



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake
Montlake Community Club

Jon Gaines (Co-chair)
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Joan Kelday
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Scott Cooper
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council

Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council

Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large

Bry Osmonson
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Timmy Bendis
Eastlake Community Council

Louise Little
University District Partnership

Leslie Wright
Laurelhurst Community Club

Miha Sarani
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Pamela Clark
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Natasha Rodgers
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Amanda Winters
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader
University District Community Council

Ruedi Rislér
University Park Community Club

Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council

TBD
University of Washington At -Large

Osman Salahuddin
University of Washington Students

Rick Mohler
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 #155

October 11, 2016

Adopted November 29, 2016

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue

Seattle, WA 98105

22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Yvonne Sanchez | Barbara Quinn | Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting) |
| Doug Campbell | Brian O'Sullivan | Pam Clark (Alt. – non-voting) |
| Kay Kelly | Kerry Kahl | Natasha Rodgers (Alt) |
| John Gaines | Bry Osmonson | Amanda Winters (Alt – non-voting) |
| Joan Kelday | Ashley Emery | Ruedi Rislér (Alt. – non-voting) |
| Brett Frosaker | Jan Arntz | Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting) |
| Scott Cooper | Timmy Bendis (Alt) | Rick Mohler (Alt – non-voting) |
| Matt Fox | Leslie Wright (Alt. – non-voting) | |

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark
(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Jon Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

A motion was made by Mr. Matt Fox to adopt the September minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. Draft CMP Presentation – Caitlyn Clauson

Ms. Theresa Doherty began the discussion by providing an update on the public outreach plan. A copy of the outreach update was provided to the Committee members.

Ms. Doherty noted that they have notified various internal and external University groups and have visited various community organizations to provide an update about the plan. Various articles and print media has been distributed to different media outlets, households, business owners, faculty, students, staff and alumni, which she passed around examples of. The public outreach are also available online.

She introduced Ms. Caitlyn Clauson to present the Campus Master Plan information to the Committee. Ms. Clauson noted that she will focus more on the development standards section of the presentation.

She identified the reasons for growth due to student, faculty and staff as well as changes in the teaching methods, increased industry partnerships, and deferred maintenance.

She showed a diagram of the overall MIO (Major Institution Overlay) and the total acres for each of sectors.

She summarized the City/University Agreement that establishes the official requirements of the campus master planning process.

She briefly discussed the long term vs. the 10 year conceptual plan for each campus sectors. The long term vision described the full buildout of the campus, developing all 85 development sites that have been identified in the plan. The 10-year conceptual plan is aligned with the requested growth amount of 6 million net gross sq. ft.

She showed a map of the long-term vision buildout and noted that majority of the development is located in the west campus and additional developments in the south campus. She added that from a net new perspective the west and east campus are having the greatest amount of growth.

She showed a map of the 10-year conceptual plan buildout. Since the committee last saw the preliminary proposal, they have identified the maximum development limits for each of the four campus sectors.

Back in February they had talked about the west campus having a maximum allowable building height of 300 ft. The Committee commented that the building height seemed too aggressive, and the University decided to reduce the allowable building height down to 240 ft. which aligns with the proposed building heights to the north. The building heights will step down as it moves south towards the waterfront. The allowable building height for the central campus remain unchanged.

She briefly described the proposed massing. The 2003 CMP growth request was 3 million net new gross sq. ft. and the identified growth capacity representative of all development was 8.3 million gross sq. ft. The growth request for the current plan is 6 million net new gross sq. ft. and the identified growth capacity is 12.9 million gross sq. ft.

She began do discuss a series of guiding principles for the plan that include the following: a) flexible framework; b) sustainable development; c) connectivity; d) stewardship of historic and cultural resources; and e) learning-based university/industry partnerships.

A question was asked about why the growth capacity changed from 2003. Ms. Doherty commented that they have identified more development sites.

She began to describe the big key moves in each of the four campus sectors as well as the development standards. The development standards of the CMP is a very robust section that covers noise, odor, and site design standards, to list a few.

Mr. Fox inquired the width of the East Campus Land Bridge. Ms. Clauson noted that is about 80 ft. but she mentioned that she will go ahead and research the exact dimensions.

(Note: Ms. Clauson provided the dimensions from Mr. Fox's inquiry via email to Ms. Sheehan. The following dimensions are as follows: On the central campus side: 75 ft. As it crosses Montlake Boulevard: 80 ft. In the plaza on East Campus: 138 ft.)

A question was asked about consideration for child care facilities around the campus and what it would look like. Ms. Clauson commented that one of the sites they are developing in the west campus is the location of the health care center, where it can accommodate and expanded within the development that was identified throughout the west campus.

Mr. Timmy Bendis asked what proposed buildings are being built at the central side of the east campus land bridge or if the new Computer Science building will go there. Ms. Clauson showed a diagram of the location of the proposed land bridge as a point of reference. He also inquired if the University owns the parking lot across Agua Verde in the west campus. Ms. Doherty confirmed that it is owned by the University.

She continued her presentation on the development standards by briefly explaining the public realm allowance and noted that they have identified the minimum distance required between the curb edges to the building façade. In total, they have developed five different recommendations for different street conditions.

She called out other additional development standards that was incorporated in the document which include flexible floorplates, midblock passages, podium heights and upper level setbacks. She noted that embedded in the document with the development standards are the development guidelines for each of the campus sectors. The purpose of these development guidelines are to identify active edges, open spaces and key pedestrian connections.

Mr. Reudi Risler commented about the total building height and the U district proposed up zone restriction of the floor area ratios (FAR), and asked if the University will be able to build towers to 240 ft. Ms. Clauson noted that for each development parcel, there is an allowable building height, but also a maximum development limit. As the University developed the maximum development limit, it is aligned with the massing. A combination of maximum development limit for each individual site along with the development standards will be each building sites constraints, much like FAR.

Mr. Doug Campbell asked if the maximum development limit is site specific. Ms. Clauson confirmed that it is site specific.

Mr. Fox asked if structured parking is still exempted from the sq. foot limits. Ms. Clauson commented that it is exempted. Ms. Doherty added that in the CMP, there is a chart for each sector that describes the total allowable gross sq. ft., the net new gross sq. ft., the approximate number of floors, height, existing parking, general use, and etc. that guides you to each of the individual sites.

Mr. Campbell asked if the individual sites can be subdivided and/or merged. Ms. Doherty commented that in the development standards within each sector each sector can go over by 20% without requesting any amendments to the CMP. For each individual sites, if the University does not use gross sq. ft. on a particular site, that square footage can be transferred to a different site within the same sector.

Mr. Rick Mohler asked if there are any procedures embedded in the document that taken into account carbon materials between the existing buildings vs. high performance building that will be built. Ms. Doherty commented that in the EIS document, there is an evaluation of future energy needs.

Mr. Fox asked if the EIS include a cumulative analysis of the effects of the CMP development and the up zoning for University related uses. Ms. Doherty commented that she will locate it in the document and will provide the information.

(Note: Ms. Doherty provided citations for the information requested via e-mail: The EIS evaluated cumulative impacts of the Upzone and CMP. The results are documented in greater detail in the Transportation Discipline Report (Chapter 10). We looked at corridor operations, screen lines and a cordon around the study area in detail. The EIS provides a little lighter touch in Section 3.15.2 towards the end.)

Mr. Bendis asked if the Burke-Gilman will be repaved. Ms. Doherty mentioned that in the plan, there re discussions about certain areas of the Burke-Gilman being redone, but it all depends on funding availability.

V. Draft CMP/EIS Review – Kjris Lund

Ms. Kjris Lund opened the discussion for the draft CMP/DEIS Review.

She noticed that there is a lot of information to follow and track and suggested to have a buddy system so the individual who has expertise and knowledge on this kind of language will be able to easily explain the terms to other groups.

She instructed the Committee to break into their subgroups and look at the draft documents and discuss how they plan to structure their comments. She noted that Ms. Sheehan has a template that they can use to fill in their comments. She encouraged subgroups to structure their comments so they can solicit written responses from the University. She mentioned that she and Ms. Sheehan are available to assist the subgroups with this.

Ms. Sheehan added that she will send out a [link](#) to the previous presentation she presented that summarized on how to reference their comments to the CMP.

(Editor's Note: The Committee broke into their subgroups for discussion)

VI. Committee Deliberation

The Committee reconvened for committee deliberation and subgroups report out.

Ms. Jan Arntz commented that the draft document is redundant. She noted that there is general discussion about the elements of the environment and the impact analysis is divided by each sector. She emphasized to look at the maps that shows the ratings of the campus wide impacts as well as the summary of impacts for reference. The University worked very hard to make this document more substantive as possible.

Ms. Lund asked each of the subgroups if they have any questions, clarifications, insights and comments that they would like to share to the Committee.

Mr. Fox of Group #4 commented that their group looked at the draft document conceptually. He added that this document talked about environmental impacts and how will the University will mitigate them. He noted that comments from CUCAC should begin looking at what the University's position on social impacts, and questions like can the University District survive an innovation district?

He mentioned that this type of question may not be mitigatable and has to be identified in this document, but a question for the community on what the University is proposing to do and consider it as a legitimate topic of discussion.

Based on Mr. Fox's initial thoughts, all of the alternatives and the bulk of the development is concentrated in the West Campus area. He suggested that CUCAC may want the University to consider and review other alternatives that do not focus on West Campus. He added that it is important to weigh in on these type of questions and have these conversations now because once this document is finalized and goes to the Hearing Examiner and the City Council, new topics cannot be brought up then.

He added that the City commented on the preliminary draft and CUCAC will get copies of those comments. This might give a sense of the range of substantive comments. He mentioned that if those comments have been reflected in the draft EIS and plan, whether or not they are adequately addressed might be a matter for this Committee to address as well.

Ms. Sheehan noted that if they are looking at the comments to keep in mind that technical experts are looking at the document and if they feel that they have addressed what you want them to address and are okay to let the City continue, go and move into the next line of questions to save some time.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the City is done commenting on the plan. Ms. Sheehan commented that there are three phases of the document. The preliminary draft that just the City departments received, the draft document that the group currently has, and a final document. Ms. Arntz mentioned that the preliminary draft comments from the City are reflected in this document.

Mr. Frosaker asked if this means that the City got what they wanted. Ms. Lindsay King commented that the preliminary draft review is mostly about soliciting if all of the information are gathered to do a second review. The City will have a 45 day comment period on the EIS while CUCAC will have 75 days to provide comments on both documents. The City will be providing comments on the preliminary draft master plan later in the year when the Master Use Permit (MUP) is submitted, and this will go out for public comments. The City has a two part review process just for the draft and then one response to all of the final documents.

Ms. Lund asked if CUCAC will receive a copy of the EIS comments by the City and the response was yes.

Mr. Timmy Bendis of Group #2 commented that their group noticed that the University is financing a potential RPZ in the U-District. However, the group did not notice how much the University is willing to finance towards pedestrian and cyclist safety. The group would like to see what the University is planning and how it would work.

He noted that the group also noticed a lack of intermodal transit capabilities around the University Stadium station. The group would like their comments to be simultaneously submitted to City Council and especially to Councilmember Rob Johnson's office to discuss the up zone issues.

Ms. Clark noted that within the Land Use regulations, there are multiple type of decisions the City Council makes. One of these issues is the U-District rezone proposal, which has been worked out in public and is a free flow conversation between the public and the City Council. However, spot rezones that you see in most neighborhoods, and a property owner is applying for a rezone is categorized as a quasi-judicial rezone. The rules imply that you cannot speak directly with the City Council members because they do not represent as legislators for that specific decision. They maintain a dual role as a judicial and legislator at the same time. There are different sets of rules regarding on how they can communicate openly with the public.

The MIMP (Major Institutions Master Plan) updates fall under the quasi-judicial rules. The CMP (Campus Master Plan) is off limits for communication to City Council members. If you successfully decided to communicate with them, then they have to recuse themselves in making decision about the plan. She added how important that these comments are and if you have a point to make, be sure it happen within the timeframe and during public comment. Mr. Fox added that these applies to all community groups.

Mr. Frosaker asked if one of the representatives from his community association decided to talk to Council member Rob Johnson, does it hold the same weight if he had spoken to him. Ms. Clark responded that it holds the same weight.

Group #2 asked if the City Council have access to the same document they are reviewing. Ms. Doherty responded that they do not. Ms. Lund added that the City Council will receive the final document with comments.

Group #3 commented if they had to identify what community organizations or affiliation they belong to when they put their comments in the record. Ms. Sheehan commented that when this Committee do its comments, it will come from CUCAC and not individual groups. All may have different comments, but it has to agree as a Committee. She added that individual organizations are welcome to submit comments as directed in the scoping notice.

Mr. Frosaker of Group #1 commented that their group discussed about how to communicate with each other, and that they are not yet in a position to make a comment since they have not gone through the entire document.

Ms. Lund reminded the Committee that the next meeting will be on November 8th, and Ms. Sheehan is asking the comments from the working groups be sent to her no later than October 27th. She would like the working groups to submit their comments in a matrix. At the next meeting on November 8th the group will go through the first round of comments. There will be another opportunity to discuss and add further comments at the next meeting on November 29th.

Ms. Lund commented that the Committee will formulate and construct on what the comment letter would look like at the December meeting.

VII. New Business

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business, and there was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment

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