Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Chair's remarks
4. Master Plan - Theresa Doherty, UW Planning and Management
5. One Capital Plan - Mike McCormick, VP, UW Planning and Development
6. CSE II Issues - Ann Mescher, FCUFS
7. Good of the Order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Christie at 10:00 a.m.

2) Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved unanimously as written.

3) Chair's remarks

Christie explained he received a complaint from a UW Seattle faculty member concerning card reader failures at exit gates in the E1 parking lot resulting in trapped drivers trying to leave the lot. After investigation of the issue, Jim Angelosante (Interim Director, UW Transportation Services) informed that the issues are due to intermittent cloud connectivity failure, which causes card readers to fail and gates to stay closed. The issue is being addressed by UW Transportation Services.

4) Master Plan - Theresa Doherty, UW Planning and Management

Theresa Doherty (Senior Project Director, Planning and Management) explained she is present to give an update on the development of the 2018 Campus Master Plan (CMP). She noted that the plan will span ten years into the future and serve as a conceptual framework for UW Seattle campus development. She used a PowerPoint during her presentation (Exhibit 1).

Doherty explained every major institution in the City of Seattle is required to complete a master plan, and UW’s must be approved by the UW Board of Regents (BoR) as well as the Seattle City Council. UW’s previous Campus Master Plan was completed in 2003. She explained that the City/University Agreement...
(CUA) establishes the official requirements of the campus master planning process; the draft and final master plans must address each of the following areas:

- Major Institution Overlay (MIO) Boundary
- General Use and Location of Proposed Development
- Future Energy and Utility Needs
- Non-Institutional Zones
- Institutional Zone and Development Standards
- Alternative Proposals for Physical Development
- Height and Location of Existing Facilities
- Existing and Proposed Circulation Network
- Proposed Development Phases and Timetable
- Existing and Proposed Open Space
- Transportation Management Plan
- Proposed Street and Alley Vacations

The CMP applies only inside the Major Institutional Overlay (MIO) boundary made up of Central, South, East, and West Campus sectors. Doherty explained that over the lifespan of the previous CMP (ten years), 3 million square feet of space was developed at UW Seattle. She noted new developments under CMP 2018 are expected to make up 6 million square feet (gross square feet) within all sectors of the UW Seattle campus; the plan identifies approximately 12.7 million gross square feet of development. She showed a “long-term vision” bird’s eye illustration of the campus (Slide 6, Exhibit 1).

Doherty explained in West Campus, a new waterfront park is being mocked up for development made up of approximately 5 acres of land. She noted development would have to occur after relocation of existing buildings in the area. A new waterfront trail is a part of the design, as well as other trails that connect down to the waterfront park. The park will include a new vista overlooking Portage Bay. Doherty explained site heights (building heights) are expected to increase in West and South Campus over the life of the 2018 CMP.

*Council feedback*

Doherty asked for questions. Christie asked if walking distances on campus are assessed as part of the CMP. Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) explained that the UW’s One Capital Plan includes strategies like walking distances, whereas the CMP addresses campus development on a grander scale.

A member asked about the process to make sure that new potential capital projects conform with the CMP. It was noted UW administration considers if a project is out of compliance with the CMP, and moreover all projects currently under consideration are incorporated into the plan during its development. After an additional question, Doherty explained that the CMP is developed in consultation with UW schools and colleges, and their own initiatives. There was some brief discussion of including FCUFS in the process for checking conformity of new projects with the CMP.
Questions subsided. Council members thanked Doherty for her presentation.

5) One Capital Plan - Mike McCormick, VP, UW Planning and Development

Introduction

Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) was present to give an update on the One Capital Plan. He noted the main goal relating to the One Capital Plan currently is to secure funding for building projects and to minimize taking on additional university debt. He used a PowerPoint as part of his presentation (Exhibit 2). McCormick explained the One Capital Plan will be reviewed by the UW Board of Regents in their June 2016 meeting as part of the 2-year repeating cycle for the Plan, which also aligns with state capital budget requests. He explained there are four areas of potential funding for capital projects: state, local, donor, and debt.

McCormick noted enrollment growth of the university is one element that must be considered for the upcoming six years. He listed some growth assumptions for 2023, including (Exhibit 2, Slide 4):

- Student enrollment in UW Seattle – from 46,000 to 49,000 FTE
- Faculty and staff in Seattle – from 21,500 to 23,000 FTE
- Research expenditures will remain flat for next few years
- Student enrollment at UW Bothell – from 4,900 FTE to 6,000 FTE
- Student enrollment at UW Tacoma – from 4,600 FTE to 6,000 FTE

He explained another major continuing cost is capital reinvestment (e.g. building maintenance), he then showed some campus planning targets for 2023:

- Capital reinvestment - 1.5-2.5% of CRV or $100-160M per year in Seattle
- Reduce deferred maintenance backlog by removing underutilized buildings

McCormick explained that an effort has been made to align the One Capital Plan with strategic initiatives around the UW. The main current initiatives are Student Experience (improve learning experience, accommodate areas of growth), Innovation Mindset (provide quality student housing, innovation district in west campus), Public as a Philosophy (improve public realm, create public resources as appropriate), and Transforming Administration (consolidate non-core functions in U District to decant other sectors, address infrastructure and renewal). Some capital projects which have been identified to align with these goals are as follows:

- Focus local/minor capital
- New buildings as shell/fit out
- Recapture underutilized space
- Proforma driven, increased equity
- Combine University investments with private development
- Continue to build South Lake Union
- Attach development of open spaces to major projects and development
- Complete Burke & Intellectual House
- Develop tower above Sound Transit for office and other uses - flexible space designed for churn
- Leverage new and existing funding sources
McCormick then displayed the draft Prioritized 6-year Capital Plan (2017-2023) (Exhibit 3).

He explained line items on the document to the council. Some minor capital money will be focused on classroom improvements as this aligns with the strategic initiative Student Experience (Item #1). Renovation of the T-Wing has become problematic, he explained, which had led to a need to alter the project; a new building will be prioritized instead of renovating the existing T-Wing in the Health Sciences Building in south campus. McCormick explained that several incorporated projects are part of an attempt to keep up with university growth.

After a question, it was noted “New O&M” in the document denotes “operating and maintenance costs,” which is an annual projection.

McCormick addressed seismic improvements at the UW after a question. This includes securing unenforced buildings and unenforced parapets. He explained that while bringing all of UW’s buildings into this initiative would cost an extreme sum of money, the immediate goal is to prevent collapse. There was some discussion of top-priority buildings, which included Lewis Hall. Christie noted the council would like to learn more about the long-term seismic event infrastructure plan for the UW in the fall of 2016.

McCormick explained that some line items are struck out in the document so that the Board of Regents can easily discern which projects were taken off since the previous capital plan.

McCormick noted that a new innovative center located in West campus has been built into the plan, wherein private and university-led research may operate side-by-side.

Questions subsided and the council thanked McCormick for the update.

6) CSE II Issues - Ann Mescher, FCUFS

Mescher explained she has an issue with the newly developed Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) II building project slotted for the construction in Central Campus. She explained her concerns are outlined in a handout to the council and guests (Exhibit 4). She noted that in 2018, the Seattle City Council and the UW Board of Regents will approve the next Campus Master Plan, though currently, the UW is operating under the previous 2003 Campus Master Plan. She listed her concerns with the building plans for CSE II, which included (Exhibit 4):

a) Inconsistent with the campus master plan
b) Based on perceived "demand" and data that is not fully honest
c) Disrespectful of immediately adjacent buildings and departments
d) Draws substantially upon state (limited) resources with inadequate discussion among stakeholders
e) No classrooms that will be available to any academic discipline other than CSE
Mescher explained that the mission of the UW guides the Campus Master Plan. She asked by what process are the goals of the CMP upheld and followed, and explained that input from many campus departments must be gathered in order to meet the goals of the CMP.

Mescher noted she would like to discuss the area near the More Hall Annex in central campus – the area where the CSE II building is scheduled to be constructed. She explained there were some other suggestions concerning renovation of that space heard in public venues, including renovation of the More Hall Annex to create a museum for UW patents and other university treasures.

Mescher explained annual updates are required by the City of Seattle for the UW’s CMP. She noted her understanding is that every six months, an update is presented to officials concerning the Plan and its progress. She explained she has not seen a record of annual updates given in the calendar years 2014 or 2015, and thus there is no indication that a new CSE II building was deliberated for construction in the More Hall Annex region by way of this process, though, that building is under development.

Mescher noted the UW’s competitor Research-I institutions go through robust processes to have their CMP’s considered by the campus community in an effort to align capital projects with the larger goals and needs of the university. She noted other disciplines (besides CSE) at the UW engage in computer simulation and modeling. Mescher noted a letter has been endorsed by the faculty and staff of Civil and Environmental Engineering expressing that department’s issues with the process for approval of the CSE II project (Exhibit 5). She noted the department of Industrial Engineering have reviewed the letter and also support it.

A member asked what Mescher would like from the council given these issues. He noted the larger issues have been received by those guests present in the council meeting. Mescher noted she would like a broader discussion opened up. There was some discussion of Microsoft and the software boom which is of economic importance to the state.

Another member asked that the many arguments be distilled down to more specific points. Mescher noted she would be happy to distill the issues to provide more clarity. It was noted the strategic initiatives of the university are not policy or code and thus no official violation has been made. A member agreed and noted he does not see what avenues the council has to further address the noted concerns.

Another member mentioned that ground is about to be broken for the CSE II building site, and it is late for objecting to the building’s development. It was noted something might be learned from these concerns, and corrected in relation to future developments.

Christie noted the council has previously agreed that the three classrooms planned for inclusion in the CSE II building are to be general assignment classrooms (for any department’s use upon request). Duane Storti (Faculty Senator, Mechanical Engineering) explained clear violations of university policies have been made apparent.
Steve Tatge (Executive Director, Major Projects, Capital Planning and Development) was present. He noted many bodies are consulted during development of the CMP, and to check that it is being complied with, noting there has been no lack of oversight or scrutiny. He noted it is fair to say that communication might have been better. Tatge mentioned that a mechanism was put in place to gather input from the College of Engineering, and noted he apologizes if this mechanism did not work.

Christie ended the discussion due to time constraints, noting the concerns would be brought up again in a future meeting.

7) **Good of the Order**

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

8) **Adjourn**

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

---

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

**Present:**  
*Faculty:* Rich Christie (chair), Laura Little, Murray Maitland, Ann Mescher, Giovanni Migliaccio, Bill Rorabaugh  
*Ex-officio reps:* Chris Byrne, John Carroll, Steve Goldblatt  
*Guests:* Theresa Doherty, Mike McCormick, Steve Tatge, Duane Storti

**Absent:**  
*Faculty:* Bruce Balick, Christopher Ozubko, Gundula Proksch  
*Ex-officio reps:* Lucas Gordon  
*President’s designee:* Charles Kennedy

**Exhibits**

- Exhibit 1 – FCUFS_May_2016_campus masterplan.pdf
- Exhibit 2 – Capital Plan update.pdf
- Exhibit 3 – Capital Plan for June_BOR SCPB -16-17 rev
- Exhibit 4 – Mescher 5/10/16 post to AAUP (partial).pdf
- Exhibit 5 – YACSB Cauce letter_final2_fcufs
2018 Campus Master Plan
Preliminary Draft Concepts

Theresa Doherty
Senior Project Director
tdoherty@uw.edu
http://pm.uw.edu/campus-master-plan
CURRENT SCHEDULE for 2018 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

• Kick off of Campus Master Plan and EIS Scoping October 14 & 15, 2015
• Preliminary Plan Concepts Developed – Winter and Spring 2016
• Draft Plan and Draft EIS published – Fall 2016
• Final Plan and Final EIS published – Winter 2017
• Hearing Examiner and City Council – Summer 2017
• City Council and Board of Regents approval – Late 2017 or early 2018
The City/University Agreement (CUA) establishes the official requirements of the campus master planning process. The draft and final master plans will address each of these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Institution Overlay (MIO) Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use and Location of Proposed Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Energy and Utility Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Institutional Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Zone and Development Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Proposals for Physical Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height and Location of Existing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Proposed Circulation Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development Phases and Timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Proposed Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Plan (TDM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Street and Alley Vacations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This plan identifies almost **12.7 million** gross square feet of development. During the life of this plan, only **6 million** will be developed within the four sectors of campus based on the square footage in the fourth column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Area</th>
<th>Net New Development Introduced (GSF)</th>
<th>Maximum Development Limit (%)</th>
<th>Maximum Development Limit (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2,010,551</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3,198,685</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2,892,735</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>4,633,571</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,735,542</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 Potential Development Sites

- 85 sites spread throughout the four sectors of campus
- Not all sites will be developed
- Only 6 million of the 12.7 identified will be developed
- Identifying more space than needed gives the University flexibility
2018 Campus Master Plan Potential* Development Site Heights

- Potential Development Sites
- Existing Buildings

*Not all potential development sites will be developed.
West Campus – Big Moves
South Campus – Big Moves
East Campus – Big Moves
Central Campus – Big Moves

Exhibit 1

[Diagram of Central Campus with various labels such as Enhanced Gateway, Active Edge, Maintain Existing Building Height, Preserve Significant Trees, Integrate Pathways, Connect to Central Campus, and Transit Station.]
Capital Plan Update

For review with Regents on June 9th

Presented by
Mike McCormick, AIA
Associate Vice President
Capital Planning & Development
One Capital Plan Process

2 Year Repeating Cycle

- **Call for Project Proposals**
  - January
  - (even years)
  - Requests are prepared working with CPD, utilizing planning metrics

- **6 Year Prioritized Plan**
  - June
  - (odd years)
  - Legislative consideration and approval modifies approach to capital plan

- **State Capital Budget Request**
  - September
  - (even years)

- **Analyze & Prioritize**
  - May/June BOR review
  - (even years)
  - Budget request vetted with Senior Administration and Board of Regents

Capital Plan serves as implementation plan into next cycle
Funding Trends

Setting Realistic Targets

Note: Funding shown is based on approval date by the Regents
Planning Assumptions

Setting Realistic Targets

Growth Assumptions for 2023

- Student enrollment in Seattle – from 46,000 to 49,000 FTE
- Faculty and staff in Seattle – from 21,500 to 23,000 FTE
- Research expenditures will remain flat for next few years
- Student enrollment at Bothell – from 4,900 FTE to 6,000 FTE
- Student enrollment at Tacoma – from 4,600 FTE to 6,000 FTE

Campus Planning Targets for 2023

- Total square footage in Seattle – add 1.6 million GSF
- Total square footage in Bothell – add 200,000 GSF
- Total square footage in Tacoma – add 165,000 GSF
- Capital reinvestment - 1.5-2.5% of CRV or $100-160M per year in Seattle
- Reduce deferred maintenance backlog by removing underutilized buildings
Strategic Alignment

Setting Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Initiatives</th>
<th>Capital Plan Goals</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Experience</td>
<td>• Improve learning environments</td>
<td>• Focus local/minor capital</td>
<td>$775M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accommodate areas of growth</td>
<td>• New buildings as shell/fit out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide quality student housing</td>
<td>• Recapture underutilized space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation District in West Campus</td>
<td>• Proforma driven, increased equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New buildings as shell/fit out</td>
<td>• Combine University investments with private development</td>
<td>$1,100M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Innovation Mindset</td>
<td>• Provide quality student housing</td>
<td>• Continue to build South Lake Union</td>
<td>$300M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation District in West Campus</td>
<td>• Attach development of open spaces to major projects and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation District in West Campus</td>
<td>• Complete Burke &amp; Intellectual House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public as a Philosophy</td>
<td>• Improve public realm</td>
<td>• Develop tower above Sound Transit for office and other uses - flexible</td>
<td>$750M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create public resources as appropriate</td>
<td>space designed for churn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidate non-core functions in U District to decant other sectors</td>
<td>• Leverage new and existing funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transforming Administration</td>
<td>• Address infrastructure &amp; renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6-Year Capital Plan Metrics

Checking the Plan

Exhibit 2
## State Capital Funding Requests

Draft for Review

### Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>2017-2019 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2019-2021 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2021-2023 UW Building Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor Capital Repair - Preservation</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burke Museum</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Major Infrastructure - Seismic Improvements (6 year plan)</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Population Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Population Health Education (T-Wing addition/reno)</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College of Engineering - Interdisciplinary Education and Research</td>
<td>Teaching/Research</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UW Bothell - Phase 4 - Academic STEM Building</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UW Tacoma - Academic Building</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UW Tacoma - Soil Remediation</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acq</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evans School - Parrington Hall Remodel</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CoEduc - Miller Hall Renovation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CoEnv - Anderson Hall Renovation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals:

- **2017-2019 State Capital Budget Request**
  - State Funds: 83,000
  - UW Building Account: 69,000

- **6 year total:** 320,000
## Prioritized 6-Year Capital Plan (2017-2023)

| Funding in $ Millions | Total Budget | Previous Cap Plan | Project GSF | New GSF | New O&M | Previous Funding | State | Debt | Donor | Local | Other | Previous Split (St|De|Do|Lo) |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|---------|---------|------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| **STUDENT EXPERIENCE** |              |                   |             |         |         |                  |      |      |       |       |       |                  |
| 1 Classroom Improvements (multi-year plan) | $30 | - | 60,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 30 | - | 182|0|20|0 |
| 2 Population Health Education (T-Wing addition/renovation) | $94 | 203 | 120,000 | 120,000 | 1.5 | 1 | 60 | - | 23 | 10 | - | 13|0|0|0 |
| 3 CoE - Interdisciplinary Education and Research | $150 | 13 | 200,000 | 50,000 | 0.9 | - | 50 | - | 50 | 50 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 UW Library Storage / Repurpose on-campus space | $15 | - | 35,000 | 13,000 | 0.2 | - | - | 10 | - | 5 | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 Evans School - Parrington Hall Remodel | $20 | 20 | 59,000 | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | 10 | - | - | - | 16|0|0|0 |
| 6 Foster School of Business - MacKenzie Hall Replacement | $65 | 65 | 90,000 | 25,000 | 0.3 | - | - | - | 65 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 Schmitz Improvements | $15 | - | 42,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 UW Bothell - North Campus - Phase 4b | $140 | 140 | 355,000 | 150,000 | 1.1 | - | - | 65 | - | - | 75 | - | 0|105|0|35 |
| 9 UW Bothell Phase 4 - Academic STEM Building | $75 | 50 | 105,000 | 105,000 | 1.3 | 1 | 54 | 10 | - | 10 | - | 59|0|0|0 |
| 10 UW Bothell - Campus Development - add'l. academic space | $50 | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0.6 | - | - | 30 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11 UW Bothell Housing - Student Housing & Dining Phase 2 | $50 | 50 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 0.9 | - | - | 40 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 12 UW Tacoma - Academic Building | $35 | - | 60,000 | 60,000 | 0.7 | - | - | 30 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13 UW Tacoma - Campus Development - add'l. academic space | $20 | - | 54,000 | 54,000 | 0.7 | - | - | 10 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 14 UW Tacoma Housing - private development | $35 | 20 | n/a | n/a | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35 | - | 16|0|4 |
| **Lewis Hall Renovation** |              |                   |             |         |         |                  |      |      |       |       |       |                  |
| **CoEnv - Anderson Hall Renovation** |              |                   |             |         |         |                  |      |      |       |       |       |                  |
| **School of Dentistry Building** |              |                   |             |         |         |                  |      |      |       |       |       |                  |
| **subtotals:** | $774 | $766 | | | | 2 | $204 | $170 | $148 | $215 | $35 | |

## INNOVATION MINDSET

| Funding in $ Millions | Total Budget | Previous Cap Plan | Project GSF | New GSF | New O&M | Previous Funding | State | Debt | Donor | Local | Other | Previous Split (St|De|Do|Lo) |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|---------|---------|------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| 15 CoE - Computer Science & Engineering Building 2 | $105 | - | 130,000 | 130,000 | 1.6 | 42 | - | - | 63 | - | - |
| 16 Population Health Sciences Building | $230 | - | 300,000 | 212,000 | 2.6 | - | 20 | - | 210 | - | - |
| 17 Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies | $100 | 179 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 1.7 | 9 | 20 | 10 | 20 | - | 41 | 60|50|60|0 |
| 18 Industry Partnership Lab Development | $400 | - | 500,000 | 500,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 19 College of Arts & Sciences - Kincaid Hall Backfill | $15 | 49 | 85,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | 49|0|0|0 |
| 20 UW Medicine - Harborview Hall Lease | $38 | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21 School of Medicine - Core Research Facilities | $12 | 12 | 11,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 School of Medicine - South Lake Union Rosen Remodel | $6 | 6 | 60,375 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 23 School of Medicine - South Lake Union Phase 3.3 | $197 | 197 | 262,000 | 262,000 | 4.5 | - | 100 | 48 | 49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **subtotals:** | $1,103 | $443 | | | | 51 | $40 | $148 | $341 | $82 | $441 | |
## Prioritized 6-Year Capital Plan (2017-2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Previous Cap Plan</th>
<th>Project GSF</th>
<th>New GSF</th>
<th>New O&amp;M</th>
<th>Previous Funding</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Previous Split</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC AS A PHILOSOPHY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Burke Museum</td>
<td>$ 83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Intellectual House Phase 2</td>
<td>$ 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 West Campus Park</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Waterfront Improvements in South Campus &amp; the Cut</td>
<td>$ 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Burke Gilman Trail Improvements - Phase 3</td>
<td>$ 16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 University District Development at Transit - non-core functions</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 UW Tacoma - Soil Remediation</td>
<td>$ 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest Hospital Expansion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 299</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 274</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 59</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 120</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 35</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 41</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMING ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 UW Medicine IT Core Applications and Infrastructure</td>
<td>$ 74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Enterprise Information Systems (Financial System)</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Major Infrastructure - Seismic Improvements (6-year plan)</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Minor Capital Repair - UW Building Account</td>
<td>$ 207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 UW Seattle - Parking garage(s) assuming add'l. 500 spaces</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 UW Seattle - Parking lot improvements</td>
<td>$ 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 UW Bothell - Parking garage</td>
<td>$ 26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Fuel Switching / Power Plant Upgrade</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Strategic Opportunities / Matching Funds</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Repair - Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 751</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 471</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 45</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 160</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 370</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 176</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,954</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,163,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,248,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 112</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 598</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 502</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 702</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 693</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,050,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 425</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 450</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 675</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Funding in $1,000s</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>2017-2019 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2019-2021 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2021-2023 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2023-2025 UW Building Account</th>
<th>2025-2027 UW Building Account</th>
<th>TOTAL State Appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Min. Capital Repair - Preservation</td>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burke Museum</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Major Infrastructure - Seismic Improvements (6 year plan)</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Population Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Population Health Education (T-Wing addition/reno)</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College of Engineering - Interdisciplinary Education and Research</td>
<td>Teaching/Research</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UW Bothell - Phase 4 - Academic STEM Building</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UW Tacoma - Academic Building</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UW Tacoma - Soil Remediation</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acq</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evans School - Parrington Hall Remodel</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CoEduc - Miller Hall Renovation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CoEnv - Anderson Hall Renovation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>PD/D/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td>$148,400</td>
<td>$93,900</td>
<td>$52,600</td>
<td>$24,100</td>
<td>$747,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 year total: $320,000
The 2003 Campus Master Plan (CMP) remains in effect until a new master plan is approved (anticipated 2018).

Schedule for the 2018 Campus Master Plan

- Kick off of Campus Master Plan and EIS Scoping – October 2015
- Preliminary Plan Concepts Developed – Winter and Spring 2016
- **Draft Plan and Draft EIS published – September 2016**
- Final Plan and Final EIS published – Winter 2017
- Hearing Examiner and City Council – Summer 2017
- City Council and Board of Regents approval – Late 2017 or early 2018

Why does it take such a long time to develop a Campus Master Plan?

The Campus Master Plan takes several years to develop because the campus environment must support and facilitate the mission of the University. To achieve this, input and feedback from a broad range of constituencies must be solicited.

Following are the stated UW Mission and Goals of the 2003 Campus Master Plan
The Mission of the University of Washington

The campus environment should support and facilitate the mission of the University. The planning process began with the mission of the University as a public institution dedicated to learning, teaching, research, and community service. With the mission as a starting point, input was solicited from the community and goals were created.

“The primary mission of the University of Washington is the preservation, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge. The University preserves knowledge through its libraries and collections, its courses, and the scholarship of its faculty. It advances new knowledge through many forms of research, inquiry, and discussion; and disseminates it through the classroom and the laboratory, scholarly exchanges, creative practice, international education, and public service. As one of the nation’s outstanding teaching and research institutions, the University is committed to maintaining an environment for objectivity and imaginative inquiry and for the original scholarship and research that ensure the production of new knowledge in the free exchange of diverse facts, theories, and ideas.

To promote their capacity to make humane and informed decisions, the University fosters an environment in which its students can develop mature and independent judgment and an appreciation of the range and diversity of human achievement. The University cultivates in its students both critical thinking and the effective articulation of that thinking.”

*University of Washington Faculty Handbook*
Goals of the Campus Master Plan

In order to support the mission of the University, the Campus Master Plan should:

**RESPECT ITS STATURE**

The Campus Master Plan should honor the status of the campus as a national treasure, a work of art, and a triumph of environmental design, enriching life with a harmonious marriage of space, form and participation.

**ENSURE STEWARDSHIP**

The Campus Master Plan should ensure good stewardship of the existing campus, maintaining and protecting the value of the University’s physical resources and character, history, architecture and open space. Change to the campus should improve and enhance, rather than detract from, the value and quality of the campus. The Campus Master Plan identifies and encourages preservation of historic resources and open space.

**PROVIDE FACILITIES**

The Campus Master Plan should provide for the facility and infrastructure needs of the next decade.

**MAXIMIZE FLEXIBILITY**

The Campus Master Plan should provide the maximum amount of flexibility in order to best accommodate future growth and take advantage of unforeseen opportunities.

**ENHANCE THE CAMPUS**

The Campus Master Plan should create an aesthetic quality appropriate to the campus as a whole and to specific areas, conserving and improving existing buildings, open spaces, and views on campus, and looking for opportunities to create additional open spaces.

**PROVIDE ACCESSIBILITY**

The Campus Master Plan should ensure access to and within the campus, maximizing non-vehicular travel, emphasizing pedestrian routes for all pedestrians, and promoting the design of environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for special arrangements or adaptations.

**PROMOTE SAFETY**

The Campus Master Plan should help create a safe and healthy environment, with personal and workplace safety considerations integral to planning and design of circulation elements, buildings, and open spaces.

**RESPECT THE ENVIRONMENT**

The Campus Master Plan should value the environment and strive to promote the conservation of natural resources and goals of the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act.

**ENCOURAGE EFFICIENCY**

The Campus Master Plan should encourage efficiency and economy in University operations, with advantageous locations for facilities and advantageous adjacencies of uses.

**VALUE THE COMMUNITY**

The Campus Master Plan should recognize the importance of the surrounding communities and strive to achieve compatible working relationships with these communities to improve the quality of life and public benefits for all in the vicinity.

Approved Compiled Plan January 2003
By what processes are the goals of the Campus Master Plan met?

- If the campus environment is to support and facilitate the UW mission, the Campus Master Plan must be developed with input and feedback from a broad range of internal constituents, including students and faculty.

- As required by City Ordinance 121688, the Campus Master Plan is further developed in consultation with a City-University-Community Advisory Committee.

From the CMP Senior Project Director’s cover letter (February 2003), the 2003 Final Compiled Master Plan for the UW Seattle Campus remains in effect until a new master plan is approved by the UW Board of Regents.

In the 2003 Campus Master Plan, important open spaces are improved and enhanced such as the plaza between More Hall and Mechanical Engineering, consistent with the 2003 CMP stated goals.

UW Campus Master Plan Kickoff/EIS Scoping - October 2015

UW CMP Online Open House - February 2016

Preliminary Plan Concepts now under development – Winter and Spring 2016

We are currently in an open comment period.
Question: How do you envision addressing the challenge of students getting between classes in time if academic buildings are farther out than they currently are?

Answer: The Campus Master Plan does not determine these types of University policies. The plan simply identifies potential development sites and as the University determines which buildings will be built where and for what uses, those types of questions will come up in conversations at that time.

Question: Where can I learn more about how Engineering facilities factor in the CMP? Specifically curious about space increase goals and specific facilities identified for replacement or upgrade.

Answer: The Campus Master Plan creates a framework that identifies potential future development sites on campus. Which colleges get new facilities and where, is something that is decided in conversations between the college leadership and the administration. Learning more about the facilities for a department like Engineering would need to be directed to that department.

My concern, as a 1983 graduate of Civil Engineering, is that the planning does not address the need for a full replacement of the obsolete and capacity restraining building of More Hall, which was built in 1949. Addressing this issue now is imperative, as the proposed master plan shows a planned new facility for CSE being sandwiched in just north of More Hall, restricting pedestrian access and flow to the entrance of More Hall. It seems reasonable that prioritizing the tear down and replacement of the existing More Hall should precede the construction of the CSE Building. Please address phasing as an important element of Campus Master Plan.

Answer: We will take into consideration the location of new facilities next to current ones, and will identify which buildings are candidates for tear down and renovation. The actual decision of which departments build new buildings and when, is a decision that will not be made in the Campus Master Plan. That decision is made by the University leadership. They work closely with the Department Chairs or College Deans to make those decisions taking into account many opinions and ideas.

Central & South Campus Preliminary Plan presentation - April 2016, CSE II is first proposed to the public.
Input from Steven G. Gilbert, PhD, DABT
INND (Institute of Neurotoxicology & Neurological Disorders)

“It should be noted that WA State played and still plays a large role in all things nuclear, for instance: 1) the largest concentration of nuclear weapons in the world at the Bangor sub base; 2) Hanford, the most radiological and chemical contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere; 3) the Columbia (Waste) Generating Station - ongoing financial unsound nuclear power plant that is a large volume nuclear waste generating station; 4) and UW medicine’s use of radiation and treatment centers.”

We could use a museum / education center to explain all this!

Other uses of the building have been proposed, i.e., as a museum of all things nuclear and as a showcase for the innovations, patents, Nobel Prizes etc. of the faculty of the UW.

Why not consider re-use of the Nuclear Reactor Building as a museum?”

(Use of this historic building as a museum is consistent with February 2013 preliminary proposal brought from Mechanical Engineering for an extension and expansion of the Mechanical Engineering Building to house two to three engineering departments.)
CMP process guided in part by the City University Agreement between UW and the City of Seattle.

Seattle City Council Bill Number: 114941  
Ordinance Number: 121688

AN ORDINANCE amending the 1998 Agreement Between the City of Seattle and the University of Washington, a Growth Management Act development regulation, to change the procedure for amending provisions concerning leasing by the University, to change restrictions on acquisition and leasing by the University, to change reporting requirements, to update references to agencies and documents, and authorizing execution of the amended Agreement.

Date passed by Full Council: November 29, 2004  
Date of Mayor's signature: December 3, 2004

The City will cooperate with the University in the formulation of the Master Plan and EIS. Representatives of the City Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and the University will consult and exchange information regarding the scope and content of the EIS and the Master Plan before it is prepared. The University will also consult and exchange information with the City-University-Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) regarding the scope and content of the EIS and Master Plan before it is prepared. The University will submit to DPD a preliminary draft EIS and draft Master Plan for review and comment by appropriate City departments prior to formal circulation.

B. Procedures for Consideration, City Approval, and University Adoption of the University Master Plan

Notwithstanding the provisions of any applicable City ordinances, the following procedures will be followed for consideration, approval, and adoption of the University’s Master Plan:

1. Once a draft Master Plan is formulated, a written copy of the draft Master Plan and Draft EIS will be submitted to CUCAC and DPD, and an application for a Major Institution Master Plan will be submitted to DPD.

2. CUCAC will hold meetings which will be open to the public. One of the meetings will be jointly conducted with the University and will be the University’s public hearing on the Draft EIS. Within seventyfive (75) days of receipt of the draft Master Plan and Draft EIS, CUCAC will provide written comments to the University on the draft Master Plan and the Draft EIS. Comments will be limited to consideration of the physical development of the University and its environmental impacts.

3. The University may revise the draft Master Plan and will prepare a Final EIS following the public meetings, the public hearing, and receipt of the comments made pursuant to SEPA.  
(10 more steps, CMP becomes final.)
Ordinance Number: 121688 (continued)

SECTION VI

Policies and Relation to the Master Plan

This Agreement supersedes the 1983 City-University Agreement and 1977 Joint Statement of Goals. This Agreement contains the applicable policies and implementation guidelines for the University, until amended. In addition, the policies contained in the then-existing Master Plan will form the basis for the development of the new Master Plan.

The agreement between UW and City of Seattle requires annual updates for the Campus Master Plan. Required annual updates are on-line but notably missing for calendar years 2014 and 2015.

Campus Master Plan Annual Reports

- 2014 (calendar year 2013)
- 2013 (calendar year 2012)
- 2012 (calendar year 2011)
- 2011 (calendar year 2010)
- 2010 (calendar year 2009)
- 2009 (calendar year 2008)
- 2008 (calendar year 2007)
- 2007 (calendar year 2006)
- 2006 (calendar year 2005)
- 2005 (calendar year 2004)
- 2004 (calendar year 2003)

None of these annual updates mention CSE II in the area between Moore Hall and Mechanical Engineering.

From the University Architect: Preliminary draft plan to be reviewed by the City in June 2016. Publication of Draft Plan and Draft EIS moved to Autumn 2016 to accommodate other City-related zoning issues that need to be resolved ahead of the UW Plan. Publication of plan in Autumn will be accompanied by public meetings and hearings in October.
UW Planning & Management (P&M) - Strategy Map for 2015-2018

Mission – What we Do
- Transform the administration at UW to provide excellence in service delivery at best value

Vision – Aspire to Be
- P&M is the trusted source for innovative solutions to UW’s administration and planning needs

Values (*UW)
- Excellence*
- Respect*
- Integrity*
- Innovation*
- Transparency
- Collaboration*
- Results Focused
- Sustainability

Focus on UW Customers (Leadership, Faculty, Students, Staff, Partners, Community)
- Improve service delivery in all units within P&M
- Lead University District Innovation Zone Planning and Campus Master Planning
- Create and implement one stop portal/process for requesting and resolving space needs
- Develop solutions to energy needs and achieve climate goals

Improve Internal Business Practices
- Improve UW wide operational and organizational processes/structures and efficiencies
- Modernize enterprise systems, information systems and processes
- Streamline university budgeting and management processes

Build Organizational/Staff Capacity
- Create professional development and recognition opportunities for all staff
- Develop effective leadership and management skills
- Develop and support robust student internship opportunities
- Improve communication within and across P&M

Manage Resources
- Eliminate duplication, cut costs and reallocate resources today for tomorrow
- Allocate, lease, build and manage space effectively and meet emerging strategic needs
- Improve and support UW-wide data storage, retrieval and analytics

Red: FY16 priorities
The University of Washington, founded in 1861, is the oldest state institution of higher education on the Pacific Coast. The University is a comprehensive teaching and research institution comprised of sixteen schools and colleges, offering undergraduate, graduate and professional education, extending knowledge through research, and providing continuing education and public service to the citizens of the Seattle metropolitan area, the state, and the region.

The Campus Master Plan should:
- designate important open spaces and views on campus and create policies to ensure their preservation and maintenance.
- identify areas that could become safe and pleasant new open space.

Sites should be selected and developed to contribute to the enhancement of the campus environment without detracting from the fundamental qualities of the campus. Each potential site should be developed to:
- improve the campus environment with high quality architecture and open space integrated with the building design.
- enhance and strengthen its context and the campus as a whole.
- be in harmony with the immediate surroundings.
- facilitate accessibility and pedestrian circulation.
- accommodate service functions with minimal visual impact from pedestrian routes and open spaces, without causing safety conflicts with pedestrian routes.
- provide a more environmentally sustainable landscape that promotes conservation of natural resources and systems.
- provide an economically feasible and functional project.
- support greening and sustainability techniques.

Land use patterns must support and enhance University programs.
- Academic land use patterns should promote academic interchange in instruction and research.
- When feasible, access should be provided so uses are not separated by arterials or other natural or man-made barriers.

While each area of campus has different characteristics that imply varying architectural responses, all University projects must meet a high level of quality. All campus areas have and must respond to a context, built form, structure, natural beauty, and scenic views.
Following are general guidelines that should be followed in new development throughout the campus. All new projects must satisfy the following design requirements:

• Maintain continuity with the context of surrounding buildings, or if the existing context is not clear or valued, contribute to the establishment of a new context.
• Conserve valued elements of existing buildings and landscape; enhance their presence with the new development.
• Express function in the design concept of the building through form and organization.
• Express the structural rhythm of the structure.
• Express entrances, places of gathering, transition from outside to inside, and protection from weather.
• Additions to existing historically designated buildings, or new construction in those portions of campus having a distinct historic character, such as the Quadrangle and Rainier Vista, shall be similar in materials and scale to the existing historic buildings or environments, and/or should complement them architecturally and aesthetically.
• Promote low maintenance and operating costs.
• Express a sense of permanence and provide for opportunities for buildings to age well.
• Express designs that consider the broadest possible spectrum of human ability in use of spaces and products.
• Building design and placement should accommodate convenient pedestrian circulation.
• Buildings proposed adjacent to or near the Burke-Gilman Trail should be designed to consider impacts on the Trail from light and glare, shadows, height, bulk, and scale.

The campus success and quality depends on buildings and open space being conceived in concert. Buildings and open space should enhance each other.

Open space will be included as a part of a project’s program and budget.

A building’s relationship to campus circulation must be considered with every project. Main entrances should be clearly identified and relate to the pedestrian circulation system. Pedestrian conflicts at the juncture of building entrances and major pathways should be avoided. Circulation of all modes of access to a building must not deteriorate the surrounding campus form and open space. For example, parking and service entrances should be screened. Where service access and pedestrian circulation coincide, the pedestrian environment should dominate, but not conflict.

Scale, Materials, and Detailing
The scale of the buildings should be considered in two ways. First, the overall scale—size, footprint, height, and profile—must be considered in relation to its surrounding buildings and open space. Usually, buildings will be “in scale,” similar to their surroundings and appropriate to the development area and use.
Over the last century, the University of Washington Board of Regents has been the steward of the University of Washington campus. The Regents recognize the value of the campus to the University, the greater University area community, the City of Seattle, the State of Washington and future generations. The campus provides a sense of permanency and place. It is a place of civic pride and beauty. The architecture and open spaces demonstrate and preserve the accomplishments of the past while providing for the future and allowing development of architectural innovations.

Campus landscape unifies buildings whose styles differ and provides an environment that is central to the well-being of students, faculty, staff, visitors, and the community.

The funding of open space and landscape improvements should not be restricted to those associated with building projects and should be given a priority which reflects their importance to the campus environment.

Sites which are feasibly and economically of a size and shape for development in one or more phases or as an addition to an existing building.
• Sites which can be served by infrastructure.
• The designation of specific building sites should be made in the context of opportunities for including and defining open space and establishing or reinforcing campus axes, vistas, and entrances.
• The size of designated building sites should be considered in terms of scale relationships with adjacent buildings.
• Buildings and open space should enhance each other—this is a strength of all great campuses including the University of Washington.

In the Campus Master Plan, open space continues to be a critical component to defining campus structure and is an essential element of the campus environment. Existing landscape forms must be conserved, reinforced and new ones provided to define new areas, gateways, views, axes, and connections. In addition, open spaces suitable for active or passive casual recreation will continue to be located throughout the campus. Open space improvements must be an integral part of all projects as the campus is developed and redeveloped. All future open spaces will enhance and add to the park like character and network of open space that is so valued by the University and surrounding community.
As part of the plan, existing major and minor pedestrian paths must be also retained.

The recommended footprint of a potential development site is based on several criteria including but not limited to, access for circulation, open space, proximity to adjoining buildings, impact on the landscape, opportunities for development on sites to contribute to larger compositions or groupings of buildings and open spaces, and alignment with existing buildings if appropriate.

Traditionally, the University has provided the University’s Capital Budget Request to CUCAC. This tradition will continue. In addition, the University also prepares an annual report pursuant to the 1998 City University Agreement. The Annual Report contains information on the University’s development program as identified in the Capital Budget Request, changes to these requests, new projects, on-going projects, and major and minor plan changes. The Annual Report and a supplement to that report issued six months after the issuance of the Annual Report, shall contain information on new projects, identify sites chosen for development, provide a description of the program or structure proposed (including gross square footage), and provide the anticipated schedule for development. The Annual Report will continue to provide information on timing and phasing of development, and the programmatic uses of potential development sites identified in the Campus Master Plan.

The surrounding central perimeter includes the eastern bluff between Stevens Way and Montlake Boulevard, and the edges bordered by NE 45th Street, 15th Avenue NE and NE Pacific Street. It is these areas, particularly the eastern bluff and 15th Avenue NE edge, that will be most impacted in the next ten years by new development. The potential development of the new light rail stations will significantly contribute to these changes.

In the plan, important open spaces are improved and enhanced such as the plaza between More Hall and Mechanical Engineering and a southern extension of George Washington Lane.
The UW Computer Science and Engineering Department has presented data to legislators in Washington’s state capital of Olympia and to selected units at the University of Washington regarding the demand for the CSE degree and employment opportunities.

UW CSE has failed to present this data more widely to the University community and more specifically to the UW College of Engineering.

A broad based dissemination of the perceived CSE demand and employment opportunities will allow a significant number of disciplines in the sciences and in the UW College of Engineering to report on the demand and employment opportunities for computational programming, computer modeling and simulation in their respective disciplines. These disciplines, among others at the University of Washington include all departments from the College of Engineering: Industrial Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Aeronautical Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Bioengineering, Electrical Engineering, Human Centered Design and Engineering Arts & Sciences: Applied Mathematics, Mathematics, Statistics, Astronomy, Biology, Physics (incomplete list)

College of the Environment: Atmospheric Sciences, Earth and Space Sciences, Oceanography (incomplete list)
Are there UW CSE faculty or students majoring exclusively in CSE who have the capacity to program and simulate the overall energy balance of our planet Earth?

Are there UW CSE faculty or students majoring exclusively in CSE who have the capacity to program and simulate the climatic patterns of our planet Earth? This includes the capacity to predict short-term weather and much longer time scale climatic changes.

Are there UW CSE faculty or students majoring exclusively in CSE who have the capacity to program and simulate the built environment? This includes the capacity to predict the performance, both short and long term of Civil and Environmental Engineering structures.
Dear President Cauce,

We are writing with regard to the new Computer Science and Engineering Building (CSE-II). We believe that the decision to build a new CSE building, as well as the subsequent site selection and building design processes, have all suffered from a lack of transparency, a failure to seek timely input from the many stakeholders who will be affected by the building, and a failure to substantively consider such input when it was offered. These flaws have been facilitated by a diffuse decision-making structure with unclear lines of authority, in which the desire to move the project ahead is implicitly valued more than the responsibility to ask hard questions about whether each decision has been adequately justified and vetted. We write to you now in the hope that some mitigation can still be achieved, and that the flaws in the process can be corrected before they adversely affect future projects.

Much of the decision-making authority for each step leading to approval for construction of a new campus building lies with the Building Committee, so it seems self-evident that this committee should have representation from all constituents who are significantly affected by the project. Logically enough, in the case of CSE-II, a few of the individuals appointed to the committee (including the Chair) were from CSE. These individuals were strong advocates for the project and had a vested interest in meeting the aspirational goals of their department. They could therefore be expected to consistently make a case for the ‘necessity’ of maximizing the space and other resources that the building will provide to their unit. We do not know the exact composition of the remainder of the committee, but it seems to comprise individuals with special expertise relevant to the mechanics of designing and constructing the building (e.g., the University Architect, representatives from Capital Projects and Development, etc.).

For CSE-II, what this committee lacked was representation from other academic units that will be affected by the new building and that might raise legitimate concerns about whether the maximalist goals of the proposing department are justified when other constituencies are considered. Under such circumstances, it is virtually impossible for the other members of the committee to even recognize, let alone critically assess, the assumptions or claims that are made by the strongest advocates for the maximalist position. For example, the non-CSE members have neither the information nor the stature within the University’s culture to critique or challenge claims that the building must have a certain number of faculty or graduate student offices to accommodate future growth, that it must be as close as possible to CSE-I to preserve faculty cohesion, or even that it must have a large atrium and juice bar to match the ones across the street in CSE-I. We do not begrudge the strong advocates for playing that role; their departmental colleagues would expect no less. But if, as we presume, the university’s goal is to optimize the process more broadly, the membership and power structure within the building committee is clearly imbalanced.
In addition to providing checks and balances themselves, faculty, staff, and students representing non-CSE constituencies would have undoubtedly communicated with those constituencies and thereby assured that the broader campus community was informed in a timely way of decisions that were being made. Such transparency was grossly lacking in the CSE-II planning process.

For example, the proposed footprint for the 130,000 sq. ft. CSE-II building occupies the great majority of the space between More Hall and the Mechanical Engineering Building (Figure 1). It eliminates an open space bordering Stevens Way that is used heavily by students and for departmental functions. As currently sited, the building will reside as tightly against More Hall as minimum set-backs permit and will rise well above the roof of More Hall. Once CSE-II is built, the front entrance to the More Hall will no longer be visible from Stevens Way, and entry to the building will require walking along a relatively narrow, tunnel-like passage between the new building and More Hall. Note that, according to the extant (2003) UW Master Plan, this site is identified for development of an underground building that would preserve the greenspace.

![Figure 1. (a) More Hall and the adjacent greenspace at present; (b) Model of proposed CSE-II, occupying the greenspace, towering over and obscuring More Hall](image)

Providing an opportunity for public comment on this proposal when the design was first being developed would likely have brought a torrent of unwelcome (to CSE) publicity and criticism, but it might also have led to design decisions that were more creative and in harmony with the existing environment. At the very least, such an exercise would have acknowledged the impact of the building on, and shown respect for, the inhabitants of the “neighborhood” that was about to be dramatically altered, and the broader UW community.

Instead, in the two years during which planning for CSE-II has been in process, the non-CSE Departments most directly affected by it (CEE, ME and ISE) have not been informed or consulted in any significant way. When a group of CEE faculty finally held a meeting recently with the Chair of CSE, he told us that he was “very, very sorry” that we had been left out of the process, but that at this point the decisions about essentially everything except the landscaping were irreversible. In defending the building committee’s actions, he claimed that, when the planners heard that the occupants of More Hall were unhappy about some aspects of the design, they made changes to accommodate our concerns. Incredibly, though, even this action was taken based on their assumptions about our concerns without inviting our input.

To our knowledge, the only meeting at which public input on CSE-II was invited was held on 26 October 2015, focusing on the DSEIS for the CSE-II building. This meeting was held after issues
such as the site and sizing of the building had long since been decided. Such timing sends a clear message that the request for comments was primarily to meet a procedural requirement rather than to seek substantive input. Even so, a number of faculty and staff did provide input on various issues. No feedback has been provided to those who spoke, and as best we can tell, these comments were not taken into consideration in any way.

The problems noted above regarding the makeup of the building committee, absence of opportunities for timely and meaningful public input, and lack of transparency in decision-making appear to be at least partially systemic and not specific to CSE-II. That is, they are outcomes that would be expected given the diffuse nature of construction project oversight on the UW campus. A number of entities are responsible for oversight of campus construction projects, but these entities are predominantly those that will benefit directly from, or be directly involved in, the construction; they do not include other departments or organizations that will be significantly affected by the construction. Furthermore, although all of these entities approve aspects of the design at various stages, they do not participate actively in the step-by-step design and do not provide input on a regular basis. As a result, by the time their approval is sought, major changes would significantly increase project cost and time to completion. Under the circumstances, their oversight becomes pro forma rather than substantive, and the intended system of checks and balances to assure that the decisions are thoroughly vetted is eviscerated.

In sum, we believe that the process for construction of new buildings on the UW campus is in need of serious repair. While this process includes mechanisms, on paper, for extensive oversight of building projects, those mechanisms are not working as intended. The problems with the process have led to decisions which we strongly oppose regarding CSE-II, but our motivation is not simply to criticize those decisions. Rather, it is to ask your help in fixing a process that operates too often in the dark, and to preserve the beauty and functionality of an irreplaceable treasure – the UW Seattle campus. A new and transparent process is required whereby plans are made readily available, the rationale for new buildings is justified with respect to other campus needs, and the campus community has an opportunity to provide input that is addressed rather than ignored.

You are the President of this great University. Please use the authority of your office to address this serious problem before a treasure that we all cherish slips away.

Sincerely,

John Stanton, Professor
Mark Benjamin, Professor
Laura Lowes, Professor
Alex Horner-Devine, Associate Professor

Endorsed by the Faculty and Staff of Civil and Environmental Engineering

cc: Michael Bragg, Michael McCormick