



**City of Seattle**  
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

**Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**  
Kathy Nyland, Director



**UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON**

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

## City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

### MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez  
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell  
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly  
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake  
Montlake Community Club

Jon Gaines (Co-chair)  
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Joan Kelday  
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Scott Cooper  
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)  
University District Community Council

Barbara Quinn  
University Park Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan  
Wallingford Community Council

Kerry Kahl  
University of Washington At -Large

Ann Nguyen  
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery  
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz  
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Chris Leman  
Eastlake Community Council

Louise Little  
University District Partnership

Leslie Wright  
Laurelhurst Community Club

TBD  
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger  
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Pamela Clark  
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Natasha Rodgers  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

TBD  
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader  
University District Community Council

Ruedi Risler  
University Park Community Club

Jon Berkedal  
Wallingford Community Council

TBD  
University of Washington At -Large

Evan Carver  
University of Washington Students

TBD  
University of Washington Faculty

TBD  
University of Washington Staff

Ex-Officio

Maureen Sheehan – DON  
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods

Sally Clark – UW  
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

### DRAFT Meeting Minutes

#### Meeting #152

June 14, 2016

Adopted July 12, 2016

UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### Members and Alternates Present

Eric Larson	Brian O'Sullivan	Jan Arntz
Doug Campbell	Scott Cooper	Leslie Wright (Alt. – non-voting)
Matt Fox	John Gaines	Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting)
Barbara Quinn	Joan Kelday	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Kay Kelly	Tomitha Blake	John Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Kerry Kahl	Ashley Emery	

### Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King
Sally Clark	Kjris Lund	Rebecca Barnes

(See attached attendance sheet)

### I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Matthew Fox opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

### II. Housekeeping

The committee reviewed the May minutes and Mr. Fox had a few suggested changes and clarifications.

A motion was made to adopt the May minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted to adopt the May minutes and the motion passed.

Ms. Sheehan introduced Joan Kelday as the new voting member representing the Ravenna Springs Community Group.

A motion was made to elect Mr. John Gaines to be the Committee's co-chair and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

### III. Public Comment

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for public comments, and there was no public comment.

### IV. Quasi-judicial Decision-Making (00:10:45)

Mr. Lish Whitson began the quasi-judicial decision making presentation.

He mentioned that the City's quasi-judicial rules came from the WA state law that sets up two frameworks for discussion of land use issues. If the issue is related to the legal rights or duties or privileges of a specific party, then it falls under the quasi-judicial fairness and act rule.

If it is about legislative actions adopting or amending neighborhood plans, or area wide zoning ordinances, then it does not fall under the quasi-judicial fairness and act rule.

The U-District rezone does not fall under the fairness act, but the Major Institutions Master Plan which is about privileges of specific parties, such as the UW, and the basic idea is when the City Council is acting to regulate property, there exists a competing interest such as the public interest to participate in the decision making, and the interest of the public and private owners to have a fair and balanced review of their application.

If an individual is applying to the City for land use changes, there are a set of criteria and codes that are reviewed against and it falls under the appearance of the fairness doctrine. If the City is proposing changes to land uses or zoning that would affect a broad number of people, then it is a legislative action, and the opportunity for a broad number of people to provide input is more important than the appearance of the fairness to a particular property owner.

These rules affect how the City Council relates to the proposal. Under the regular legislative rezone action, the City Council holds public hearings from a broad range of public interests and is making a political decision about what is most appropriate for the area they are talking about.

If it is a quasi-judicial application, the City Council makes a decision based on a record prepared by SDCI and it is reviewed by the Seattle Office of Hearing Examiner, then sent to the City Council. The City Council makes their decision based on the record. The idea is that it is fairer to have a record that is compiled for the City Council to base their decision rather than to a politically influential property owner.

Under the City Council's rule, the Master Plan is now pending and the City Council cannot make a decision outside the record the Committee will be compiling along with the University and SDCI. The City Council should not be talking to advocates or opponents of the Master Plan. If a City Council member does hear arguments either for or against the Master Plan, they need to disclose that information. There will not be an opportunity for the other side to provide arguments during the City Council's review. If a City Council member has shown prejudice, they need to be removed from the decision making process.

Mr. Fox asked if a statement to a City Council about not to approve the legislative U-district up zone until the CMP has been adopted is appropriate. Mr. Whitson commented that is a question on timing, and while it is not about the merits of the proposal, he does not recommend doing it.

Mr. Campbell commented if there are any restrictions on members of this Committee speaking to the public or community groups and councils regarding the Master Plan. Mr. Whitson commented that it only applies to the decision makers.

Mr. Gaines commented about communications within the members of the Committee. Mr. Whitson commented that all is fine and it only applies to the City Council that will be making the final decision based on the record that this Committee will compile.

Ms. Clark asked what if a staff member of Council Rob Johnson comes to the Committee meeting. Mr. Whitson noted that it is okay, but they should not be communicating to Mr. Johnson about what they heard from the meeting.

Mr. Whitson mentioned that the record contains the Master Plan, EIS, comments from members of the public, and this Committee, and any proposals and information SDCI receives. Ms. Sheehan noted that as part of the City/University agreement, CUCAC will provide a report that will go to this record.

#### **V. CSE Building: Status of Trees (00:21:20)**

Ms. Clark introduced Mr. Steve Tatge, the Executive Director for UW Major Capital Projects and Mr. Kurt Jensen, project manager for the UW Capital Planning and Development.

This presentation is specific to the scale of the tree removal.

Mr. Kurt Jensen noted that questions regarding the number of trees being removed during this project arose from the early design guide submittal to the City. The University presented a drawing showing the existing trees on the site and the trees that would be removed under a worst case scenario, which is about 44 trees, in order to construct the project some of which are listed as exceptional trees, because once they made the submittal, they cannot take more trees that were proposed. The EIS mentioned about 18

exceptional trees that were proposed to be removed, but they do not have the exact total numbers of trees to be removed.

The landscape design is still under development. The project team is in the process of looking at which of the existing trees to keep or replace with new trees. At this time, the team cannot say which trees will be retained until the final landscape plan. The intent is to put back a landscape that would grow to be a mature landscape.

There will be trees that they will make an effort to save, and others that are desired to be removed because of poor location. The University will have a lush landscape at the end of this project and will follow the requirements in the agreement with the City about tree replacement. The University landscape architect is involved in the development of the landscape design. The University cares about this topic and the project team has gone through some extensive and expensive projects to save these trees.

The project team will be presenting the project to the UW Joint Architectural Commission and the UW Joint Landscape Advisory Committee this week.

Mr. Emery was hoping that they would replace the trees because these are areas where student groups meet to hold their meetings.

Mr. Jensen mentioned that the trees that are up against MoreHall and the Engineering buildings will not be removed. It will only those that will be impacted by the construction of the building.

When trees are taken down, the UW Facilities takes a look at these trees and make a determination of what they want to retain or reuse as part of the building such as furniture, paneling, etc.

Mr. Emery commented that it will be appreciated if the project team will let them know as to the number and location of trees to be removed as soon as possible since there were a sizable amount of faculty were upset about the tree removal.

## **VI. Transportation Management Plan (00:39:45)**

Ms. Doherty handed out a document that listed the different outreach channels, and public meetings they had attended or spoken to about the Master Plan. She informed the Committee to let her know if they want her to speak at one of the neighborhood council meetings to present the University's Master Plan.

Mr. Doherty began the Transportation Management Plan presentation by introducing the three transportation consultants: Mr. Kurt Gahnberg, Ms. Jeanne Acutanza, and Mr. Marni Heffron. Mr. Gahnberg and Ms. Acutanza are from the Transpo Group, and they are working on both the TMP and EIS.

The Committee had asked about what transportation information were going in the Master Plan. The TMP is one of the twelve elements of the City/University Agreement. This presentation will discuss about the goal and components of the TMP as well as the transportation methodology and analysis in the EIS.

The scope of the consultants is two-fold; they will look at the Campus Master Plan (CMP) and the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and update these documents and make recommendations on what needs to be in the TMP. For the EIS, the consultants will be looking at the four alternatives and their impacts.

One important element to keep in mind is each of the Major Institutions comes up with a TMP goal. These TMP goals are summarized in the annual report. There are nine different components of the TMP and the University needs to meet the goals of each component.

The current TMP goal for the University is the AM/PM Vehicle Cap and the current SOV rate being reported is 18%.

Mode split is defined as what mode of travel you choose to make for your trip. Transit is the largest mode among the student, faculty and staff in the past six years due to the U-Pass program. This data was captured through the University's annual commuter trip survey.

A comment was made that the light rail system will also have a huge impact. Mr. Gahnberg noted that they expect that the light rail will have a huge impact, but mentioned that there is currently no precise way to measure its impact.

Mr. Gahnberg mentioned that one of the key element of the TMP is to identify the goal, and what you are trying to achieve. Currently, the existing TMP is based on the goal that is adhering to the same trip cap and the proposal is to maintain that goal.

The University is committed to limiting vehicle trips by limiting parking capacity on campus. When parking is built, it is a replacement for parking that is being displaced by growth. The parking cap number they committed to the current plan is 12,300 parking stalls. Resident student parking is not included in the supply and demand tally.

He also showed a map of the potential new parking locations around campus. These are the candidate sites that has been identified to develop parking, any may or not be developed as parking within the timeframe of this CMP.

A comparison of campus parking ratios among other Universities nationally was shown, and the University is one of the lowest spaces to person ratio at 0.17.

One of their job is to take the CMP and develop an assessment of the transportation impacts. What the Transpo Group has done in the EIS is to make a conservative assumption and anticipate a reasonable worst case as a potential snapshot going forward and do the mitigation on TMP strategies.

The methodology regarding transportation demands, whether it is about traffic and parking, they will analyze the existing data and make sure that they have a starting point that will represent reality. They will then use the annual surveys to establish what the existing modes are and how much growth is occurring. Growth will be based on the actual headcount compared to future headcount. The group will then develop a travel demand model that addresses both traffic and parking and calibrate it not just with existing conditions but to a number of years. These demands will then be inflated by user types.

Mr. Risler commented on how the group takes into consideration the folks that are living in Lynwood that will be traveling into campus on the new light rail system. Mr. Gahnberg mentioned that the model they are using is to identify the demand centered on how many new trips are being developed. They will look at the zip code information based on the survey data from the University as well as the region to identify where those trips are going. They will identify the new demand, where they want to go, and what route they want to take. These choices will differ depending on where you are coming from.

Mr. Campbell asked if there is a possibility of encouraging high density residential development in the neighborhood as part of transportation planning. Mr. Gahnberg noted that there certainly is, but from an EIS standpoint, they don't want to make assumptions that are not a planned reality (funded). From a planning standpoint, looking at high density residential particularly at a development targeted and income level that is appropriate for campus employees and students is a big piece that will make the neighborhood more compact and more walkable than a vehicle mode.

A comment was made if they take into consideration people walking to the university by parking in the neighborhood. Mr. Gahnberg noted that it is in their analysis.

He mentioned that the methodology approach on these transportation issues are about the same. They establish an existing infrastructure to support the travel modes, and as they look ahead for 2028, they look at what is to be changed and funded. They will assume if there is no action or baseline, the future associated with each of the modes including what they expect to be in place. They will then add the specific growth increments associated with the University's growth that goes back to the travel demand model.

There will be different metrics for each of the modes, and they will evaluate the level of adequacy of these modes.

They will use the City's transportation model and determine that assuming the baseline, the City's preferred scenario for the comprehensive plan is to support a more robust and calibrated model detail available, as the primary analysis. The primary analysis is going to assume growth that is consistent to the City's preferred comprehensive plan.

They will make a conservative assumption, and what they assumed for 2028 is no change in the existing modal choices that the University travelers make.

A comment was made about the geography impacts on the primary and secondary impact zones, and he has not seen any analysis on these in the presentation. Mr. Gahnberg mentioned that in the survey data, it indicated some amount of hide and ride activity that is going on within the secondary impact zones. It is covered under the TMP for the University and it identifies residential parking zones to consider as a means of protecting parking zones in the residential area.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that if they have further questions about the TMP, to send her an email.

## **VII. Committee Deliberation (01:29:30)**

Ms. Lund informed the committee that she compiled a list of questions from prior meetings. What she heard from tonight's presentation was about neighborhood impacts. More information about these impacts will be summarized in the EIS.

One of the questions that came out from the last meeting was how transportation impacts would be shown with regards to the population growth of faculty, students and staff if the TMP goal is 18% of SOV.

Mr. Gahnberg commented that when they analyze the growth population, they had to deal with the growth of different population streams (i.e. faculty, student, and staff). They identified that if there was no change in the mode split, the University might see 1,000 more vehicles during the peak hour. He noted that they had to deal with the system that was already grown. Based on his experience from these studies, the impact of additional vehicles will be minimal.

Mr. Campbell asked if the consultants are studying the degree of increase that is not attributed to any of the mode because the residents already live in the area, meaning people that are not commuters, and yet are part of the population stream. Mr. Gahnberg mentioned they were not assuming that would happen. They would characterized it as one of a potential strategies that would help support the change in the reduction of the mode split so they could change auto travel and transit travel to walk travel. Mr. Campbell commented that if it is an actionable alternative that they propose actions to encourage such as bicycling or walking. Mr. Gahnberg mentioned that within the purview of the transportation analysis itself, which is not what they are proposing. This will amount to a significant change in the Master Plan.

Mr. Campbell was hoping that the University would propose a subsidized housing for faculty and staff as a way to address the SOV trip that will be created in the future.

Ms. Lund summarized the discussion by describing the impacts as conservatively as possible in order to provide opportunities for mitigation strategies and actions.

Mr. Risler commented about mitigations towards public transportation such as adding more trips or bus lines in the transit corridor.

Mr. Gahnberg mentioned that the University has a lot of clout to King County Metro with the U-Pass Program as an effective tool. The further success of the U-Pass program will definitely increase transit demand and the University will be in a position to work with King County Metro and Sound Transit to accommodate the increase in demand.

Mr. Gaines commented on the park and hide and where are they assessing the impact on the current population and population growth.

Mr. Gahnberg noted that they have not fully developed a methodology for evaluating park and hide in the neighborhood. They will be partnering with the City of Seattle to come up with a metric to identify hot spots of neighborhood and on-street parking. He mentioned that at the end of the day, it is not about measuring what the difference is, but rather acknowledging that this occurs. The goal for future transportation demand is to minimize this occurrence.

## **Working Group Discussion (01:44:24)**

Ms. Lund reminded the committee members that at the last meeting that a handout was provided that talks about different ways CUCAC could organize into working groups. The group agreed that dividing the CMP elements into four working groups was preferred. Group 1 would be looking at the baseline data assumptions, offsite impacts, boundaries of the MIO, and UW property ownerships. Group 2 would be looking at transportation, parking, bike, pedestrian, and circulation, linkage to growth capacity, cumulative

impacts, and offsite impacts. Group 3 would be looking at open space, landscaping, screening, and street and alley vacations. Mr. Fox mentioned that street and alley vacations should belong to transportation. Ms. Lund mentioned that some of these categories could overlap. Group 4 would be looking at development standards, design guidelines, height, bulk, and scale, uses, location, new development, and alternative development proposals.

Each of these groups would also look at all of the geographic areas. These working groups will look at the details, but they will not provide the final comments. The groups will reconvene as a whole to summarize what each of the group discussed.

The groups will not have staff support outside the regular meetings. She suggested that if the group are willing to meet a little longer, they could break up the committee meetings and have the first hour for group discussions and then reconvene as a group.

Working groups may want to meet prior to receiving the draft CMP EIS. It will be up to the group to decide on how they want to organize their discussion.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the University had presented and shared enough information prior to the draft plan. Unless projects comes up under the existing Master Plan, the University does not have any new information to present to the Committee. She suggested as an option is to have the meeting with an open agenda.

Mr. Campbell mentioned that there was interaction between the University's plan and the up zone plan for the neighborhood, and the comment period for the up zone plan for the neighborhood was supposed to end on June 30<sup>th</sup>. If the Committee would want to comment, they had to ask for an extension of the comment period. The Committee will then have to meet in July in order to come up with the Committee's position. SDCI released a very significant plan and he felt that some of the people within the neighborhood did not have enough time to review and digest the plan.

A motion was presented to have CUCAC send a letter to OPCD (Office of Planning and Community Development) requesting a 45 day comment extension for the U-District rezone proposal and have a representative to come to the July meeting to make a presentation; it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

Ms. Sheehan asked if they cannot present in July, will the July meeting be cancelled. Mr. Fox noted that the Committee will have to wait for their response and make a decision about when to hold the meeting.

Ms. Clark informed the Committee about the Pac-12 non-Saturday football game. This year the game is scheduled for Friday, September 30<sup>th</sup>, against Stanford. This information is being sent out early to the neighboring communities to inform them about the Friday night traffic issues.

Mr. Campbell informed the Committee that the U-District square created a model for the U-District. It will be on display at the Bulldog. This model will be helpful in describing the public space option for the U-District, and he encouraged the University in creating a similar model of its plan to display its proposal for growth.

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.