



City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

MEMBERS

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council
Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council
Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club
Tomitha Blake
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
TBD
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

Meeting Minutes
Meeting #150
April 12, 2016
Adopted May 10, 2016
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Eric Larson	Brian O'Sullivan
Doug Campbell	Scott Cooper	Kerry Kahl
Kay Kelly	Matt Fox	Jan Arntz
Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting)	Barbara Quinn	
Brett Frosaker	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King
Sally Clark	Kjris Lund	

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

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

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

III. Public Comment

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

IV. UW Board of Regents – Jeremy Jaech, Board Vice-Chair (00:03:40)

Mr. Fox welcomed and introduced Mr. Jeremy Jaech from the UW Board of Regents.

He noted that there was perception among the Committee members that the Board of Regents does not recognize CUCAC's role. He mentioned that this is a great opportunity for Mr. Jaech to hear what CUCAC's challenges and issues are in working with the Board of Regents.

The Board is not part of management, they are responsible for hiring and dismissing the president of the University. Regents are appointed by the Governor with the goal to support the mission of the University as it applies to the state of Washington.

There are a lot of activities that are going on around the University and the Board tends to hear these activities from management. Being actively involved and participating in the public comment period usually results in a big impact and reactions from the Board when participants present a very compelling statement. He believed that the public comment is one of the best avenues to go through to express their grievances.

Mr. Jaech is in his 3rd year of a 6 year term. He acknowledged that it takes a long time to understand all the different functions of the University. He remembered the issue of open space and the plaza as opposed to constructing a building on top of the light rail station, and commented about having received public comments regarding the issue but late in the process. He felt that there was no support among the administration for an open space proposal. He could see the frustration CUCAC might have felt for not being heard by the Board after a tremendous amount of work done about this issue.

He commented that it will be better to develop a new way of communication or start a new channel if CUCAC felt their issues are not being heard by the Regents.

In regards to the open space and public plaza, Mr. Jaech noted that he was not involved early in the process, but a group of individuals made a presentation at a meeting where the Board of Regents approved the property swap from Sound Transit. He had an understanding that the Regents committed themselves to not do anything to preclude having a public square above the station, but the Regents were not able to commit to a public square.

Mr. Campbell mentioned that Phil Thiel, the architect who originally did the proposal made a presentation at this Committee in 2014, and there was a unanimous approval in support for the University of not doing anything to preclude a public square above the station. Subsequently, the University District Partnership (UDP) sponsored a series of forums where the community gathered and decided that a central public square was the number one community goal for the neighborhood. There was an Urban Land Institute (ULI) study that came out last year which was a collection of professional opinions regarding what should be above the station. The proposal suggested the University Bookstore move to the proposed building above station, and the station site was not appropriate for housing because faculty and staff would not want to live in the neighborhood. He noted that these opinions were made by professionals, and not a market study. At that time, the University's intention was to build a tower above the station in support of an innovation district proposal.

Mr. Campbell added that the Committee sent a second letter reiterating its unanimous support of not precluding a public square above the station. Mr. Campbell's involvement began after the inception of the proposal and felt that some in the community was excited about the University's plans for growth and to have an innovation district in the neighborhood. He felt that the neighborhood has to grow as a community as well, and does not want to see the community evolve into a second downtown for the City of Seattle or an office district. He also mentioned that if the neighborhood has residences where transitional students, or hosting low income housing, and not a type of housing where faculty and staff would want to live, the community is in danger of becoming a business district almost exclusively rather than a community that hosts and provides a livable community for its residents including a wide spectrum of incomes.

Mr. Campbell commented that from his perspective the Regents have not heard this point of view even though the Committee has presented the issue twice. The neighborhood has its own mission and would like to see the University to support the community's mission to be a home for thousands of residents who are associated with the University and not an eight hour business district.

Mr. Jaech sensed that the current state of play among the Regents was there was not a lot support of having a plaza and there was no clear idea of what should be there. He noted that the idea of creating an innovation zone has been discussed, but he felt that there was not momentum among the Regents. The Regents looked at the property and agreed that it is a valuable asset, and it could be used in many different ways, but having it as a public square is not one of the ways. His personal opinion was that there was no clear understanding of its best use.

Mr. Campbell asked about having the U District host housing for professionals who may want condominiums or host a bigger mix of income including permanent residence. Mr. Jaech commented that personally he

could support this and it is not currently a place he would like to live. Mr. Campbell asked if the Regents agree to have it be a place where people would like to live, and it is not the core mission of the University, but it supports the neighborhood's mission.

Mr. Jaech commented about possible trade-offs and comes down to how a proposal supports the mission of the University on behalf of all of the citizens of the state. When the Regents look at the land use around the University, you want to be a good neighbor, but also you want to look at promoting the mission of the University, and it gets challenging on how to deal with possible trade-offs.

There is currently a lot of heat around the cost of student housing and it impacts the way the Regents think about building more dormitories, but also trying to make the private market affordable as well, this will play well if you want to keep the rents down, it keeps out other factors that are in play, thus the issue of housing affordability for student is a huge issue.

Mr. Larson commented that he was troubled by a notion that the UW management's primary concern is its fiduciary responsibilities. He believes that the function of the Board of Regents is different. Its job is not to look at every single detail of where the money comes and goes, but to step back and consider a larger goals of the University, and help it succeed as a neighbor. He was troubled because he sees the role of the Regents as being a role of the University's management. He felt that the Board should be backing up and taking a position about what the community values.

Mr. Jaech responded that the Regents have a variety of different perspectives, and there are members of the Regents that are very tied to the City. He noted that the type of conversations the Regents typically have are mostly student centered, faculty centered on teaching, research, service, and how to get what the University creates out to a broader community. Being a good neighbor is what the University wants.

Mr. Larson commented that to succeed as a good neighbor, the University should be an active participant in reaching out to the community. He noted that he was disappointed when he heard about the University's response to the idea of a public square.

Mr. Jaech noted that they heard about the public square, but heard only from the management's perspective about the best use of the land. He commented that tonight's forum was helpful to know that this Committee exist and what the issues are.

Ms. Yvonne Sanchez made expressed her disappointment seeing the University operate as a private sector body and it is losing sight of its public institution role.

Mr. Jaech responded that he disagrees with her comment. The Regents focus is always on access and affordability to many students, getting the most faculty and conducting impactful research, and he does not think it is all about money. Money is an important issue because of lack of State support, and seeking ways to afford those things makes it a primary concern.

A comment was made regarding what the Regents see looking at a city block in a middle of the U district and treating it as any other developer, and that is the perception of the community. As a public institution, the community expects other values to be added to the equation and providing public space is one of those.

Mr. Jaech responded that you cannot equate not doing the plaza with treating it like any other developer because there are many other uses of the space that is highly desirable to the community, and an open space is not the only way.

Mr. Fox commented that what he sees is just an office building for technology tenants as part of the innovation district, it does not fit the criteria. He and the Committee felt that the University's direction is to have a private sector office building for tech tenants if it the best use of the property above the station.

Mr. Jaech commented that he is convinced that it is not the best use of the property, and he mentioned that he is a biggest proponent of creating an innovation zone in the area. Personally, he is not excited for a tech company to set up office space above the station. He mentioned that it is still an open debate on the best use of that space.

Mr. Frosaker commented about it is nice that the Regents know that CUCAC exist and if there are any interest this Committee would like to bring up to the Board, and asked about what is the best way for these issues to be heard.

Mr. Jaech mentioned that once an agenda item is created, it is brought to one of the major committees, Academic & Student Affairs or Finance & Asset Management. As of March 1st, Mr. Jaech is the Chair of the Finance & Asset Management Committee, and has a say on what goes at the agenda.

The Administration always brings in items to present, but the Chair and other Committee members can present agenda item of their interest. If this Committee wants to raise an issue that captures the attention of the Committee members that issue can be considered. It is not always easy, but it is possible.

Mr. Campbell asked the current issues that are in his Committee, and Mr. Jaech responded that the issue involves responsibly using the debt that is available to raise to build buildings, and laying out a roadmap of what, where and when to build.

Mr. Fox added he would be happy for CUCAC to hear about the prioritization process. The what, where, and when a new building is being built early rather than late in the process. One example of hearing about a building that was very late in the process was the utility building that was supposed to be the gateway to the neighborhood. Mr. Jaech commented that when he hears gateway, most of the conversations were centered on the transit station and the Burke Museum, but he has not heard about the utility plant being as a gateway. Mr. Frosaker commented that the utility building was presented with a budget constraint and there was no money available to make the aesthetics design more appealing.

Mr. Jaech mentioned about the One Capital Plan, which is a monthly report that is presented to every Board of Regents meeting as one method.

Mr. Jaech encouraged the Committee to invite other members of the Board of Regents to attend a CUCAC meeting because he believes most of them do not understand that there is a group that is working with the issues that affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Campbell inquired about the best way to bring up some of these community issues to the Regents, and Mr. Jaech provided his email address.

A comment was made about the role and level of involvement of the Board of Regents in the current Master Plan process. Mr. Jaech responded that the Regents are not involved very deeply; they rely on the campus architect and staff to make the technical decisions but if there are issues, then now is a good time to bring it up to the Regents.

V. Campus Master Plan: Public Outreach Plan (00:49:00)

Mr. Fox expressed his concern regarding direct mailing and direct outreach to the primary and secondary impact zones. He felt that the language and commitment around it was not solid, even though it was called out on the plan. He understood that direct mailing to individuals who are not engaged in the process as well as notifying property owners and residence should be a priority to establish the connection on what is happening around the community.

Mr. Campbell commented that he agrees with what Mr. Fox's goals are regarding public outreach. He noted how it is stressful when neighbors are find out what has been happening around the community after the project is complete. He suggested a physical scale model of the project so people in the community could see it. He commented that postcards mailing are good, but the overall impact is minimal. A scale model of the development that can be displayed at the bookstore will have a tremendous impact since it will be seen by a number of people.

Mr. Fox commented about having a three dimensional scale model of the different development areas and having it displayed at a bookstore is a great idea since it will be viewed by huge number of people.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that she and Mr. Campbell have had a discussion about this and she noted some of her concerns. She agrees with what Mr. Campbell wants to accomplish, but creating a scale model is challenging since the development phases is very large. The consultants are already being scoped to do a

sketch up model where a person can go into a computer and zoom in and look around the development areas, but not a physical scale model. Ms. Doherty added she could have a kiosk, or run a series of photos or information about the project on a TV screen at the bookstore. She would like to encourage the public to go to the website or attend the online open house meetings to get more feedback. She can ask the consultants if they can produce a scale model and the cost and how long it would take to produce a scale model.

Ms. Barbara Quinn commented that there is a whole group of people that can be reached to create a physical scale model or a virtual walkthrough sketch up. From her experience in designing the Portage Bay viaduct, the architects were able to create virtual bridges where the neighborhood can see and able to compare the possible size of the project, and they were able to comment by posting notes on the drawing board.

Mr. Cooper commented about more people will go to the project website and provide feedback if they were able to see a physical scale model available to them.

Mr. Frosaker commented his concerns about a physical scale model of the MIO build out will lead to the false perception that this will happen in the next five years, but in reality, this build out is a twenty year plan.

Mr. Fox commented that a physical scale model is a good thing to do, but had concerns about what will be included in the model that may confuse people. Mr. Campbell responded that sections of a physical scale model should be removable and be able to distinguish between a small and large version of a campus.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that her early discussion with Mr. Campbell was to look at a full buildout, but she made a judgement on what buildings to put on this scale model since only half the 13 million sq. ft. will be developed, and she was unsure about if these buildings will be built at a given timeframe.

Ms. Doherty asked for some clarification regarding Mr. Fox's concern about the public outreach plan, and Mr. Fox responded that having a more description regarding direct mailing and the details on how it will be implemented.

A comment was made about this topic has been in the agenda since November and would like to know what has been done in the prior processes.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the public outreach plan does not need to be approved by this Committee, but it needs to be reviewed and commented on.

Ms. Doherty suggested that she could bring a paper that summarizes the accomplishment of the outreach plan in the upcoming meetings.

Mr. Cooper asked how the feedback, comments and results from the plan will be digested and communicated back to the community.

Ms. Doherty noted that when the draft EIS and draft Master Plan comes in, all comments have to be responded to. These comments will be published along with the final EIS. The comments from the scoping meeting are all published on the website.

Mr. Fox commented on a report back regarding the feasibility of having a scale model available. Mr. Campbell noted that there is no possibility that the University will spend money on creating a scale model.

Mr. Campbell made a motion that CUCAC proposes the University to build a physical scale model that shows the different buildout proposals for the twenty year Campus Master Plan. It was seconded by Ms. Quinn. The Committee voted and there are 9 in favor; 2 opposed, and 0 abstain. The motion passed.

Mr. Frosaker commented that when his community group saw a proposed buildout for a parking lot by Husky Stadium, the community assumed that it is going to happen right away without knowing the processes involved, and that is why he voted against a scale model buildout.

VI. Campus Master Plan: South/Central Campus – Theresa Doherty (01:09:43)

Ms. Doherty made a presentation about the South and Central Campus. She noted that the campus is divided into four precincts. She showed a graphic representation of the 2003 undeveloped sites versus the 2018 development sites.

She mentioned the proposed massing and at the last meeting the discussion was about the number of years the plan will go through and it has been decided that plan will go down from 20 to 15 years. Based on all the data analysis regarding faculty, staff, and student population and how many new buildings are needed, the 2018 CMP growth request has changed from 8 million gsf, down to 6 million gsf. The capacity will still be around 13 million.

She noted the current building heights from the 2003 Master Plan, and what the University is proposing. Currently, the tallest building is at 240 ft. in South Campus, and it will be on several sectors of the campus, and an additional 300 ft. will be the tallest building in the West Campus portion. All the other areas in the Central Campus remain the same.

Central Campus

The goal for the Central Campus is to retain, enhance, and respect the core campus.

She described the development guidelines and noted these guidelines will be expanded when the actual plan is developed, but it will be the same guidelines for each sector of the campus area. These focused areas are the corridors, edges, pedestrian, and the location of parking and service areas.

Mr. Fox commented if Stevens Way to 43rd, which is a shared street, will turn into a bus street, and Ms. Doherty responded that there is no plan to turn this into a bus street.

Ms. Doherty showed the different development zones to get a better idea where the proposed buildings will be and their footprints. When the committee gets the full Master Plan, it will list all of the development sites, heights, total sq. ft. etc.

South Campus

The goal for the South Campus is to make it more porous, increase and enhance the existing open space, and make a new open space as well as a large land bridge that connects to the Central Campus. The development guidelines are the same as the Central Campus.

South Campus has only one development zone, and it is composed of a series of buildings.

Mr. Risler commented about a whole lot of demolition in the South Campus, and Ms. Doherty commented that the whole area will need to be demolished in stages so each of the buildings can still continue to function, and this will be a long and complicated process in replacing the parking and building structure.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the current or new plan allows structured parking garages. Ms. Doherty responded that the new plan assumes that a new parking can be built underneath as part of the building. Currently, the University has 12,300 parking stalls, and this will be the same assumption going into the next Master Plan. She noted that it is necessary to move parking around the campus that will meet the needs of where people are.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the plan allows University to build an entire structure dedicated to parking. Ms. Doherty responded that she does not know if the University would do that.

Mr. Campbell asked if parking will not increase in the next 15 year plan. Ms. Doherty responded that will be the assumption.

Mr. Frosaker commented if there is a trend in minimizing parking or keeping them the same. Ms. Doherty noted that if they look at the number of faculty, staff, and students they anticipate for the next 15 years, the 12,300 parking stalls is a very small number compared to what the population is going to be. The University anticipates and assumes to continue the current modes of transportation which is 20% SOV, and there is no other Major Institutions that has reached that level. Ms. Quinn mentioned that the goal is not to exceed 12,300 parking stalls.

VII. Committee Deliberation – Kjris Lund (01:23:20)

Ms. Kjris Lund had a chance to talk to almost everyone by phone since the last meeting and the most common questions she heard from the Committee members was what is the role of CUCAC regarding the Master Plan. She proposed that at the next meeting, she would ask Ms. Doherty to do a brief presentation of what was presented in August, the role of CUCAC, and the Master Plan process.

Ms. Lund mentioned at the May meeting, the committee will also discuss about the Transportation Plan including parking, circulation, etc. The transportation presentation will be relatively preliminary, but the presentation will provide familiarity and the assumptions that goes into the planning process before a full review of the draft Transportation and Master Plan.

She showed the twelve elements that the University expects to include within the Master Plan. One of the ways to organize and process this information is to comment on these twelve elements.

The twelve elements are as follows: identifying the height and location of the existing development with the boundaries, location of open space landscaping and screening, use and location of new proposed development and alternatives for these developments, development standards, parking, bikes, pedestrian, circulation, transportation plan, energy, utilities and deficiencies in terms of energy, and alternative proposals for development. Non-Institution designation are uses not owned by the University within the Master Plan boundaries.

She asked how these were handled in the last Master Plan and the answer was parcel by parcel. The question was what were the development alternatives and Ms. Doherty mentioned that at the last Master Plan, the University identified 68 development sites and each one of these sites is a development alternative. The process will be the same for the new Master Plan.

With regards to the University's development phases or timelines, University does not have a specific plan for which project would come first, but it does not mean this Committee could not provide any comments.

Ms. Lund compiled all of the committee's questions and comments and categorized them in order to track them easily.

During the May/June timeframe, Ms. Lund suggested the Committee look at breaking into smaller groups and focus on specific issue areas since there is an enormous amount of information to discuss and so many permutations on the Master Plan that it will be helpful. She would like to have a discussion at the next meeting regarding the group break out and the topics each of the groups would like to tackle, and the areas could be campus section or by subject area.

Mr. Kahl asked if the twelve elements are their own sections and whether the primary and secondary zones are addressed in each element. Ms. Doherty commented that the primary and secondary impact zones are analyzed specifically for the EIS.

Ms. Lund commented how CUCAC should suggest what they want to see and not just react to what they are seeing. She heard comments about the University being an open campus and the benefits this has for the community-at large, but concerns about the new Master Plan will make this less the case. She provided an example about what happen to South Lake Union becoming more like an office park.

Ms. Arntz commented that she felt CUCAC is always in a reactionary mode and it would be helpful if CUCAC did some brainstorming and go back to their communities and ask them what they would like to see instead of reacting to what the University is telling them to do. She asked a question about ways to co-exist with the neighborhood in a positive way.

Mr. Campbell commented that the way he would answer the question is to help make the U-District the kind of neighborhood that faculty and professional staff of higher income want to live here, but noted that this is outside the scope of the University.

Ms. Lund commented that it would be helpful to have the UW mission available in order to further understand its commitment to the community and the Committee as they provide comments to the Master Plan.

Mr. Frosaker suggested that if the Committee breaks into smaller groups he would like to focus on the guidelines around the twelve categories instead of the Campus precincts.

Ms. Sheehan commented that in the last Master Plan, the Committee broke into smaller groups and discussed their findings to a larger Committee so there was a discussion on various issues.

Mr. Risler asked about who will be writing the EIS. Mr. Doherty responded that the consultants are writing the EIS, and if there are any adverse impacts, there are plans on how to mitigate and respond to these impacts.

Mr. Campbell suggested organizing the subgroups by compiling a list of questions that needs to be answered and divide these question into sub areas.

Mr. Brian O'Sullivan made a comment about his neighborhood's specific interest is knowing what the baseline assumptions are and making sure that the EIS is a believable document. Ms. Doherty noted that all of the assumptions are outlined in the EIS and then an analysis of these assumptions takes place.

Ms. Lund mentioned that she will compile and build on the comments she heard tonight and come up with different approaches that the Committee that go over and review collectively. She briefly mentioned the innovation district and talked to Ms. Clark and Ms. Doherty about it since most of the committee members do not know what is meant, and suggested a tour.

Ms. Clark commented about [Waffle Wednesday](#) at Start Up Hall where startup businesses that want to be near the University meet once a month for a morning social networking and gathering to discuss entrepreneurship. She suggested that if folks are interested to attend these type of launching points, it can be arranged to do a brief tour.

Ms. Lund mentioned that she would like to have that opportunity and would ask Ms. Sheehan to coordinate a specific date to do a tour.

Ms. Doherty suggested to have one of the Committee meetings be held at the Start Up Hall.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business introduced to the Committee.

IX. Adjournment

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