

To: City-University Community Advisory Committee  
From: Sally Clark, UW Office of Regional & Community Relations  
Date: July 17, 2019  
RE: CUCAC impacts on the 2019 UW Seattle Campus Master Plan

CUCAC members have asked if the University or City has a comprehensive list of CUCAC-connected changes to the 2019 Campus Master Plan (CMP). After almost four years of work, it can be difficult to recall feedback given at the start of CMP development process. No document existed with the feedback tracked from start to finish. The UW Office of Regional & Community Relations has reviewed CUCAC meeting minutes, formal CUCAC comment letters, CUCAC member testimony, and the CMP and EIS. The following is an attempt at compiling a comprehensive description of CUCAC comments and recommendations reflected in the Final CMP.

CUCAC's work on the 2019 Seattle CMP can be broken into three stages:

- COMMENTS PRE-DRAFT
- COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS & CMP (RELEASED OCTOBER 2016)
- COMMENTS ON THE FINAL EIS & CMP (RELEASED JULY 2017) THROUGH COUNCIL ADOPTION (JANUARY 2019)

**I. COMMENTS PRE-DRAFT**

Recommendations made by CUCAC before release of the Draft EIS and Draft CMP are not reflected in formal comment letters like in later stages, although, a couple were the subject of formal CUCAC votes. CUCAC's minutes were reviewed for preliminary stage suggestions and recommendations. Many of CUCAC's comments in 2015 and 2016 meetings sought clarity on presentation materials and methods; some were recommendations the University did not take up; and others were incorporated in the Preliminary Draft CMP and Draft EIS and CMP.

CUCAC began receiving briefings and offering feedback on both CMP process and content in **August 2015**. CUCAC meeting minutes show initial feedback dealt with projected timelines and deadlines; availability of documents; and the methods of public engagement during development of the CMP. **The University included CUCAC's recommendations for additional community outreach in its process.**

In **September 2015**, CUCAC received a presentation on South Campus planning within the overall CMP work. Feedback at that meeting expressed concerns about building heights and view corridors both from campus and Portage Bay; concern that the University was not pursuing more pedestrian bridges over the Burke-Gilman Trail (Eastlake); and concern that the University would not have sufficient parking to meet future demand (Eastlake and Wallingford).

**The University subsequently studied these themes closely during the development of the CMP, specifically looking at the building heights and view corridors in South Campus, the level of service on the Burke-Gilman Trail, and the future campus parking demand.**

In **October 2015**, CUCAC received a briefing on the CMP kick-off and EIS scoping. Comments revisited past limitations on the University's development outside the Major Institution boundary and at least one member advocated that the CMP include planning for development inside and outside the MIO. The group adopted a statement supporting this position.

In **January 2016**, CUCAC received a briefing on the preliminary Draft CMP concepts. This included the projections of enrollment, space planning methodology, peer institution benchmarking, initial "big ideas" with regard to open space and access to shorelines, and initial proposed development sites and height limits. Minutes show questions at that time centered on understanding the need for growth. Concern was expressed about the initial possibility of almost-300-foot building heights in West Campus. **The University later dropped these heights consistent with the lowered heights in the U District Rezone.** Questions came up, also, about wanting to better understand setbacks and the views from ground-level. **These informed the next round of CMP diagrams and defined view corridors, and the EIS work.**

In **February 2016**, CUCAC received a presentation on planning for West Campus. CUCAC recommended shadow studies to better understand the impacts of the proposed heights. **The University included shadow studies in the EIS.**

In **March 2016**, CUCAC received a presentation on planning for East Campus and was introduced to Kjrj Lund, the group's facilitator for CMP work. A question was raised about whether it would be better to center the future Innovation District vision in East Campus. Comments recommended that the University break up massing in East and West Campus to prevent "monolithic" structures and better serve a likely rise in pedestrians. **This informed the Draft and Final CMP, and the inclusion of mid-block corridors.** Other comments mentioned the desire for 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to be more porous, and for a better understanding of parking plans. **Both comments are reflected in the CMP. See e.g., CMP pgs. 120-21; 184-85.**

In **April 2016**, CUCAC took up consideration of the University's proposed outreach plan. A desire for more direct mail to residents was expressed, and an expanded outreach plan was established, implemented, and documented in the 2019 CMP appendix. There was the desire for a scale model of the proposed CMP. CUCAC voted 9-2 for the University to build a scale model. The University did not build a model. After this discussion item, CUCAC received a presentation on planning for Central Campus and South Campus. Questions arose about the University planning adequately for increased parking demand. The University explained that the CMP will depend upon no increase in current parking allowed. **Future parking demand was addressed in the EIS and parking management strategies are incorporated in the CMP. See e.g., CMP pgs. 265-66. Subsequently, the City Council conditioned the CMP on lowering the parking cap applicable to campus.**

In **May 2016**, CUCAC reviewed its approach to small group work, open public meetings rules, and quasi-judicial restrictions on councilmembers. The substantive presentation for the night was on the Transportation Management Plan element of the CMP. Several questions regarding growth alternatives and transportation system elements were suggested for analysis in the EIS work. The group was reminded of the necessary connection between analysis, identified impacts, and potential mitigation for SEPA compliance. **CUCAC’s recommendation that a “lower growth” alternative for West Campus was part of the EIS (Alternative 2).**

The review of the TMP continued in the **June 2016** meeting where Transpo Group staff, the traffic consultant working on the CMP, talked about the proposed analysis in more detail. A CUCAC question asked if new residential development associated with light rail in North Seattle and North King County will be part of the analysis. **Transpo said “yes.”** Another question asked if increased walking from parking in the neighborhoods will be analyzed. **Transpo said “yes.”** Another question asked about how to measure “park-and-hide.” **Transpo replied they were working with the City on how to do that.** One comment suggested the University should provide subsidized housing for faculty and staff in the U District to address SOV trips. **The University later announced a subsidized housing project targeting lower wage staff and faculty.**

In **October 2016**, CUCAC received a presentation on the Draft EIS and CMP. Many questions from CUCAC were for clarity about what’s in the documents related to development sites, development standards, and carbon emissions. Specifically, a question was asked about whether the EIS looked at the cumulative impacts of development in the MIO and in the U District rezone. **The answer was “yes.”** Also, CUCAC asked if the Burke-Gilman Trail would be repaved. **The University included commitments in the CMP to widen and improve the BGT.** Small groups started framing their comments on the Draft EIS and Draft CMP in this meeting.

Small groups continued work in the November 8 and 29, and December 6 and 13, 2016, meetings on a comment letter on the Draft EIS and CMP, discussed in the next section.

## **II. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS & CMP (RELEASED OCTOBER 2016)**

After the University released the Draft CMP and EIS in October 2016, the University received 129 comment letters and emails. **The University responded to each in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.** EIS pages 5-35 to 5-43 respond to the 67 individual comment topics identified in the CUCAC letter. The University also responded to comments by modifying the Final CMP to address issues raised.

The following topic areas of CUCAC comment, among others, were addressed in the Final CMP as reflected in the EIS:

- Activation of the West Campus Green open space.
- Inclusion of a “transit agency stakeholder group” as a TMP strategy that includes coordination with King County Metro.
- Removal of the NE Boat Street vacation.

- Clarification of the status of development in the E1 parking lot.
- Clarification of the “Innovation District” strategy and uses.
- Campus sustainability practices.
- Clarification of the University’s utility needs and anticipated utility system upgrades.
- Clarification and reduction of the proposed heights in West Campus and correlation to heights allowed in the University District. Reduction of heights in South Campus.
- Clarification of the timeframe for delivery of open space commitments.
- Refinement and clarification of upper-level setbacks.
- Revisions to the text of the CMP.

III. **COMMENTS ON THE FINAL EIS & CMP (RELEASED JULY 2017) THROUGH COUNCIL ADOPTION (JANUARY 2019)**

CUCAC submitted its final report and recommendations for conditions on August 30, 2017, after a tight string of summer meetings refining priorities and language. (Much pizza was consumed.) This report to the City “to make recommendations... for modifications to the 2018 [now 2019] University of Washington Campus Master Plan” formed the basis for CUCAC’s testimony at the Hearing Examiner (December 2017) and to City Council (June-July 2018). The final report contained 33 recommendations on 16 subjects, many similar to the subjects and recommendations from the Draft stage that were addressed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Meeting minutes demonstrate that CUCAC’s members understood that several of CUCAC’s recommendations would be considered outside the City’s land use authority. Nonetheless, committee members demonstrated a passion for taking the subjects forward for advocacy.

At the request of the City, the University submitted a letter clarifying its position on several CUCAC topics that were further addressed in the City’s recommendation on the CMP and at the Hearing Examiner and City Council. That letter is attached and shows the University’s commitment to considering CUCAC’s priorities through the process. The final CMP adopted by Council addresses the topics in CUCAC’s final report in the following ways, and forms the basis of the University’s ongoing CMP commitments:

1. **Proposed open space and trail:** CUCAC was **largely successful** in tightening the triggers for staged development of the future West Campus Green and in specifying annual report elements related to new open spaces and the Waterfront Trail. UW had already committed to work with the City on parking solutions for Portage Bay Park users and interpretive signage.
2. **Multinodal growth:** CUCAC stuck by its early commitment to push this element despite the City’s and UW’s responses that the subject is outside the scope of the CMP and something the University already does outside the CMP. The City did not adopt two of the three recommendations. **The City did adopt a reporting requirement on UW’s capital plan.**
3. **Affordable childcare:** CUCAC achieved **two out of three** recommendations under this subject. The University is still poised to participate in a pilot voucher system outside the CMP to be led by the City, and will report on progress on affordable childcare in the

annual report. In addition, to encourage construction of childcare space, the CMP exempts new childcare space from the 6 million GSF.

4. **Affordable housing:** CUCAC made six recommendations. The University is voluntarily meeting the intent of one of CUCAC's recommendations by way of the partnership with Seattle Housing Authority to develop housing for lower-wage staff and faculty in the U District. As discussed in many forums throughout the CMP process, affordable housing is a critically important issue to the University. Efforts to improve housing access continue independent of the CMP.

It should be noted that CUCAC's Recommendation 12 was intended to compel the *City of Seattle* to meet *its* obligations to report to CUCAC on housing development in the greater U District Urban Center. The University continues to support City reporting in this area.

5. **Planning framework -- Circulation and parking:** This recommendation was for UW to take "leadership role" in ensuring effective transportation coordination. The City seemed to struggle with this recommendation as it lacked grounding in the EIS. Nonetheless the UW expects to be an active participant in transportation planning through the Transportation Stakeholder group envisioned in CMP's Transportation Management Plan.
6. **Planning Framework – Parking:** CUCAC's recommendation implied that the City should not exclude new above-grade parking from developable square footage calculations. The City did not act on this item. **Perhaps more importantly, the City Council later lowered the parking cap from 12,300 possible spaces on campus to 9,000 possible spaces.**
7. **West Campus Innovation Focus:** CUCAC recommended the CMP be modified to include more detail in this area (after the University expanded the chapter between the Draft and Final Plans). This likely was not a specific enough recommendation for the City to incorporate.
8. **University Community Development Strategy:** CUCAC's recommendation was that the City withhold approval of the CMP pending a place-making strategy for outside the MIO boundary. The City declined to do that as there was no regulatory or EIS basis.
9. **Independent Small Businesses –** CUCAC recommended withholding approval of the CMP pending a plan to integrate small business into the "footprint" of campus expansion. **The City Council was interested in this recommendation and took three steps to meet CUCAC's intent:** space for small businesses will be exempt in calculating the 6 million GSF; the University is formally encouraged to explore ways to increase diversity of on-campus retail ownership; and the University will report annually on small business presence on campus.
10. **Planning Framework – Transportation Management Plan:** CUCAC made six recommendations in this area. **The City adopted arguably half of those:** the reporting requirement; the lowering of the SOV rate over time to 12%; and general improvement of the pedestrian and bicycle experience in the MIO with required BGT improvements.
11. **Height, Bulk, Scale:** CUCAC commended the University for lowering some heights in South Campus from 240' to 200', then made multiple view corridor and down-sizing

recommendations across West Campus in Recommendations 24-27. The City Council did not adopt CUCAC Recommendations 24 and 25. Recommendation 26 asked for study of impacts in the event of vacating N. Northlake Way. The City did not adopt this as the CMP did not include an application for vacating that right-of-way, so such a study will occur later at the time of an application, as required by the regulatory structure for street vacations. The City Council did not adopt CUCAC's Recommendation 27 for reducing the proposed heights for Sites W19 and W22.

12. **Leasing and Acquisition:** CUCAC urged the City to include development outside the MIO in the 6 million GSF; include above ground parking in developable square footage; restrict development "overage" potential in West Campus; and report on industry partnerships. **The City met CUCAC's intent in the third item.**
13. **Development Standards – Light and Glare:** CUCAC recommended the City require "something akin to privacy glass" to protect Portage Bay and other neighbors from light and glare. **The University acknowledged that interior and exterior lighting must be accounted for in South Campus and other areas, and that it would address these concerns on a site-specific basis as new buildings are proposed.**
14. **Development Standards – Site Design Standards:** This is a recommendation to lower the proposed height on site W-37 to protect views to and from the University Bridge. The City did not agree with CUCAC regarding view protection for this site, citing desire for density near light rail stations.
15. **Development Standards – Tower Separation:** CUCAC recommended a greater tower spacing distance than the proposed 75', which was modeled after the standard in the U District. The City declined to hold UW to a different standard than the rest of the neighborhood.
16. **Stormwater run-off:** CUCAC recommended that the University be a leader and exceed City standards. **The City adopted language encouraging the University to explore Best Practices.**

This record shows CUCAC impacted the development and content of the 2019 CMP from start to finish. CUCAC's careful work reviewing details and vision improved the plan – a plan that will guide development of one of the nation's most beautiful campuses for years to come.