



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

Timmy Bendis
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake
Montlake Community Club

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

TBD
Ravenna Springs Community Group

TBD
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Amanda Winters
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

TBD
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Yvonne Sanchez
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

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

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 #169
August 22, 2017
Adopted October 10, 2017

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

Members and Alternates Present

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Timmy Bendis | Matthew Fox | Jan Arntz |
| Doug Campbell | Barbara Quinn | Jon Berkedal (Non-voting Alt.) |
| Kay Kelly | Brian O'Sullivan | Barbara Kreiger (Non-Voting Alt.) |
| John Gaines | Kerry Kahl | Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.) |
| Amanda Winters | Ashley Emery | Rick Mohler (Non-Voting Alt.) |

Staff and Others Present

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Maureen Sheehan | Sally Clark | Kjristine Lund |
| Theresa Doherty | Lindsay King | |

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

There were no meeting minutes to approve at tonight's meeting.

III. Public Comment (00:01:41)

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments.

Mr. Bill Roach commented that he spoke two weeks ago before the Committee to consider adjusting the University's SOV to 12% instead of 15%. A copy of the letter summarizing how to achieve this goal was made available to the Committee at the last meeting. He summarized the studies and analysis made by their Transportation Consultant reinforcing and confirming the need for an aggressive 12% SOV goal.

IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion (00:14:00)

Ms. Kjristine Lund opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS comments.

Ms. Lund commented that the goal of tonight's meeting is to vote on the final recommendations. She also wanted to make sure that the correct representatives from the different community groups are seated at the table for the final voting.

Ms. Lund began by reviewing the outstanding items on the matrix that need to be discussed and asked representatives from the working groups to discuss their comments. She mentioned that the Committee have voted on the items on the matrix and agreed that these comments will go into the final letter.

Mr. Reudi Risler commented about the RPZ and he was not clear about the University's position. Mr. Gaines commented that the RPZ's depends on the University's primary and secondary impact zone boundaries. Ms. Lund noted that Mr. Risler's is recommending that they do not have any further comments about the RPZ in the letter. A majority voted not to include the RPZ comment in the letter.

Ms. Lund noted that Comment #55 was voted not to include in the letter. She added that there is further discussion regarding the tower separation.

Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Lund began the discussion on the issue of affordable housing. The majority voted to change the reference to HALA to MHA (Mandatory Housing Affordability) fees for Recommendations #11 and #12.

A comment was made about the conversations they have had with the community around housing and they came up with ideas on how can the University advance the housing affordability in the area and noted that businesses and housing developers already pay MHA fees.

Mr. Doug Campbell recalled voting on this and adding an amendment that MHA fees be allocated to support housing in the primary and secondary impact areas.

Mr. Campbell commented about the innovation district and recommended to add a reference to the Brookings Institute article on what an innovation district would look like. A majority voted to include a reference in the letter.

Ms. Lund noted that the introductory paragraph on Comment #8 will be modified by removing the reference to specific organizations, and the recommendation will stay as written. A majority voted to modify Comment #8.

Mr. Campbell and Mr. Bendis commented on adding a language about integrating small businesses within the University campus to provide opportunities for students and staff. A majority voted to integrate the language.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on leasing and acquisition. A comment was made on recommending a 3 million sq. ft. development cap on the West Campus. (Recommendation #28)

Mr. Gaines asked if University employees are counted in the TMP for the industrial partnership growth in the West Campus. Ms. Theresa Doherty confirmed that they are counted.

Ms. Lund commented that Recommendation #28 contains multiple items and have asked the Committee if it is comfortable to vote the recommendation. The Committee decided to vote and voted in the majority for all items on Recommendation #28.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on transportation. Ms. Sheehan noted that the Committee struggled on how to approach Comment #10 and five Committee members worked over the past two weeks to organize and summarize the specific details of what Comment #10 would like to achieve. Ms. Lund mentioned that there were eight comments embedded in Comment #10 and the opening paragraph is about encouraging the University to work with City Departments.

Mr. Bendis commented that his group encountered challenges because they could not illustrate the comments individually but rather an overarching approach since it covered different topics. He recommended to read Comment #10 as one. Mr. Bendis commented that Comment #18 should have a language that shows that the University has funding available for transportation projects. The Committee voted with a majority.

Ms. Lund commented that there was different focus on outcomes as well as edits on Recommendation #19. She suggested that the Committee vote on as currently written with the only change about the term staff, faculty and employees. The Committee voted and it did not have a majority. Mr. Bendis suggested to have further discussions on Recommendation #19.

Ms. Jan Arntz noted on Recommendation #20 about calls for more reporting. She commented that these will result in money spent hiring a transportation consultant to produce more reports instead of using the money for transportation mitigation and improvements. The Committee voted with a majority to include Recommendation #20 as written.

The Committee voted with a majority to have Recommendation #21 as written.

Mr. Bendis commented that Recommendation #22 is about setting up conditions for Recommendation #21.

Mr. Fox commented that adding time markers on Recommendation #22 is good, but felt less comfortable with the demands as stated.

Mr. Campbell commented that he prefers the idea that Mr. Gaines recommended about adding a condition based on the square footage percentage that is being developed.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the Committee's discussion by stating that further issuing development permits will be delayed until the SOV goals are achieved. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the statement.

Mr. Bendis commented that Recommendation #23 lacks performance metrics for pedestrians, and noted that having adequate metrics to measure pedestrian and rider experience is essential.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the discussion by stating that improving the pedestrian and bicycle experience within the MIO and the primary and secondary impact areas with performance metrics. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the statement.

Mr. Risler commented on adding a sentence to Recommendation #18 that states having collaboration with other transit agencies must yield concrete mitigation projects to improve the transit rider, pedestrian and bicycle experience. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the addition.

Mr. Fox commented and reaffirmed that W-28 be reduced to 90 ft. and W-22 to 160 ft., and that W-19 and W-20 will be retained along the existing zoning for Recommendation #27. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the edited statement.

Mr. Fox noted that any changes to the development standards under the City/University agreement be considered as a minor plan amendment.

Ms. Lund noted that a proposal was made to delete Comment #14 from the letter because the City/University agreement already provided a role. The Committee voted unanimously to delete the comment.

Mr. Fox commented about tower separation and recommended that SDCI consider increasing the distance in the east, west, and south campus to ensure variations in height and spacing. The Committee voted with a majority and agreed with the statement.

Recommendation #19 was voted down and Ms. Clark suggested to have someone introduce an alternative as a substitute. Mr. Campbell proposed a recommendation that states that the University provide a transit pass to all University employees and staff as a standard employee benefit package. Mr. Campbell made a motion to include the that CUCAC encourages the University to include an employee transit pass as a universal employee benefit package. The Committee voted with a majority and agree with the statement.

Ms. Sheehan noted that she added an overview section for the letter that highlights the areas of disagreement and will continue to discuss regarding transportation planning, delivery of the proposed open space, excess height and bulk along where the campus and the community meet, and a livable university district.

She reminded that Committee that she will have a final document by the end of the week.

After the Committee reviews the final document, Ms. Sheehan will submit it to SDCI no later than August 30th. SDCI will take the document into consideration for their final recommendation before it goes to the Office of the Hearing Examiner around December. A representative from this Committee is encouraged to attend the hearing to provide a synopsis and answer questions. Ms. Clark noted that the Committee's co-chairs will be asked to attend.

Ms. Lindsay King added that beginning October, SDCI is required to submit their draft to the University and CUCAC before the final recommendation is published.

Ms. Sheehan noted that the process is not over and reminded the Committee members to be active through the implementation of the future Master Plan.

VII. New Business

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business. Ms. Clark mentioned that the agenda for the next meeting in September will be light, and there will be a Population Health project check-in presentation scheduled for October's meeting.

VI. Adjournment

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