



Minutes #180

(October 9, 2018)

City of Seattle/University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC)

Tuesday, September 11, 2018

6:30 – 8:30 PM

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue, 22nd Floor

Seattle WA 98105

Attendees/CUCAC Members:

John Gaines	Barbara Quinn	Julie Blakeslee	Timmy Bendis
Sarah Swanberg	Brian O’Sullivan	Reudi Risler	
Amanda Winters	Kerry Kahl	Jon Berkedal	
Matthew Fox	Ashley Emery	Rick Mohler	

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the July 10 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

Ms. Sally Clark informed the Committee that the Board of Regents will be meeting tomorrow to hear a presentation from the UW Real Estate about the U District Station building. UW Real Estate is looking for development partners to build a proposed 12 story building that fits within the 160’ commercial building site. UW will be leasing 100% of the building and looking at consolidating various leases there.

Mr. Fox commented that this topic should be discussed at the October meeting. Ms. Clark will check with UW Real Estate if a October presentation is feasible.

Mr. Fox mentioned that the UW Bookstore is considered a future development site, and Ms. Clark noted that the UW Real Estate is referencing a map for the Board of Regents that shows the various development sites that were thought about and suggests that how the UW Bookstore site could be develop under the current zoning.

3. Public Comments (00:06:19)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

4. Husky Stadium Transportation Management Plan (TMP) (00:06:28)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion about the Husky Stadium TMP.

Ms. Julie Blakeslee presented an update on the Husky Stadium TMP. She noted that they are currently working with SDCI and SDOT.

Questions were asked about current football attendance and season ticket holders, and Ms. Clark responded that she will request for more information from Mr. Dan Erickson, UW Assistant Athletic Director, regarding attendance and season ticket holders.

Ms. Blakeslee mentioned the proposed new TMP structure will have an operations plan and annual surveys. She added that the performance goals for the TMP increases the non-auto mode split and improved and efficient traffic control measures. Ms. Clark added that the University worked with SDOT, Sound Transit and Metro regarding the performance goals to make sure that the University is not unintentionally setting higher automobile levels.

A question was asked about Lyft and Uber as well as tailgaters and where do they fit in the TMP categories and Ms. Winters mentioned that they all are under the automobile category.

Ms. Blakeslee shared some of the comments regarding the TMP draft EIS, and Ms. Clark added that the TMP draft EIS is different from a standard EIS for a development project. It is not an EIS in expanding the stadium. The goal in revising the TMP is to diminish impact overtime.

A TMP Development timeline was shared and noted that the final TMP and EIS may be completed by mid-September 2018. The technical advisory committee will be meeting and drafting a resolution that will go to the City Council by winter 2018 or early 2019.

Mr. Reudi Risler asked what type of groups are being targeted for the survey, and Ms. Blakeslee responded that they survey a Pac-12 game as people enter the stadium and they do random sampling as each person enters the stadium/game. The point of the survey is to understand how people are travelling to and from the game.

Mr. Risler asked how the survey evaluates the impact in the neighborhood, and Ms. Clark responded that survey shows how the University is doing with the performance goals of the TMP. The University collaborates with both Metro and Sound Transit regarding the overall quality of service and these agencies are more equipped to gather the type of data Mr. Risler is asking about.

Mr. Rick Mohler asked if there is data to project the positive impact of light rail stations opening and if it is consistent from game to game, and Ms. Winters mentioned that they will be collecting more information as more Link stations are opened.

Ms. Sarah Swanberg shared the Ravenna-Bryant Community Association's comment letter regarding the UW TMP. The main concerns are the pedestrian access to the stadium and the Light Rail station and would like to coordinate with the UW to get a study or analysis done to make the access make sense.

5. Health Sciences Education Building (00:41:12)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on the Health Sciences Education Building.

Ms. Jeannie Natta introduced herself as the project manager for the Health Sciences Education building for Capital Planning and Development and Ms. Jaclynn Eckhardt as account manager. Ms. Eckhardt will be working with the different programs that will be moving to the new building to ensure that all their needs are met. Ms. Natta will be managing the project through design and construction, and Mr. Yura Kit will be also involved in the administration and facilitation of the project.

Ms. Eckhardt briefly summarized the project goals and objectives of the Health Science Education Building. The scope of the project has been reduced since the 2016 pre-design. It is now 110,000 gsf., down from 120,000 gsf with a project budget of \$90 million.

Ms. Natta commented that this project is part of the 2018 Campus Master Plan at site S40. A site investigation has been completed and a Geotech report of the site is underway. The design and build selection are underway and there were three finalist that were selected. Construction is anticipated to begin in Spring 2022 depending on the final approval of the CMP. She also noted that the project follows the 2018 CMP South Campus guiding principles.

This is Phase 1 of a multi-phase project. Phase 1 is for a new building that will allow decanting of space to enable the renovation or replacement the T-Wing. The proposed project would build to approximately 100', while the allowed zoning at this site is 200'. The future phases of the project that will go through state funding will do a phased approach on how to address the T-Wing.

A comment was made about CMP that provides transparency to the south campus. It was also meant that instead of having a long building parallel to the waterfront, the project will provide a green and pedestrian passageway that the public and students can walk through the waterfront.

A comment was made if the design will be complete before construction begins, and Ms. Natta noted that the design and build project will be continuing design and construction will begin at the same time.

Mr. Jon Berkedal commented that during the presentation by the University and the CMP, the discussion was replacing the life sciences building because it was getting old. It was discussed reducing the footprints of the buildings as they replace them with taller buildings and site corridors to see the waterfront. Ms. Natta commented that the challenge will be getting the funds to take the life science building down.

Mr. Risler asked if there is a long-term vision for this project that would look way beyond a 20-30-year plan. Ms. Eckhardt noted that it is part of the Phase 2 project, an implementation plan for the South Campus.

Ms. Natta mentioned that they will be back around spring or summer to provide updates about the project.

6. CMP Updates (01:06:01)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for CMP updates.

Mr. Fox mentioned that Council Central staff sent out a document summarizing the proposed amendments by various City Council members. He added that some of this Committee's top priorities were included in the document.

Ms. Clark commented that the City Council PLUZ committee will meet again on September 19th, and Councilmember Rob Johnson indicated that he would like to have a vote on a preliminary package. This package is a similar report by the Office of the Hearing Examiner that summarizes the findings of fact, conclusions, and recommended conditions.

There is a list of fourteen subjects for potential amendments by the Council members. The language of these amendments has not been released yet. If the committee votes on the 19th, it goes forward to the full City Council vote on the 24th or the week after. This will depend on the scheduled budget speech by the Mayor.

Under the City/University agreement, there is a 30-day window where the Board of Regents will make their response. This triggers a back and forth discussion by the Regents and the City Council until a final agreement is reached. CUCAC will be able to provide comments after the City Council takes its first action.

7. New Business (00:43:43)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for Committee's new business.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that DON sent out a survey to the Major Institutions asking for feedback on how to improve the Major Institutions process. She will provide a report to review the results at the October meeting. A comment was made that there was no option to opt-out a question about race. Ms. Sheehan noted that the City would like to have information on who City are engaging with. She will bring this attention to DON's Communication team.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the topics for the upcoming meeting include the Sound Transit site and the potential response of CUCAC to the City Council's decision on the amendments.

Mr. Fox suggested to do a placeholder to discuss the City Council's decision in the upcoming meetings.

8. Adjournment

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