



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

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

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting # 149

March 8, 2016

Adopted April 12, 2016

UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Matt Fox	Jan Arntz
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	Leslie Wright (Alt. – non-voting)
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Kerry Kahl	Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Scott Cooper	Ashley Emery	

Staff and Others Present

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

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox commented and suggested some amendments to the February minutes. On page 2 of the final paragraph, it should read:

She mentioned DPD is working on a potential rezone for the U District and there will be towers in the U District taller than these if the current draft is adopted.

On page 3 of the first paragraph, last sentence, it should add:

To replace old residence halls.

On page 3 of the 3rd paragraph above the West Campus Framework, it should add:

Which may require vacations of both streets.

Mr. Fox also asked that the specific height increase proposals for the different height zones be included in the minutes.

A motion was made to adopt the February minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, one abstaining due to non-attendance to adopt the February minutes and the motion passed.

Note: There was a back and forth discussion about street vacations, and Ms. Sally Clark clarified that the City University Agreement requires that the University "identify potential" street, alley and aerial vacations in the CMP. So the CMP will identify three alternatives that include vacating Boat Street, not vacating Boat

Street and creating a Woonurf but the UW is not proposing at this time to vacate Boat street, it is only identifying it as a potential vacation. If the UW did want to vacate that street, there is an additional City process they would have to go through to vacate a street which would occur after the CMP is passed and includes a whole separate list of outreach and procedures.

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

Ms. Clark informed the Committee that the new vice chair of the Regents, Mr. Jeremy Jaech, will be attending the CUCAC meeting in April and to forward any advance questions or inquiries for Mr. Jaech to her or Ms. Maureen Sheehan to provide Mr. Jaech advance preparation.

Mr. Jaech has been on the Board of Regents since 2012 and he was appointed by former Governor Christine Gregoire. His term ends on September 2018 and he is a UW graduate. He is also a computer technology expert and an entrepreneur.

A question was raised about what are the expectations with meeting Mr. Jaech. Mr. Fox commented about informing him that this Committee exist.

Mr. John Gaines suggested asking Mr. Jaech if he knew about the work of CUCAC and how much weight the Committee's recommendations and decisions impact the Regents decisions.

A comment was made about letting Mr. Jaech know about the Committee's displeasure on a decision made regarding the light rail station.

Ms. Sheehan asked the Committee how much time they would like to be set aside for Mr. Jaech to address questions and comments from CUCAC. Mr. Fox suggested that since there is some flexibility on the Campus Master Plan presentation timeline schedule, he would like to have more time allotted for Mr. Jaech.

Ms. Clark informed the Committee that it is Mr. Jaech's expectation to hear and comment on the Committee's questions and concerns.

Note: There was a back and forth discussion regarding the Board of Regents authority to make decisions and Mr. Clark commented that the Board of Regents are vested through Washington State law, control development decisions relating to the campus, as well as the University's budget. Ms. Clark noted that related information about what the Board of Regents do and their process are available at the [Board of Regents](#) website.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. UW Tent City Committee (00:20:10)

Ms. Hana Alicic of the Tent City Collective made a presentation on the UW campus potentially hosting Tent City 3. Ms. Alicic is a 2014 UW graduate and a Public Health Major, and currently works for the Tenants Union.

The Tent City Collective members are comprised of UW Students and Alumni, current and former Tent City residents, and Seattle community residents that are concerned about homelessness. The mission of Tent City 3 UW is to galvanize, educate and unite students to end many inequities that perpetuates homelessness and other forms of oppression. The goal is to bring Tent City 3 to the UW campus in winter of 2017.

Tent City 3 is a homeless encampment that has been in existence for 10 years. Tent City has been hosted by various sites. Hosting would occur somewhere new every 90 days. Tent City 3 is not one of the encampments that falls in one of the Ordinances that was passed last year. It operates through a Consent Decree with the County. Site requirements are approximately 10,000 sq. ft., and at maximum, a site would host 100 residents. Tent City would prefer to move every 90 days because of their mission for public outreach to different communities and building good will and also it is helpful to move for public health and structure maintenance. Tent City has a strong structure of self-governance, a democratic run community, and has built a strong relationship with the neighborhoods. The community also has a strict code of conduct, it is a clean and sober community, and they follow a process on how to ask residents to leave Tent City.

One of the reasons a University would host Tent City is because of the current state of emergency on homelessness, a huge crisis on housing affordability. There are increasingly more discussions regarding homelessness, and having a Tent City is a temporary solution to address the issues.

The group has already had a two year relationship with Tent City residents, and the comments they heard were positive regarding providing them a sense of community and security in their daily lives. Ms. Alicic mentioned about the UW Vision Statement and it shows the role of this public institution in the community.

Is believe that bringing Tent City 3 to UW will provide a learning opportunity, and galvanize students to the issue of homelessness and offer creative and real solutions.

Both Seattle Pacific University (SPU) and Seattle University (SU) hosted Tent City in the past, and their experience had been very positive. The UW Tent City Collective has been in close communication with SPU due to their being the most recent host of Tent City.

The group talked to SPU students about Tent City and it had been a positive and transformative experience to be able to learn about Tent City from its residents.

She emphasized that this is not an issue of charity, and there are some logistic elements of providing residents a place to live for 90 days, but the true reasoning is to provide a bi-directional learning opportunity and build a sense of coalition between students and the Tent City residents, as well as focus on social justice issues and create practitioners who would practice the vision and learn from individuals that they are trying to serve, break down the stigma about homelessness, and finally, it is all about community building.

Currently, the group is reaching out to various departments on campus and working on developing curriculum, this could include panels, service learning opportunities, or actual classes. The group received a promise from Undergraduate Academic Affairs, which encompasses all of extra programs that the undergraduates, that they agrees to serve to as the academic host for Tent City 3, if they come to campus. They will help coordinate all of the learning activities and ensure that is not overwhelming to Tent City residents.

The group is also working on gathering widespread support and endorsement from various faculty and staff, neighborhood community councils, and students. They recently hosted an event for the 46th District Legislature and they had testimonies from the residents of Tent City 3 and from organizers about the homelessness issues, and all of the three legislators signed off on the work the group has done. The group is also raising awareness as well as public outreach, and talking to students about the issue.

The group provided this brief presentation to ask for CUCAC's support.

Mr. Gaines asked if the operator was SHARE and Ms. Alicic answered that it has been operated by SHARE for the past decade.

Mr. Doug Campbell asked about the turnover ratio for Tent City 3. Ms. Alicic commented that Tent City 3 does not track the demographic data of residents, she is unsure about the turnover rate. Ms. Clark commented that the average turnover rate is about 3 months. Mr. Campbell asked if they know the identity of the individuals who stay in Tent City. Ms. Alicic mentioned that whoever comes in to the Tent City, has to have sex offender screenings, and they go through a registration process. The issues that comes out is when a resident decides to leave Tent City 3 without informing anyone, of which there is a formal process for.

A question was asked about the possible location of Tent City 3 on campus. Ms. Alicic noted that they are currently looking at a list of location possibilities, and they have been in close contact with Ms. Kristine Kenney, UW Landscape Architect, to work on possible sites that works best for both the campus and Tent City 3. Some suggestions include the lot behind the College Inn that currently has construction going on and Parrington lot behind the UW School of Law. Ms. Clark mentioned that parking lots are difficult especially in the parking area where the new Burke Museum is being built. Ms. Clark noted they are working through potential locations around campus. Ms. Alicic is in the process of proposing sites.

A question was asked about any feedback from Campus Police, and Ms. Alicic mentioned that they met with Campus Police Chief, John Vinson, and he has no concerns about it, but if any issues comes up, they can go directly and communicate with the Campus Police.

Ms. Barbara Quinn asked about the attraction of other people in this location and also the issue of security and control since UW campus is huge. Ms. Alicic mentioned that they are currently working with Tent City regarding procedures when residents come to camp and does not abide by the Code of Conduct. The group is working on how to assist residents leave the campus area. Currently, Tent City has a security system and security personnel that are responsible for the condition of the camp. She also noted that the issue of Tent City being in a neighborhood and attracting a lot of people has not been a problem so far.

Mr. Fox commented that he has not seen any problems while working around the homeless and emphasized by his experience that Tent City is operated very tightly.

Ms. Alicic mentioned that they are working on to make sure that the no neighboring districts or specific district service providers are overburdened by Tent City 3.

A question was asked about what has to happen now until the winter quarter where the Tent City 3 will be placed. Ms. Alicic mentioned that they will be meeting UW President Cauce in March. In April, the group is working with various departments to get commitments regarding educational engagements.

The logistics conversation will continue, but there is no official timeline, and will find out more once a conversation with UW President Cauce takes place. The group chose the winter quarter because they would like to have preparatory classes start in the fall and also a marketing push during fall to prepare the students, and possibly classes in the spring.

Mr. Gaines asked about what the group will do with the research that they conducted. Ms. Alicic mentioned that they are working with Public Health students to come up with a framework for public institutions as a whole, and the group is working with other faculty members to determine what other types of research can be done.

Ms. Clark mentioned that the group will be meeting with UW President Cauce on March to present their proposals. President Cauce will not make a decision at that meeting. She will need to hear more from the surrounding communities. There will be meetings that will be sponsored by the University in the month of April in order to hear from the campus and neighboring communities.

Ms. Clark noted that she does not know if they will be able to present a Tent City 3 location at that community meeting. The group would like to continue to do research and expand the list of possible locations. She noted that they will need to hear feedback about potential impacts when a location is determined.

Ms. Alicic mentioned that they would like to have more visible community support as much as possible and asked CUCAC members that if they are a member of a community council or organization and wished to endorse this opportunity, to go ahead and reach out to the Tent City Collective via email, twitter or Facebook, and the group can set up a presentation.

Several CUCAC members commented that they and their community councils see no reservations in supporting Tent City on UW campus.

Mr. Brett Frosaker made a motion for CUCAC to support Tent City 3 on the UW Campus and it was seconded. The Committee voted unanimously and the motion carried.

V. Campus Master Plan: Public Outreach Plan (00:45:00)

Ms. Theresa mentioned that the Public Outreach Plan was presented to this Committee back in January and it is a summary outline on how to get public input about the Campus Master Plan. The University recently had the online open house, where about 180 individuals signed up, and about 100 individuals actually called in and listened.

The University is planning to do more of the online open house once the draft plan is published. Ms. Doherty asked the Committee for an endorsement and support of the Public Outreach Plan. She mentioned that the City/University Agreement talks about a Public Outreach Plan.

Mr. Fox commented on the need for direct mailing as part of the outreach plan. He noted that the language about direct mailing was vague, and would like to have more clarification about what a direct mailing looks like. He mentioned that direct mail often goes to the property owners, and would encourage to extend direct mailings to residents, businesses, and property owners.

Ms. Doherty commented that they send out postcards out to about 12,000 residents that are in the primary impact zones. She noted that there are still in the preliminary concept plan and once the draft plan is published, more public outreach will be involved including walking and talking to individuals, businesses and property owners around the neighborhood.

A comment was made about having a more thorough and recent listing of all neighborhood as defined by next door neighbors.

Mr. Doug Campbell made a comment about his reservation for supporting the plan at this time because it is a big decision that would affect the community. Ms. Doherty emphasized that this is only a preliminary concept plan and once the actual plan is published, there will be numerous opportunities for public outreach such as in-person meeting, online open houses, and public hearings.

Ms. Doherty commented that what CUCAC is supporting or endorsing is the different methods and concepts the University will do for public outreach such as direct mail, social media, online meetings, etc.

Mr. Fox suggested to move the endorsement and adoption of the Public Outreach Plan at the April meeting. He recommended for a broader outreach plan for those individuals that are not actively engaged. He reminded the committee members to submit their suggestions if they have other broader and specific options to be included in the Public Outreach Plan.

VI. Campus Master Plan: East Campus Presentation (00:54:31)

Ms. Rebecca Barnes reminded the committee members that this is a work in progress in preparation for the preliminary draft plan, and all of the comments, questions will be compiled and evolve into a finished product. The campus is divided into four sectors and tonight's discussion will be on the East Campus precinct. The focus at East Campus will be the University's athletics, as well as the Union Bay natural area.

Ms. Barnes commented about the Five Guiding Principles and how this will reinforce the direction of the Campus Master Plan.

She presented a graphic illustration of the Campus Plan that showed the balanced approach of preservation as well as developmental changes around the campuses. She illustrated the proposed buildings which demonstrated a full buildout of about 14 million gross sq. ft. and the University is asking for 8 million gross sq. ft.

The public realm framework that summarizes the commitment to the vision for balancing the increased growth and development in each of the campus area which creates a large framework of open space, better connectivity, and waterfront continuity.

She showed a comparison between the 2003 and 2018 development parcels, which showed the 2003 sites that have not been developed, and the sites that the University is proposing for the 2018 development sites. There were some development parcels in the 2003 Master Plan, which the University decided not to include in the 2018 Master Plan. Rebecca mentioned that CUCAC sent a letter asking the University to not develop the site close to Denny yard and that site is not included in the 2018 plan.

She presented a graphic view of the existing massing and the parking lot areas where the University requested permission to develop. There will be replacement parking once these surface parking lots are developed.

She showed the Shoreline Access and Management Plan noting the Master Plan abides by respects 200 ft. setback.

The East Campus is thought of as a long term location for innovation uses such as research, etc. and have the West Campus as the initial focal point of the Innovation District activities.

She commented on the Proposed Sustainability Framework that summarizes how the Master Plan extends the sustainability of its land use through access and mixed used access improvements, make better use of the land, etc.

East Campus Framework

The big moves that will be happening in the East Campus area include:

- a) Enhancing the pedestrian connection a land bridge;
- b) Opening a corridor that leads into the Union Bay Natural Area;
- c) Reinforcing the edge along Montlake and behind the Burke-Gilman trail;
- d) Maintaining development at the edge of Montlake with a 130 ft. building height max;
- e) Optimizing development on existing surface parking lots;
- f) Creating a continuous shoreline trail

There are no details at this time about parking, but by the time a draft EIS is published, there will be more information about policies and intentions regarding parking.

A question was raised if there are any intentions around East Campus to acquire the Talaris property and Ms. Clark confirmed that there are no intentions.

She showed a diagram of the Rainer Vista view shed and commented on how conscious they are about Rainier Vista.

Development Standards

She mentioned that they keep looking at key parameters for the Campus-wide Development Standards and invited suggestions that can be included in the list.

A question was raised if Hec Ed stadium will stay the same in the next 20 years. Ms. Barnes commented that she has not heard anything about the Hec Ed building.

Mr. Fox asked about the proposed building heights at the south of Husky Stadium. Ms. Barnes said they will be about 160 ft. and 200 ft. setbacks from the waters edge.

Ms. Barnes presented a diagram of the campus transformation and a comparison between the existing and proposed sites.

Mr. Campbell commented about the Innovation district and the U district, and noted about giving more emphasis of the innovation to the East Campus in order to give the U district time to develop its residential potential. Ms. Doherty responded that there has been no firm decision made and the issue on infrastructure investments on East Campus which is easier to get in the West Campus.

VII. Committee Deliberation (01:37:00)

Ms. Kris Lund introduced herself as she will be facilitating the end of the meetings. Ms. Lund is a UW graduate of the School of Business. She resides at Montlake and has worked with land use before.

She commented that at the last meeting the committee discussed the West Campus Plan, but due to time constraints, there was not enough time to deliberate.

According to the work plan, the committee will continue to get these type of presentations about the preliminary work on the Master Plan through May. Previously, the anticipated timeframe to review the draft plan would be in late spring/early summer. Now it looks like the draft review will not be ready until fall. This creates a hiatus over the summer and these Campus Master Plan presentations will continue. In fall, the goal for the committee is to focus on the formal comments. In September, the committee will divide into

working groups and Ms. Lund suggested between now and May to think about how to structure these subcommittees since there will be a variety of topic areas that needs to be addressed.

She mentioned that some of the answers that they heard so far are vague since the University is gathering more information. She noted that Ms. Sheehan is compiling a running list of all of the questions, topics and comments that needs to be addressed.

She read through some of the comments made from the last meeting about building footprints and not seeing the setbacks, and questions around when can the committee see those information. She noted about inquiries about showing the topography more clearly.

Mr. Fox commented about the lack of real time massing studies and making comparisons on building heights at an aerial view is insufficient compared to having it on the ground.

Ms. Lund commented about the topic of light and air that was inquired at the last meeting, and it was briefly mentioned at tonight's presentation.

Another topic that was raised was making 15th as a porous boundary, and not a hardline, and she was not sure where the discussion will lead into.

Another request that was brought up at the last meeting was the shadow studies, in particular on Parrington Lawn and urban farming.

She mentioned a discussion about net parking and parking reduction and the University has no sense yet about what the requirements will be.

With regards to health and safety, she noted that it is not overtly addressed on the Campus Master Plan, but assumes it will be addressed in the EIS.

Ms. Lund mentioned that one of her goals is to get more questions and comments from the committee members. She mentioned that she will reach out to each of the members in order to gauge their style and to make sure that all of the voices and accommodate each of the member's points of view.

She began to open committee discussion on what they heard at tonight's presentation.

Mr. Fox commented about the East and West Campus buildings, and would like to have the building heights along Montlake and Pacific be arranged, with a mix and match scenario so it would not look like monolithic.

Mr. Brett Frosaker commented that Mr. Fox's comment is a good point on Montlake. He noted that Montlake is a high capacity roadway, and it should not be that way all the time. By the time these buildings come up, there will be a lot more pedestrians on the streets, and these pedestrians would like to have a positive experience along Montlake.

Ms. Lund mentioned some of the comments regarding the innovation zone in regards to phasing and timing. Mr. Campbell mentioned that he is an advocate for having the U district as an innovation district as well as a residential district for professionals that are associated with the University rather than being a commuter destination.

She noted that she will mark housing as a question mark for the phasing of the innovation district.

Ms. Clark asked Mr. Campbell a clarification about having the district dumped into a residential development market. Mr. Campbell mentioned that he wants housing for professionals, faculty and staff and university related resident with the goal of building community among the residents.

Ms. Clark asked whether the University was doing housing on the West Campus. Mr. Campbell commented that he was hoping that the East Campus tech sector happen simultaneously with West Campus, that all of the offices and the innovation district development does not have to happen on the West Campus and take the pressure off from the University District regarding office development.

Mr. Reudi Risler commented about the Transportation Management Plan, and he mentioned that it has been three months since it was mentioned, and there has been no discussion regarding transportation. Ms.

Sheehan noted that the committee can request a presentation about from the University, but it will not provide any specific details.

Mr. Risler asked about a big picture of the transportation plan for the whole district. Ms. Doherty mentioned that they could make a transportation presentation at the May presentation and present on the draft EIS at the June meeting.

Mr. Frosaker commented about the lack of discussion about the impact of the overall program and the massive growth on the neighborhoods.

Ms. Lund asked if the EIS covers what Mr. Frosaker had mentioned. Ms. Doherty confirmed that the EIS does cover the overall impact to the neighborhood. The EIS will cover about twenty elements that could impact the neighboring communities.

Mr. Frosaker inquired if the University will talk about the impacts outside the MIO as well as joint ventures and purchasing properties outside the MIO. Ms. Lund commented that the task of this committee is to discuss what is happening within the boundaries of the MIO.

Mr. Frosaker mentioned that in the past, there has been discussion about the impacts on leased properties.

Mr. O'Sullivan requested a more detailed discussion on data analysis, growth forecast that is related to the Master Plan regarding transportation, parking, etc. that he could share and discuss with his neighbors. Ms. Doherty commented that they can look at population increase and its impact in the next 20 years and do an evaluation, and all of these information will be generated at the draft EIS.

Mr. Fox commented that with extra time for the work plan, this will provide an opportunity for the committee to revisit and discuss any issues.

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.