initiated” to correct the unintended implication that the Provost’s Office was initiating assessment of one specific site assessment, and not several site alternatives.

From the Provost’s Office, the proposal goes to CASPO (with support from CPO) to identify and evaluate site options. The proposal is evaluated to see if there is an available site in the Master Plan that fits the programmatic needs of the submitting school, college, or unit. The proposal then goes to the Capital

Facilities Committee (on which Provost Huntsman and Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig serve) to identify a preferred site, and to sign the project agreement.

Schaufelberger said, "There needs to be input at an early stage in the process from the campus community. Specifically, we need some people's opinions on possible site alternatives before the Capital Facilities Committee enters the process. This is because of emotional issues, which, as everyone remembers, were pronounced with respect to the new Law School. You need to consult with those who work or live at a particular site, to avoid disconcerting political problems."

Cox and Doherty concurred. Cox said, "We need FCUFS feedback on proposals that can truly move forward." Schaufelberger said, "You need to have CASPO approach CUCAC or FCUFS and ask, 'Are there any emotional, or other, problems with this proposal?'" Rutherford said, "The worst thing is if people are not consulted, if they only find out from a *fait accompli*." Balick corroborated this observation: "Faculty and other community output is vital."

Cox said she will move CUCAC and FCUFS up the approval process to the third step, in tandem with CASPO. The second appearance of CUCAS and FCUFS will be adjusted to follow, and not precede, the initiation of the predesign study by the Capital Facilities Committee. They will act in tandem with AACF at that step in the process.

It was emphasized that, with major new buildings, there is a particular need to look at options. This bears on the first appearance of the Board of Regents in the process ("Comments on Options as part of semiannual report"). It was suggested that "more real cost information" needs to be shared at this juncture. It was further suggested that FCUFS ex officio member Richard Chapman, Associate Vice President for Capital Projects, could give a summation of the semiannual report to the council at this point in the process.

Doherty said that CUCAC is concerned about the General Site Approval Process and would like to learn what is anticipated with respect to new proposals. She said, "We have told CUCAC that every six months we will update them on the status of current and future development projects. The first report will be when they receive the written 'Annual Report' on the Campus Master Plan, followed six months later by a verbal presentation to CUCAC on the same subject." Cox added that there are "two kinds of reviews: 1) projects going forward [for the most part, projects over five million dollars]; and 2) projects being considered."

Cox said, "We have three levels of budget forecasting: 1) biennial forecasting; 2) six-year forecasting; and 3) 10-year forecasting, or the Master Plan (beyond projects currently in the pipeline). Cox said, "The Governor's office produces its own 10-year forecasting plan, and we want to be coordinate with that plan."

The revised General Site Approval Process, following today's discussion, is as follows: 1) Schools, Colleges/Units (Proposal for Major New Buildings); 2) Provost (Site Alternatives Assessment Initiated); 3) CASPO with support from CPO (Identify and evaluate site options) in tandem with CUCAC and FCUFS; 4) Capital Facilities Committee (Identify a Preferred Site/Project Agreement Signed); 5) Architectural Commission (Architectural Opportunities Report and Architect selection); 6) Regents (Comments on Options as part of semiannual report); 7) Capital Facilities Committee (Initiate Predesign Study); 8) FCUFS, AACF, and CUCAC (review and comment); 9) Capital Facilities Committee (Approval of Predesign, Recommendation for Design Contract and Final Site Approval; and 10) Regents (Final Site Approval and Approval to Proceed with Design).

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Thursday, February 14, 2002, at 12:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

