



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

TBD
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
Amanda Winters
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
TBD
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
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
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 #166
July 11, 2017
Adopted July 25, 2017**
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Barbara Quinn	Timmy Bendis (Voting Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Voting Alt.)
Matthew Fox	Kerry Kahl	Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
Amanda Winters	Jan Arntz	Rick Mohler (Voting Alt.)

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
-----------------	-------------	----------------

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

There was a motion to adopt the May 9 and June 27 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. Final CMP/EIS Review

Mr. Fox opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS.

Ms. Theresa Doherty mentioned that there are two volumes of the EIS. Volume I contains the same information that and any additions to the plan is bolded. Volume I also contains all the appendices and analysis referred to the EIS. If anyone is interested in the Transportation Discipline Report, she has the hard copies available. Volume II contains the comments, letters, emails, etc. and the University's response. The University's response is correlated to the number on each of the paragraphs. She added that they looked at all the comments and created key topics at the beginning of Volume II. The information was consolidated in a commonly asked question for each category.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan consolidated all the Committee's comments and the responses from the University in a matrix for reference. She asked Ms. Doherty to stay for a short while to clarify any commentaries from the Committee regarding the EIS.

V. Final CMP/EIS Working Groups (00:12:12)

Ms. Sheehan introduced Ms. Kjristine Lund to discuss next steps.

Ms. Lund began that there will be four meetings scheduled to understand, and assess the University's response to the comments and formulate a consensus and submit their report by August 30th. The report from this Committee will be addressed to SDCI and any recommendations will be consolidated with the SDCI's recommendation report that will be submitted to the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. King confirmed SDCI will maintain an open record until the time SDCI submits its recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, and the Hearing Examiner augments the public record.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal for tonight is to familiarize oneself with the documents, break into small groups by topic areas organized for the draft, reconvene and talk about what was discussed in the subgroups. At the July 25th meeting, the group will have the opportunity to discuss and prioritize the issues on how to respond to them. Ms. Lund suggested to have all the group's comments be combined and have reached a consensus for the final letter at the August 8th meeting.

Ms. Lund mentioned that Ms. Sheehan prepared a matrix that shows the Committee's comments and the responses from the University. It also shows if the responses from the University has adequately resolved or satisfied the comments.

A question was asked about the meaning of "is noted" by the University on the document. The word "is noted" meant that the University read and acknowledged the comment. Ms. Clark added that for some of these comments that were listed cannot be resolved by the University until the actual CMP is acted upon. Ms. Doherty added that some of the comments that were noted were referred to a reference chapter in the CMP/EIS.

VI. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion

Ms. Lund opened the discussion by breaking into small groups to review the final CMP/EIS.

The subgroups were divided into the following: transportation; open space and landscaping; development standards, design guidelines, height, bulk, scale; and University property ownership, etc.

Ms. Lund suggested that each group to focus on the important topics that can be incorporated to the final comment letter or requires further clarification.

(Editor's Note: The Committee broke into their subgroups for discussion)

Ms. Lund asked the subgroups about which comments were resolved and satisfactory based on the response from the University that needs to further discussion.

Group #1 noted that Comment #4 is resolved. Group #2 noted that Comments #7, 8, 10, 12 and #13 were satisfactorily addressed by the University.

There was further discussion among the subgroups about Comments #11 and 12 and Ms. Lund suggested to hold the discussion on these two comments.

Group #2 noted that Comment #13, 35, and 36 were resolved by the University.

A comment was made about Comments #17 through #21 were satisfactory, and added if any of the subgroups would like to add comments to provide additional expertise.

Ms. Lund asked about the potential roadblocks the subgroups would like to address and other challenges that they may encounter when they are reviewing the documents.

Ms. Doherty addressed the issue on housing and she mentioned that the University included a section in the CMP about housing as well as additional information in the Volume One of the EIS.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that there were comments regarding the view corridors, night glare, etc. and these were addressed in the design and development standards.

Ms. Lund commented about any clarification between the University's 10-year commitment versus the plan beyond ten-years particularly in East Campus.

Ms. Doherty noted that the City University Agreement requires a long-term vision plan for the entire campus. She added that in addition to the plan, a 10-year conceptual plan was developed based on the

2003 CMP. She mentioned that the long-term vision for East Campus shows the entire build-out while the 10-year conceptual plan identifies what the University thinks they might develop.

The Transportation subgroup commented about the University's responses about stronger language on transportation plan, and the need for having constant collaboration and participation among other transit agencies are important.

Ms. Doherty commented that there is detailed information about the University's approach to transportation in the EIS. She added about comments regarding initiating a leadership role by the University in these issues, and looking at the role of the stakeholders and collaborating with them is also essential.

A comment was made about preserving the historic buildings and properties around campus and Ms. Clark mentioned that there is a separate round table that discusses historic preservation.

Mr. Fox commented about the issue on Cloverleaf Green and Ms. Clark noted that she will invite a representative from SDOT to discuss the status about Cloverleaf Green.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that she heard numerous comments about transportation plans and she encouraged the Committee to read the EIS sections that talk about transportation.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal of the next meeting is to hear back from the subgroups, gathering information and clarification about the University's response.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that they cannot meet with more than 9 members any decision making through email.

VII. New Business

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

VI. Adjournment

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