Meeting Synopsis:

1. Agreement on FCUFS Review of Capital Projects
2. Review of the draft One Capital Plan

1. Agreement on FCUFS Review of Capital Projects

Rich Christie distributed an email from Senate Chair Jack Lee dated Thursday, April 10 discussing an agreement between Paul Jenny, Vice Provost of Planning and Budgeting, and the Senate Leadership, concerning faculty governance input to the capital planning process.

The Council then discussed the agreement with John Seidelmann of the Office of Planning and Budgeting (OPB), who works for Paul Jenny and is the designated OPB contact for the Council. Minor modifications were made to better suit the availability of the Council and its interaction with the process. In particular we agreed that:

a. OPB will bring a draft revision of the One Capital Plan to the Council for review once a year in April. The plan is only modified once a year, and April is the right time to influence the revision. (The Lee email said twice a year.) There was some discussion as to whether a review in April would permit enough time to respond should a major issue arise. We decided that the Capital Plan has enough inertia that a major issue arising in April would reasonably require the next year to resolve.

b. OPB will bring the minor preservation projects 10 year plan to the Council for review in May of even years. OPB will bring the biennial minor projects budget to the Council for review in May of odd years. (The Lee email had proposed doing this twice a year, but the budgeting is on a biennial basis.)

c. OPB will bring projects to the Council for review after a project agreement is signed but before the project is sent to the regents. The Council will include faculty on the project team at the review, if possible. The Council will schedule biweekly meetings in coming years to provide timely review of the projects, and may also conduct special meetings if a review is urgent. OPB will try to bring projects to the Council before siting is finalized.

d. The Council will add a standing agenda item for OPB and a Capital Projects Office (CPO) representative to provide short updates on important changes in project status, aka ‘the buzz’.

e. OPB will notify the FCUFS Chair of projects that will be presented to the Regents about two weeks before the Regents meeting. The purpose is to allow the chair to provide a brief to the Senate Chair concerning the project, whether it has been reviewed by FCUFS and if there are any outstanding issues of FCUFS concern.

2. Review of the Draft One Capital Plan
The Council and John Seidelmann reviewed the draft One Capital Plan.

Rich Christie asked about the University debt limit. John said that debt capacity is determined by UW policy to maintain its credit rating. The One Capital Plan identifies potential borrowing of about $1.6B in the next 10 years. John estimates that about half that amount will be possible, so the UW will need to prioritize its debt funded projects.

Rich asked if there were expanded descriptions of the projects, as the one line descriptions in the One Capital Plan are sometimes too vague. John agreed that better descriptions would be useful and said that OPB is working on assembling project descriptions. Rich asked if they could be available online for the next review next year.

Rich noted that a Child Care project was in Tier III, meaning unlikely to be funded. In the ensuing discussion the Council strongly supported a higher priority for expanded child care facilities. Child care had excellent prospects for donor support, as rich alumna and the wives of rich alumni were quite likely to be attracted by the prospect of having a child care facility with their names. The Council had heard last year from Mindy Kornberg, VP of Human Resources, that if child care space could be found (regulations make this space expensive) HR could find contractors to provide the child care services, so that only capital was needed, not an operating budget. John will take the Council’s views back to OPB.

The Council resolved to send a letter supporting development for child care to Connie Travis, after checking with the child care task force.

Rich asked about the ‘CSE Multiple Building Renovation’ project in Tier III, given that CSE has a new building and a second new building project is high in Tier II. John said that this may be left over from previous versions of the One Capital Plan and would be looked at.

Rich asked which of the Tier II projects were likely to go to the Regents in the coming year. John went through the plan and listed about 15 such projects. Each project was briefly discussed, with commentary about its importance and various funding mechanisms. Rich asked John to identify the top three such projects. John listed:

- The Life Sciences building, which will be funded for design
- The new CSE building
- The Health Sciences Education Phase IV T Wing Renovation, which will be a high priority for state funding.

A general comment from the Council was that the Tier system does not do a good job distinguishing among high and low priority projects. For example, Richard Chapman, VP of Capital Projects, announced a week ago Monday that he would take the Molecular Engineering Building Phase II (a Tier II project on the One Capital Plan) to the Regents for approval at the May meeting. (This is apparently based on using Sound Transit funds to build Phase II in order to move research into Phase II and away from Sound Transit tunneling.) Also, the new CSE building is Tier II, but appears to have a high priority. Presumably this is the motivation for the ‘buzz’ agenda item.
At the conclusion of the meeting the Council thanked John and OPB for their time and effort in making the review opportunity possible.

Minutes by Rich Christie, FCUFS Chair richc@uw.edu

Present: Faculty: Christie (Chair), Balick, Nash-Gates
Ex-Officio Reps: Byrne, Zuchowski
Guests: John Seidelmann (Office of Planning and Budgeting)

Absent: Faculty: Ozubko, Proksch, Mescher
President’s Designee: Kennedy
Ex-Officio Reps: Goldblatt