



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

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

TBD
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

Meeting Minutes
Meeting #154
September 13, 2016
Adopted October 11, 2016
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Kay Kelly	Matt Fox	Miha Sarani (Alt.)
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting)
Joan Kelday	Bry Osmonson	Pamela Clark (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Ashley Emery	Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Eric Larson	Jan Arntz	Rick Mohler (Alt. – non-voting)
Scott Cooper	Timmy Bendis (Alt.)	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark
(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

The Committee reviewed the July minutes and, Mr. Matt Fox added comments and clarifications.

A motion was made by Ms. Jan Arntz to adopt the July minutes as amended, and it was seconded by Mr. Timmy Bendis. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan informed the Committee that the University will be doing a presentation to the Urban Forestry Commission tomorrow afternoon. This Commission provides oversight and advises the Mayor about urban forest issues throughout the City.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. Tent City 3 Update

Ms. Sally Clark

She mentioned that this group came to this Committee previously to introduce this project and are back to provide an update. In summary, UW is working a proposal from students to host a Tent City 3 in winter quarter 2017.

Mr. Nathan and Mr. Tucker Richards introduced themselves and they will be providing a brief update on the Tent City collective.

Tent City Collective is comprised of the Seattle community, UW community and Tent City 3. Tent City 3 is the longest standing legal tent city organization in Seattle. This group has been around for 15 years. The purpose of Tent City

Collective is to educate and unite UW students, community members to essentially end homelessness and work with the University to host Tent City 3 on University owned land for 90 days.

Mr. Richards mentioned that UW President Cauce made a final announcement that Tent city will be coming to UW with overwhelming support from the students, faculty, and staff. President Cauce felt that this fits with the public university's goal to end and address the problem of homelessness.

The location of the Tent City 3 will be a W34 parking lot by the UW Fisheries. The tentative date move date is by December 17, 2017. Currently, Tent City Collective is working on how to provide the amenities needed and working with the University to inform the community through public engagement events.

The next step is to send out an RFP to all faculty where they can submit an idea for engagement for Tent City 3.

Ms. Clark added that there have some mixed reactions; and the UW and the Collective have reached out to Boat Street residents and businesses, and some of the businesses are not thrilled. She noted that they will keep them informed and updated on what is happening and any expectations.

A question was asked if Tent City is the long term solution to end homelessness. Mr. Richards noted that he sees that Tent City is an emergency solution, not a long term solution, to end homelessness and keep individuals and families off the streets in a safe and secure location.

A question was asked if the University could host more than once. Mr. Richards added that Seattle Pacific University (SPU) had a good experience hosting a Tent City.

A question was asked about the types of amenities are needed to support Tent City 3. Mr. Nathan mentioned electricity, water for washing blankets and clothes, and bathrooms, etc.

A question was asked about how much money is needed. Mr. Nathan noted that they have not figured it out yet. They have to determine and prioritize which amenities need to be paid for, and what the University will provide. There are current plans for several fundraising events.

Mr. Richards mentioned that there will be focus on fundraising as well as informing the student body about Tent City 3.

A question was asked if the University is donating the land or do they have to pay for the loss of revenue for parking. Ms. Clark noted that there is no loss of revenue for the parking lot; there will always be capacity and space available. The parking lot that will be used was cleared out and it was essentially used for contractor parking during the Life Science building construction. Some of the contractor parking will be displaced.

Mr. Frosaker asked how Tent City was funded historically. Mr. Richards noted that SHARE/WHEEL, is a not-profit organization that organizes Tent City, provides certain portion of the funds for the amenities.

A question was asked about how many individuals or families does the Tent City can accommodate. Tent City 3 can accommodate about 50-100 people, and there will be tents for singles as well as families.

Mr. Fox added that the Committee already provided support for this project.

V. Population Health Facility SEPA Update

Ms. Jan Arntz informed the Committee about a new project that is in the works. The project is in a very preliminary stage, and it will be looking at three different sites for the facility.

Ms. Sally Clark introduced Ms. Jeannie Natta to provide a brief description and summary of the Population Health Facility project.

Ms. Natta is a project manager for the UW Capital Planning and Development. She noted that this project is under the Land Use regulation for the 2003 Campus Master Plan (CMP), and also brought forth the vision for the 2018 CMP for consideration in looking forward for the future.

The project began as initiative of the UW on population health. UW President Cauce expressed her desire to bring together faculty, researchers, and experts to collaborate and find synergy to work on world

health concerns. The University wants to see itself as a leader and become a leader of this initiative regionally, nationally, and globally and create space for the University.

The basic function of this facility is to house the Institute of Health, Department of Global Health, and other programs and portions of public health. The UW estimates that will need a 300,000 sq. ft. site.

The facility will be an office type space, not a research-type laboratory. The goal of the space is for interaction and learning classrooms and to anticipate a collaborative type of environment for the public as well as other entities from other places.

Currently, the project is in the SEPA/EIS scoping process and initiating the SEPA process to analyze the alternatives from these three sites. The scoping notice will be published in September, sometime this week. There is a 21 day public comment period. Ms. Natta mentioned that once this project moves forward, she anticipates coming back to CUCAC sometime in December or January of next year to present more information.

Best case scenario, the UW anticipates the EIS and site selection will happen between now and April 2017, while the design conversation and selection process will happen February 2018 and begin construction May 2018.

Ms. Natta provided a map that shows the three potential sites for the facility along with details of the maximum square feet and height for each.

The long term vision for Site A (West Campus) is to balance a dense development with access to open space, focusing on proposed development around new functions at the heart of the district, and connect the University District to the waterfront.

The long term vision for Site B (Central Campus), is to preserve and enhance the character of the historic setting and its significant buildings and open spaces, maintaining existing building height limits and providing additional capacity to support the University's educational, research and service missions.

The long term vision for Site C (South Campus) is to increase development capacity and create a state-of-the art health sciences complex and academic medical center, creating an inviting, functional and attractive public realm, and improve access to West, Central, and East campus through enhanced pedestrian connections and a continuous waterfront trail.

Ms. Natta added that in addition to the EIS, there is a Site Review Committee that is gathering information on the cost to replace the parking, how much parking will be lost and also displacing programs and buildings. All of this information will be captured in the EIS.

She noted that the reason these three sites were chosen was the desire to make sure this facility is connected within the proximities of the health sciences area.

A question was asked about any programmatic thoughts on how the ground floor be activated. Ms. Natta noted that they are working with real estate on this. Depending on which site is selected, ground floor activation will be looked at by the University.

A question was asked if this project/initiative will be interacting with the Gates Foundation or will it be totally separate. Ms. Natta commented that this initiative is very broad, and reiterated President Cauce's message that the intent of this initiative is to be regional, national, and global, and she will not be surprised if it interacts with the Gates Foundation or other institutions and foundations in all different locations.

A question was asked if global health is similar to the University's social work and research. Ms. Natta noted that global health is part of the School of Medicine and School of Public Health. It is a tricky and complicated connection, but there is a synergy that exist between these schools.

A comment was made that these synergies are already happening, and the goal of this initiative is enhancing it even further by bringing all of the campus partners together in one location.

A question was asked about funding sources, and Ms. Natta noted that funding is expected to come from multiple sources.

Mr. Fox commented that he felt that this project is very sudden compared to other building projects. Ms. Arntz noted that they want to bring this information as early as possible so everyone that is involved can provide input for site selection and future decisions. She added that having CUCAC and the public get involved in the site selection process is essential.

Mr. Fox expressed his skepticism and concern on how much time this Committee can provide input and comments with all other things happening with the CMP.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the height this project is based on the existing CMP, and could it change once the project progresses. A comment was made that it is based on the existing CMP and will not change.

He added if any of these three sites are from the current zoning heights. Ms. Natta commented that all three sites has a potential to have a building at this height. They have to use the Land Use regulations that are in effect, and they will be looking at a visionary standpoint on the upcoming Master Plan.

Mr. Rick Mohler made a comment about concerns of the view to the water for Site C, but also suggested that pedestrian permeability, may block access for pedestrians for both Site A and B, particularly for Site B is important. Site B is challenging because of the substantial grade change; it will be a complex exercise. Ms. Natta noted that they recognized the concern because of the very narrow site.

VI. Draft CMP/DEIS Review Planning

Ms. Lund opened the discussion for the draft CMP/DEIS review planning.

She discussed and reminded the subgroups about the CMP/DEIS review process and informed the new Committee members and alternates.

She noted that the official release date of the planned EIS is October 3rd. There will be a 75 days comment period. The next Committee meeting will be on October 11th and the Committee members will get a hard copy of the document in addition to its being available online. Ms. Sheehan will verify with Ms. Doherty if each organization/neighborhood council will get a copy. Mr. Fox suggested to send a link to the Committee once the document becomes available online

Ms. Lund noted that if there are new members or alternates that were not part of the initial briefings about the CMP, all documents, minutes, and presentations are posted at the [DON website](#) and the [UW website](#).

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that CUCAC has a 75 days to comment, while the public has 45 days.

Ms. Lund added that for CUCAC the comment period ends on December 17. At the meeting on October 11, the subgroups will have an opportunity to work and look at the materials, and organize their comments. A public hearing for the EIS plan is scheduled on October 26.

Mr. Frosaker inquired if it is possible to access and download the entire document online. Ms. Arntz noted that a link to the document will be provided.

Ms. Lund commented that the subgroups will have another opportunity to meet at the regular CUCAC meeting on November 8th. The plan is to have two scheduled meetings in November. The staff is proposing an additional meeting on November 22nd or November 29th as potential dates for a second meeting in November.

Mr. Fox mentioned that he was asked about this, and would prefer to meet the week after Thanksgiving. The Committee members unanimously decided to meet on Tuesday, November 29th.

Ms. Lund mentioned at the December meetings on the 6th and 13, the goal will be to draft a final response letter in order to meet the deadline on December 17.

The process will be having the subgroups meet during the CUCAC meetings so that the staff are available if there are any questions, and also comply with the public notice requirements.

Mr. Frosaker asked if the MIO boundaries are negotiable. Ms. Arntz commented that they would be negotiable but they are not proposing any changes.

Ms. Lund mentioned that they have kept track of the issues that was brought up and it will be provided to the subgroups during their review.

As part of the process, she added that each subgroup should nominate a note taker, and use a log to keep track of the comments. This notes and comments will then be sent to Ms. Sheehan so she has a record and compile them for distribution to other members of the Committee. During the meeting, the subgroups will have an opportunity to report back to the entire Committee to answer any questions. This will not be a formal report. During the December meetings, the goal is to consolidate all of the comments, notes, etc. in order to come up a draft comment document and the final version.

Ms. Sheehan noted that it is up the subgroups to decide their meeting schedule and how frequent they will meet. She asked to compile their list of comments so she can be able to combine them and share them to other members during the CUCAC meeting. She added that different City departments will be looking at the draft, and they were put into notice that these document will be coming for them to review.

Ms. Lund clarified that the subgroups have many opportunities to meet offline if they decide to instead of meeting during the CUCAC meetings.

Mr. Gaines asked about the standards for consensus. Mr. Fox commented that they abide with the bylaws, but if there is no consensus, they would go by the Robert's Rules of Order.

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

VII. Committee Deliberation

The Committee reconvened for committee deliberation.

Ms. Lund heard a few questions during the small group discussions and one of the questions was the name of the firm that is doing the EIS. Ms. Arntz noted that EA is doing the EIS. Ms. Lund commented that the EIS is a separate document from the Master Plan, but the EIS is on the Master Plan. The group should identify the relationship between the two documents.

Ms. Arntz commented that the fundamental difference between the EIS and the Master Plan is that the EIS document analyzes the impacts on the Master Plan, and its various alternatives.

The other question that Ms. Lund heard was can the group request mitigations when making comments. Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Arntz agreed. Ms. Arntz added that the EIS does include a list of mitigating measures that talks about how various impacts are mitigated. If the group feels there are additional measures that should be considered or were not proposed, the group can definitely add comments about it.

Ms. Lund commented that she understood the frustration about getting the document and providing comments on a very tight timeline. The University worked hard in providing updates to the Committee while developing the plans.

A question was asked, since the group has a limited amount of time, will the documents be available to use online. Ms. Sheehan commented to make sure it is a collaborative activity and the group are welcome to share their comments in the format they prefer, but make sure that she receives in an Excel spreadsheet form.

A question was asked if they can make edits or comments on a PDF format and post it online. Ms. Arntz noted that she will need to check on it. Mr. Fox added that a more expensive Adobe software is required.

Mr. Frosaker asked how does the public submits their comments. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that public comments are sent directly to the University. Ms. Arntz added that the public can send comments by email, letter or phone calls. The contact information will be in the document.

Ms. Lund reminded the group to appoint a note keeper for the group and provide the information to Ms. Sheehan. She also added that if they feel that there is a conflict regarding group dynamics to go ahead and inform Ms. Sheehan.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that she would like to have the comments from each subgroups to her by November 1st so she can compile them for review at the next Committee meeting on November 8th.

A question was asked if a hard copy of the document will be available to pick up in advance. Ms. Arntz will find out and will inform the Committee.

VIII. New Business

Ms. Clark reminded the Committee about the upcoming evening football game on September 30th at 6:00 pm. A number of campus parking lots will be taken up during the course of the day for tailgating activities in preparation for the game.

IX. Adjournment

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