



Minutes #182

(Adopted March 12, 2019)

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

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

6:30 – 8:30 PM

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue, 22nd Floor

Seattle WA 98105

Attendees/CUCAC Members:

Timmy Bendis	Sarah Swanberg	Julie Blakeslee
Doug Campbell	Matthew Fox	Colleen McAleer
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	

Staff and Other Present:

Sarah Belz	Sally Clark	Troy Stahlecker
------------	-------------	-----------------

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox suggested holding the adoption of the October 9 minutes at the next meeting to get clarification on what was said about the parking cap discussion.

3. Public Comments

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

4. University District Station Building

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on the University District Station Building.

Mr. Troy Stahlecker, UW Capital Planning and Development began his University District Station Building (UDSB) project update. The project has been ongoing since 2013 when the University Board of Regents entered into an agreement with Sound Transit for development rights over the UDSB. The University has until 2025 to permit the structure above the transit center or it reverts to Sound Transit.

Sound Transit will begin construction in the summer 2020, and the fall of 2021 the train will start running. He hopes that the interior work inside the UDSB will be done at the same time and the building being occupied by January 2022.

The University would like to do its due diligence in the design work and be prepared before the platform is built in summer of 2020. Most recently this September of the past year, the Board of Regents approved that the UW go to test the market for a developer.

When the UW did a study in 2017 to figure the massing and concluded that a 12-story, 240,000 sq. ft. commercial office building is appropriate. A broker package is currently out and looking at the RFP to have a developer build a 12-story, 240,000 sq. ft. building. The RFP to the broker has been issued but has not advertised to potential developers. He anticipates that to happen in the next couple of weeks. He commented that normally his office will run through the process, but a 3rd party is currently assisting to speed the process.

Mr. John Gaines asked about who will be owning the building, and Mr. Stahlecker mentioned that the lease will revert to the University, and there will be different buyouts, but the fail safe will be in 70 years and the University has the option to buy out ahead of that. 100% of the building will be occupied by the University, and this is a good opportunity for the University to consolidated leases, efficiencies and bringing synergies within the administrative staff. Mr. Gaines asked about the reasoning behind bringing in a 3rd party to help through the process, and Mr. Stahlecker mentioned that the University does not know how to do this new future development scheme and it is actively learning the process for the University to do in the future.

The University is planning to go back to the Board of Regents in the spring 2019 to approve the lease contract with the developer that was successful in the RFP/RFQ process.

Mr. Gaines asked who could lease the space down the road and Ms. Clark mentioned that technically anybody could lease it. There were discussions that Continuing Education and Career Pathways could possibly occupy the space, but not the laboratories, etc.

Mr. Doug Campbell asked if the developers will choose the tenants, and Mr. Stahlecker mentioned that the University will choose the tenants and set the rates. He added that the University already set the rates based on existing rents in the area.

Mr. Gaines commented about how the University has control of the building if a 3rd party is building it, and Mr. Stahlecker mentioned that in simpler terms, the University is using the developer's debt to build a building and thus lowering the cost of the University by using the developer's debt capacity.

He noted that the University will go to the Board of Regents in spring 2019 to approve the deal and currently the University is soliciting and testing the market. He would come back to this Committee when the deal is approved, and the University would have the developer and designer on board. He added that since the University is behind the process, it is advancing the design work at the University's expense if the deal does not go through.

Mr. Fox commented that CUCAC should take a strong position of having a public bathroom in the station building and he would like to know when the best time is to present this in the initial design phase.

Mr. Campbell asked if the University has given any guidance regarding amenities to the UDSB, and Mr. Stahlecker mentioned that they are not in that phase yet. He mentioned that one of the objectives of the UDSB is that it gives control of the site to the University and contribute to gateway to the U District and the UW campus for light rail users.

Mr. Stahlecker will come back to this Committee on summer 2019 to provide an update and discuss advance design input.

5. UW CMP Update & Next Steps

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on the UW CMP Update and next steps.

Ms. Clark mentioned that the 14-day reply period closed today at 5:00 pm. At the last meeting, CUCAC discussed and confirmed a letter that was submitted in the 30-day window which closed on October 26. It is the comment letter on the City Council's preliminary decision to approve the Master Plan with conditions. City Council has received letters from different folks after the Council's actions. The Central Staff compiled all the letters and sent out to everyone who has commented. A 14-day window was opened to comment on other's comments and it was closed today at 5:00 pm. She noted that not all chose to comment. There were comments from the University, the University District Council, and SDCI.

The City Council will walkthrough with staff the responses and the replies in their Planning and Land Use Committee meeting on Wednesday, December 5th at 9:30 am. She does not have any confirmation if the Council will act before the end of the year. The Committee will have another meeting before the end of the year on December 19th. If they decide to move out of Committee, it needs to move to the full City Council and to the Board of Regents.

Ms. Clark commented that there is no timeline on when the City Council or the Board of Regents to take any action. She is hoping that any action or decision could happen by the end of 1st quarter 2019 when the City Council and the Board of Regents agree on the remaining conditions in dispute.

6. RPZ Subsidy – Wallingford

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on the RPZ subsidy.

Mr. Jon Berkedal made a presentation about the RPZ subsidies in Wallingford at the October meeting. There is a new RPZ being created in Wallingford. He re-read the Master Plan concerning the RPZ and it was stated that the University's limit of contribution permits and RPZ is \$100,000.

Mr. Gaines asked how the fund is being allocated, and Ms. Barbara Quinn noted that University Park gets a yearly discount, but it varies. Mr. Berkedal noted that the Master Plan states that if you are in an impact zone, you will get a 100%, and if you are in a secondary impact zone, it could vary. Wallingford will have a new designated RPZ, but it has not been assigned.

His understanding is that because it is an RPZ that is in the impact zone and has been designated by the University, the members of the Wallingford community that ask for permits will be in the general pool with everyone asking for permits, and when the money is spent, it is gone. Now, because of another designated RPZ, some folks in Wallingford will be competing for the limited funds.

Mr. Berkedal asks if there is a mechanism or can this Committee request to increase the subsidies. He is asking if the Committee can draft a letter appealing to the University for an increase in subsidies as a sign of being a good neighbor. Ms. Clark commented that the City is ambivalent about the RPZ, and the University would like to make the City and the nearby neighborhoods happy.

Mr. Fox commented that he is fine having this Committee making a request to the University, since it is not a condition of the Master Plan. Ms. Quinn made a motion to have CUCAC write a letter requesting the University to increase its RPZ subsidies due to the continued increase in population growth in the primary and secondary impact zones, and Mr. Jon Gaines seconded. The Committee voted as four in favor, three against and two abstentions. The motion passed.

Mr. Fox will ask Ms. Sheehan to draft a letter for the Committee to review.

7. New Business

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on new business.

Mr. Fox asked the Committee to cancel the December meeting. Ms. Clark mentioned that there are no University project updates presentation.

Mr. Campbell asked when will the Committee continue discuss the University District Station Building, and Mr. Fox noted to continue the discussion at the January meeting.

Mr. Fox suggested to tentatively cancel the December meeting pending any new announcements or development updates from the University.

8. Adjournment

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