



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

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

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**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Meeting #151
May 10, 2016
Adopted June 14, 2016
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Eric Larson	Brian O'Sullivan	Jan Arntz
Doug Campbell	Barbara Krieger	Scott Cooper
Kay Kelly	Matt Fox	John Gaines
Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting)	Barbara Quinn	
Brett Frosaker	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)	
Natasha Rodgers	Tomitha Blake	
John Berkedal	Kerry Kahl	

Staff and Others Present

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

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

The committee reviewed the April minutes and Mr. Fox had a few suggested changes and clarifications.

A motion was made to adopt the April minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted to adopt the April 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. Campus Master Plan: Role of CUCAC & CMP

Ms. Sheehan began the discussion by reviewing the City University Agreement and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the role of CUCAC. She referenced the City/University Agreement (Section II) as the guideline that summarizes CUCAC's contractual responsibilities.

Mr. O'Sullivan asked if the Master Plan is a 15 or 20 year plan. Ms. Doherty mentioned that it was discussed previously that it will be a 2015-2035 plan, but the plan is now for 2018 - 2028. She noted that it is a 10 year conceptual plan with no end date; the end date is when the square footage is developed. Ms. Doherty noted that under the existing Campus Master Plan, if the University

was not able to build out the approved square footage, the University can still build it out after the 10 years out. The capacity does not disappear after 10 years.

The committee will receive the Campus Master Plan and the EIS together. The EIS will analyze the impacts of the Campus Master Plan. The more the questions or concerns are tied to both the City/University Agreement and EIS, the more likely the University will be able to respond and address these comments.

Note: The committee began a back and forth discussion regarding the City/University Agreement and the boundaries of the MIO (Major Institutions Overlay). Ms. Doherty mentioned the discussion around the University purchasing properties outside the boundaries are covered under a different process.

For the draft Campus Master Plan/EIS, the committee will provide written comments to the University limited to consideration of the physical development of the University and its environmental impacts. For the final Master Plan/EIS, the committee will report their findings, public comments and recommendations to the Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI).

The goal of the University is to get the documents to the committee at the end of September/beginning of October 2016. The committee has 75 days to comment on draft Master Plan and EIS. During those 75 days, the committee may break into subgroups. The plan is to have the Final documents to the committee by April/May of 2017. The committee then has 56 days to report any findings, public comments and recommendations to the Director of SDCI.

A question was asked for clarification between regular committee members and alternate members. Mr. Fox added that it is better to have the alternate members be part of the conversations, however only the member may vote, or the alternate if the member is not present.

V. Committee Deliberation

Open Public Meeting Act

The Open Public Meeting Act requires a group mandates that to have a meeting or discussion, the meeting needs to be accessible and open to the public and there needs to be an opportunity for public comments. This act would like to avoid any discussions and decisions behind closed door where the public is unaware.

Mr. Fox made a comment that if the meeting has quorum (minimum of 8 individuals), the Open Public Meeting Act is enforced. CUCAC wants to make sure that when committee members do meet and have discussions, the preferred location should be at committee meetings.

Ms. Sheehan talked about the rolling quorum issue, where a group that has six individuals are meeting, and four members decided to stay, and two individuals decided to leave the meeting, and an additional four individuals decided to come and participate in the meeting, this is not allowed under the Open Public Meeting Act.

Ms. Clark reminded the committee members that they do not want them or the University to be at risk and end up that was an unintended violation of the Open Public Meeting Act. Keep in mind that if there are eight individuals that are in your group even if you are a regular or alternate member, the group is now under the Open Public Meeting Act and the group should provide a meeting notice and be accessible and open to the public.

If the group continues to discuss a policy type decision and make a back and forth comments over email, an individual may challenge the decision and request records the group used in all of the emails even though the discussion was not open to the public.

It is possible to talk outside meetings, but only if you stay under the 8 member threshold. These subgroup meeting should have minutes.

A comment was made that if these subgroups are formed with 3 or 4 members, that they can go ahead communicate through email, and Ms. Clark agreed.

Ms. Clark mentioned that the University would like to have a clean process with regards to whatever is being debated, discussed, or proposed.

Quasi-Judicial

Because the University has submitted their letter of intent of updating their Master Plan, it becomes a Type 2 decision and quasi-judicial. City Council members are now at the point where in regards to the Campus Master Plan and EIS, they can only look at the public record that will be submitted. Quasi-judicial processes are intended to make sure that there is a level playing field, and that there is a record of

The City Council should be aware and responsible for the new quasi-judicial list of items in the City, and that they should avoid having ex-parte communications.

Ms. Doherty noted that the Campus Master Plan is quasi-judicial, and the University cannot talk about the content of the Master Plan to the City Council, but the rezone is a legislative process. You can discuss the rezone to the City Council. Ms. King commented that it is an ongoing discussion among the City, when there are two action moving forward at the same time and one is quasi-judicial, and the other is a legislative process. However, there is an interest and need to address the cumulative impacts and it is the University's responsibility to integrate them in the EIS.

Mr. Frosaker made a comment that the U-District upzone EIS will come out before the Master Plan EIS; therefore, the University EIS cannot take into account the items in the Master Plan EIS, the concerns about U-District EIS would probably want to weigh in on the University's Plan EIS because that is when it is being dealt in cumulatively.

Ms. Sheehan provided handouts regarding the Elements of the EIS. The alternatives look at the elements of the environment and analyze the impacts. The University does not have a preferred alternative.

Mr. Campbell made a comment about the proposals, and his specific thought in the previous meeting was to develop the West Campus slowly so the neighborhood will have less impact from the development. These were not included in either of the alternatives. The alternatives look at developing East Campus versus South Campus rather than a possible alternative of going slower in the West Campus.

Ms. Quinn made a comment about the method on how other members of the committee can specifically influence what will be in the Master Plan. Ms. Sheehan noted that when the draft plan comes out; CUCAC will have an opportunity to make comments as well as an individual you are allowed to comment, and are encouraged to do so. Ms. King added that you can make comments on the EIS and Master Plan, and both of these documents are authored by the University. It will also go through the SDCl process and she mentioned that their comments can also be submitted to SDCl.

Working Groups

Ms. Lund began the discussion on how to organize working groups.

A handout was provided that talks about different ways CUCAC could organize into working groups. One of the basic assumption is that the subgroups will report back to CUCAC on the results of the breakout groups, these subgroups will not submit comments independently. Secondly, the comments from the subgroups will relate to both the EIS and Campus Master Plan. Everyone is invited to serve on any of the subgroups or more than one, with the exception that this subgroup does not exceed a quorum.

The first option would organize around the key issue areas in the Master Plan and discuss the twelve elements. The second option suggests organizing the subgroups by elements of the environment (EIS) and the third option by geographic areas of the campus (West, Central, South, East). Ms. Arntz made a comment that it is important to look at the Master Plan and EIS together. In either case, a group should look at its items in relation to the four areas. Ms. Lund provided an example about the transportation, parking and bikes, and that a subgroup will be looking at these topics for each section of the campus. Mr. Fox noted that Option 1 relates better than Option 2.

Mr. Gaines asked about getting outside help to review the plans and the EIS. Ms. Sheehan responded that the subgroup are welcome to do that, but neither the City nor University will cover the cost of outside consultants. Ms. Lund suggested to flag any questions or issues they may encounter during the discussion and the committee could ask Ms. King from SDCl regarding the guidelines. Ms. King noted while the committee is making comments on these documents, the City will also be making comments. If there are any

specific questions, she suggested to direct them to her and she can pass them to the appropriate technical experts.

A comment was made about a motion that the committee had at the past meeting about a scale model and its progress. Ms. Doherty mentioned that she is in the process of looking into it. She mentioned that the University does have a computer model and she had offered it to the committee. Once the draft CMP is released in September, the committee can begin looking at the computer model. All of the drawings are available online, but will have to structure how the computer model will be available online and she will discuss it with the consultants. Mr. Campbell asked if any of the consultants have physical models for the areas of the campus they are working on, and Ms. Doherty mentioned that they do not.

Transportation Management Plan presentation

The University would like to gather any advanced feedback on the issues the committee wants to cover.

Mr. Risler inquired about the scope of work the consultants have and inquired on how they get instructions to do their work. Ms. Doherty mentioned the elements of the environment which the consultants have to analyze along with the four alternatives. He also asked if there is a process for the consultants, the University, and the public to make any amendments to the plan. Ms. Doherty mentioned that once the draft EIS is published, if they feel there needs to be adjustments, they can submit comments.

Ms. Lund made a comment that at next month's meeting, the committee will have an opportunity to express its opinions, and the University will capture and provide these comments back to the consultants for review.

Mr. Fox made a suggestion that this committee take a formal position at next month's meeting that the University needs to analyze an alternative that would reduce the amount of development in the West Campus. Ms. Doherty responded that Mr. Fox's suggestion is being analyzed, and does not guarantee it is going to happen.

Mr. Risler noted that the light rail is getting to be popular and he would like to know how a Transportation Management Plan will address the issue of overcrowding once the system becomes available in the Northgate neighborhood.

Ms. Lund made a comment that the adverse impacts on public transportation are evaluated in the EIS. She inquired about if there are any mitigation to these impacts, and can CUCAC make a recommendation.

Ms. King noted that the purpose of the EIS is to analyze impacts. An EIS can offer mitigation once the impacts are identified. Comments regarding the potential mitigation are allowed in the draft EIS. The final EIS will start to incorporate all of these comments during the review process.

Mr. Fox made a statement that when the City Council hears the public comments on the final Master Plan after the final EIS, and you identified that their mitigations were inadequate, and these comments were in the public record, you can address these to the City Council when they consider the Master Plan. Ms. King confirmed that statement. You can provide comments through the end of the process provided that they were in a public record.

Ms. Lund noted that for the transportation element presentation at next month's meeting, the committee would like to cover: intersections, the relationships to the EIS, as well as the bridges (i.e. Montlake).

Ms. Clark reminded the committee that the Transportation plan is incomplete, and she is asking feedback so that the Transportation group will have an idea on what to cover in their presentation next month.

Mr. Campbell added that he is interested about the demographics of the transportation modes for the increased population.

Mr. Fox added that assuming the transportation mode is split and parking remains constant, there would be more physical drivers, and where would these drivers park.

Mr. Risler added concerns about public transportation capacity, and whether the light rail system and King County Metro has enough capacity to efficiently transport the public to and from the University.

Mr. Frosaker also added the expansion of the RPZ's as a topic of discussion.

Ms. Clark reminded the committee to make sure to attach these identified issues to the actual adverse impacts of the projected change, and whether these are attributable to the University or whether these are a combination of effects.

VI. Adjournment

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