



MEMBERS

- Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council
- Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council
- Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
- Jean Amick
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
- Dave Eckert
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council
- Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council
- Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large
- Emma Slager
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
- Jeannie Hale
Laurelhurst Community Club
- Bob DeLay
Montlake Community Club
- Betty Swift
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council
- TBD
- Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Jorgan Bader
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- TBD
- Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- TBD
- Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Jorgan Bader
University District Community Council
- Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Club
- Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council
- TBD
- University of Washington At -Large
- TBD
- 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 #143
August 11, 2015**
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Jorgen Bader (Alt.)	Brian O'Sullivan
Doug Campbell	Eric Larson	Kerry Kahl
Jean Amick	Matt Fox	John Berkedal (Alt.)
John Gaines	Barbara Quinn	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Rainer Metzger
Curtis Bain	Rob Lubin	Eugenia Woo
Theresa Doherty	Natasha Rodgers	

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Matthew Fox opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.
Mr. Doug Campbell asked to make an addition to the agenda regarding the proposed action at light rail station that Ms. Sally Clark had shared.

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox postponed adopting the July minutes until September pending his review and an update to the attendees. Copies of minutes should be provided at the meeting.

III. CUCAC, City & University Agreement, Campus Master Plan

Ms. Theresa Doherty made a brief presentation about how CUCAC, City & University Agreement and the Campus Master Plan all connect. There have been questions regarding what is the Master Plan and its timeline, and the goal of having this walkthrough is to provide more information.

The purpose of the CUCAC is to: advise the City & University about the physical development of the greater university area, encourage the provision of adequate city services, preserve the positive aspects of the University' presence in the community, review and comment on potential adverse effects, and assist in protection of the adjacent communities. The committee is responsible for reviewing the draft and final master plan, major and minor amendments, environmental documents, annual reports, and making recommendations. CUCAC has 16 members represented by members of the neighborhood councils as well as University and City representatives.

The Campus Master Plan identifies development sites, open spaces, open space and circulation patterns and recognizes the need for coordinated comprehensive

planning. The current Master Plan was done in 2003, and the next may look 10 to 20 years out.

The new Master Plan addresses and identifies the boundaries and non-institution uses within the University's boundaries. It also looks at the new development site plans, proposed open spaces and landscaping, and where additional height is needed.

The last Master Plan identified 68 development sites, with 8 million sq. ft. of potential development, but the University only requested 3 million sq. ft. In the past additional development sites have been requested and approved after the Master Plan was approved. The new Master Plan would identify where the development would take place in the next 15-20 years. The updated Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will work to further reduce single occupancy trips from the current 18%.

The new Campus Master Plan does not have any development phases because it is dependent on funding and private fundraising. This information will be available in the annual report that will summarize the budget request, what money was received, and what buildings will be built. The report will look at history to project future annual development. There is a monthly report from the Capitol Projects team that goes to the Board of Regents.

The target timeline for the Master Plan are as follows: In 2015, Sasaki was identified as the main consultants, Transpo Group will provide the TMP, and AEI will be the utilities consultant, and Hillis Clark Martin and Peterson (Ryan Durkin) is the law firm. Between August to December 2015, will be spent looking at preliminary concepts and EIS alternatives, August – September there will be presentations regarding the South Campus framework and E1 parking lot review. Sasaki will present in October about the vision and guiding principles for the Master Plan. November and December will be do discuss preliminary concepts so we can have a robust discussion with the committee about the identified concepts in January 2016.

CUCAC and the University will have 75 days to review and comment on the Draft EIS and Master Plan and will have public hearings before the MIMP submission. After the comment period, the committee will look at the comments, and will have an opportunity to respond to them and discuss how to develop the final EIS and Master Plan.

She noted that whole process would take through 2018 after all of the discussions, public hearings, and responses from the City Council and the Board of Regents.

Doug asked if Lease Lid is included in the Master Plan and the answer was it was looked at in the EIS and the University asked that it be removed and in 2003 the City Council said the impacts of Lease Lid need to be reported in the Annual Report.

Mr. John Gaines asked how long CUCAC members stay on the committee in order to maintain continuity. Mr. Fox mentioned that it varies and depends from each community councils if they want to replace their representatives to follow through with the process. Mr. Gaines suggested the committee consider how to perpetuate ideas that are started and issues that are observed.

Mr. Eric Larson asked what will happen if the City and the University are at odds with the Master Plan. Ms. Doherty stated that it will go to the City Council and they will provide their preliminary decision to the Board of Regents and the board will have the opportunity to respond to the decision. After the MIMP is established, there will be no more discussion from the City Council.

Mr. Jorgan Bader stated that the community are overwhelmed last master plan with documents and there is nowhere to get them. Ms. Sheehan noted that the agenda and presentation materials are posted on the UW CUCAC website. Mr. Fox commented that it was helpful for the committee to be able to review the materials prior to the meeting. Ms. Sally Clark mentioned that her goal is to send the link with the materials to Ms. Sheehan a week before the meeting; the committee will have an opportunity to review them prior to meeting. There is also an effort to list in the agenda how many times or sessions the presentation materials are presented to the committee.

IV. North Campus Housing Update

Mr. Rob Lubin from the University Housing and Food Services provided a brief presentation and update on the North Campus Housing; a schematic design of the project was presented to the committee.

The North Campus Housing project was based on the following components; a) student demand; b) the age of buildings that need significant work in the next ten years; c) revitalizing the space for academic programs; and d) the Campus Master Plan, the demand for housing operations.

The North Campus area is referred to as a Phase 4 of the Campus Master Plan. The pre-design phase was presented to the committee six months ago.

The major goal of this housing project is to add beds and provide regional spaces for students that would enhance their academics: dining, wellness areas, and academic resource centers.

The North Campus will be integrated with the main campus understanding that there are numerous historic buildings in the area. This means the project will need to be aware of scale and setbacks from those buildings in order to be good neighbors. Aggressive sustainability goals, AIA 2030 Challenge: 60% reduction in energy use, hitting 50-55% energy use in west campus and hoping for something similar in North Campus.

Existing residence halls, McMahan, Haggett, McCarty and Hanson, the project will be redeveloping buildings but adding only 300-400 new beds, 2800 existing to 3200 approximately.

The North Campus is a two-phase project. Building A is in schematic design. Buildings B, C, and D will complete construction in the fall of 2018; buildings A and E will start construction in summer of 2018; and project completion in the summer of 2020. The demolition of McCarty Hall will be in the first phase while the demotion of Haggett Hall will be in the second phase.

The new project will try to utilize the existing footprints to avoid further ground disturbance and additional expense of regrading. Mr. Lubin noted that the North Campus project also made emphasis on the trail systems around the area with an opportunity to immerse oneself in a forest environment, as well as landscape architecture by retaining 206 trees and removing 265 and planting back 270 trees to create a richer biodiversity with an increase of biodiversity.

He mentioned that the rebuild will be largely on established footprint that is ADA accessible and close to community amenities and easy access to service drives.

Predominantly double rooms and private baths, also a wing of double rooms with shared bathrooms. To hit a price point, intentional triple and quad rooms have been identified to address pent up demand at a lower price point for students that want to give up privacy for more affordable housing. A question was raised about the effectiveness of private baths, and the ability to co-mingle with other residents. Lounges were developed, with staff to intentionally program those spaces, to bring people together. Whitman court is currently drivable by the public; the intent would be to make it a pedestrian way only used emergency vehicles and during move-in and out.

Student housing is an auxiliary, and paid for by student rents and food sales, not tuition. Rent for these dorms will go up 50% as the buildings in west campus did. The committee expressed concerns over cheaper, older housing going away. The triples will run approximately \$150 less than a double and quads \$300 less per month.

A question was raised about how many units will be demolished and built. Mr. Lubin noted that about 1,450 will be demolished and about 2,800 will be built. Mr. Lubin emphasized that for this type of project, it was less expensive to redevelop than to renovate, turn garden conditions of the 50's to a more urban experience. Mr. Lubin noted that the construction is wood frame over two floors of concrete and five floors of wood.

Wood is being looked at for siding, rather than brick, but there is concern of the longevity of wood. Mr. Jorgen Bader suggested taking a good look at the campus parkway buildings because of its black, dark brown and dreary atmosphere that it will bring to the area.

Mr. Lubin stated that the steam plant is considering transitioning to a hot water distribution plant. The current plant is maxed out. The heat source in these residence halls is electric base board heat, because it is affordable and electric prices are less than the steam plant costs.

V. Computer Science & Engineering (CSE) II Project

Mr. Curtis Bain from the University's Capital Project Office and project manager for the CSE project provided a brief presentation and status update including planning and pre-design work for the project.

One of the key milestones is the completion of the pre-schematic design phase that summarizes the program, scope and cost for the preferred site. The project also completed its contractor selection process and is in the process of requesting funds from the state and presenting a draft SEIS for public comments. The goal is to complete the design by next summer and occupancy by fall of 2018. The construction of the project will depend on funding availability.

The Draft SEIS is schedule to come out in September 2015. Under the SEIS, two different sites are identified for the project. They are identified in the Campus Master Plan as Site 14c located south of the Faculty Club, and Site 16c (preferred by the University) located between More Hall Mechanical Engineering and the Paul Allen Center. The oil tank that feeds the steam plant needs to remain and is a key driver for site 16c. The draft SEIS will be submitted to this committee to have enough time for comments. Mr. Fox suggested having it to them at a time that it can be discussed at a meeting before comments are due.

Mr. Bain showed a graphic representation of Site 16c that shows the diversity of the site from a planning perspective as well as other features such as a common plaza, testing yard for the Civil Engineering program, and administrative and portable buildings on site. One of the major goals for this project is to develop and integrate the building into the campus environment that includes landscaping and high mix of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Alignment of Snohomish lane and alignment with bridge to HecEd is being taken into consideration.

The goal is to finish design by summer of 2016 and start construction, depending on funding and entitlements, and occupancy by fall 2018. A very aggressive schedule.

Mr. Bain noted that during the construction period, there will always be pedestrian access to Stevens Way to the HecEd Pavilion and stairs will be accessible. Mr. Bader expressed his concern for pedestrians walking through the construction how it can be unsettling especially during the nighttime. How will the project handle putting people in peril? Ms. Clark mentioned that she would reach out to Metro and the North East District Council regarding the planned bus routes and alternates during the construction period.

A question was raised about Site 16c and is it the University's intention to demolish the More Hall annex (nuclear reactor building) listed on the NRHP. Mr. Bain responded that under the preferred scheme, the University has not made a decision. A follow up question was raised about what is the basis of demolishing the building. The SEIS will assess the pros and cons of both sites and assess the impacts of different design schemes, including whether to demolish the building and adaptive reuse. The University will then decide the selection of the sites and review the schemes.

Mr. Rainer Metzger from DoCoMoMoWeWa (Documentation of Conservation of Architecture Building Sites in the Modern Movement in Western Washington) that advocates for the conservation of modern architecture, generally 1950's and 1960's but this is still being debated, made a comment that it strongly opposes in the demolition of More Hall.

VI. Other Discussion Items – Public Square Light Rail Station

Ms. Clark updated the group on the future use of the site above the University Light rail station.

About two years ago, no decision had been made and all options were on the table. The University is working with Sound Transit to figure what is the best thing to do above the station box that reflects what is best for the University's mission as well as the community and the University's livability studies in the strategic plan. A decision was made recently in conjunction with Sound Transit to harden the station box so a larger building can be built, specifically an approximately 14 story office building, with a mix of

tenants. The money that will be going to harden the station box precludes the idea that it will be a central open space.

Sally acknowledged this is not the answer those advocating for open space wanted to hear. There is a possibility there will be a requirement in the future that any height over the five over two would be purchased via the bonus system, some measure of those funds would go towards programs such as affordable housing, childcare, historic preservation, open space, etc.

There is still the IHOP site. Although not ideal, it may be one piece of open space puzzle.

The decision was made in consultation between the Capital Projects and the Planning Office and vetted with people in the administration. The Board of Regents has been informed but it is unclear if they were asked if they can take any action.

Mr. Campbell expressed his extreme dissatisfaction and disappointment about the decision. He mentioned that the community has expressed its clear preference and stated that what Ms. Clark's describing is telling the community that the University is unwilling to be a serious partner by making a preemptive choice right before the Open Space Forum Report comes out taking an important option off the table. He noted that the Open Space forum that happened last fall had a consensus that a central civic square is the number one goal for the neighborhood. The committee feels it is misrepresentation to say the decision was based on community input. It was agreed that it is not uniform throughout the community that the light rail property is the ideal location for a public square. It was felt that the University is behaving like another developer instead of a public institution. The question was posed: why is the University preempting the one possible open space that exists today without showing their support for helping the community find a place for an open square. Skepticism was expressed about the community supporting up zoning without the community assets to go along with the private assets.

It was suggested the University include in the development agreement, require open space, somewhere, to contribute to the community's need for a public square, similar to what may have happened on Capitol Hill.

He stated that there was a resolution in this body that was approved at Meeting #125 with unanimous support in 2013:

The City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee endorses the concept of a plaza in conjunction with the Sound Transit Station and that neither the University nor City of Seattle should take an action that would preclude development of such along the general lines proposed by the University District Square Organization with details to be determined.

The Doug Campbell motioned to reaffirm the 2013 resolution; the motion was seconded by Jorgen Bader.

The question was called. The vote on the motion was:

9 in favor
1 opposed
none abstaining

A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

It should be noted that Ted Johnson, sculptor in residence recently passed away.

VII. Adjournment

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