

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Thursday, **January 14, 2005**, at 3:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Heerwagen, Korshin, Rorabaugh and Treser;
 Ex officio members Chamberlin, Jan Arntz-Richards (for Chapman), Fales, Liias, McCray and Pike.
 Guest John Coulter, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs; and Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs, Office of Regional Affairs.

ABSENT: **Professor** Souter;
 Ex officio members Waddell and Liias.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 29, 2004 were approved as written.

Campus Transportation Planning – Peter Dewey, Assistant Director of Transportation Services; and Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs.

Peter Dewey, Assistant Director of Transportation Services, gave a brief background on recent efforts in transportation planning at the University of Washington. Schaufelberger said the council's chief interest is in long-range transportation planning at the University.

Dewey said the University has been doing intensive long-range transportation planning since the mid 1970's. Much of the effort has quite naturally focused on ways to limit the vehicle-trips to the campus and the area surrounding the campus.

The first phase in long-range transportation planning was the inauguration of car-pooling programs. In 1983 discounts for transit passes were created for the first time. And in 1991 the U-PASS program was created. A "radical reorientation" of pricing for transportation went into effect. With a U-PASS, those coming to campus paid half the normal bus fare. It cost four times more to drive than it did to take the bus or to car pool. The alternatives also improved: There was more bus service available; bike facilities were enhanced all over campus; and the Burke Gilman Trail was repaved.

Dewey said it must always be borne in mind that Transportation Services is a self-sustaining program. The money it makes is reinvested in transportation services, for the most part. Dewey said the U-PASS program has been "very successful" in its first decade-and-a-half of existence. "The population at the University has grown considerably, however [since 1991]; thus, the challenge in transportation services has remained demanding. There are now 11,500 parking stalls on the campus at UW Seattle."

Asked about rising or falling numbers of vehicle-trips to campus, Dewey said, "More and more people have chosen not to drive [to and from the campus]. And much of this can be attributed to the increasing success of the U-PASS program."

As for a breakdown of commuters to [UW Seattle's] campus, Dewey said, "10% of our population (6,000) lives on the eastside. Another 6,000 lives in Snohomish County. North Seattle has by far the largest population of campus commuters. A significant number of commuters come from Capitol Hill. And many come from South King County and Pierce County."

Asked about the other campuses, Dewey said, "We do some transportation planning for UW Tacoma and UW Bothell, though most of our efforts thus far have focused on UW Seattle." He said the expectation is

that there will be growth on all three campuses. “They are financed independently,” he added, “though we sell U-PASSES to UW Bothell. Asked by Schaufelberger about planning between the three campuses, Dewey replied: “Three years ago, Metro reoriented a route that includes UW Bothell and UW Seattle, as well as other stops. This has proved very successful.” He said there are “closer academic ties between UW Seattle and UW Bothell [than between UW Tacoma and UW Seattle].” There is limited express service to UW Tacoma. He noted that there is a “high growth in transit routes to both Tacoma and Bothell.”

Asked about the make-up of Transportation Services, Dewey said, “The department includes Parking Services, Transportation Planning [in the Transportation Office], the U-PASS program, Motor Pool, and Transportation Services. My job is transportation planning. Again, all entities in Transportation Services are independently financed. Parking subsidizes the U-PASS Program. U-PASS includes Metro and other services too that go well beyond Seattle.”

Referring to the 2003 U-Pass Annual Report, Dewey pointed out that the U-PASS annual budget is approximately \$11,525,471, which covers a variety of expenses. At \$10 million, the largest single expenditure is for transit service contracts. Funding for the U-PASS comes from user fees, parking permits, parking fines and other University sources. Revenue from U-PASS sales covers 49 percent of program costs. The University’s contribution to the program, which comes from parking fines and other UW sources, is \$1.5 million per year. The remainder of the revenues is transferred from the University’s parking permit sales in order to help fund the U-PASS program.

Dewey said students pay \$13 per month for U-PASSES (for a one-zone PASS), whereas they would pay \$50 per month without the U-PASS. Dewey said, “We may change the cost of the U-PASS according to kind of usage and other factors.” But it is not known when that change might be effected.

Dewey said, “The big picture – where we are going – has to do with such questions as: How many people will be coming here [not only to the UW Seattle campus, but to all three campuses]? The Campus Master Plan establishes an estimated growth over time. For employees, it is a straightforward projection. For students, there is a ten-year estimate, but that estimate is less straightforward.”

Dewey said there already is a “limited vehicular capacity on the streets in the University District, and on arterials entering the U-District from nearby neighborhoods; and there is limited parking as well. The central question remains: How do we get fewer people to drive here?” Asked about figures over time on the campus population, Dewey noted that upwards of 62,000 employees and students come to the campus today (where 80% of the overall campus population is present on any given day). This number is up considerably from the preceding decade.

Addressing projections for 2012, Dewey said that target figures include 51% SOV for faculty, 36% SOV for staff, and 7% SOV for students. He added: “These figures are based on a random survey.” He stressed once again, “We need to get faculty and staff out of their cars; we can’t rely on students in this area.” Balick asked, “Where does the push have to come from?” Dewey said the key problem “is that we don’t have the transit resources we require to get more people to take transit. There are not enough seats available in certain corridors. We’ll maintain 12,300 parking spaces, and not exceed that number, per the Master Plan 2002-2012. Because there are limits in transit and parking, we need more biking and walking [to campus]. There are 1,300 employees and students per day who live within two miles of campus who choose to drive.”

Dewey told the council that parking has a varying distribution of utilization. Parking on campus peaks at noon, as does classroom utilization. Autumn Quarter is considered the peak season in parking utilization, followed by Winter, Spring, and Summer, in that order.

Dewey said a new faculty member sent him an E-mail in which he was asked: Why isn’t parking free at night? “We’re self-sustaining,” he reiterated. “We get \$1 million per year from parking after 4:00 p.m. We would have to get that money from elsewhere.” He added: “We *are* more liberal about parking slots at night.”

On the subject of housing, Dewey suggested: “Regarding better-priced housing near the University, which would alter travel modes, we checked different universities around the world. We have, in Washington, a different constitution; we don’t have the funding, and haven’t found a means to do this as yet [i.e., get better-priced housing close to campus].” With respect to housing stock, Dewey said 70% of the houses within a mile of the University are not associated with the University. As for biking, he noted: “We have the largest number of bike ‘lockers’ [among universities] in the nation. It’s obviously much cheaper to bike to campus. But there is a conflict with biking longer distances. The Burke Gilman Trail is great, but we are not likely to get another such trail in any other direction.” Balick said: “If we nudged the City to put in more bike lanes, they might be put in.”

Dewey said he would be glad to come to another FCUFS meeting, if the council would like him to.

Regional Biocontainment Laboratory at UW – John Coulter

Schaufelberger informed the council that Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath expressed disappointment – at the January 10, 2005 Senate Executive Committee Meeting – that faculty governance was not abided by in the grant proposal process for a new DHHS/NIH biosafety level-3 Regional Biocontainment Laboratory (RBL) at the University of Washington. In his opening remarks at the SEC meeting, Ross said, “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.”

John Coulter, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, and Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs, told the council today: “None of us wants this [process] to be a secret.” He said the grant proposal was a faculty-driven effort. “Faculty got the grant, and sought a place in Health Sciences immediately.” Coulter said, “I worry about the people in the labs.” He noted that the difference between a P3 and P4 facility [this would be a P3 facility] “is significant”. He said, “We have about 30 P3 facilities at UW Health Sciences. We have no P4 facilities here.”

Coulter emphasized that “we want to explain [the proposal and the facility] in our community. We want to have them see the grant application.” He said that, “from a health and safety aspect, we need such a building, whether on or off campus.” He noted that the grant application “got sent out two weeks before deadline [for submission]. We want everyone to see it.” He said the state “is very supportive” of the proposal.

As for the purpose of [the work to be performed in] the building, Coulter said, “Its purpose is to develop vaccines. The government is interested in protecting against bioterrorism, and that is why we got the grant. We’re using the bioterrorist money to work on these vaccines.” Tresser said, “I thought this grant proposal went through the usual process.” Coulter said, “We have a good committee to check all the issues. This building would be a very safe building.”

Schaufelberger said Karen Van Dusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety, will be asked to visit the next FCUFS meeting, along with “other relevant players,” to discuss the proposal and the facility with the council. Schaufelberger said, “The process for site selection was *not* followed; the process for grant application *was* followed.” [He distributed a sheet delineating the General Site Selection Process.] Pike said, “This all happened very quickly. The decision to move forward was not made until December 2004. The grant stipulated that ‘this is a potential site’.” Devasia said, “The perception [throughout the University] is that there has been a lack of following through on the [site selection] process.”

Schaufelberger said, “The University is committed to shared governance. Faculty Senate leadership was never consulted [in this grant proposal process]. CUCAC was never consulted. It looked like a fait accompli.” Rorabaugh said, “The administration should have known to contact the Faculty Senate leadership.” Chamberlin asked, “Could we get a timeline on when people involved in the process knew what they knew?” Pike said she would get the timeline and show it to the council. Schaufelberger said, “When you submit a grant application as a faculty member, there is a process you need to go through.” Tresser commented: “If you short-circuit the process, there will be a problem with perception.”

Devasia said he is dismayed that “when a presentation is given in an FCUFS meeting, everything has already been decided, and sometimes, everything has already been done. It’s a frustrating experience for me personally.” Pike said, “Most projects do move more slowly than this project moved. Perhaps we should talk [to FCUFS] about potential projects.” Balick said: “It’s all about faculty being allowed to have influence on the [facilities] project process.”

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Friday, March 4, 2005, at 3:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder