



MEMBERS

- Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council
- Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council
- Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
- TBD
Laurelhurst Community Club
- TBD
Montlake Community Club
- Jon Gaines
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council
- TBD
Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- Dave Eckert
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- 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
Chris Leman
Eastlake Community Council
- Louise Little
University District Partnership
- Jeannie Hale & Colleen McAleer
Laurelhurst Community Club
- TBD
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 # 147

January 12, 2016

Adopted February 9, 2016

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Eric Larson	Kerry Kahl
Doug Campbell	Matthew Fox	Evan Carver
Jeannie Hale (Alt.)	Ruedi Risler (Alt.)	Ashley Emery
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Jan Arntz
Brett Frosaker	Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Theresa Doherty
Peter Shapiro	Amy Gore	Lindsey King
Rebecca Barnes	Kay Kelly	Scott Cooper

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Matthew Fox opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed. Mr. Evan Carver is our new University of Washington Student representative. Mr. Scott Cooper is here as possible a Roosevelt Neighbors Association representative.

II. Housekeeping

Mr. John Gaines made a motion to adopt the November minutes and Mr. Eric Larson seconded. Mr. Ruedi Risler and Mr. Carver abstained since they were not present at the November meeting. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

Mr. Fox reminded the Committee members that he is still in the process of looking for a co-chair.

Mr. Sally Clark mentioned that she has not had the opportunity to communicate with the Board of Regents regarding a schedule to come to one of the CUCAC meetings, but will have more details before the next meeting.

III. Public Comment

Mr. Fox asked if there were any members of the public who would like to make a comment. Mr. Carver asked about the structure of the Committee and inquired about who are the members of the public. Mr. Fox mentioned that this Committee will begin to consider the Campus Master Plan (CMP), this is a good opportunity for the public to make comments.

Mr. John Gaines made a comment about the More Hall Annex and its significance. He believes that is worth preserving. He asked whether this Committee can further discuss about this issue. Mr. Fox mentioned that the

Committee cannot take any further action about this issue outside of this meeting since the deadline for comments has passed and the Committee chose not to provide further comments.

IV. Campus Master Plan: Preliminary Concepts (00:13:30)

Ms. Theresa Doherty made a brief presentation of the Campus Master Plan (CMP) Preliminary Concepts. Copies of the presentation were handed out to the Committee and it is also available on the UW Regional and Community Relations website.

Ms. Doherty and Ms. Rebecca Barnes will present an overview of the CMP tonight, and over the next three months to provide more details about the Preliminary Draft CMP concepts until a draft CMP and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is presented in May.

Winter 2015 Ms. Doherty presented to CUCAC the schedule and how the City/University Agreement and CUCAC fit together. The Committee was able to look at a Public Outreach Plan. The goal for this year is to discuss in more details the CMP and have the Draft CMP and EIS out and published. Once these draft plans are published around May, CUCAC has 75 days to make comments. The Committee will need to make plans to discuss and comment about these draft plans in the given comment period. The University will respond to comment on the Draft CMP and EIS and then the final CMP and EIS, expected to be published January 2017.

Growth Profile

Mr. Doherty noted that the City/University Agreement outlines the 12 elements that needs to be included in the CMP. (See presentation) More detail about these elements will be discussed in the upcoming meetings. She emphasized that the CMP development are restricted to the Major Institutions Overlay (MIO) boundaries.

The new CMP will be structured similar to the 2003 CMP. The 2003 Plan identified 68 development sites, these 68 sites have a development potential of 8.3 million sq. ft. The University went to City Council and asked for 3 million sq. ft. of that to develop over the next 10 year planning period. The new Campus CMP is a 20 year plan but the same concepts will be used to identify development sites and capacity that needs to be developed over the next 20 years.

One of the main reason for additional capacity is the growth profile of the University. In the 2003 plan, the University was accepting more students and as having access problems. The same issues are relevant today. The University is looking at a growth increase of 15%

The consultants thought about how to accommodate these increase in population with the space the University currently has. The first thing they looked for is the current built space capacity. She noted that the University has about 18 million gross sq. ft. on campus.

She noted that the following methodologies used to assess the space needs includes: 1) space needs model; 2) development history/projection analysis; 3) benchmarking; and 4) industry and innovation.

A graph was shown to describe the deficit scenarios. For example, a deficit of 50,500 student FTE (full time equivalent) would require 3.4 million additional sq. ft. / 5.2 million gross sq. ft. and a deficit of 57,500 student FTE would require 4.8 million additional sq. ft. / 7.4 million gross sq. ft. Under the 2003 CMP, approx. 3 million sq. ft. has been developed. This number did not take into account the number of beds on campus, and currently, there are about 9,300 beds on campus.

The University talked to Housing and Food Services and they determined that there will be a need for additional beds, but it does not know how many at this time. Currently, they house 20% of the students on campus, and if these number is taken and applied to the projection numbers discussed earlier, it would mean that an additional 245,000 sq. ft. of beds or 770,000 gross sq. ft. is needed.

In the 2003 CMP, the University said that they would develop around 300,000 sq. ft. per year, and history shows that the University actually developed 290,000 sq. ft. per year.

The consultants also looked at the benchmarking model. They looked at other peer institutions such as Rutgers, John Hopkins, University of Texas, etc. and determined that University of Washington is at the bottom of the pack compared to other institutions regarding the sq. footage.

A comment was made that the peer benchmarking model is misleading because all campuses have variable lands and the University has a constraint zone compared to other institutions. Ms. Doherty responded that by looking at the numbers they will look at how the University will accommodate those needs.

A comment was made if there was any thought that was given regarding open space per capita. Ms. Doherty mentioned that Ms. Barnes presentation will answer that question, but the University wants more enhanced open space and would like to maintain its current open space.

Mr. Risler made a comment about having other University campus locations such as in Tacoma, Bothell, and other newer campuses to be included in the benchmarking comparison. Ms. Doherty responded that they will look at that.

A comment was made about is the maximum development potential at 7.8 million gross sq. ft. in the 2003 plan, meanwhile the University asked for 3 million of the 7.8 million sq. ft. In the new plan the University would need an additional 2.8 million sq. ft. at a high end. Ms. Doherty clarified that the number does not include the innovation district and student housing, and University is still formulating the number that the will be requested.

The University is interested in pursuing an innovation district. She noted that other universities have done it and the West Campus is a potential area for industry innovation. In most cases, they are either technology or biotech focused. The University is looking at an innovation district at a broader range other than the technology or biotech fields.

The University of Washington has won numerous awards and a recent global innovation exchange that was announced recently will bring numerous start-ups for the University. Ms. Doherty noted that they are looking to do more in this area and looking at different physical buildings for the staff, faculty, and students be involved in attracting and bringing industries to the campus for additional start-ups.

A comment was made regarding what is the potential sq. footage for an innovation district. Ms. Doherty mentioned that they do not have a number.

A comment was made about student growth and population and whether these students are from Washington State or outside the state. Ms. Doherty responded that she does not have the current population breakdown, but will provide more information about the percentages.

Mr. Risler made a comment about not only having a snapshot of what the University student population make-up is, but also data that compares international students versus local students. Ms. Doherty responded that they will be able to compile this data.

Ms. Doherty reminded that the student enrollment numbers presented earlier are projections and it is not a guarantee that the University will reach those numbers. The CMP only looked at what has happened in the last ten years.

A comment was made about the University being a selective school and asked whether the University needs to grow. Mr. Fox made a comment that this is a fair question to ask. Ms. Doherty responded that these are the questions that will be raised, and it will be up to the Committee to make comments about it.

Ms. Clark made a comment that framing the question about an increase or continue to grow is difficult to differentiate.

Ms. Sheehan made a comment that CUCAC's role and part of the City/University Agreement is not to question the University's needs, but to look at the way the University chooses to accommodate for that need.

A comment was made that in the last CMP, the University asked for 8 million sq. ft. and only used 3 million sq. ft. Mr. Fox commented that the University identified a potential of 8 million sq. ft. but only built 3 million

sq. ft. The question was did the projections used to developed the 2003 CMP inflate to 8 million sq. ft.? Mr. Fox noted that it was not presented clearly, and 8 million sq. ft. were identified, of which only 3 million sq. ft. can be built to provide flexibility.

Mr. Frosaker commented that he understood that it is not CUCAC's role to question the University's need, but it will be beneficial to ask, does the University need to grow at this urban environment knowing the impact it will have by adding more people on the community? Ms. Doherty mentioned that the impact of growth development will be analyzed in the EIS, and Ms. Sheehan noted that these are the areas the Committee will have an opportunity to make comments.

Campus Framework – Rebecca Barnes (00:38:32)

Tonight's presentation is very broad and will present more details in the upcoming meetings.

The University is looking to improve the conditions of the campus, but also the surrounding communities. There were constraints identified such as steep slopes along the East Side of the central campus, but there are lots of opportunities for improvements.

The guiding principles include:

- 1) Innovation industry – it is a new concept since the 2003 CMP, and its main theme is having a great educational and research institution engaged in many ways for students, researchers and outcomes for the public is benefitted by through research and participation with a various industries.
- 2) Stewardship and Sustainability – talks about the preservation of historic structures and places, contributions to economic well-being, energy and environmental conservation.
- 3) Public Realm and Place making – describes the open spaces.
- 4) Connectivity – talks about parking and the destinations available within the University's grounds as well as community accessibility for faculty, staff and students.

The University campus in Seattle is organized along major axes (Rainier Vista, Memorial Way, Olympic Vista and the Quad). The University's commitment in the new CMP is to open more access to the waterfront to the general public. The goal is to share the broad benefits of the shoreline.

In addition to open space, the location of active destinations along the major pedestrian thoroughfares on the West and Central Campus by using buildings to frame and activate space.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the diagram shown are the current buildable sites. Ms. Barnes noted that these are the proposed development sites. Ms. Doherty noted in the previous discussion that 3 million of the 8 million sq. ft. has been developed and the 5 million sq. ft. that was identified in the last CMP that has not been developed were incorporated in the development sites.

Regarding the circulation framework, Ms. Barnes noted that some already exist, the only differences are the land bridge that connects across Montlake, an emphasis on pedestrians of Brooklyn Avenue as the major north-south pedestrian access, and a much stronger visual and physical connection between Portage Bay and the core campus.

A comment was made about bike infrastructure that has not been discussed in the circulation framework. Ms. Barnes noted that the bike infrastructure topic is on the radar.

A comment was made about the condition of the on-campus and off-campus parking. Ms. Barnes mentioned that it is included in the plan. Currently, there is Study Campus Mobility Framework that is ongoing that will inform the new CMP about modes of operations and behavior standards on how to handle parking given the growth that will be underway. She noted that more information will be available and be presented to the Committee in the upcoming meetings.

In terms of the built environmental framework and identifying potential development sites, Ms. Barnes listed the rationale for these development sites. These include: building condition, deferred maintenance, low density buildings, and stakeholder conversations.

Mr. Frosaker made a comment about the height of the buildings along West Campus. Ms. Barnes noted that they are about 100-300 sq. ft. and it is a way of developing greater densities. The images of the buildings that were shown were from the EIS proposed zoning.

Ms. Barnes showed a brief summary of the four campus precincts. More detailed information about these precincts will be available over the next few months.

Mr. Risler made a comment about the missing light rail station in the diagram. Ms. Barnes noted that the light rail station will be added.

The big news regarding the core campus was that there were no proposals for increasing any buildings and the center of the campus will see very little construction and development.

Mr. Doug Campbell asked if 3rd parties can lease space on campus. Ms. Doherty mentioned that they could probably lease space on campus.

Mr. Campbell raised a question about these 3rd party spaces were able to migrate from a University campus property to an innovation district or was there a plan to have these different scenarios. Ms. Doherty responded that the University may have to look at this and was not sure if there is a process to do that.

The Committee had a back and forth discussion about the MIO and growth outside the MIO boundaries, and a comment was made that further discussion about this topic will be discussed extensively in future meetings especially when the Committee discusses the innovation districts.

Ms. Doherty reminded the Committee about an online public meeting on February 23rd. The link to the meeting will be available soon.

Mr. Risler made a comment about the importance of having an overall transportation plan integrated to the CMP. Ms. Doherty responded that the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is a whole chapter in the CMP. The current Mobility Framework study will be integrated into the TMP in the CMP.

Mr. Frosaker made a comment about the positive benefits of the buildout of the campus within the MIO seen tonight, but noted that once the discussion goes about the boundaries outside the MIO, that is where his concerns are and he hopes that this will not hinder any issues within the MIO boundary.

V. Campus Master Plan: CUCAC Work Plan (01:38:30)

Ms. Sheehan proposed a CMP Work Plan. She mentioned that the University has a schedule to keep regarding the comment period and review time. The work plan provides adequate time for the Committee to provide feedback. The plan also shows the presentation schedule of each of the precincts as well as Committee deliberations, and be able to provide information to their neighborhoods to get feedback before the draft is receive.

The draft CMP is scheduled to be published in May and this is where the Committee begins the process of commenting on the plan. The work plan will be a work in progress. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that in the 2003 CMP process, there were about seven subcommittees that discussed a wide variety of issues about the CMP including transportation, etc. She also noted that the Committee should meet twice a month beginning in May in order organize, review, and finalize comments for submission before the comment period ends.

Mr. Frosaker made a comment about having a conversation among the Committee members and with the neighborhood about what is important about the CMP. He has concerns about collaborating on pre-determined topics without any discussion on a broader issues such as transportation and MIO topics.

Mr. Fox commented that the University will present its plan by going through each of the area, and it will be up to this Committee to make sure to provide comments at the given time and be able to present other components that extend to different areas.

A comment was made about the twelve elements that have to be addressed in the CMP, and when the draft is available, the Committee can decide about forming subcommittees to focus on these topics.

Ms. Sheehan suggested of compiling their top five concerns via email by the next meeting, and she can compile a general list of where people are at and have an evolving process when the presentations are being presented.

Mr. Campbell commented about having a smaller working group meeting to collaborate on one area of the CMP.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that if the Committee decides to get together and meet in smaller groups, it cannot be a quorum so it will not violate the Public Meeting Act.

Ms. Doherty commented that the University would like to have the draft plan out before summer, and schedule a public meeting around June. The process takes a long time and any adjustment to the proposed work plan schedule will be problematic. She suggested splitting the time on having the Committee to discuss each campus area as well as other issues.

A comment was made about more specific details of the CMP, whether it will be presented by the technical consultants. Ms. Doherty mentioned that the consultants are located in Boston. She can request to have them come in to one of the meetings to make a presentation. She also mentioned that any updates or details about the plan will be communicated through her and Ms. Barnes.

Mr. Fox suggested to have the meeting start a half hour early at 6:30 pm instead of 7:00 pm. Mr. Frosaker made a motion to move the meeting start time from 7:00 pm to 6:30 pm, it was seconded, the Committee voted, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Since it will be a two hour meeting, Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Clark will be working on a different meeting location so people can bring food in the meeting. Mr. Fox expressed some concern about moving meeting location because it may disrupt the meeting start time and potential parking issues around campus.

Ms. Sheehan asked the Committee if there was a strong preference of bringing their own handouts, since the University provided presentation handout. Mr. Frosaker appreciates having the handouts readily available. Mr. Risler noted that having handouts available makes it more convenient.

Mr. Frosaker appreciates having a link to the presentation available after the meeting for the Committee to take a look at.

VI. New Business

Ms. Clark made a brief announcement regarding the meeting structure and about the University's communication to the Seattle City Council about the process. The CMP process is a quasi-judicial process. City Council members are not supposed to have an ex-parte communication with any party that is going to advocate on some aspect of the CMP. The Committee can talk about the process of the plan, but not the details. If a Committee member encounters any City Council member of the community, Ms. Clark noted to be mindful about not discussing any action to be taken about the plan.

A comment was made suggesting that Ms. Sheehan or Ms. Clark send a message out about this topic so they can explain and inform their neighborhood constituents.

Ms. Sheehan will sent out reminders about the next meeting, and also reminded the Committee that if they have any comments and feedback about the course of the presentation to go ahead and send it to her.

VII. Adjournment

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