



# Minutes #187

(Adopted November 12, 2019)

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

Tuesday, October 8, 2019

6:30 – 8:30 PM

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Seattle, WA 98105

### Attendees/CUCAC Members:

John Gaines

Ashley Emery

Jorgen Bader

Doug Campbell

Colleen McAleer

Barbara Quinn

### Staff and Other Present:

Nelson Pesigan - DON

Sally Clark – UW

---

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

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

Ms. Clark mentioned that Mr. Doug Campbell is no longer the representative for the University District Partnership (UDP). The new interim representative is Mr. Mark Crawford. Mr. Campbell is now with the University District Community Council (UDCC).

Mr. Gaines commented about updating the Committee's member list by the next meeting. Ms. Clark noted that before the Campus Master Plan work, she and Ms. Theresa Doherty had a coffee tour with all the representatives of the community councils, and clubs around the area and she mentioned about reaching out to these representatives again post-Master Plan.

## 2. Housekeeping

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

The adoption of the September 10, 2019 minutes was postponed due to lack of quorum.

## 3. Public Comments (12:46)

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

---

#### **4. Campus Master Plan Memo (13:10)**

Ms. Clark mentioned that there were questions that Mr. Jon Berkedal brought up regarding this Committee's influence on the Campus Master Plan (CMP). The memo summarized and described the impacts this Committee had on developing the CMP.

Ms. Clark noted that the University's position was that CUCAC did affect and influenced the development of the University's CMP. She mentioned in the memo the process the University and CUCAC took regarding conversations around the Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) rate, childcare requirements, and the final list of conditions. The University went through the meeting minutes discussions, initial feedback from neighbors and the public, scoping comments, and looked at the totality of impacts.

She noted that CUCAC had several feedback and recommendations related to open space, multi-modal growth, circulation, West Campus innovation, etc. This demonstrated that this Committee had a huge impact on the plan and acknowledged that it was not the critical impact some of the members would like to have.

Mr. Ashley Emery asked Ms. Clark if the Committee did provide a huge impact to the CMP, and Ms. Clark agreed that the Committee had a huge impact specifically when CUCAC and SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections) made significant changes on the staging on how the West Campus development will be played out. The University did not originally propose a link between the development of specific sites and having a proposed design and execution of open space done concurrently with the development of these sites. The development of green space will happen through the course of the CMP and CUCAC suggested and recommended and SDCI agreed to hold the University accountable in the delivery of the plan.

Mr. Campbell commented about the development process that involves three million gross square feet on the West Campus and the University would have considered having this development in other parts of the City included. Ms. Clark noted that the City/University agreement stated that the University has a responsibility as a state institution of higher learning to serve the state and the region. There is always a careful examination of how and where the University should grow, and that growth is an obligation to the people of the state of Washington. She added that the University has no control over where it should grow since it is the decision of the State.

Mr. Campbell commented that in terms of planning, he noted that there was no option other than the West Campus, and Ms. Clark responded that there was an array of options for growth given the student growth population. She added that the City of Seattle has a multi-modal growth strategy and it is an urban center programmed for growth. There were options for the University to grow among the four quadrants. Ms. Clark acknowledged that there were trade-offs during the development of the CMP.

Mr. Emery commented that some of the University projects that were presented at the Committee were already defined, and Ms. Clark asked what substantive role the Committee wants when a project is presented. She noted that Ms. Julie Blakeslee does an excellent job in introducing the architects and upcoming project presentations early to this Committee.

Ms. Clark suggested having another tour or meeting at one of the project sites that was presented before the Committee including the Population Health Building or the Burke Museum so the Committee members can look at and compare the design or structure of the site as was presented.

Ms. McAleer commented about presenting a minority opinion about any issue that the Committee was concerned about the CMP. She noted that having a minority position presented should be part of the record and needs to be incorporated in future CMP development.

## **5. Committee Deliberation**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for Committee deliberation.

Mr. Gaines commented that having Ms. Kjris Lund facilitate and help define and structure a work plan for this Committee would be useful. He mentioned that the cost of having her facilitate and design a work plan that this Committee can implement would cost \$10,000. Mr. Pesigan mentioned that DON had conversations with Ms. Lund about narrowing the scope and focus on the implementation of the Campus Master Plan.

Mr. Gaines commented that it will be up to this Committee to help guide Ms. Lund to identify these common topic areas that the City and University can agree to have this Committee be effective.

Ms. Quinn suggested having the City more involved in identifying issues that are important to both the University and the community.

Mr. Emery commented that by the time this Committee hears or comment about a specific project from the University, it is already been decided. He noted that some of these projects may have gone through several phases before it gets introduced to this Committee.

Mr. Campbell suggested having Ms. Lund assist in making this Committee be a congress of community councils that have an influence on the City and University in identifying their broader goals on specific projects and having the community its own perception about what development would look like.

Ms. McAleer commented about traffic circulation and transportation impacts around the University and the surrounding area is an issue that is more important to the neighborhood rather than the specific design of a building.

Ms. Clark commented that what the Committee would like from Ms. Lund is a more drill-down approach on specific issues that affects both the City and University that is adaptive. She asked the Committee about what the structure would look like if the Committee decides to go on this route. She added that any suggestion from this Committee about changing the process on Early Design Reviews and Guidelines may be problematic to the City.

Ms. Clark also added that Mr. Campbell's suggestion of having a group of community councils and recreating a neighborhood district council that this Committee can explore as a scope of work from Ms. Lund will not sell with the University. She noted that the University needs CUCAC to be a body where the University can present and hear comments from the surrounding neighborhood and community about new buildings and programs.

She noted that issues regarding the Montlake Triangle, U District up zones, the design on 43<sup>rd</sup> are all important questions, but cautioned that having these as part of the scope of CUCAC will be a difficult sell for both the City and University to pay Ms. Lund to identify and facilitate.

Mr. Gaines commented that having Ms. Lund be involved early in the work planning process is important to ensure that the Committee remains intact and engages with the issues that are happening around the University and the nearby communities. Ms. Clark commented that the group needs help from Ms. Lund to navigate and identify its post-Master Plan work. She added that the challenge is to identify the scope the members would think she would focus into.

Mr. Bader commented about having a discussion around the Montlake project and make sure that the neighborhood understands its impact. Ms. Clark asked if the Committee would like to have the presentation about the Montlake project sooner, and the Committee members agreed that to have it sooner rather than later because of the time the project will be implemented.

Ms. Clark commented that King County Metro and SDOT are the leads for the project and Mr. Pesigan will have to reach out to their representatives for their availability at the next meeting. She suggested having a regular meeting next month that will include the Montlake Triangle presentation and working with Ms. Lund about identifying the scope and begin the work plan discussion at the beginning of the year.

Ms. Clark noted that if Ms. Lund is unavailable at the November meeting, having a small group of Committee members begins a conversation with Ms. Lund outside of the regular meeting. Mr. Gaines asked about how to go about assembling a small team to begin the conversation and Ms. McAleer suggested having access to members' email addresses and they can reach out to them about it. Ms. Clark commented that the Montlake Triangle project presentation at the next meeting would require a different approach to meeting management if the Committee would like to involve and invite neighbors and community councils or groups to hear about the presentation.

## **6. New Business**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business.

Mr. Bader asked to invite a representative from SDOT, WSDOT, and Sound Transit to do a presentation about the Montlake Triangle project. He noted that there were concerns about traffic circulation and impacts that have not been clearly articulated to the neighborhood that is going to be affected specifically in North East Seattle.

Ms. McAleer added that this project may have potential traffic impacts on UW circulation and traffic as well.

Mr. Gaines agreed on having a representative from the following agencies to discuss any traffic impacts and mitigations in place to alleviate the concerns that were brought up the impacted neighborhood.

Ms. Clark mentioned that there had been several meetings with the folks from the Eastside and service area about two years ago and there has not been any communication or update about this project to the residents of North East Seattle.

Mr. Bader inquired about the search for the new chief of the UW Police Department and asked about having citizens be involved in the search panel. Ms. Clark commented that Mr. Hoard is on the search committee

panel and it will be too late to have a citizen be on the panel. She will ask Mr. Hoard if there are any community events and forums that the community can attend and participate to ask questions to the finalist before a decision is made.

Ms. Clark mentioned that the University is still searching for a University architect.

## **7. Adjournment**

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