



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez
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

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

Amanda Winters
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 #157
November 29, 2016
Adopted January 10, 2017
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Brett Frosaker	Jon Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Doug Campbell	Eric Larson	Barbara Krieger (Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Matt Fox	Pamela Clark (Alt. – non-voting)
Barbara Quinn	Kerry Kahl	Natasha Rodgers (Alt. – non-voting)
Joan Kelday	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjris Lund	Lindsey King
-----------------	-------------	------------	--------------

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the October 11 meeting minutes. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

A motion was made to adopt the November 8 meeting minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

III. Public Comment (00:11:59)

Ms. Claudia Newman, a land use attorney, and partner of Bricklin & Newman LLP commented on behalf of the U District Alliance for Equity and Livability. Her practice takes a public interest perspective, representing neighborhoods and environmental groups to protect the environment and the community.

She mentioned that the U District Alliance urges this Committee to recommended proposals that include conditions to mitigate adverse impacts associated with affordable housing, transportation, child care and all social and economic associated with this project. She added that these issues are within the scope of review that the Committee can comment on. The Committee has the authority to recommend or deny the plan if the issues and impacts that are important to the Committee are not adequately mitigated.

She reminded the Committee that there is a precedent for holding on to principles and issues that the Committee members care about. She mentioned Swedish Cherry Hill where their Advisory Committee provided a majority report recommending significant changes to status quo due to the proponent's failure to address the issues their concern about.

A question was raised about the definition of "public interest". Ms. Newman mentioned that the term "public interest" is well-defined by categories under

the EIS. SEPA has definite elements of the environment and her focus is about impacts to the public such as housing, transportation, social and economic caused by development.

Mr. Doug Campbell inquired if the Advisory Committee from the Swedish Cherry Hill limited themselves to the immediate surrounding area of their Master Plan or was it about citywide impacts. Ms. Newman responded that she does not remember, but the immediate focus was on the size of the project, i.e. height, bulk and scale.

IV. Committee Deliberation (00:19:10)

Ms. Kjrís Lund opened the meeting for Committee deliberation and review of subgroup comments.

Ms. Lund proposed going through the first six pages of the document and address transportation at next week's meeting. She reminded the subgroup that this will not be a brainstorm session to identify new issues, but the comments that the subgroup submitted. She added that there may be some issues that could come about during the discussion, and she would rather have these discussions on hold and go back to it later.

She also reminded the group about the Committee's bylaws, and the important of having a consensus. She asked the members to indicate their approval of the comments by signaling a thumb up or down as they go review the comments.

She noted that she would also like the members to speak up if they disagree about a comment. Ms. Lund emphasized that the bylaws gave this Committee the responsibility to represent their respective neighborhood about the positive and negative impacts of the University's development plan.

A question was raised about the glare issue from all the new high buildings facing the Portage Bay. She noted that she felt that this issue was not strongly emphasized. She added that she may pursue this issue separately from her neighborhood's point of view.

Mr. Reudi Risler asked about the next steps after the process is complete. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the draft comment plan they are working on will go the University along with the community comments. These comments will be organized in a matrix and the University will respond to each of the comments. A final document will be issued from these comments that will go to the Office of the Hearing Examiner. This Committee will write a recommendation and it will go to SDCl.

Mr. Risler asked if a specific issue such as socio-economic impact come about after the final process, how will the University respond to it. Ms. Sheehan responded that the University will handle it and will respond appropriately. Mr. Fox inquired if CUCAC will have an opportunity to mention that their solution was inadequate. Ms. Sheehan responded that CUCAC's response will in the recommendation report to SDCl. Mr. Campbell asked if there would be any changes to the EIS based on the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Sheehan responded that theoretically, yes.

Ms. Lund reminded the subgroup about what they are asking for, is the group asking to revise, amend, or have additional analysis to the plan.

Ms. Yvonne Sanchez made a comment about the University recognizing that it is a learning institution for future generations and it should be a model for how an institution should interface with the community. She mentioned about the current dormitories are big walls and it sends a terrible message about environmental impact to the community.

Ms. Lund noted that she talked to Ms. Sheehan about envisioning the letter from this Committee may contain an introduction and broad statements about livability, neighborhood, overarching vision and points of view the Committee may want to express and then focus on the specific elements on the plan.

Ms. Lund began the discussion by reviewing Comment #1 regarding boundaries/primary and secondary impacts. She mentioned that there was a long discussion about this topic and she noted that her recollection among the subgroup was not to move forward or revisit the issue. A comment was made that the group decided not to pursue increasing the MIO boundary because of its complexities. However, he noted that if there is 6 million sq. ft. in the plan, and there is expansion into the primary and secondary zone, to consider it as growth under the CMP and make the primary and secondary zone as a fifth zone. Mr. Frosaker commented that was the middle ground the group came up with.

Mr. Risler suggested to have this issue as a parking lot item since it was unclear how it was stated in the comment.

Mr. Campbell commented that the purpose of this process is to capture the impact of the University's expansion on their surrounding community, if the Committee excludes the part of the growth that is undetermined, the Committee is not capturing the growth in this process.

Ms. Lund suggested capturing the comment that was made and revisit them at the next meeting.

She asked the group about clarification on Comment #4 to determine what the group was trying to say and how they want the University to respond. Mr. Risler commented that if the University has not made any statements or shown interest in buying more properties, he would consider this an editorial comment. However, if the University plans to buy properties, they should make a statement that addresses its impacts or pay for things such as a U-loo. Ms. Sheehan asked if he would like to see additional community public benefits added if the University is not paying any taxes.

A question was raised if the University builds a building and they are not ready to move in yet, and decide to lease the building, does the City get something out of it. Ms. Sally Clark commented that it may be subject to a potential lease hold excise tax.

Ms. Lund commented that Ms. Sheehan will come up with a language that captures the group's comments. Ms. Sheehan added that she may go and ask the group for language clarity.

Ms. Lund asked if there are any further clarification on Comment #6 or it has been addressed from previous discussions. Mr. Risler commented that the specific comment is about the transportation analysis and level of service. Ms. Sheehan noted that since it is a transportation topic to go ahead and table it at the next meeting.

Ms. Lund asked if there is a group consensus on Comment #7. Ms. Sheehan suggested to change the word "other" to "all". Mr. Campbell suggested to add "potential" to the cumulative impacts.

She asked about Comment #8 and if there are any further discussion or clarification. Ms. Sheehan commented that she will work with Mr. Rick Mohler about his comment about thru access.

The group agreed on Comment #9 regarding signage on the waterfront trail and should be coordinated with the City of Seattle and how it reflects the important role of Native Americans.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on Comment #10. Ms. Sheehan noted about the University keeping up with their promises rather than waiting until the end of the project. Ms. Sheehan asked if the Committee would want to add some type of triggers for the University to develop and ask them to put in place to receive the required amenities.

She also noted that Comments #10 and #11 are similar in terms of the promises tied to something else. Ms. Lund noted that what she heard from the discussion is about other public benefits that are included in the plan such as open space, proposed park and the Burke-Gilman trail. She asked if the Committee would recommend or require the University to implement an open space before approval for certain square footage that is a specific or a generic statement about public benefits throughout the plan. Mr. Frosaker and other members of the Committee commented that being specific is essential.

Ms. Lund suggested to table Comments #11 during the discussion about transportation.

The group agreed in Ms. Lund's rephrasing of Comment #12 to "requiring the departure to be a minor amendment with public review and comment" to make it more of a statement.

Ms. Lund asked what the group wants the University to do regarding Comment #13. A comment was made about adhering to the highest and most modern standard available. Mr. Risler commented about having the University adhere to the highest standard and follow best practices.

Ms. Lund noted that the University had to get necessary permits to get things done and these permits had to comply with the City's best practices. She asked the group about what they want to link this comment into. Mr. Fox suggested to table Comment #13 and work on the specific language.

The group agreed on Comment #14 regarding new rooftops.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on Comment #15. She asked about what was the specific recommendation on this comment. The recommendation was that if buildings obscure other buildings from the south, they can never have solar. She added having it step it down to the south so there will be an opportunity for solar.

Ms. Lund asked the group about restating Comment #16. Mr. Fox suggested combining this comment with regards to cumulative impacts discussed earlier. Ms. Sheehan noted that she will combine Comment #16 with Comment #7 that discussed cumulative impacts should occur in all elements of the environment.

Ms. Lund asked Mr. Fox to walkthrough the comments from his group about heights, bulk and scale. Mr. Fox noted that his group recommended lower heights at Comments #24, #22, and #21 and maintain the existing zoning of 105 ft. at Comment #30.

He noted to strike down Comment #23 as it talks about the design guidelines with respect to the College Inn. Ms. Sheehan clarified that Comment #21 and #22 should stay at 105 ft., and w30 will be no more than 90 ft.

Ms. Sheehan asked about Comment #20, and Mr. Fox noted that Comments #20 and #21 are the same and can be combined.

Ms. Lund noted on keeping Comments #24 and #25; and Comment #26 is related to Comment #14.

Mr. Fox mentioned that Comment #27 is a statement of fact and request the University to amend the maps to include lower zone heights.

Mr. Fox noted that on Comment #28, his group suggested that there should be a mix of building heights and a 240-ft. wall on Pacific is too much. He expressed his concern about having the area more monolithic.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned she will reach out to some of the group members to clarify some of the language before next week's meeting. She added that they will be meeting on the December 6th and 13th. There will be a brief presentation update about population health on the 6th. She asked the group to read through the remaining comments and identify whether you agree or disagree.

V. New Business

There was no new business.

VI. Adjournment

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