



MEMBERS

- Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council
- Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council
- Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
- Jean Amick
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
- TBD
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

Meeting Minutes Meeting # 146 November 10, 2015

UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Jean Amick	Ashley Emery
John Gaines	Brett Frosaker	Kerry Kahl
Matthew Fox	Barbara Quinn	Jan Arntz

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Theresa Doherty
Lindsey King	Robin Chalmers	

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox made a motion to adopt the October minutes, Mr. Brett Frosaker seconded. The Committee voted unanimously and the motion passed.

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

Ms. Maureen Sheehan informed the group that the Master Plan Scoping comments as well as the University's Public Meeting summary were sent out. If there were any concerns, please inform Ms. Sheehan.

Ms. Sally Clark met with folks from the Board of Regents regarding a schedule to come to one of the CUCAC meetings. Ms. Clark mentioned that they are looking at a January or February meeting since the University has no scheduled presentation in December.

A question was raised if the intent is to have members of the Regents to attend every CUCAC meeting. Ms. Clark noted that what came about was to have a Regent come to a meeting to engage in a real time dialogue with CUCAC, and it will be a one-time meeting and/or discussion.

III. Public Comment

Mr. Kevin Volkmann, a member of the public, mentioned he appreciated public comment being taken at the meetings.

IV. Campus Master Plan: Review Public Outreach Plan

Ms. Theresa Doherty made a brief presentation of the Public Outreach Plan. The plan was sent out by Ms. Sheehan to the Committee to provide any comments or

input. The plan was approved by CUCAC and it summarized about the City University Agreement, where the CUCAC and the University worked together, as well as the role of CUCAC as the main source of ongoing input from various community groups.

There were several goals and objectives of the Plan and one of these is to outline and reach out to target audiences regarding the Campus Master Plan. These audiences include folks on and off campus, government agencies, nearby residences, neighbors, business and stakeholders.

Ms. Doherty mentioned the different methods of outreach for these audiences including sending out post cards, fact sheets, and brochures, updated websites, open houses, meeting with community groups, engaging and working with Ms. Lindsey King of DPD, City Departments, as well as social and print media.

She also noted having an online public open house for those individuals who cannot attend the meetings. This way, people can sit at their desk and participate in an online public meeting.

She asked for comments and suggestions from the Committee regarding other ways they can reach out and communicate with the public about the Master Plan. She also mentioned about the existing community blogs that are available as another method of outreach. A suggestion was made about having community meetings. Ms. Doherty mentioned that they plan on doing ongoing community meetings.

A suggestion was made about having a street level presence or a visitor type information center where the public can drop in and pick up brochures. A comment was made about having it available at the Farmer's Market and at the City's neighborhood service centers.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that the Internet was not the same ten years ago, and they plan to utilize the Internet in the public outreach.

A suggestion was made about creating physical models that shows the different building massing so the public could comprehend its implications on their neighborhood. Another suggestion was access to online building models as well.

Mr. Fox commented that the publication list was very good and noted that this is not a one-time publication, but the information will be published several times a year.

He also made a comment on the Open House meetings and encourage the Committee members to look at and read the public comments. He praised the University for capturing these public comments.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that if they have any other ways of communicating with the community such as newsletters or blogs, to send them to her so she can include them in her distribution.

V. Computer Science & Engineering Building EIS Comment Period

Note: The Committee had a back and forth discussion about the Preferred Alternative Plan regarding the More Hall Annex building. Ms. Clark mentioned that there are four alternatives that are being looked at, but there is no definite decision has been made by the Board of Regents.

Mr. Kurt Jensen introduced himself as the new project manager for the Capital Projects Office and provided an update on the Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) building.

The CSE program is a fast growing program that is short on space in the current facility and projected future growth requires additional space.

The proposed project would provide additional academic and research space to meet the needs of the program. The project will provide approximately 134,000 gross sq. ft. of space for the CSE Program. It will have classrooms, engineering labs, office space for staff, graduate and undergraduate students as well as space for related support services.

The preferred site is the current site of the More Hall Annex across E. Stevens Way from the existing CSE Building. The proposed building is a 63 ft. high, four and half story building.

A pre-schematic design study has been completed to help develop the scope and cost for the project. The schematic design began in August 2015 and scheduled to be completed at the end of November 2015.

The project architect is LMN and Mortensen Construction has been selected as the general contractor/construction manager.

The total project budget is approximately \$105 million. Project funding came from different sources such as the State of Washington, University of Washington, and the majority of the funding came from donor campaigns from the College of Engineering.

Currently, the project is in the SEPA review process, the draft supplemental EIS was published in early October. A public hearing was held on October 26, the comment period ends November 23rd. The final EIS is scheduled to be published January 2016.

The SEIS considered two sites and multiple options for the site. The preferred site is 16C.

The key objective for the preferred site is to have the new building in close proximity to the existing building so as to feel more like a campus instead of two separate entities. There were several sites that were looked at, but these two sites came out as the top two.

Mr. Jensen provided a diagram of the area to describe the preferred and alternative sites in more detail. Several massing studies were conducted and studied to show what the building would look like.

He described what the building in the preferred site would look like in terms of ground floor, potential work areas, administration and public space, and café. He described the larger classrooms in the ground floor, office and event spaces in the upper floor.

Mr. Fox made a comment if there are visual treatments in the DEIS that addressed the challenge of incorporating Snohomish Lane, More Hall Annex and Jefferson Lane into the preferred site. The drawings have not evolved further than what is in the DEIS. Mr. Jensen noted that there have been site plans that they can review to address these issues. He briefly showed a rough model of what the building would look like to show the size and location of the building.

One of the issues on the north side of the building is the nice landscaping and matured trees. The other side toward More Hall, the landscaping is not well developed, the desire is to keep towards More Hall to maintain an older landscape as possible. When the project team looked at possible options to incorporate More Hall into the building or preserve it, it would be difficult to balance the program goals for the site and would be problematic to maintain the More Hall Annex building.

Mr. Jensen showed a broad project schedule that shows the different phases of the project and the goal is to have it ready for occupancy for fall quarter of 2018.

A question was asked whether the project involves more classroom space than what was presented to CUCAC earlier. Mr. Jensen responded that it has been the same program since the beginning of the project.

A question was asked if there were students and/or staff that would like to see More Hall Annex preserved. Ms. Jan Arntz in the public hearing period, there were comments expressing to both keep and demolish the More Hall Annex. She mentioned that most of the faculty concerns, if the preferred site is chosen, is the impact to the existing More Hall entrance and the use of the plaza and open space.

A comment was made that they are in the process of working with the neighboring buildings to identify the impacts and how they would accommodate their needs, and the goal is to address these requests as part of the project.

Mr. Frosaker asked whether the idea of preserving the More Hall Annex is about having a reactor in it more than its architectural design. Ms. Arntz noted that there were two things that were considered to determine its historic determination, one is its architectural design and the other is that it was a nuclear research facility.

Mr. Frosaker asked the Committee if they feel this is the preferred alternative they would support. A comment was made about requesting for a study or summary on why it is significant to preserve the building and provide comments about it. A question was raised about what would happen if CUCAC does

provide commentary on the EIS. Ms. Arntz noted that any comments would go to the University's Board of Regents.

Mr. Jensen mentioned that they do respond to all of the comments in the Final EIS and encourage the Committee to read through the document.

VI. New Business

Mr. Fox mentioned that the University does not have any presentations in December and would like for the Committee to decide if a December meeting is necessary.

Ms. Clark suggested to hold on the December meeting for now until she hears something from the University about any upcoming projects. If she does not hear anything back, she would reach out to Ms. Sheehan and connect with Mr. Fox about cancelling the December meeting or to have a voluntary social get together to celebrate the end of the calendar year.

VII. Adjournment

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