Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of the Minutes from November 3rd, 2016
4. Chair’s Remarks
5. Rules of Procedure revote (attached)
7. Campus Master Plan – Questions – Theresa Doherty, Rebecca Barnes
8. Good of the Order
9. Adjourn

---

1) Call to Order

Christie called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2) Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the Minutes from November 3rd, 2016

The minutes from November 3rd, 2016 were approved as written.

4) Chair’s Remarks

Christie reported he met with the Secretary of the Faculty, and there was a concern that the formerly approved FCUFS Rules of Procedure document provided that FCUFS subcommittee chairs would be submitted to the senate for confirmation with that designation, which is not implementable under the current process. Christie reported the language in question was struck from the document, and he would like the council to revote to endorse the revised Rules of Procedure.

5) Rules of Procedure revote (attached) (Exhibit 1)

The council held a revote for the FCUFS Rules of Procedure; the document was approved (Exhibit 1). Quorum was discussed, given that the smaller campus subcommittees plan entails several new members be added to the council. Schedules for the meeting of smaller campus subcommittees were
discussed, and it was noted detailed schedule information need not be included in the Rules of Procedure.

6) **One Capital Plan – Sensitivity Testing – Mike McCormick** (Exhibit 2)

Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) and Steve Kennard (Director of Capital & Space Management, Real Estate Office) explained they have joined the council to discuss stress testing of the One Capital Plan as it relates to funding and prioritization of projects. They showed an excel document designed for this purpose (Exhibit 2).

The guests explained state funding and debt capacity are two vulnerable funding areas for One Capital Plan projects. It was noted there may be a sizeable reduction in university debt capacity, as well.

McCormick noted the stress testing task revolves around a “scoring system” that allows for individual projects to be evaluated based in certain criteria, and scored. The higher the score of a project, the higher it may be prioritized in the One Capital Plan when funding constraints occur. The idea is that scoring system will delineate which projects can be postponed versus prioritized, and this information can then be discussed with stakeholders. McCormick explained projects that accomplish multiple goals generally receive a higher score. The draft scoring criteria are as follows:

“Project earns 1 point for contributions to the following:
Reducing cost by increasing space utilization
Reducing cost by lowering DM Backlog
Increasing revenue
Investing in infrastructure (additional/better classrooms)
Accommodating student enrollment growth
Accommodating growth in research funding/activities
Enhancing the Student Experience
Enabling the Innovation Mindset
Contributing to the Public as a Philosophy” (Exhibit 2)

McCormick and Kennard noted they would like to receive feedback on the draft scoring criteria, especially relating to any potentially missing criteria.

After a question, the guests explained that the red area of the excel sheet establishes that debt funds will be used for the included projects, whereas the yellow area threshold designates projects that are highly likely to be completed. The rubric grades range from 1-7.

**Council feedback**

A member brought up how the criteria connect to the mission of the university, and explained consideration should be given to if any areas are missing relating to the university’s mission.
Christie pointed out the current scoring system is not specific enough to reflect the realities of the usefulness of the included projects. For example, classrooms which come as part of certain capital projects may be for general assignment, or for use only by the housing unit, and the former is generally more useful to the university as a whole. A member noted location of classroom space might be additional criteria to be weighted.

Whittington explained she has professional expertise in this area, and would be happy to consult with the guests outside of the meeting. She asked other council members to consider new criteria to be included in the scoring system. Whittington recommended that the draft scoring system be shared with the Campus Advisory Sustainability Fund Committee, of which she acts as a faculty advisor.

Christie explained there is an income increase that comes with the construction of a new classroom and increased capacity. He noted income dollar per square foot could theoretically be broken out by research, student credit hours, and for spaces rentable by outside vendors.

Maitland asked how “risk” is built into the current scoring model, especially liability relating to compliance, or seismic projects, which have no special attention given to them in the current model.

The guests noted the list of criteria will be revised and returned to the council for another review. It was noted consultation/outreach should occur given the new model for prioritization of projects.

Maitland brought up market share, as well as the reputation of the university as it exists externally, and noted these elements are not scored under the current model.

It was noted the topic will return for discussion in a future meeting.

7) Campus Master Plan – Questions – Theresa Doherty, Rebecca Barnes (Exhibit 3)

Christie explained the council remains focused on the university’s need for more general assignment classrooms. He explained a Class C resolution has been drafted requesting that additional classroom space be emphasized in the new Campus Master Plan (CMP). The council reviewed the document and engaged in word-smithing.

It was decided South Campus would not be addressed in the resolution, given that many classrooms there are not for general assignment, and that the ultimate goal of the resolution is to influence the CMP.

There was some discussion of a “ten-minute walk zone,” and where the focal point of that zone exists on Central Campus. It was noted a point just west of Drumheller Fountain is the middle point if you consider the locations of all general assignment classrooms on Central Campus. Further discussion revealed the current walk zones extend into South Campus too far.

Changes to the document were implemented and tracked in the meeting, concluding with a final read-through (Exhibit 3).
The resolution was approved by majority vote of council members.

8) Good of the Order

There was some discussion of garnering co-sponsors for the resolution before forwarding it to the Senate Executive Committee.

9) Adjourn

The council adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Bruce Balick, Rich Christie (chair), Murray Maitland, Bill Rorabaugh, Ashley Emery, Jan Whittington
Ex-officio reps: Chris Byrne
Guests: Mike McCormick, Steve Kennard, Rebecca Barnes

Absent: Faculty: Laura Little, Ann Mescher, Giovanni Migliaccio, Annmarie Borys
Ex-officio reps: John Carroll, Steve Goldblatt
President’s designee: Charles Kennedy

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – FCUFS Rules of Procedure Draft 3_fcufs_111716
Exhibit 2 – OCP stress test weighted sk ej Nov 16 16
Exhibit 3 – FCUFS Class C resolution
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS)
Rules of Procedure
Draft 3 November 3 2016

Preamble
Because most facilities and services are local to specific campuses, the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) is comprised of three semi-autonomous subcommittees, one for each branch campus:

- FCUFS-Seattle (FCUFS-S) for the Seattle campus
- FCUFS-Bothell (FCUFS-B) for the Bothell campus
- FCUFS-Tacoma (FCUFS-T) for the Tacoma campus

These Rules of Procedure provide procedures for the operation of the subcommittees and the full FCUFS Council.

Subcommittee Members
Subcommittee members are FCUFS voting members, and are nominated and approved in the usual way. Their designated subcommittee may be included in the nomination.

Subcommittee Chairs
The FCUFS Chair also chairs one of the subcommittees.

Subcommittee Chairs are designated by the Secretary of the Faculty with advice from the FCUFS Chair.

Jurisdiction
Subcommittees shall deal with facilities and services issues specific to their local campus. The full FCUFS shall deal with issues that broadly affect all three campuses. Issues that are not associated with a specific campus, but do not affect all three campuses, shall be dealt with by FCUFS-S. The FCUFS Chair shall resolve any jurisdictional disputes.

Subcommittees may communicate directly with relevant parts of the administration concerning facilities and services on their campus. Subcommittee chairs may communicate directly with the Chair of the Faculty Senate on relevant issues, and with the Secretary of the Faculty concerning administrative issues, provided the FCUFS Chair is kept informed.
**Meetings**

Each subcommittee shall meet on its own schedule as determined by the subcommittee Chair, and with its own agenda. The full FCUFS shall meet as determined by the FCUFS Chair, with an agenda determined by the FCUFS Chair. Full FCUFS meetings will use teleconferencing to minimize physical travel. Subcommittee Chairs shall ensure that minutes of their meetings are taken, edited, approved by the subcommittee and provided to the Secretary of the Faculty, copy to the FCUFS Chair. The FCUFS Chair shall ensure that minutes of full FCUFS meetings are taken, edited, approved and provided to the Secretary of the Faculty.
## One Capital Plan (2017-2023) by scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding in $ Millions</td>
<td>Total GSF</td>
<td>New GSF</td>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Test Targets:</td>
<td>$2,425</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma - Student Housing - Court 17 Acquisition</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine - Harborview Hall Lease</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell Campus Development - add'l. academic space</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Health Facility</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitz Hall Improvements</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Capital Repair</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Engineering Building 2</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Museum</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for projects underway:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$661</strong></td>
<td><strong>$441,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring:

- **Project earns 1 point for contributions to the following:**
  - Reducing cost by increasing space utilization
  - Reducing cost by lowering DM Backlog
  - Increasing revenue
  - Investing in infrastructure (additional/better classrooms)
  - Accomodating student enrollment growth
  - Accomodating growth in research funding/activities
  - Enhancing the Student Experience
  - Enabling the Innovation Mindset
  - Contributing to the Public as a Philosophy
A Class C Resolution Offered to the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington by the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

Draft 3 Bruce Balick, edited by Rich Christie and Bruce Balick 11/17/16

WHEREAS the education of undergraduate students on the campuses of the University of Washington is, has been, and will continue to be its primary mission and primary reason for state support, and

WHEREAS the University Master Plan anticipates an increase in undergraduate matriculation of 8000 students (20%) on the Seattle Campus by 2028, and

WHEREAS planning for facilities to assure the success of our core mission is best done on time scales of 10 and 100 years, and

WHEREAS the number of lecture-general assignment classrooms rooms with a capacity of 100 to 800 seats on the Seattle Campus has systematically lagged behind enrollment for at least a decade, and

WHEREAS the pending improvement in the utilization of existing general assignment classrooms is not likely to provide adequate classroom space in and after 2028 due to enrollment growth, and

WHEREAS future general assignment classroom space must be situated in reasonable proximity to allow students to move from one room to another in ten minutes to ensure efficient utilization of capital assets, and

WHEREAS faculty are generally very concerned about the proximity of classrooms to their offices,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty of the University urge the Provost

TO identify and protect building sites at least three designated parcels of land in the core of the central part of the Seattle Campus and similarly functional sites at other campuses for future classroom buildings to satisfy long-term needs for general assignment classroom seating, and

TO modify the Master Plan for the Seattle Campus presently under consideration for adoption in 2017 by the Regents and the City of Seattle so as to assure that the construction of buildings sited on those parcels these sites will undergo a special review for long-term impact on undergraduate education before any use of the site is approved.