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 March 19th, 2015

The minutes from March 19th, 2015 were approved as written.

4) Chair’s Report

FCUFS Class C Resolution on Childcare

Christie reported the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) approved the FCUFS Class C resolution on childcare with one minor edit, and it will now be forwarded to the Faculty Senate to be voted in the April 23rd meeting. The Faculty Council on Student Affairs (FCSA) has also endorsed the resolution, he noted.

Recent UW Architectural Commission meeting

Christie noted the Burke Gilman Trail renovations have been redesigned to have simpler, lower-cost mixing zones as concerns have grown over an internal and external analysis which show that the project may be up to 70% over budget. He added there has been discussion over what will happen with the Burke Gilman Trail section adjacent to the Life Sciences Building, which is not yet known. He explained there will need to be either a wall or a bridge constructed to account for the terrain.
Christie mentioned there have been conceptual designs for the West Campus Utility Plant, with a plan for inclusion of an interpretive display, which may show information on sustainability programs at the university. Though, he noted a number of groups will likely have interest in utilizing the display for alternative purposes. He noted the design for this building has been well-accepted.

Christie explained there have been redesigns for the entrance to the Burke Museum, and the adjoining parking lot, with a goal to make it simpler.

Christie informed the council there is a study for UWS South Campus which includes a plan for replacing most of the buildings in that region over a 20 year period. He noted the initial proposal was to only replace the parking lot in south campus, but the plan has since evolved. After some questions from the council, Christie explained Lyndsey Cameron (Principal Architectural Associate, Office of the University Architect in Planning and Management) may be able to provide more information on the proposed renovations in a future council meeting. There was some discussion over the architects’ desire to balance critical mass density for research purposes with a design that remains aesthetically pleasing - in the new Life Sciences Building.

5) John Seidelmann, Major Project Activity Report, One Capital Plan Update (Exhibit 1)

John Seidelmann (Director, Capital and Space Planning, Office of Planning and Management) was present to give an update to the council on the Major Project Activity Report and the One Capital Plan.

State Capital Budget Requests

Seidelmann explained that his department’s first priority is Minor Capital Repair. He explained legislative budgets show the minimum allotment of funds requested to be available for this project.

Seidelmann explained that the Health Sciences Education T-Wing Renovation/Addition will be funded through the Predesign stage, as requested.

He noted the Computer Science Engineering Expansion Project will see support in the level of Design, though no funding for the Construction phase is seen currently.

Seidelmann explained the Life Sciences Building is showing no funding in any of the state budgets. Christie reminded the council that the fifth floor of the Life Sciences Building will be left as a “shell” if no funding is provided or otherwise located.

Seidelmann explained the UW Tacoma Urban Solutions Center (Construction Phase) is supported in the senate budget.

The School of Nursing Simulation Learning Lab and the Health Sciences Interprofessional Education Classroom are both supported.

Seidelmann explained the Burke Museum is showing it will be supported in its total requested amount of $46 million.
Seidelmann explained his office will develop their own capital budget after the budget amount are finalized.

Seidelmann explained the Computer Science Engineering Expansion Project is unique as both the Design and Construction phases have funding requests in this session. Normally, he explained, large scale projects request funding for only one phase, each two years.

*One Capital Plan (Exhibit 1)*

Seidelmann noted that the One Capital Plan is an overview of the next ten years and is used for developing fiscal year capital budgets for a subsequent two years. He explained all the schools and colleges are asked to submit proposals to potentially be included in the plan. He clarified that some of the proposed projects are more workable than others based on their ability to be funded and their institutional importance; the One Capital Plan is used to anticipate what future investments should be, and potentially could be, going forward in planning for the next ten years.

Seidelmann noted that currently, his office has requested that all schools and colleges submit proposals for the One Capital Plan, including an additional one page description of their projects and justification for including them in the plan. Seidelmann explained this process is brand new this year, and is meant to aid in refining the list. He noted they have seen 140 proposals - 41 of those being new, and 36 having recently dropped off. They garner a sense of new projects through this method, and also better understand the priorities of the schools and colleges. Seidelmann noted they have reviewed all new project proposals at this point, and have had a chance to ask for additional information on certain projects.

Seidelmann explained that the Capital Projects Office is now starting the institutional review process for the first draft of the One Capital Plan with FCUFS. He noted they will also consult with varying schools and colleges, Treasury, Advancement, and other departments. Eventually, the plan will go to the university President and Provost for any adjustments, and then to the UW Board of Regents in May and again in June for approval of the capital budget.

*Questions*

After looking through the draft One Capital Plan (Exhibit 1), the council asked several questions.

After question, Seidelmann explained that one project the council might have interest in is the Childcare Expansion Project, which has been elevated on the list of projects.

Seidelmann explained there are a number of roof replacement projects included in the plan, which go beyond simple minor repairs.
One Capital Plan 2015 Update

April 2015
One Capital Plan
Overview

- Current FY Capital Budget and view of next 10 Years
- Projects identified by Unit proposals and institutional planning
- Updated with best project information available
- Project prioritization by Tier based on:
  - Urgency of need
  - Institutional support
  - Funding availability
- Tier III - Future Funding Opportunities beyond 10 year funding expectations
One Capital Plan Update

Proposals

- Request for proposals sent to all Schools, Colleges and Administrative Units
- 140 project proposals received
  - Project description, purpose and need
  - Risks/Issues/Opportunities
  - ASF/GSF and estimated project cost
  - Proposed fund sources
- 41 new projects added
- 36 projects removed
One Capital Plan Update
Administrative Review

- Data entry and reconciliation
- Review of program requirement, type, and square feet
- CPO validation of cost estimates based on:
  - Existing estimates and assumptions
  - Approximate program space needs (GSF)
  - Rough order of magnitude cost ($/GSF)
  - Level of certainty in site, scope and budget
- Preliminary proposed fund sources and timing
One Capital Plan Update
Institutional Review

- Schools/Colleges/Units
- FCUFS/SCPB
- Treasury/Advancement - debt/donor analysis
- Planning & Management with Provost/President
  - Prioritization, fund sources, and timing
  - 2015-17 Capital Budget
- Board of Regents
  - One Capital Plan - May 2015
  - Capital Budget Approval - June 2015
Capital Planning and Development Process

1. Project Identification
   - Program estimate (GSF)
   - Site options identified
   - ROM cost estimate $/GSF
   - Low accuracy

2. Project Feasibility
   - Program defined
   - Site considerations
   - Cost estimate $/GSF
   - +/- 25% accuracy

3. Project Development
   - Pre-design scope defined
   - Site development cost
   - Factored cost estimate
   - +/- 15% accuracy

4. Project Implementation
   - SD/DD/CD design specs.
   - Site selected and approved
   - Cost estimates at each stage
   - +/- 10% to +/- 5% accuracy

One Capital Plan
- Project Prioritization (Tiers I, II, III)
- Funding Plan
- Debt capacity analysis
- FY Capital Budget

One Capital Plan updated with best project information available

Financial Feasibility
- Due diligence (debt, donor)
- Regents Approve FY Capital Budget
- Regents Approve Individual Projects > $15M

Priority projects advance to next stage of development

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
After question, Kennedy (president’s designee) explained that the E1 Parking Lot Replacement’s high cost can be attributed to the fact that the lot was originally built on a landfill, and is now deteriorating. Renovations for the area are inherently expensive, as is the surrounding soil remediation.

Seidelmann explained the School of Nursing Building is a new project. He noted the dean of Nursing has requested that the office look at the possibility of a new building instead of smaller planned renovations to an existing structure. Christie noted the building will have to interact with the plan for the whole of south campus.

Seidelmann noted the One Capital Plan will be finalized in May 2015. The council thanked Seidelmann for presenting.

6) Andy Casillas, South Transit Update (Exhibit 2)

U-link

Andy Casillas (Project Manager, Capital Projects Office) noted he is present to give an update on Sound Transit. He explained he will also give information on the Montlake Triangle Project, as it is indirectly associated.

Casillas explained that U-link (University link) refers to a portion of transit that goes from Westlake to the University of Washington. He noted Northgate-link is the area between Husky Stadium and Northgate mall.

Casillas mentioned that this month and next month they are beginning pre-certification testing of light rail trains. Sound Transit has very recently begun physically bringing in trains and conducting fit tests, he explained. In June 2015, they will reduce the fencing around the transit station, and open up the rest of the plaza.

Casillas explained that in June 2015, it will be known if the project is running on schedule, and a launch date will be confirmed for the year 2016.

Casillas explained that tests will be conducted in July to assess the vibration from the trains while running at speed, to make sure the vibrations meet acceptable standards for operating near the UWS campus. This is tested by setting up measuring probes in four nearby buildings, he explained.

Casillas noted that the certification testing process for U-link will not satisfy certification requirements for Northgate-link, which will require its own testing in the year 2020.

He noted in August, FTA testing will begin for the trains in motion. This process includes running the trains at varying speeds while evaluating safety systems, communication systems – if there any life-safety issues, patrol issues, and so on.

Casillas explained on May 1st, NE Pacific Pl. roadway will reopen to all traffic. He explained in early June 2015 the entire vista triangle will be opened.
Sound Transit
Montlake Triangle Project

Construction Progress update
April 16, 2015
ST U-Link Milestones

- April-May – pre-certification testing of light rail trains
- June – reduce construction fencing to head house only
- June – ST announce official opening date
- July – Certification testing for vibration and EMI compliance
- August – Pre-revenue testing (FTA)
- 1Q 2016 start light rail service to UW

MTP Milestones

- May 1st – open up NE Pacific Place to all traffic
- June – open entire vista, triangle and BGT to public
ST Northgate Link

- Web cam [http://www.earthcam.net/projects/jcmnorthlinkllc/soundtransit/?cam=cam3](http://www.earthcam.net/projects/jcmnorthlinkllc/soundtransit/?cam=cam3)
- May – NB TBM start tunneling from RVS to UDS
- Oct – NB TBM hole through at UDS
- Dec – NB TBM arrive at 15th Street to start under campus
- April 2016 – NB TBM arrive at Husky stadium
- SB TMB 2-3 months behind
U-District Station
Casillas noted a redesign took place concerning the railing of the vista triangle, which involved swapping the material of the railing from aluminum to steel for financial reasons. However, the steel was less pliable, and ultimately not a workable substitute. He noted the new handrail will be shipped in on May 8th and 9th and installed. Traffic will be largely circumvented in the area during those days, he mentioned.

Balick explained that he had concern over weeds growing in landscaped areas, as the associated maintenance to remove them has been costly in the past. Casillas affirmed that there are indeed already weeds, which arrived from the landscape vendor. He explained dandelion roots in particular are very strong, and expensive to remove. Casillas noted his team has been meeting regularly with landscaping contractors to carry out early weeding, before invasive plants have a chance to seed or sprout.

**Northgate-link**

Casillas explained there are two tunnel-boring machines which have begun boring tunnels from Northgate to the UWS campus. He explained those tunnels will be finished at the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.

Casillas explained that in May 2015, a tunnel will begin being bored from Roosevelt Station to the U-District Station. In October, the tunnel boring machine will have arrived in front of the UW towers. In December, the boring machine should arrive on the fringes of the UWS campus on 15th St., with an aim for the tunnel to be completely bored out to Husky Stadium in April 2016.

Casillas explained that the U-District Station work zone is about two-thirds excavated currently, and by the time a concrete platform is laid at the bottom, the tunnel boring machine will have nearly arrived at the site.

**Council feedback**

Mescher explained that there is a chance that experimental work/research may be adversely affected by tunnel-boring machines passing under the UWS campus. She noted the fact that one machine is behind the other in its work, and questioned if this may bear implications of an extended period of possible disruption. Casillas explained that there is a ten-month timeframe to bore the tunnels, and little can be rearranged as the machines must be extracted from the work zones near the same time when they have completed their work. He mentioned that one machine has been slowed, to see if the other is able to catch up in its amount of progress, as a potential troubleshoot for an extended period of disruption, and generally to allow for both machines to operate in sync.

Balick recommended that in a future FCUFS meeting the council look into the plans for construction of the U-District Station. Casillas mentioned that the date of mobilization for beginning construction on the U-District Station is April of 2017. He noted before this date, there will be excavations and concrete work, but construction will largely quiet down after that, until the build date.
The council thanked Casillas for presenting and he left.

7) Housing and Food Services Phase IV: McCarty Hall Replacement

Jon Lebo (Director, Major Projects Group, Capital Projects Office) and Victoria Morris (Project Manager, Capital Projects Office) were present to share information with the council regarding the McCarty Hall Replacement.

Lebo explained the concept for North campus includes replacing both McCarty Hall and Haggett Hall with new student housing. He explained the first component of ‘Phase IV: A’ is demolishing McCarty Hall. He noted early site work will begin for ‘Phase IV: A’ in winter of 2016. The project is slotted for completion in the summer of 2018. He noted they are requesting the UW Board of Regents approve this plan next month.

Lebo explained they are also incorporating a new dining hall in Building D of the new site, as well as a commissary (restaurant). Lebo explained this dining facility will provide services to students, faculty, and staff. He explained there are plans for meeting rooms, fitness centers, seminar spaces; the concept is based in creating a “village,” he explained. One of the buildings, for example, includes plans for a small market café.

A member asked what the net gain in beds will be after the project is fully completed and the old buildings demolished. Lebo mentioned the net gain in beds will be approximately 300. He noted the overall net gain for all the phases of campus housing renovations will yield a net gain of roughly 3000 beds, however.

Lebo explained that the concept of “surplus” planned for McMahon Hall refers to looking at alternatives for the Hall, such as renovations to make it into an office, or another facility. This could also mean demolishing the building, he noted.

Lebo clarified that demolishing existing buildings was ultimately found to be cheaper than remodeling them. Moreover, new buildings allow for varied approaches to room design. Lebo noted the room rates for the newly built facilities are roughly $600-750 dollars per month. He noted that they are also looking into triples and quad rooms, as well as communal bathrooms, in providing lower cost alternatives. He explained they did not want to create a “cheaper” building (e.g. the concept of a low-rent building). Lebo mentioned that housing rates will increase much more significantly off-campus, in comparison to on-campus housing, due to interest rates and other factors.

Lebo mentioned that campus safety has been very important in all stages of design for the new housing complex - including lighting, door design, and large-scale designs of the spaces to minimize possible “lurker” areas.

After question, Lebo explained that childcare was not considered in the revisions of buildings because of the construction type his office is utilizing for new buildings. He clarified that the wood construction design they use is not compliant with childcare building codes.
Kennedy noted Josh Kavanagh (Director, UW Transportation) and himself have discussed renovating the area of the N5 parking lot for childcare. It was noted adjacent green space is also necessary for buildings used for childcare, which is another obstacle in finding buildings for that particular use.

8) Good of the Order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

9) Adjourn

Christie adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.
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