



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

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

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 #156
November 8, 2016
Adopted November 29, 2016
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Eric Larson	Ashley Emery
Doug Campbell	Scott Cooper	Jan Arntz
Kay Kelly	Matt Fox	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
John Gaines	Barbara Quinn	John Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)
Joan Kelday	Kerry Kahl	Rick Mohler (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Bry Osmonson	

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

Mr. Fox suggested to adopt the October minutes at next month's meeting (November 29).

III. Public Comment

Mr. David West of the U District Alliance for Equity and Livability, a coalition of area labor community, social service and faith organizations whose concern is the growth in the U District commented and suggested for the Committee to intervene with the MIMP up zone process.

He noted that the University's expansion will have an adverse impact on affordable housing to students and staff, transportation, child care, residential communities, and does not acknowledge the realities this will effect on race and social issues. He provided a copy of the detailed comments to the Committee.

Mr. Fox commented that when he attended the EIS scoping public hearings, a number of people echoed and expressed the same concerns on these various issues.

A comment was made about the role of the University as a public institution to educate and inform future generations about its responsibility to provide an affordable and livable city, and not just about dollar-and-cents.

Mr. West suggested inviting their Land Use attorney at the next meeting to make a short presentation on the issues summarized in his comments. Mr. Fox and Mr. John Gaines mentioned that they are open to the suggestion.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that she will reach out with Mr. West to schedule something.

IV. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Kjrís Lund opened the discussion for group presentation and deliberation.

Ms. Lund asked the University staff to do a short presentation to clarify and answer questions about the comments that were made so far on the plan. After the presentation, each group will have 15 minutes to present the topics they were assigned to. The goal for tonight's meeting is to have the full group hear the comments and recommendations and understand the various issues. The City and University staff will then take what the group has written and what was heard at our next meetings and format and structure the language to a final comment letter.

As each group presented, she will listen and will try to filter the following: 1) is there a consensus on the comments or disagreements? 2) are the comments relevant and does it relate to the role of CUCAC, and 3) is this a priority for the group.

She reminded the Committee that there will be more opportunity between tonight and the next meeting on November 29th to integrate new comments and add new information. If comments are rejected by this Committee or there was not enough agreement; the individual and the community group that they represent will be able to submit comments as well. These plans are huge documents, and it is the responsibility of this Committee to influence and effect these plans. It is important for this Committee to be clear and persuasive on their comments to have an impact to these plans.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she received 140+ comments so far and more comments will be added after this meeting. Rather than relying on her to transcribe these comments, she requested if the group can go ahead and write these additional comments and submit them to her by November 18th.

Ms. Theresa Doherty began by addressing one of the comments regarding primary and secondary impact zones. If the group wants to look at the analysis on primary and secondary impact zones, they should focus on the EIS and there are sections that discuss this. She added that if they are interested in reviewing transportation, there is a transportation report with fold-up maps that discusses the primary and secondary impact zones with regards to different intersections.

Ms. Doherty mentioned a comment that the UW Tower is 240 ft. and she clarified that it is 325 ft.

There were questions about how much space the University leases and the number of employees; she noted that under the City/University Agreement, the University is required to publish an annual report about the Master Plan, and this information is available in the report and are available online via the [DON](#) website as well as the University's [Regional & Community Relations](#) website.

Ms. Doherty mentioned about questions on how much space the University leases outside the MIO boundary. This information can be found at page 33 the Campus Master Plan, summarizing the existing space outside the MIO as well as a map of where these buildings are located.

There were concerns raised about the impact of employees coming in and out of the MIO boundary. She noted that all University employees are accounted for, the only group of employees that are not counted are Harborview, who has their own Master Plan.

Subgroup Discussion:

Ms. Lund began the discussion on the presentation of each of the subgroups.

Group #1

Group #1 addressed the primary and secondary impact zones and transportation details.

Mr. Brett Frosaker mentioned the impact of Montlake Boulevard by cars and pedestrians has been adequately analyzed as it relates to the impact to the neighborhood and the primary and secondary zones, and if the influx of traffic has been vetted.

Mr. Frosaker commented about the second bridge on whether it has been approved or not. He added that this was not addressed in the EIS and its impact to pedestrian access.

He also noted NE Pacific Street, Montlake Boulevard and the concern about Light Rail traffic and major truck traffic routes whether these has been adequately mitigated with regards to access.

With regards to the east side growth and the elimination of about 800 parking spaces, that he is not the right person to make a comment on it since he was satisfied with the parking situation that was addressed in the EIS.

The group inquired about where would the cars go and park once these spaces are eliminated.

Mr. Fox asked what will the new parking space would look like if these are built at a different campus site and if these spaces can satisfy the demand.

Mr. Frosaker commented that the purpose of the MP and EIS is to assess, analyze and mitigate all of the impact within the MIO, and felt that if falls short in explaining these impacts for not including the areas outside the MIO.

Mr. Fox echoed his objection on expanding the MIO boundary since it empowers the University in a way that he is not comfortable with. He noted that expanding the MIO boundary gives the University unilateral power and removes these properties from the City's land use code.

Mr. Frosaker commented about structured parking and noted that since it has an adverse impact, it should be counted against the square feet, and should be encouraged to build an underground parking if it is possible. He suggested that if it is built underground that it should be counted as part of the square footage.

He added about the concerns about his neighborhood group around buildings along Montlake and the potential increase of pedestrian traffic and off-street parking spill over. He suggested a possible mitigation of having RPZ for the neighborhood in the area as well as more sidewalks.

Group #2 (00:46:18)

Mr. Reudi Risler commented that it is essential and important to have coordination between the University and the Transit agencies in order to resolve the transportation challenges.

He added that the University should focus on more transportation infrastructure project and not just the U-Pass.

He mentioned about the intersection level of service and how the University will be pedestrian and bike friendly. He suggested that these types of investigations apply to pedestrians and bikes and there were very little metrics or information about it. He noted that all investigations about traffic changes off campus should be analyzed and driven by data such as pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle counts and identify the needs for reasonable connections in the area.

Ms. Lund mentioned that she has not read through the transportation appendix and asked Ms. Doherty if such data that was presented by Mr. Risler is readily available.

Mr. Rick Mohler made a comment about looking for a data driven metric that yields a clearly described commitment to these issues, and he noted that this was lacking. There were suggested language, but lacks the specifics to make sure it happens.

Mr. Douglas Campbell commented commute distances could be included a metric. Mr. Risler noted that it is one of the topics that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Fox mentioned about what he heard from the public hearing about lower wage University employees who live far from the campus and how they spend more time travelling to and from the campus. Once the U district becomes more upscale, fewer employees will be able to afford to live in the area.

Mr. Risler commented about RPZ's and added that the University needs to do more work around it such as how it will be enforced. Mr. Frosaker commented that the RPZ issue is about keeping students and staff from parking in nearby neighborhoods, and how much the University is willing to spend to have these RPZ's in the neighborhood.

Mr. Risler commented about the Burke-Gilman trail as an important transportation route, and the University needs to do more about improving this trail.

He also noted that there were a lot of language about “shall be done”; and it should say “will be done” so it will be focused on real work and commitment.

Mr. Fox challenged the comment stating that the location of the proposed innovation district that will make an important contribution to the campus and neighborhood, noting that this has no universal agreement (Item #32).

A comment was made about making sure the University’s role in accommodating bike parking particularly at the Brooklyn station as well as access to campus from the west of the Roosevelt light rail station is reinforced.

Group #3 (00:59:34)

Group #3 commented that they agreed on the Group #2 comment regarding the east campus land bridge (Item #29), they would like to ensure about the Union Bay natural area be protected.

Ms. Lund commented that in the Master Plan presentation, her impression was that the land bridge was terminated on the other side of the natural area. Mr. Frosaker noted that the concern is about the impact of the new development and the run-off it will cause. A comment was made about making sure that the University is aware about this resource and how it is going to be mitigated.

A comment was made about the environmental impact of the surface parking that exist is far greater than the new development.

Group #3 felt good about the plan by the University. They expressed some environmental concerns about the landscaping at the large park and making sure the public is discouraged from sleeping or hiding in the area. It should be safe as well as make public amenities available to the public. A comment was made about ensuring a balance between safety and public accessibility.

The group was enthusiastic about the waterfront plan and how it incorporates a walkway to the west campus. They would like to see signage for kayakers and expressed concerns about the waterfront launching area for boats and activities and they would like to have more details on how this is going to be mitigated.

A comment was made about concerns regarding rooftop surfaces, solar panels, and greener buildings. Ms. Lund commented that these issues can be summarized under the development guidelines.

Ms. Lund commented about an issue that was brought up regarding view corridors. Mr. Fox noted that a designated view corridor need to be added on building size 38 west of the University Bridge looking south.

Group #3 echoed the same issues the other group brought regarding green development to absorb storm run-offs.

A comment was made about the concerns at Portage Bay, that if these properties are not properly lit, they may cause glare across the water into the neighborhood.

Group #4 (01:09:40)

Mr. Fox commented about the University is arguing that the new height zones is consistent with the zone heights being proposed in the U District upzones. He noted that this is only true if the U District upzone has two heights; and all maps should show the lower heights and upper heights.

He argued that the University buildings will not look like a slender, residential type buildings but will be blockier commercial/institutional buildings. He noted that the entire conceptual underpinning that going 240 ft. is consistent with the U District zoning is not necessarily the case unless the University is building slender, residential towers and providing the amenities that qualify for the increased heights.

He noted that they are recommending w21 be at 105 ft.; w30 at 90 ft. because of its adjacency to the College Inn.

The group is not looking at downzoning most University properties, but instead at interfacing with the neighborhood where the proposed buildings are incompatible with surrounding zoning.

He mentioned the open space in the west campus area, and recommends hard triggers to ensure that the west campus green space will occur.

The group needs clarification about the existing industry and academic partnerships in the innovation district, and noted that the buildings on east campus have no precedent in the surrounding areas with regards to 130' building heights and the groups supports a designated view corridor on W-38 and along Montlake.

Mr. Campbell commented about neighborhood focus and the University's cumulative impacts. He noted that their concern is maintaining the neighborhood, not just as a commute destination but at a sustainable level.

He noted that the University did not fully study the effect of dispersing its growth among other neighborhoods. Also, the University has not looked at other innovation districts in other cities, to look at their effect on communities. The University may have to take some remedial action to ensure that the neighborhood remains a neighborhood and that it will remain open to all income levels. These concerns and issues were not analyzed in the EIS. The University should look at moving some of the University's growth where lower income employees live and developing those neighborhoods.

Ms. Lund commented about if the group have had discussions around building mass and block coverage. Mr. Fox noted that they made several comments about tower separation and discussed increasing the public realm allowance, and upper level setbacks.

Ms. Lund asked if the group talked about the consequence of the growth target the University has. Mr. Fox commented that they did discussed about it, and they do not see any built alternative that has a built of less than 3 million sq. ft. in west campus.

Mr. Campbell commented that there is nothing in the EIS that addressed how to preserve the U District as a neighborhood.

He added that they would like the University to study the impacts of growth of other Universities and identify if innovation districts are a neighborhood or a workplace commute destination. He suggested that the University make a possible modification to the plan that shows the percentage of employees that can walk to campus to work.

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Lund began to ask the Committee if they have any disagreements to the comments that the group presented. She noted that Mr. Fox pointed out his disagreement on expanding the MIO boundary.

(Note: The Committee had a back and forth discussion about the definition, language and technicality of a MIO boundary.)

Ms. Lund noted that this Committee does not want to revisit the MIO boundary issues. She commented that any suggested changes to the MIO boundary can go forward within their own community group. She addressed the Committee's concern about the connection about what is happening on and off campus as well as the primary and secondary impact zones. Mr. Frosaker commented that if the University decided to build off campus and outside the MIO, these should be counted in the total sq. footage.

Ms. Lund asked the Committee if there are any other comments from the group that the Committee may not get behind and the option is to submit comments individually or through their community group.

Mr. Fox reiterated that there is no universal agreement regarding the innovation district.

Mr. Campbell asked if his comments addressing in regards to social and neighborhood issues are shared by the group. Mr. Fox commented that he agrees in concept and principle, but it may need some language clarification.

Ms. Sheehan added that the group should clearly define what makes a neighborhood and livable.

Next Steps:

Ms. Sheehan noted that any additional or new comments, and clarifications that were not covered in the matrix needs to be submitted by November 18.

The next scheduled meeting is Nov 29 and the format will be like this meeting with more organized comments. There will be no new comments accepted at this time.

The Committee will meet on December 6 and the goal is to draft a response letter.

At the December 13 meeting, the Committee will be finalizing and voting on what the comments and the comment period closes on December 19th. Between December 13th and the 19th, she will be finalizing the comment letter, and will not ask for any clarification from the Committee.

V. New Business

There was no new business.

VI. Adjournment

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

Comments on the University of Washington's 2018 Master Plan

Submitted to the CUCAC, Nov. 8, 2016

By the U District Alliance for Equity and Livability

- The UW is operating in a high-cost city, and this expansion plan will make housing and other costs even more expensive for low-wage workers and students. Yet the Campus plan neither acknowledges this reality, nor makes any attempt to mitigate these effects.
- The campus expansion calls for expanding the campus buildings by one-third, and population by 20 percent, yet the University is not providing affordable housing, child care or transportation options for many of its current staff and students, let alone new staff trying to live in a more expensive city.
- The most new construction is planned for the west campus, adjacent to the high rise buildings planned for the U District upzone, yet the plan does not clearly answer the question how this small area of the neighborhood will accommodate the additional combined growth. This is where the U District should be encouraging a residential community, not an office park.
- The expansion will raise housing costs in the U District, causing more, and because there is now light rail access to Rainier Valley is easier, it will increase competition for affordable housing in Southeast Seattle and other neighborhoods, already at high risk for displacement.
- The expansion will worsen already bad traffic congestion problems in the U District, making longer commutes for UW staff and students using bus transit, at a time when more students and staff will have to commute because of housing displacement.
- The UW's child care plan, critical for employees, but not covered in the Master Plan, is for additional space on campus. Low-wage UW employees don't want expensive slots on a long campus waiting list. They need financial support for child care in their own communities.
- The expansion plan uses the narrowest possible definition of sustainable development and a "triple bottom line" in its "Guiding Principles." Sustainability includes environmental, social and economic measures, including equal opportunity, poverty alleviation and societal well-being. The plan omits any discussion of equity factors, and focuses mostly on business development.
- The University claims to be committed to racial justice, but nowhere does this plan acknowledge that workers and students of color at the UW will be affected the most by the plan, for all the reasons above. East African and Filipino workers are two of the largest groups of employees on the campus and Medical Center, but if you look at the UW's Public Participation Plan, there is no real outreach to immigrant communities or communities of color, their organizations, their unions, or advocates for affordable housing or child care.

General Comments on the UW's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

- UW failed to consider other alternatives to expanding the Seattle campus, 1) shifting development to other UW campuses in the region; 2) creating a satellite campus in the region; 3) putting some high-rise development in an area that already has significant high-rise development, such as South Lake Union or downtown.
- UW failed to analyze potential environmental or social impacts of the likelihood that the UW will increase the cost of staff transit passes, as was proposed this year.
- UW failed to analyze social and environmental impacts of the University's failure to provide affordable childcare alternatives for additional staff.
- UW failed to fully analyze and document the combined impacts of 1) UW expansion and 2) U District upzone and 3) UW property development and property leasing outside the campus. This combination impacts traffic, environmental health, air quality, housing, land use and other impact areas. Merely stating that "Land use and traffic as part of the U District Rezone Proposal are assumed as part of a cumulative analysis" is not adequate.
- UW failed to analyze the impact of campus expansion on housing costs, either on campus, in U District, or in other neighborhoods where additional population will live.
- There is no analysis of the housing displacement impact of the expansion plan, either physical (demolition) or economic (rent increases), even though the U District and other neighborhoods are already at high risk of displacement, according to the City of Seattle ***Given this, not credible for EIS to say that "significant housing impacts would not be anticipated."***
- The EIS traffic analysis assumes that many students and staff will continue to live in the U District, but that analysis fails to take into account the cost of new market-rate housing in the U District which will force more students and staff to live farther away, which will inflate the number of people driving and using transportation. ***Given this, the transportation analysis is not credible.***
- The EIS offers no significant mitigation to vehicle issues, transit plans or potential displacement. There are no plans to make transportation more accessible for its over 13,000 new community members.

Detailed Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

The UW's EIS fails to adequately address transportation issues in three meaningful ways, and offers next to nothing in the way of mitigation. These issues compound each other and need to be fully addressed and mitigated before the plan should be improved.

The key failings are:

- 1) The EIS assumes current housing stocks and transportation trends at UW and in the University District will continue, despite abundant evidence of displacement risk in the University District, particularly when it comes to housing costs and stock and the impact of the MIMP and University District upzone on displacement
- 2) The EIS fails to adequately combine the effects of the MIMP with the upzone, even though there is overlap between the parties advocating for both and they will be concurrent processes. There are methodological issues in traffic estimation and places where the appendix and published results disagree with each other. Combining the MIMP and the upzone estimates in some cases causes traffic to improve dramatically, which seems implausible given the scopes of both projects
- 3) The combined MIMP and upzone will potentially cause UW to be out of compliance with its own Transportation Demand Management program with the city, even though neither the upzone nor the MIMP directly address this

1) The EIS has the following to say about access to housing near the MIMP area.

“With planned construction of multi-family housing nearby, drive alone trips may continue to decline as students, faculty and staff have choices for living near campus. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.”

COMMENTS:

The EIS offers no projections of where UW students and staff will live in the future or how this impacts transportation. Instead, it uses where they live now and notes that most MIMP development will be close to new private Multi-Family Housing from the rezone or student housing. This is woefully inadequate. It also offers no significant mitigation plans of any type, despite claiming “identified mitigation measures.”

The much lauded “Seattle 2035: Growth and Equity” analysis on racial justice notes that the University District has the highest risk of displacement in all of North Seattle, due to factors such as the percent people of color, linguistic isolation and rent costs. The upzone will increase rents as much as 20% and drive lower income students, staff and other residents out of the neighborhood. There is no guarantee that the close to half of UW students who live within a mile of UW now will be able to afford to live there. This will cause further flight from the neighborhood and dependency on transportation, particularly as the UW student and

staff base expands by 13,000 people. The MIMP EIS therefore cannot assume a significant amount will be able to afford to live in the neighborhood.

2) The EIS has the following to say about integrating research methods with the upzone analysis

“For this analysis, background growth was interpolated from the 2035 Comprehensive Plan traffic volumes, which were developed using the City developed travel demand model, to reflect the 2028 horizon year. *Land use and traffic as part of the U District Rezone Proposal are assumed as part of a cumulative analysis***.* In addition to vehicle traffic, the City developed travel demand model provides background growth related to transit, pedestrians, and bicycles.” 03-15-17

COMMENTS:

- 1. *The EIS does not explicitly combine the effects of the rezone and the MIMP on transportation anywhere in the main document, and only does in a Transportation Report Appendix, where most combined effects get worse. Some important combined effects are left out entirely.***
 - a. The combined analysis shows vehicle speed as slowing significantly on the main North/South University District arterials, including to 36% of the predicted Alternative 1 speed (3.9 VS. 10.7 mph) on 11th Avenue Northbound and 76% on Roosevelt Southbound. This does not appear in the main EIS.***
 - b. The combined analysis show the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios on the Ship Canal, University and Montlake Bridges worsening, yet none of this is covered directly in the main EIS.***
 - c. The combined analysis shows volume and traffic time on almost all East/West corridors and Montlake remaining similar or even improving over the MIMP EIS. This seems to suggest that more people moving into the area will somehow lower East/West traffic. This seems highly doubtful, even with road and transit improvements. There are major methodological issues here.***

- 2. *There are several places where the methodology and data section of the Transportation Report appendix reports disagrees with the main EIS. Most notably, the appendix lists one speed on arterials for a given alternative, but the EIS reports another speed. For 11th Avenue Northbound, this is 5 miles an hour off for the “Alternative 1” proposal.***

3) The EIS has the following to say about UW complying with its Transportation Management Program (TMP) and the number of vehicle trip caps to and from the University District

“All Action Alternatives are not expected to exceed the set vehicle trip caps, even with this conservative 20 [%] drive alone split. The university will continue to find ways through the Transportation Management Plan demand management strategies to evolve and further reduce the amount of single occupant vehicles that are generated during the critical periods subject to the caps.”

COMMENTS:

- 1) The EIS Table 3.15-24 directly contradicts this claim. It projects higher traffic in 2028 than the current am trip cap, both to the UW campus and to the University District. It tries to mitigate this by presenting lower traffic during the PM trip period, thus creating a lower total. However, the caps were originally designated per time of day, and not intended to be aggregated in this way. The EIS is already out of compliance. Moreover, pm traffic in the University District is currently much higher than am traffic. There is no explanation of how am traffic would end up larger than pm traffic by 2028, other than the unstated assumption that more people are commuting to the neighborhood.**
- 2) The paragraph immediately after table 3.15-24 states that these are forecast illustrations only and that “they assume no change in mode split from 2015 levels, and thus may be considered conservative and worst case assumptions” given light rail expansion. This is an unreasonable assumption, given the fact that UW’s mode split is so good because so many students walk to campus, and there is significant risk of student displacement from the university district, and not necessarily along lines serviced by light rail.**
- 3) The combined analysis of the MIMP and upzone does not include information on the total number of vehicle trips to and from the area during the peak period trip threshold. Without adding in the rezone, the EIS already acknowledges that peak trips to the area will be very close to the maximum daily threshold, and greater than the am peak threshold. The rezone effects were likely not included because combined, they would make UW out of compliance with the agreement. This is a significant problem.**

MITIGATION:

Most importantly, The EIS offers no significant mitigation to vehicle issues, transit plans or potential displacement. The only vehicular mitigation listed is the removal of two roads and the extension of three others. For transit mitigation, the EIS refers to UW’s existing Transportation Management Plan, which it will likely be out of compliance with by 2028. UW offers no measures of displacement, no measures of how to correct it, and no plans to make transportation more accessible for its over 13,000 new community members.

List of Endorsing/Member Organizations

Church Council of Greater Seattle
Service Employees (SEIU) Local 925 (UW Clerical Workers)
Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)
WA Federation of State Employees Local 1488 (UW Service Workers)
Coalition of Immigrants, Refugees and Communities of Color (CIRCC)
M. L. King County Labor Council
Beacon Hill United Methodist Church
UNITE HERE (Hotel) Local 8
United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS)
Laborers Local 242
South CORE/ Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle
WA State Nurses Association
Transit Riders Union
SEIU Health Care 1199NW (Nurses)
Puget Sound Sage
UAW Local 4121 (Grad Students)
Moms Rising
Laborers District Council
Teamsters Local 117
NW Laborers Coalition
One America