



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

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



**UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON**  
OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

**MEMBERS**

TBD  
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell  
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly  
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake  
Montlake Community Club

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

Jean Kelday  
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Amanda Winters  
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

TBD  
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery  
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz  
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Timmy Bendis  
Eastlake Community Council

Louise Little  
University District Partnership

Leslie Wright  
Laurelhurst Community Club

Miha Sarani  
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger  
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

TBD  
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

Osman Salahuddin  
University of Washington Students

Rick Mohler  
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

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

**Meeting Minutes  
Meeting #167  
July 25, 2017  
Adopted August 8, 2017**  
UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**Members and Alternates Present**

Doug Campbell	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Non-Voting Alt.)
John Gaines	Kerry Kahl	Rick Mohler (Non-Voting Alt.)
Matthew Fox	Ashley Emery	Ruedi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
Barbara Quinn	Jan Arntz	

**Staff and Others Present**

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King	

(See attached attendance sheet)

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Mr. John Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

**II. Housekeeping**

There was a motion to adopt the July 11 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

**III. Public Comment (00:05:17)**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments.

Ms. Abigail Doerr, is the advocacy director at Transportation Choices Coalition. They advocate for more reliable transportation option for the state of Washington and the Puget Sound region. She commented that they were pleased with the goal of the MP to attain a 15% SOV by 2028. However, they do not believe that the solutions that were laid out in the MP were significant for the ambitious target, but believed that there are realistic solutions.

She commented that the Master Plan could provide details on how the University will prioritize a sustainable subsidized U-pass programs for all students and staff in order for the SOV goals to be realized. The current U-pass program for students is very successful, however, the opt-in options adoption rate is lower among faculty and staff which is the reason why the faculty and staff SOV rate is much higher. In order to attain this SOV goal, it is critical to have the U-pass be universal for faculty and staff.

She also added that there should be interim goals for the 15% SOV 2028 target. The current plan states that if the University does not meet the target by 2028, it can be denied building permits. It appears that most of the 6 million sq. ft. of development will be built by then, and there is no sufficient

accountability or incentive for the campus to meet the target. She requested the Committee include in their comments that there should be one or more interim goals and an accountability provision in the CMP. She also mentioned that they will be submitting additional comments that relates to race and social justice, integration with bike and pedestrian mobility and connectivity in the U-district.

#### **IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS.

Ms. Kjrjris Lund commented that the format for tonight's meeting is to begin identifying any issues for the final letter to be submitted.

She asked the Committee if there were any follow-up questions that arose from the group work at the last meeting.

Mr. Matthew Fox commented about the W20 and W28 zoning sites and inquired about what "conditioned" down to 90 ft. mean when the underlying zoning is 240 ft., and how binding it will be for future decision makers. Ms. Theresa Doherty commented that condition down means they can only build to whatever the number is; meaning it can only go as high as 90 ft. With regards to how binding it is, she added that as long as the University is operating under this Master Plan it will be binding because it is a standard and not a guideline.

Ms. Lund noted at the last meeting, the groups were reviewing the chart and identifying if there were issues that need to be resolved. She added that the group should not be just looking at the EIS, but at the Master Plan as well. Most of the comments were specific to the EIS, and she wants to make sure that they are also tracking on what is on the MP since it has been modified since the Draft.

MR. Rick Mohler asked about any implications of the recent State Supreme Court. Ms. Sally Clark responded that a State Supreme Court decision about the landmark codes and the UW/City of Seattle Campus. She noted that they are in the process of incorporating language in the EIS and Master Plan that reflects the recent decision.

Mr. Reudi Risler asked how minor sentences and typos in the Master Plan should be dealt. Ms. Jan Arntz noted that there will be an addendum that will identify the errors, and any errors found should be compiled and shared with CUCAC comments.

#### **V. Final CMP/EIS Working Groups (00:12:12)**

*(Editor's Note: The Committee broke into their subgroups for discussion)*

#### **VI. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion**

Ms. Lund opened the floor for group discussion.

She added that the final plan may look different depending on the City Council's conditions. These conditions will be based on the recommendations and comment letters from City staff, including CUCAC. If The Committee can recommend how to mitigate impacts and the City is required to incorporate or respond as part of the plan. She reminded the group that if the original comments and concerns were adequately addressed by the University, that is fine, but if they were not, they can encourage the University to strongly respond to it.

Ms. Lund mentioned about a question from the transportation subgroup about access to the letters that were written by other agencies. Ms. Doherty noted that all the letters and the University's responses to these letters and comments can be found in Volume Two of the EIS.

Group#1 reported that many of the responses were referencing the sections in the EIS. They commented that they should look at the specific words in the EIS and determine how to provide conditions especially on the issue of child care.

Ms. Doherty commented that the EIS is a disclosure guide while the Master Plan is a reference for the Land Use Code and buildings.

Ms. Lund reminded the Committee that Group #1 is dealing with the aspirational and visionary notion of the University and the discussion is focused on the preamble to the original letter.

Group #2 commented that the recurring theme in the comments was asking the University to play a bigger role in the transportation coordination because there are so many different players, it will be beneficial for the University to take the lead. They added that regarding pedestrian realm and access to transit and felt that the University's responses were quantitative and what they were looking for is a strong commitment to pedestrian's urban design.

A comment was made about how he was surprised when reading the transportation appendix on the degree on how the faculty were lagging behind students and staff in SOV travel on to campus. Mr. Reudi Risler commented about having the University provide additional resources and use the available campus land for bus lanes.

Ms. Lund mentioned that the more specificity they could provide on the comments will be helpful for those receiving the comments.

Group #3 focused on light from the new buildings in south campus and do not believe this was adequately addressed by the definitions in the EIS and Master Plan. The group felt that the University has not responded about the glare at night from the new construction. Group #3 added about the storm water issue was not clearly stated and whether the storm water flows on site to a rain garden.

Ms. Lund commented if there is a code requirement that is available for review. Ms. Lindsay King mentioned that there is an analysis of impacts and mitigations in the EIS.

Group #4 mentioned that they spent most of their time reviewing Comments #43 through #56, along with #57 and #61. Mr. Fox noted that the University did not address their concerns about more building height. The group felt adding upper level setbacks to mitigate the effect of a 240-ft. height on the Ave. and the W41 parking lot were not addressed.

Mr. Fox mentioned that there were areas the University did a satisfactory job including the lowered heights on Pacific. The group was satisfied with the mid-block pass throughs, and the east-west pedestrian pass through between Pacific. They brought up a technical error on the map on p.207 that still showed a 240-ft. height. The group felt that there were still concerns in the West Campus area and the language around the University's role in property taxes that were cited elsewhere in the document.

Mr. Fox commented about their concern about design departure standards and felt that there should be language that if there are any significant changes that a process should involve CUCAC's input.

He commented about the view study of Montlake Blvd. looking to the South at street level was not addressed completely. He also added that Comment #61 is a concern because it does not show in the EIS on how it would look at ground level.

Ms. Clark asked about the comment regarding the study of the Montlake Blvd. NE looking to the south if there is a point the group is looking at. Mr. Fox mentioned that he did not phrase the question well so he will go back and do more analysis on the response.

Ms. Lund commented about the pedestrian experience and since there are members of the Committee who are bicyclist if the issue of the bicycle and pedestrian experience has been addressed. Mr. Fox commented that they looked at the pedestrian experience aesthetically but not from a mobility perspective.

Ms. Lund commented about the next steps in drafting the written comments. Ms. Sheehan noted that the subgroups made a list of comments and submitted it to her. She suggested to do a similar approach of submitting and responding to the comments and she will compile them, and have it available for the next meeting. Mr. Fox added that it will be nice to have a rough draft of the document to review in advance.

Ms. Sheehan asked if the group can submit their comments by COB August 7 so she can compile the proposed responses for the next meeting.

## **VII. New Business**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

## **VI. Adjournment**

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



August 4, 2017

Dear City University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC),

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the University of Washington's (UW) Campus Master Plan. Transportation Choices Coalition is an organization that is working to bring more reliable and affordable transportation options to Washington residents. We encourage you to consider our feedback to include in your report to the hearing examiner.

The UW is an important institution and community partner in our region, with more than 67,000 employees and students. UW has been a leader in transportation demand management encouraging people to bike, walk, and take the bus and train to campus, reducing GHGs and preventing many cars from clogging adjacent roads.

However, the UW has ambitious plans to grow over the next 10 years: up to 6 million sf of development that would accommodate 4,600 new employees and 8,675 new students. While UW's transportation planning has been strong, we believe that the institution will need to double down on its commitment to reducing single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips in order to meet its 15% SOV target by 2028.

We offer the following comments and recommendations:

### **U-PASS**

- **Goal:** Sustainably funded, subsidized, universal transit for students, faculty, and staff
- **Background:** The U-PASS is the bedrock of the UW's transportation management program. The current universal student U-PASS transit pass has provided an affordable transportation option for students, and helped contribute to a 2015 SOV rate of 9% for students. However staff and faculty have a SOV rate of 36% and 46%, respectively. In 2015, faculty participation in U-PASS was 58%, and 68% of staff have a U-PASS, yet more than 80% of employees agree that U-PASS is a benefit of working for UW, which shows a latent demand for this important transit benefit.<sup>1</sup> Moving more staff and faculty to transit will be a key element of reducing the university's overall SOV rate, though cost may continue to be a barrier for some employees.
- **Recommendations:**
  - Commit to a universal U-PASS program as a necessary strategy to achieve the SOV target of 15% by 2028.
  - Identify and commit to sustainable funding for the U-PASS that would provide a lower- or no-cost option for all faculty, staff, and students.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://facilities.uw.edu/transportation/files/reports/transportation-survey-report-2015-v2.pdf?ref=>

- Provide clarity about current and historic funding sources and subsidy levels for U-PASS. We would also like some clarification about the difference between the “discount” rate explained in the TMP and the actual level of subsidy provided by the UW. We understand that the UW has been exempt from the 50% subsidy requirement for the ORCA Passport Program.
- Work with stakeholders and partners to identify holistic, comprehensive, and meaningful solutions.

### SOV Target

- **Goal:** Demonstrate continued progress towards attaining the overall SOV goal.
- **Background:** The current plans says that if UW doesn’t meet SOV target by about 2028, it can be denied building permits. However, it appears that most of the 6 million sf of development will be built by then, so there isn’t sufficient accountability or incentive for campus to meet this target
- **Recommendations:**
  - Commit to interim SOV targets every 1-2 years, with clear performance measures
  - Issuance of additional building permits should be contingent on demonstration of continuous progress towards the achievement of these interim SOV targets

### Additional comments:

- **Multimodal connections**
  - Commit to ensuring that transit operations/service is adequate for planned growth, and provide specific and implementable solutions to demonstrate concurrency eg., purchasing additional transit service, or locating growth only near sufficient transit service.
  - Prioritize that future growth should occur near transit (not just “consider” transit when locating growth).
  - Plan to create seamless multimodal transfers at the Husky Stadium and University light rail stations. Coordinate with SDOT to increase access to shared mobility services and great pedestrian and bike connections in these areas.
- **Clarify and review parking goals**
  - Availability of parking creates incentives to drive, even if it’s not during commute time, yet currently “non-commute” related parking is not counted in the parking cap. The plan should be more clear about how the parking cap is determined including the underlying assumptions and methodology of what parking is counted towards the cap.
  - Campus space for development is limited and parking is an expensive use of space that could be used for housing, or program-related development. With all the additional transportation options available, the plan should consider lowering existing parking cap as well as move away from building additional parking when existing parking lots are redeveloped.
  - Strengthen efforts toward pay-per-use for parking.
- **Commit to Race and Social Justice Initiative analysis of policies and plans**
  - The City of Seattle’s Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI) is a powerful policy tool to increased access to opportunity. By applying an RSJI analysis, the plan can better assess and implement the availability and affordability of the various transportation options for low-income students, faculty and staff.

- **Performance, accountability and mitigation**
  - Performance
    - Consider breaking down the SOV rate by student, staff, and faculty to track trends.
    - Are there GHG goals? Affordability goals? Transportation safety goals?
    - In particular, we think there should be performance measures around transit crowding and reliability.
  - Accountability
    - The stakeholder group (identified on page 261 of the CMP) should be fleshed out and given clearer structure and responsibility.
    - Potentially they should be tasked with performance review and identifying mitigation.
  - Mitigation
    - Mitigation in regards to transit is not adequate (limited to some bus stops / stop improvements).
    - Demand to capacity numbers seem lower than anticipated, which could mean an underestimation of impact and mitigation.
    - Impacts to transit speed under the preferred alternative show high impacts to transit speeds in some areas.
      - Clarify: Is this due to overcrowding at stations (dwell time) or to additional trips (congestion from other vehicles)?
    - We should identify thresholds at which believe more mitigation should occur. Then, if there is annual monitoring for crowding and transit speeds, we can identify a trigger point for crowding and or transit speeds at which the UW should invest in more service, or add speed and reliability improvements.

We believe that the recommendations above are critical for ensuring the mobility in the neighborhoods and community in and around the University District as the campus plans for growth. At Transportation Choices, we know that we can either plan for growth or be totally overwhelmed by it. With the recommendations above, we believe that neighborhoods and community in the University District will be well prepared for the future. We encourage you to use these recommendations in your report on the final draft of the Campus Master Plan.

Sincerely,



Abigail Doerr  
Advocacy Director  
Transportation Choices Coalition