



Minutes #186

(Adopted November 12, 2019)

City of Seattle/University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC)

Tuesday, September 10, 2019

6:30 – 8:30 PM

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue, 22nd Floor

Seattle, WA 98105

Attendees/CUCAC Members:

John Gaines

Jon Berkedal

Julie Blakeslee

Kay Kelly

Kerry Kahl

Colleen McAleer

Jorgen Bader

Ashley Emery

Staff and Other Present:

Nelson Pesigan - DON

Ross Pouley – UW, RAP Consulting

Julie Knorr – UW, Project Delivery

Aaron Hoard – UW, Regional & Community Relations

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. Housekeeping

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

Mr. Kerry Kahl commented about a discussion on having the meeting every other month instead of monthly unless the University has materials to be presented in front of the Committee.

A motion was made to adopt the July 16, 2019 minutes, as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion was passed.

Mr. Nelson Pesigan asked to move the discussion about Ms. Kjristine Lund's facilitating a work plan session under new business.

3. Health Sciences Education Building (HSEB) (03:34)

Mr. Gaines introduced Ms. Julie Knorr to present the Health Sciences Education Building.

Ms. Knorr mentioned that the project is in early design. She noted that one of the project goals is to create a hub for the Health Science education and training that fosters interaction, collaboration, and

creativity for students and health professionals. She added that the building design is to support the goals of the 2018 Campus Master Plan.

She showed a diagram of the Campus Master Plan and the current site location of the project. She noted that the design team would like to maintain the elements that were outlined in the Master Plan including the mid-block corridor, gateway, overpass and pedestrian connector. She mentioned that building footprint is about 100,000 sq. ft.

The building will be four-story above grade free-standing building, a full basement level that includes technical spaces for small and big programs. The building will be hybridized, and it will be a wood building. The structure itself will be steel-frame, and the ceilings will be exposed wood that utilizes local materials and aesthetics.

Ms. Knorr mentioned that they are still developing on the different programs and adjacencies that will occupy the building. She noted that most of the building will be classrooms and active learning classrooms for future and collaborative style uses. The basement of the building will occupy the anatomy lab suite.

She showed a sketch of the building site and she noted that since the site is very constrained, the design team does not want to look like a massive building. She described the building will have an active edge where there will be student activities and transparency along Pacific St. The big area of the building will showcase the programmatic functions including large classrooms, etc.

She commented that the design team is currently working on the façade of the building. She showed a diagram where the areas of circulation and landscape will occur around the building as well as the different street views.

Ms. Knorr showed the current project schedule and noted that the building will be completed by summer of 2022.

Mr. Jorgen Bader commented about the traffic at NE Pacific St. especially with the buses and he recommended having a turnout for buses at the area, and Ms. Knorr responded that there is an existing turnout but not for buses. She added that they are looking at moving the bus stop as part of the project scope but noted that having the bus stop at its current location makes sense, but also acknowledges that there are challenges on queuing the large buses in the area.

Mr. Berkedal asked about the impact of this building to the Campus Master Plan and what the future buildings would look like around this building, and Ms. Knorr responded that she does not know about the timeframe, but the desire of the project is to open the corridors. She is not sure how extensive the buildings will be after the project is completed.

Mr. Berkedal commented that he was surprised that the University will put a building on this space without knowing what will come next. Ms. Blakeslee commented that the thought of having a green space around the building is always thought of as well as pathways and corridors. She added that in the CMP, it shows the building structures in the area and the University is trying its best to adhere to the constraints and the placement of these new buildings. She noted that the concept diagram is only an illustration.

Mr. Berkedal asked if there are no plans for building an additional floor to the current building project and Ms. Blakeslee noted that there are no plans for additional building height given the small footprint of the site. The focus of the design team is the walkability around the site.

4. Founder's Hall (34:20)

Mr. Gaines introduced Mr. Ross Pouley to present the Foster School (Founder's Hall) project.

Mr. Pouley mentioned that the project is in the northeast quadrant of the campus, and the scope is to design and construct a new 86,000 sq. ft building to replace MacKenzie Hall. The Landmark Preservation Board reviewed the Hall and it was not listed as a historic building.

The new building will occupy a mix of programs including instructional, academic and administrative spaces. One of the goals of this project is to continue the success of attracting faculty, students, and staff as well as creating a space that is flexible and adaptable to meet the evolving needs of the Foster Business School.

Mr. Pouley briefly summarized the relationship of the project to the CMP with regards to the total maximum gross square footage, the maximum number of floors and the height limit. He noted that the proposed height limit for the Founder's Hall will be 82 ft.

He provided the different diagrams and view angles of the building including the massing studies and elevation. He also showed the circulation pattern and pedestrian experience around the site area as well as the landscape character and engagement with the Denny Yard.

He provided a project schedule and mentioned that it is ahead of the Health Science and Education Building project. The project is currently in the design phase and they are looking at submitting the demolition and construction permit later in the year. The construction will begin in March of 2020 and have the completion date by the end of 2021.

Mr. Bader commented about improving the walkway along Hansen Hall to make it more pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Gaines commented that at the Committee went on a tour last July and looked at the quad as well as Denny and Paccar Hall and he appreciates the studies and works the design team did to improve the front area.

Mr. Berkedal commented about staying below the maximum height and volume of the building and asked what were the deciding factors that were considered and Mr. Pouley responded that they looked at the maximum level and the idea of adding additional floors never materialized as well as cost and code changes that may happen. The design team was very practical in the programmatic elements of the building as well as funding even though the building is 100% donor-funded.

5. 2018 Annual Report (2003 Campus Master Plan) (1:08:40)

Mr. Gaines introduced Mr. Aaron Hoard to present the 2018 Annual Report for the 2003 Campus Master Plan.

Mr. Hoard commented that the annual report talks about the City and University Agreement as well as leasing, jobs in the surrounding U District, etc. and it both reports on the City/University Agreement and the Campus Master Plan.

He noted that this will be the last iteration of the report because of the new CMP. He mentioned that they are in the process of developing a new reporting style and he asked the Committee for feedback on what items they would like to see in the next report.

The annual report is broken up into five general sections including building developments, housing, and jobs in the U District, transportation, leasing/purchasing/gifting of property and community involvement.

Mr. Hoard highlighted the important items on each of the sections including the capital budget spent, the number of jobs at the University, housing efforts and programs that the University provides to staff, mode of transportation and trip caps by students and faculty, leasing and purchasing, and the work that the University does in partnership with the University District to support the community and neighborhoods regarding homeless youth.

Mr. Bader commented about the University District Partnership and mentioned that residents north of the 50th were unhappy about how the business improvement area was administered. He asked if the University is going to participate in these discussions with the UDP, it must be fair and be represented by the people.

Mr. Berkedal commented about having the report sooner. He added that it would be helpful if the next report would provide about the impacts of these building projects that involve student housing, parking and traffic to the nearby neighborhood since he has the responsibility to report back to his community council. Mr. Hoard responded that he will reach out to the City to have their portion of the report be available sooner.

6. Public Comments

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

7. Committee Deliberation (1:30:24)

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Mr. Campbell provided a summary of the upzone discussion for the U District. He mentioned about the scoping for the new upzone proposal is currently being discussed. He noted that there were two versions of the upzone being proposed. One proposal is to have no action and the other is to have a community mix option. The City is proposing what is to be included in this option including additional Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) capacity could be attained by making the already upzoned portion of the neighborhood and allow taller buildings.

He mentioned that the other option is having the second upzone be delayed that would include a downzone of the Ave and a possibility of building additional density around the Children's playground at 50th.

He mentioned that there is a big conversation that is happening, and the City is presenting a community proposal as an alternate for the blanket upzone in the various areas. The City has not made clear why the upzone is necessary. He suggested having this Committee weigh in on the conversation. He also mentioned that both City Council candidates for District 4 have endorsed pulling the Ave out of the secondary upzone proposal. He suggested having an agenda item at the next meeting for an upzone discussion.

Ms. Colleen McAleer commented that the City Council is voting on eliminating several SEPA requirements that are related to all the land issues that are going to happen. She recommends the neighbors to submit their comments and look at what they are proposing and the role of SEPA and displacement.

Mr. Gaines commented about the objectives of this Committee in between the Campus Master Plan (CMP) and the upcoming projects by the University. He noted that having a better context and definition of the goals of this Committee will be helpful. He mentioned that Ms. Kjriss Lund was supposed to come to this meeting to help facilitate the discussion and the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) is currently working the specific agreement with Ms. Lund.

He noted that this gives more opportunity for the Committee to discuss any specific work plans or ideas for Ms. Lund to use and develop when she becomes available for this group. He also mentioned about the meeting frequency for this Committee.

Mr. Jon Berkedal commented that the meeting frequency will depend on the scope of the work that the Committee expects to undertake and decide on how often the Committee will meet.

Mr. Gaines suggested developing a more defined program for Ms. Lund to facilitate. He suggested having this Committee to meet next month to discuss this program. Mr. Kerry Kahl and Mr. Berkedal mentioned that both will be out of town and they will not be able to participate in the meeting. Mr. Berkedal addressed his concerns about meeting the quorum since the two members will be out. He added that he applauds the work and efforts of the Committee chairperson does to reinvigorate the group and defining what this Committee can do and accomplish.

Mr. Gaines mentioned about reserving a large part of the agenda item for Committee deliberation to discuss the scope of work the Committee would want to pursue and delay any University presentations. Mr. Pesigan mentioned that one of the agenda items is for Ms. Sally Clark to discuss the CMP Memo. Mr. Berkedal asked if the memo can be distributed prior to the next meeting so he can submit his comment to the group.

Ms. Julie Blakeslee commented about Committee member vacant spots on the roster and Mr. Gaines asked Mr. Pesigan to follow up with members who have not shown in the meetings if they are still participating.

Mr. Berkedal reminded the Committee that there is a Committee bylaw that states that any member who missed two consecutive meetings are no longer members of the Committee. He encouraged the Committee to read through the bylaw and the City and University Agreement to understand the roles and responsibilities of this Committee before the next meeting as a basis of the work plan discussion at the next meeting.

8. New Business

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business.

Mr. Gaines commented about having a co-chair for this Committee. He noted that he will keep reminding the Committee about their interest in being a co-chair.

9. Adjournment

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