



Minutes #183

(Adopted May 14, 2019)

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

Tuesday, March 12, 2019

6:30 – 8:30 PM

UW – Life Sciences Building

Attendees/CUCAC Members:

Doug Campbell

Natasha Rodgers

Ashley Shook

John Gaines

Barbara Quinn

Ashley Emery

Sarah Swanberg

Jon Berkedal

Colleen McAleer

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan

Sally Clark

1. Tour of Life Sciences Building

[Note: CUCAC members and University staff toured the Life Sciences Building]

2. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. John Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

3. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the November 13, 2018 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion was passed.

4. Public Comments (03:42)

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

Mr. Gaines introduced the representatives from the Tent City Collective (TCC) to present an update to the Tent City 3 (TC3).

Tent City 3 is an encampment of homeless individuals that move every 90 days due to City permitting issues. The encampment has 100 individuals that are homeless, drug-free, alcohol-free, violence-free. The current tent city is located at Lakeridge in the Renton/Boeing airfield.

Mr. Gaines asked about the changes or any lessons learned from the time TC3 was on the UW campus. Several students shared that there was pushback concerning safety, but there was overall community support around the project. TC3 has their own security to ensure the safety of the surrounding neighborhood. He added that TC3 was very successful while they were last at the campus because of academic involvements with the School of Medicine, as well with racial, and social departments.

There was no exact date or location as TCC is in the planning stage, but aiming to host winter quarter of 2020 or early January. The long-term plan is to have TC3 on campus on a rotating basis.

Ms. Barbara Quinn commented about having TCC come back to the Committee and hear more details about their long-term plans.

TCC shared that CUCAC endorsed the project back in 2017 and would request CUCAC continue its support and endorsement.

TCC is currently working on generating support from the student body and creating a proposal that can be submitted to UW President Ms. Ana Mari Cauce by the end of April. Ms. Clark mentioned the in the preliminary meetings with Ms. Cauce, that she is open for a proposal to host TC3 again on campus if it connects to the mission of the University and support from the University community.

The last time TC3 was on campus, there were eight University classes that worked directly with TC3 residents. The residents visited classes and interacted with the students. TCC intends to get the community involved in their activities including donations, etc.

Mr. Doug Campbell asked if the University created reports about the prior encampment, and Ms. Clark mentioned that there was an initial evaluation about the goals and accomplishments of the encampment, but the University does not track about individual residents' outcomes.

TCC mentioned regarding jobs and housing outcome among the TC3 residents, and it is not within the scope of TCC to monitor and track these outcomes. The primary goal in having them on campus is to have a partnership with the University and the community, to learn educational opportunities from the students and the residents.

Mr. Ashley Emery commented about having a tool to measure its success whether it is a good thing having them on campus.

Mr. Emery made a motion of having CUCAC support the project conceptually and ask TCC to come back and present their proposals for more information and continue the conversation, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

Mr. Gaines suggested having CUCAC draft a letter of support to TC3 between now and April.

5. Campus Master Plan Update (17:56)

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion on the Campus Master Plan update.

Ms. Clark mentioned that the Board of Regents adopted the Master Plan and is in a 30-day comment period that ends on March 20th, this is the SEPA comment period. At that point, the plan is done, and all are free to speak about the subject to your City Council elected officials.

The consultants and the University staff will do a final compiled plan, and the plan reflects all the changes that was submitted and decided between the draft and the final. The final compiled plan is the plan you want to reference into.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the plan will be available at the City's and University's website.

Mr. Campbell asked for a summary of the City Council's objection about the SOV rate, and Ms. Clark shared that the language that was adopted by the Regents includes a statement to say that the University's proposal is already a stretch goal and through the City's adoption of a further stretch goal, the University will need the partnership of other agencies in order to achieve the goal. There is no model that the University has run or changes to the U-pass unless Sound Transit, Metro, and SDOT makes improvements to its service connections.

Mr. Campbell commented about a hard stop in the development of the square footage and Ms. Clark mentioned that the City will say that it is not about making good faith efforts, and the City works with every developer to make good faith efforts to achieve those goals and as long as these efforts are being done, the City will continue to work with them.

She added that the parking cap was instituted even though the University did not like it. It is going to have an effect to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Gaines asked if linkage established between the amount of development and the requirement to construct the park on the waterfront, and Ms. Clark commented that the details of the concept was it will link to development sites.

6. New Business (23:55)

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion on new business.

Mr. Gaines commented about Mr. Matt Fox's resignation from CUCAC and mentioned having a discussion among CUCAC members on how to make this Committee interface better with the communities they represent as well as connecting with the University.

Mr. Campbell mentioned that Mr. Fox raised an important issue about having the City and University agreement renegotiated. It was unclear what the City and University agreed upon and he felt that this Committee's participation has limited scope and impact to the decisions made by the City and the University.

Ms. Sheehan commented that the agreement is between the City of Seattle and the University and utilizing the community council system to engage the community and neighborhood in the conversation. The Committee may ask for a renegotiation on the agreement and continued engagement with the neighborhood groups is important. She challenged the Committee if it can help push these community groups to put more effort in the engagement process.

Ms. Sarah Swanberg commented that the bylaws state that CUCAC is an advisory committee and she would like to have more clarity on what the "advisory" role means to have a meaningful impact to the decisions made by the City and the University. She added if the Committee could make changes to the bylaws, how would the language be changed.

Ms. Quinn commented that the discussion be an agenda item at the next meeting. Mr. Emery agreed with Ms. Quinn about reviewing the agreement at the next meeting and identify if the role of CUCAC as

an advisory committee is still relevant to the members and to the community and develop recommendations. Mr. Emery also voiced his concern about the diminishing attendance at these meetings.

Mr. Gaines acknowledged Ms. Theresa Doherty and Ms. Clark did important work getting this Committee and the community ready for the UW Master Plan and the neighborhoods were interested in reviewing the Master Plan. Now that it is done, they need to bring the interest back.

Ms. Clark challenged Mr. Fox's letter and his narrative that stated nothing was done with this Committee's recommendation. She mentioned that there were several documents and matrices that this Committee has done showing the University reviewed and responded and made changes. University needs the feedback from CUCAC for SDCI to understand the concerns of the community.

Mr. Jon Berkedal commented that if CUCAC does not make any recommendations to influence or change the approach of the University, people will be reluctant to show up at these meetings. Ms. Clark mentioned that the challenge is the staff from Capital Projects wants to do a good job and present quality legacy projects to the campus. The Capital Projects team will not come to these meetings if there are not major projects happening around the campus.

Mr. Gaines echoed what Mr. Berkedal mentioned and have the Committee review where it is at, understand its purpose and what kind of influence it has to the City and the University. He asked if there are any available resources within the City to assist on this. He added that if the Committee could get the full attendance of all the community representatives will help in the discussion.

Ms. Swanberg suggested having a retreat-type of meeting, and Ms. Sheehan asked if they could reach out to their community groups and do an outreach about the next meeting in May.

Mr. Gaines commented that if an agreement is renegotiated that there should be a reason, and Mr. Campbell commented about looking at ways that establishes CUCAC as a partnership rather than adversaries.

Ms. Sheehan suggested inviting City representatives such as the Director of the Department of Neighborhoods and staff that are well-versed with the City/University agreement to discuss the options and what this group could look like long term. Mr. Berkedal commented that he felt that the neighborhoods have no close connection with the City, and he wants to know about their expectations.

Ms. Sheehan suggested the Committee meet every other month since there are no major activities that the University will be reporting on. She also asked if tonight's meeting format where a tour of a building would be helpful in upcoming meetings. The group was supportive of the idea of more building tours.

Ms. Clark suggested that part of the City/University agreement is to hear about the City's role and what is happening around the City. She thought that having a presentation from the City about what is happening will be informative in the upcoming meetings. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will invite representatives from the City to the meeting and begin the conversation about what the City agreement means and get feedback from this Committee.

Mr. Campbell suggest having the next meeting on May to have time to prepare for City/University agreement discussion and collaboration.

7. Adjournment

Mr. Gaines mentioned that the adoption of the October 9, 2018 meetings will be at the next meeting due to a lack of quorum.

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