



MEMBERS

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council

Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club

Kathy Laughman
Montlake Community Club

John Gaines
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council

TBD
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Scott Cooper
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

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

Bob DeLay
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke 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

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

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

Meeting Minutes
Meeting # 148
February 9, 2016
Adopted March 8, 2016
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Matthew Fox	Jan Arntz
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	Leslie Wright (Alt. – non-voting)
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Ann Nguyen	Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Scott Cooper	Ashley Emery	

Staff and Others Present

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

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Brian O'Sullivan made motion to adopt the January minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted with one abstaining due to non-attendance and the motion to adopt the January minutes passed.

Mr. Fox mentioned that the Committee is still seeking for a co-chair.

Ms. Sally Clark mentioned that she has no one scheduled from the UW Regents to attend a CUCAC meetings. She is working with the Regents staff on this.

Mr. Fox mentioned the Laurelhurst Community Club is appointing a new representative to CUCAC. Ms. Kay Kelly from the Laurelhurst Community Club is employed by the University and funded through grants. While she does not have any direct financial interest, a disclosure form was completed and submitted to DON. There were no questions or comments.

Ms. Sheehan reiterated that all CUCAC representatives should be neutral and have no financial interest in the decisions that are made in this Committee.

Ms. Sheehan also introduced Ms. Kjristine Lund. In the past, Ms. Sheehan discussed having a facilitator for the Campus Master Plan process. Ms. Clark, along with Ms. Doherty have selected Ms. Lund. She was observing in the January meeting, and will be observing tonight's as well. The plan is for Ms. Lund to be facilitating at the March meeting.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. Campus Master Plan: West Campus (00:10:21)

Ms. Theresa Doherty provided a brief presentation summary of the overall campus framework. She noted that these presentations are available at the [UW Regional & Community Relations website](#). Ms. Sheehan mentioned that at the back of the presentation is a sheet to write comments and questions about the presentation.

Ms. Doherty announced the upcoming online open house on February 23rd at noon. This is an opportunity for the broader public to see the preliminary concepts and ideas about the Campus Master Plan (CMP).

A diagram of the campus framework was presented which shows the MIO boundary and the different precincts. The guiding principles include:

- 1) Flexible framework
- 2) Industry partnerships
- 3) Sustainable development
- 4) Connectivity
- 5) Stewardship of historical and cultural resources

Ms. Doherty mentioned the importance of the Innovation Districts. A graphic was shown to differentiate what is a mixed used vs. an innovation district.

Various universities around the country have a focus on biotech, tech, and health, and the goal for the University is to have a variety of sectors such as Arts & Culture, Health Sciences, Architecture, Business, Engineering, etc.

A map of the primary and secondary impact zones was passed around and noted that the EIS will analyze these impacts within these boundaries.

There was a question about the term “optimized parking”. Ms. Doherty mentioned that her understanding is optimizing surface parking and go to structures so a park can be built within the structure.

A graph was shown that summarized the proposed massing. In the 2003 CMP, the University asked to build 3 million sq. ft. but identified 8.3 million of development capacity. The 8.3 million is the same as the 13.2 gross sq. ft. but will be over a 20 year timeframe.

A question was about why a 20 year timeframe instead of 10 year. Ms. Doherty commented that the University is trying to be a better steward on what it is available and able look for a long-term development rather than a short-term development. She noted that having a short-term plan is very time consuming project.

A comment was made that things change and the areas of development will look different for a long term plan and suggested that it may not be the best approach. Ms. Doherty commented that other Major Institutions are doing the same approach.

Ms. Clark commented on how the UW plans for capital projects is related to the State Legislature. Funds for the Burke-Gilman trail has been budgeted through the 2025-2027 period. Building a 10 year plan, and dealing with the State Legislature is very difficult as far as capital planning.

Ms. Doherty noted that as the University look at these potential sites, if these sites are not identified and its capacity, one of the University departments can come in and build on this site and under develop it. Having a long term plan is a better strategy.

She showed a graphic of the proposed heights and identified that the tallest height at West Campus will be 294 ft. She mentioned that the SDCl is working on a potential re-zone for the U-District, and there will be towers in the U District taller than these if the current draft is adopted.

A question was asked if the West Campus is expected to be primarily dorms. Ms. Doherty responded that there are currently a few dorms in West Campus, but the new development will not be dorms, however there are new dorms are being built in the North Campus area to replace older residence halls

A question was asked whether the buildings are required to be at this height or it is the maximum allowable height once the Plan is approved. Ms. Doherty mentioned that it is the maximum allowable height.

Ms. Doherty showed the open spaces and the proposed new open spaces along the water and major land bridges as well as the proposed 7 acre Waterfront Park, which may require the vacation of Boat Street.

West Campus Framework (00:24:07)

Ms. Barnes showed a diagram of the proposed West Campus. The big change is the open space at the center of the West Campus and extends to Portage Bay. The grids of the streets that shaped the West Campus would be respected with a friendly pedestrian and bike pathway, making more pedestrian and bike oriented routes available to the public.

She showed a diagram of the proposed building heights and how it does not expand the footprint of the buildings in order to increase the pedestrian environment and strengthening the street connections, and how the properties that the University currently owned in the West Campus are utilized.

She showed an aerial view of the West Campus area and identifying the new buildings that are being proposed according to the guidelines.

A question was asked about when the proposed University up-zone will take place. Ms. Clark mentioned that the City of Seattle needs to adopt the Housing Affordability Livability Agenda (HALA) before they proceed with the South Lake Union up-zone and then the U District up-zone.

Ms. Barnes mentioned that the West Campus will be part of the Innovation District where academic research, entrepreneurs, small and start-up businesses would come together and socialize their ideas.

A question was raised if the mixed use area are restricted to this geographic area or can they be built in other areas as well. Ms. Doherty commented that the West Campus is the suitable area for these mixed use, and the University has not looked at other areas of the campus for this use. She also noted that this is only an illustrative scenario of what the West Campus would look like.

A question was asked about what is the benefits to the students. Ms. Barnes noted that the students will be closer and more directly involved in research that is applicable to the real world.

Ms. Barnes showed a picture of current 15th Avenue and how the re-imagining of 15th Avenue would look showing where the core campus and the University align at 15th Avenue with the goal is to create a more porous edge to the University campus.

Sound Transit will be coming along 43rd and Brooklyn in five years and there have been numerous community discussions about 43rd street being a pedestrian entrance to the campus.

A question was asked if there are plans by the City for transit corridors in the next five to ten years on 15th or Campus Parkway. Ms. Barnes commented that she has not heard about the plan. The University District Partnership has been trying to engage various transit agencies to participate in the long term planning, but they are very reluctant to engage.

West Campus Development Standards (00:55:42)

Ms. Barnes briefly summarized the West Campus Development standards including the campus wide development zones. The goal is to provide a human and lively environment for the general public.

She also summarized the development principles that will apply to the West Campus including: building footprints, setbacks and design.

A diagram of each of the West Campus zones were shown describing their existing condition and how the development standards are incorporated into each areas of the West Campus.

From north to south:

Existing Max Height	Proposed Max Height
H5 – 105 ft.	240/300 ft.
H3 – 65 ft.	200/240 ft.
H2 – 50 ft.	160 ft.

A question was raised if there will be a net increase in parking around West Campus. Ms. Barnes noted that parking will be accommodated in similar proportion, but will provide a more detailed explanation in the upcoming presentations.

There was interest in shadow studies and analysis on the proposed 200+ ft. buildings, it is expected to be covered in the EIS on a site by site basis.

A question was raised about when transportation will be discussed. Ms. Barnes noted that transportation will be discussed.

V. U-Loo Project Briefing (01:23:37)

Mr. Ruedi Risler made a presentation on the U-Loo Public Restroom project. The University District Partnership has received numerous complaints regarding human waste clean-up. In 2015, CleanScapes reported about 1,500 sanitary clean-ups that includes human waste and needles.

Mr. Risler noted that it is a human need, and not everyone is comfortable using the restrooms in a restaurant or a coffee shop. The target population for this type of facility are the homeless, visitors from the Farmer's Market and early morning and late night shift workers.

Along with Ms. Clark, the U-District Partnership Clean and Safe Committee is applying for a grant to complete this project and agreed to be the fiscal sponsor. The Committee went to DON (Department of Neighborhoods) Neighborhood Matching Fund and applied for \$22,000 to fund the project. This is a matching fund and the Committee has to provide \$11,000 in a community match primarily through volunteer activities.

The Committee leading this project is comprised of an Executive Committee, Steering Committee and two consultants, SvR Design and Broadview Planning, that will provide similar studies.

The work plan for the organization includes reviewing existing facilities, public involvement, and outreach to major stakeholders. The consultants will provide best practice reviews and experiences from other cities, review possible facility types such as brick and mortar and standalone facilities, review and identify potential locations within the U District, recommend these 2-3 locations, and publish a final report.

Volunteers conducted a survey of existing restroom facilities around the U district, and have identified 41 restrooms that have no restrictive signage but were not necessarily available 24/7.

Public outreach took place at the Farmer's Market, in front of the bookstore and at Schmitz Hall as well as various presentations and focus group discussions. Over 600 comments were collected and overwhelmingly were supportive of the plan. A map was provided to identify location preference for these facilities. He noted that the Light Rail Station came up as a primary and preferred location, but Sound Transit was not

The committee did a technical feasibility study and identified that these restroom sites can be built inside a building, but remains very expensive and complex. All the other potential sites require building it along the sidewalks.

The cost of installing and connecting these structures to the plumbing, electricity and sewer system is about \$250,000. He noted that there are more work to be done to identify best practices and plans on how to handle needles and sharps.

The U-Loo team is confident they can get the needed funds from the City of Seattle for acquisition and installation, but the City indicated that they do not want to fund the ongoing maintenance of these facilities that will cost about \$30,000/year.

The questions that are being raised about the project are: can the University District Partnership Clean and Safe will be able to lead this project and if a location is chosen, will it be acceptable to the public.

A question was asked about how much CleanScapes charges for the clean-up. Mr. Risler only noted that the data they have are the 1,500 complaints that they received.

Ms. Clark mentioned that Recology is the vendor the UDP contracts with for nightly clean-ups in different zones of the Ave and regular graffiti check-ups along the University District. She noted that human waste clean-up, needles and sharps pick-ups are not in their portfolio.

Mr. Risler noted that if a decision is made in spring, there will be more technical planning to do before these facilities are installed and be available.

A comment was made that the location of these restrooms will be the controversial. He suggested of having a best practice analysis. Mr. Risler commented that they have asked businesses around the area and they agree on having these restroom sites installed, but would prefer not near their business area. He echoed about the need for transparency regarding site selection in the final report.

A question was raised if Sound Transit provides bathrooms for their riders. Mr. Fox commented that he is not aware if such facilities exist within the major transit system. Mr. Risler mentioned that he looked at the transit system areas in Portland and they do not have these restroom facilities either.

VI. Committee Deliberation (01:42:05)

Mr. Fox began the deliberation regarding the Committee's adoption of the Public Outreach Plan.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that she presented the plan in November. She noted that the City/University Agreement calls for a Public Outreach Plan and stated that the University will work with CUCAC to create a plan that summarizes the different types of outreach methods and what the goals are.

Mr. Fox commented that the overall plan was good and he supports the plan. He mentioned that he will leave the decision to the Committee if they decided to do further review of the plan. He suggested that since there are new individuals who recently joined the Committee to postpone the adoption of the plan so they have time to review it.

Ms. Doherty commented that the adoption of the plan is not time sensitive and can be adopted at the next meeting and she can send the plan again to the Committee for review.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the plan that was presented showed all the methods of outreach such as different online and print publications, public announcements, etc. Ms. Doherty confirmed that was the plan.

VII. New Business (01:44:30)

Ms. Clark shared there is a request from a student collective to present on the proposed Tent City at the March meeting. Currently, the group is doing their outreach and talking to different community groups about their proposal that UW host the Tent City for 2017. Their goal to reach out to this Committee in order to get feedback about the potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. And since, it is the use of campus facility, they want to make sure that they are communicating to the right group.

Mr. Fox commented that he has some reservation and concerns having the group doing their presentation on April due to the limited amount of time the Committee has to discuss about the Campus Framework.

A suggestion was made to have a motion to bring them at the next meeting to do their presentation.

Ms. Clark made a suggestion on how to talk to them and send any information to the Committee for review.

Ms. Sheehan suggested to have time allocated for their presentation after the Committee had finished through the Campus framework discussion.

Ms. Clark noted that their goal is to make sure that no one will be surprised if the UW host a Tent City before the end of the academic year. The group hopes that they will have the opportunity to comment regarding health, safety and operations. The group will be able to speak about how the Tent City will be set-up, but they will not be able to take initial feedback about early outreach.

A comment was made about how much time they would need to present. Ms. Clark noted that they probably will not need much time, and a 15 minute presentation will be sufficient.

Mr. Fox agreed that a 15 minute presentation is sufficient, and suggested to the Committee to have their presentation at the next month's meeting.

Ms. Sheehan commented on having their presentation go first followed by the Campus Master Plan presentation.

A comment was made about the Master Plan and if there will be some time allocated at a later time to discuss the health and safety impacts of the plans that was presented. These health and safety impacts include the safety of the parks and courtyards and how to keep the public from wandering in and around the buildings, water retention areas, etc.

Ms. Sheehan suggested that these comments can be a good working group or a subcommittee discussion that needs to be captured and addressed for future reference for the final report. Ms. Doherty added that these comments will allow them to respond to these type of issues and questions.

A comment was made if these type of issues are addressed in the EIS (Environmental Impact Study). Mr. Fox noted that EIS does not get into these issues unless these are emphasized in the scoping of the EIS.

VIII. Adjournment

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