

# UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY URBAN CENTER APPROVAL AND ADOPTION MATRIX

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Key Strategies</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A. Southwest Quadrant.....	5
B. Lower Brooklyn.....	8
C. Northern Tier .....	12
D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development.....	17
E. The Ave/15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor.....	22
F. Ravenna Urban Village .....	27
<b>II. Specific Activities for Implementation</b> .....	<b>31</b>
Land Use and Economic Development .....	31
Transportation.....	33
Housing.....	39
Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features .....	41
Arts and Cultural Activities .....	44
Social Services .....	46
Public Safety .....	47
Community Coordination, Communication, and Participation in Decision Making .....	48
<b>III. Activities for Longer-Term Consideration</b> .....	<b>50</b>

---

Prepared by the University Community Urban Center Association and City of Seattle's Interdepartmental Review and Response Team. Compiled by the Strategic Planning Office, July 21, 1998. Amended by City Council Central Staff, November 11, 1998.

## Introduction

Through the City of Seattle's Neighborhood Planning Program, 37 neighborhoods all over Seattle are preparing neighborhood plans. These plans enable people in neighborhoods to articulate a collective vision for growth and change over the next 20 years and identify activities to help them achieve that vision. The plans are also intended to flesh out the City's Comprehensive Plan. Because each plan is unique, this Approval and Adoption Matrix has been designed as a standard format for the City to establish its work program in response to the recommended activities proposed in the specific neighborhood plan.

The matrix is divided into three sections:

- I. *Key Strategies*: usually complex projects or related activities that the neighborhood considers critical to the successful implementation of the neighborhood plan.
- II. *Additional Activities for Implementation*: clearly defined activities that are not directly associated with a Key Strategy, ranging from high to low in priority.
- III. *Activities for Longer Term Consideration*: activities that, for a variety of reasons, are not yet ready for a formal City response or are intended to be implemented several years in the future.

The neighborhood planning group or its consultant generally fill in the Activity, Priority, Time Frame, Cost Estimates and Implementor columns. The Executive Response and Executive Recommended Action columns are filled in by City departments. Staff from almost every City department have participated in these planning efforts and in the preparation of this Matrix. The Council Action Taken column is filled in by the City Council. Ultimately, the City Council will approve the Matrix by resolution along with the neighborhood plan.

### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY URBAN CENTER PLANNING PROCESS**

During the past 3 1/2 years, while the University Community Urban Center was working on its plan, the community undertook many initiatives (all of which are referred to in the plan) with community and City support.

They include the following:

- The Ave Plan was initiated prior to the neighborhood plan and had several important outcomes. The plan produced an Ave Charette and five work sessions with the UW Cascadia Institute. It also helped to initiate a new University District BIA that has been in

operation for over two years. In addition the Ave planning process focused on community safety and introduced the SARA process to the community with a workshop and report. Outcomes of this earlier plan include a mini police office on the Ave (in the Neighborhood Service Center) and working with SEATRAN on a pilot project where bus bulbs were installed on one block of the Ave as a demonstration project of proposed street improvements.

- The City-University agreement on new lease lid was developed with a broad variety of representatives from communities surrounding the UW. UCUCA members participated extensively in this process and are pleased with the revised agreement.
- SEATRAN was successful in soliciting funding for sidewalks along Blakely Ave. that were a high priority for Ravenna residents.
- Representatives of both University Village and the Ravenna Urban Village worked with DCLU and NPO to reach agreement to work collaboratively on a master plan for University Village.
- SPU has initiated a 50th Street master controller project which will provide a mechanism for multiple street and lighting improvements in the planning area. NPO is represented on the planning committee for this project.
- The Arts and Culture Committee of the UCUCA has agreed to form an ongoing Arts Council and meets on a monthly basis. The Chamber of Commerce has initiated an Arts and Culture Campaign for promotion of the business district.
- The UCUCA sponsored and planned a Sound Transit charrette which provided clear guidance to Sound Transit on the preferred alignment, station locations, and key issues related to design, access, and operations.
- A UW Architecture and Urban Planning studio provided a lot by lot photographic record of the Southwest Quadrant area with analysis of key open space and design issues.

## I. Key Strategies

Each Key Strategy consists of activities for a single complex project or theme that the neighborhood considers critical to achieving its vision for the future. While the Key Strategies are high priorities for the neighborhood, they are also part of a twenty-year plan, so the specific activities within each Key Strategy may be implemented over the span of many years.

The Executive recognizes the importance of the Key Strategies to the neighborhood that developed them. Given the number of Key Strategies that will be proposed from the 37 planning areas, priorities will have to be set and projects phased over time. The Executive will coordinate efforts to sort through the Key Strategies. During this sorting process, departments will complete the next level of feasibility analysis. This may include developing rough cost estimates for the activities within each Key Strategy; identifying potential funding sources and mechanisms; establishing priorities for the Key Strategies within each plan, as well as priorities among plans; and developing phased implementation and funding strategies. The City will involve neighborhoods in a public process so that neighborhoods can help to establish citywide priorities. The results of these efforts will determine which strategies and activities are to be given priority for City response in 1998-2000 versus later implementation.

The department most involved with the activities for a Key Strategy is designated as the lead. Otherwise, DON is designated as the lead. Other participating departments are also identified.

The Executive Response lists activities already underway and other tasks that the Executive has committed to commence during the remainder of this year or the next biennium.

The University Community Urban Center Neighborhood Plan contains six Key Strategies, organized by geographic areas:

- A. Southwest Quadrant
- B. Lower Brooklyn
- C. Northern Tier
- D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development
- E. The Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor
- F. Ravenna Urban Village

## A. SOUTHWEST QUADRANT

---

### ***Description***

The Southwest Quadrant, lying south of NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. between I-5 and Roosevelt Ave. NE, was nicknamed “WORO” (west of Roosevelt) by planning participants because it is somewhat separated from the rest of the University community by the Roosevelt commercial corridor and the University Bridge. The area consists of low-rise apartments and single-family homes to the Burke-Gilman Trail, with older industrial uses being replaced by newer office and light industrial uses to the south. The vision for this quadrant is that both areas become more attractive and better connected to surrounding services and amenities. Rather than a major shift in land use pattern, the plan envisions a continuation of existing trends, with additional capital improvements to upgrade the physical setting.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

The vision for this quadrant is one where existing trends will continue. The plan calls for aesthetic improvement and better connections to surroundings; this approach is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

This strategy consists of relatively small projects that could be implemented incrementally; individual recommendations are not dependent on one another.

Department responses included below: DCLU, SEATRAN, DPR, DON, Fire. Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** DON

**Participating Departments:** SEATRAN, DCLU, DPR

#### **Activities Already Underway:**

1. DPR is currently working with citizens to form an Adopt-A-Park Group for the area around the Burke-Gilman Trail near the University Bridge.

#### **Tasks to be Undertaken in 1998-2000**

1. Feasibility Evaluation Tasks:
  - a. Investigate ownership of property proposed for public open space (e.g., vacant triangles at NE 41<sup>st</sup> St. and 11<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE).
  - b. Prepare scopes of work and preliminary cost estimates for recommended physical improvements for transportation and open space.
  - c. Based on preliminary project budget, identify which elements of the proposal (e.g., pedestrian improvements on NE 42<sup>nd</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> Sts., creation of new parks, or upgrading and enhancement of existing parks) would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy.
  - d. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - e. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.
2. Coordinate with Sound Transit station area planning and City’s station area planning (1998-1999).
3. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

## Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy

A. Southwest Quadrant						
#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Estimate	Implementor	Executive Response
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>						
D7	Create a small park at the 7 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE street end at Lake Union, perhaps with environmental restoration, hand-held boat launch, and a small seating area.	H		Apply for Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) and Interagency Committee (IAC) (State) grants. (Note: This would also be a great place to use off-site environmental mitigation funds when needed for other Lake Union shoreline projects.)	Washington State funds, DPR	Several potential fund sources for street end/public access may be applicable to this project. DPR is developing an equitable method of distribution for a small amount of SPIF funds that have not been allocated. Other potential sources include ALEA funds or the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC). Note, however, that most open space fund sources are very competitive and a local match would have to be identified. The community should consider applying for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant for design.
D8	Improve NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. from I-5 to the campus as green streets. Focus special attention on sections between the Ave and the campus. (See Activities B6, B7, and B9.)	H	Sound Transit station development.	Undetermined; depends on the scope of the improvements.	SEATRAN, Sound Transit, KC/Metro, UW.	Both NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. are designated as key pedestrian streets in Seattle's Comprehensive Transportation Program. Designation of a street as a "green street" or "key pedestrian street" does not automatically mean that physical changes to the street will occur. The next steps are: a detailed streetscape plan has to be developed. Design is usually a community-initiated task. Other neighborhoods have used Neighborhood Matching Grant funds for this purpose. Second, funding has to be identified either from new private development, a public agency, or a Local Improvement District for installation of improvements. If the strategy is to rely on new development to provide the improvements, they may not be contiguous or extensive.
D15	Enhance gateway along 11 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE north of Campus Parkway. Improve the vacant triangles at NE 41 <sup>st</sup> St. and 11 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. Construct gateway features (perhaps significant trees, lights, or signs). Also upgrade bus stop.	H		Approximately \$100K to \$200K.	SEATRAN, Community, KC/Metro.	This project would be a good candidate for the Neighborhood Matching Fund.
D23	Upgrade the area around the Burke-Gilman Trail near the University Bridge, I-5 bridge, and Peace Park. Improve the landscaping and paths. Add security lighting where needed.		As funding is available.	Parks maintenance funds.	DPR, Adopt-a-Park program.	The Adopt-A-Park coordinator may be able to help the group identify fund sources for minor improvements or direct them to a grant source. For additional street or alley lights, the neighborhood or Adopt-A-Park group is encouraged to develop a lighting plan by working with Seattle City Light's North Service Center. SEATRAN has

<b>A. Southwest Quadrant</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
						jurisdiction for lighting on arterials. The plan should include location of lights, type of lighting fixtures and lighting calculations.
D25	Improve 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE north of the Burke-Gilman Trail to improve residential conditions.			Undetermined; depends on the amount of self-help.	SEATRAN and property owners.	The City will work with the neighborhood to clarify this recommendation.
D27	Require sidewalks and street trees for all new development south of the Burke-Gilman Trail and east of the University Bridge.			Mitigation for new development.	SEATRAN, Community; developers.	The neighborhood should first determine the street classification in this area (see Seattle Comprehensive Transportation Program). The design standards for each classification set the requirements for street improvements, including trees and sidewalks, with new developments. If no new development occurs, street tree plantings can be a good community-based activity, often funded by the Neighborhood Matching Fund. Technical assistance is available from the SEATRAN Arborist's Office or the Seattle City Light Urban Tree Replacement Program.

**A. Southwest Quadrant - Council Action Taken:**

Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action with following additions:

1. The Executive shall review its policy regarding security lighting on streets and alleys and shall provide the Council with a report, analysis and recommendations by June 1999.
2. City departments that own vacant parcels within the planning area should work together with the community to identify parcels that might be usable, on a temporary or permanent basis, for open space purposes identified by the community, and should include Parks and DON as an implementors.

## **B. LOWER BROOKLYN**

---

### ***Description***

The Lower Brooklyn area is roughly bounded by Roosevelt Ave. NE, NE 43<sup>rd</sup> St., University Way NE, and Portage Bay and consists of an established low- to mid-rise multifamily neighborhood north of NE 41<sup>st</sup> St., the Lower Roosevelt/11<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE corridor, and the University of Washington Southwest Campus to the south. The area was nicknamed Lower Brooklyn, or “Lo-Bro,” by the Planning Committee because Brooklyn Ave. NE emerged as a critical north-south link connecting the Southwest Campus area to the residential neighborhood and the commercial districts to the north. The vision for Lower Brooklyn is to intensify and solidify the residential neighborhood’s character, to provide a better transition between the campus and adjacent activities, to integrate proposed transit improvements, and to improve gateways and connections around the periphery.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

The vision to intensify and solidify the residential character of this area is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

This strategy consists of relatively small projects that could be implemented incrementally; individual recommendations are not dependent on one another.

Department responses included below: DCLU, DPR, SEATRAN. Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** DON

**Participating Departments:** DCLU, SEATRAN, DPR

#### **Activities Already Underway:**

1. Development of an overall conceptual design is currently underway along NE 43<sup>rd</sup> St. with a one-block demonstration project to improve the pedestrian link between the Ave and the campus on NE 43<sup>rd</sup> St.

#### **Tasks to be Undertaken in 1998-2000**

1. Feasibility evaluation tasks:
  - a. Identify any parcels for potential open space acquisition in the area between NE 40<sup>th</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup> Sts./Brooklyn Ave. NE and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.
  - b. Prepare scopes of work and preliminary cost estimates for recommended transportation improvements.
  - c. Based on preliminary project budget, identify which elements of the proposal (e.g., funding for green street improvements) would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy.
  - d. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - e. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.



2. Coordinate with Sound Transit station area planning and City's station area planning (1998-1999).
3. Coordinate with UW Master Plan process, beginning in 1998. Encourage the UW to enhance or expand Sakuma Park and to construct a contiguous waterfront trail extending from the Montlake Bridge to University Bridge.
4. In 1999, address design guidelines proposals in as part of a coordinated effort to implement neighborhood-specific design guidelines citywide.
5. In 1999, evaluate the feasibility of a "payment in lieu of open space program" as part of urban center implementation project. If deemed effective, apply it in urban centers or other villages that do not meet Comprehensive Plan open space goals that include such a program in their neighborhood plan. Begin development of a funding strategy for land acquisition with City resources. Use contributions from developers over time to make improvements to these sites. Examine other options to increase open space supply, including, for example, Transfer of Development Rights, or dedication of private land for public open space.
6. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

### ***Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy***

<b>B. Lower Brooklyn</b>						
#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame (Years)	Cost Estimate	Implementor	Executive Response
<i>Land Use and Economic Development</i>						
A3	Rezone from L-3 to Midrise (MR) in Lo-Bro and refine design guidelines to ensure privacy for neighbors, hidden parking, visible open space, and design quality (see rezone action A3).		Implement a rezone upon adoption of the urban center plan.	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	Community will do analysis and preliminary validation. DCLU will undertake a formal process.	Rezone actions may be adopted on approval of the UCUC plan. DCLU will work with the community to craft design guidelines covering the issues of most concern to the community in relation to the proposed rezones. The community's proposed guidelines need to be edited to: eliminate overlap between the existing citywide guidelines and the proposed changes; distinguish additions and changes to existing guidelines; and be written as statements of intent rather than prescriptions. DCLU staff is actively working with the community and expects to bring a proposal to the Council in late 1998 or early 1999 for Council consideration.
A4	Rezone the east side of Brooklyn Ave. NE from NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> St. to NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. and the south side of NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. from the alley between Roosevelt Way NE and Brooklyn Ave. NE from NC-3 (40) to NC-3 (65) (see rezone action A4). Rezone the east side of Brooklyn Ave. NE between NE 41 <sup>st</sup>		Upon adoption of plan.	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	Community will do analysis and preliminary validation. DCLU will undertake a formal process.	Rezone actions may be adopted on approval of the UCUC plan.

<b>B. Lower Brooklyn</b>						
#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame (Years)	Cost Estimate	Implementor	Executive Response
	St. and NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> St. from L3/RC to NC-3 (65) (see rezone action A4a).					
A14	Refine design guidelines in NC-3 areas where the ground floor commercial use requirement is relaxed and in MR zone to increase open space visible and accessible from the street. Open space requirements could be met through contribution to a fund for open space acquisition, as in Denny Regrade.		Adopt within one year of this plan's adoption.		Community and City are exploring this now.	Allowing single purpose residential (SPR) development outright in this NC-3 zone, as opposed to as a conditional use, can be accomplished with adoption of the neighborhood plan. See comment for A3 re: design guidelines. See narrative above re: open space.
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>						
D8	Improve NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. from I-5 to the campus as green streets. Focus special attention on sections between the Ave and the campus. (See Activities B6, B7, and B9.)	H	Timed with Sound Transit station development.	Undetermined; depends on the scope of the improvements.	SEATRAN, DCLU, Sound Transit, KC/Metro, UW.	Both NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. are designated key pedestrian streets in Seattle's Comprehensive Transportation Program. Designation of a street as a "green street" or "key pedestrian street" does not automatically mean that physical changes to the street will occur. First, a detailed streetscape plan has to be developed, usually by the community. Other neighborhoods have used Neighborhood Matching Funds for design. Second, funding has to be found from new private development, a public agency, or a Local Improvement District for installation of improvements. If the strategy is to rely on new development to provide improvements, they may not be contiguous or extensive.
D9	Support the UW's enhancement/expansion of Sakuma Park at the foot of Brooklyn Ave. NE as part of their master plan update.		Complete.	Complete.	UW.	This issue can be addressed as part of the UW Master Plan process.
D13	Support UW efforts to construct a contiguous waterfront trail extending from Montlake Bridge to University Bridge.	H	UW sets schedule.	Undetermined. (See B14 and B15.)	UW.	This issue can be addressed as part of the UW Master Plan process.
D26	Improve Brooklyn Ave. NE as a green street and signed bicycle route for Ravenna Blvd. to the water.			Undetermined.	Community, SEATRAN.	SEATRAN does not routinely place signs along bike routes (to avoid visual clutter), although in this case SEATRAN has agreed that signs can be placed strategically at key decision points, pending identification of funding.
D33	Unify the area between NE 40 <sup>th</sup> and 41 <sup>st</sup> Sts./Brooklyn Ave. NE and 15 <sup>th</sup>		UW sets schedule.	Undetermined.	UW, Community, DPR, ESD,	This issue can be addressed as part of UW Master Plan process.

<b>B. Lower Brooklyn</b>						
#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame (Years)	Cost Estimate	Implementor	Executive Response
	Ave. NE. Develop small open spaces and improve streets as parcels are redeveloped.				SEATRAN.	

**B. Lower Brooklyn - Council Action Taken:**

Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action with following additions:

1. Designate green streets as requested in neighborhood plan (Activity D2, etc.). DCLU shall prepare legislation for designation of the green streets for consideration by the Council. The Executive shall also work to reconcile all the City policies and regulations regarding green streets, including those in the draft Transportation Strategic Plan, and adopt a clear policy regarding how the City will respond to the green streets designation.
2. Prior to completion of development of its annual work program, DCLU shall present a draft work program, with a listing of the issues to be reviewed under the urban center implementation project (including review of the payment in lieu of open space program issues identified above) to the Council for early feedback on policy issues and prioritization of issues.
3. In reviewing proposed design review guideline recommended for this neighborhood plan, DCLU shall consider similar recommendations from other neighborhood plans and citywide issues. DCLU's analysis and report to the Council should summarize its consideration of such issues as well as cost impacts associated with administering numerous design review guidelines.
4. For Activities D9, D13, D33, and all others in this matrix where the Executive response indicates that the issues will be addressed as part of the UW Master Plan process, the City shall take an active role ensuring that the issues are raised and addressed in the Master Plan process.

## C. NORTHERN TIER

---

### ***Description***

The Northern Tier includes two areas in the northwest section of the urban center (see Figure III-1): all the residentially-zoned areas north of NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. from 20<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, all the residentially zoned properties north of Greek Row, all the residentially zoned properties north of NE 50th Street from University way to I-5, and properties fronting the south side of NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. In essence, the area extends over all the northwest residential neighborhoods and the NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. corridor. However, the recommendations for this area are intimately linked to those of the University core and the Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE corridor and should be considered as a whole.

The community's vision for the Northern Tier emphasizes neighborhood concerns. Since this is one area in the urban center that appears appropriate for family-oriented housing, a top priority is protecting and stabilizing the existing residential neighborhoods and providing residences with yards that will appeal to families with children. Also, the NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. corridor provides an excellent opportunity to build on existing resources to create an integrated complex of community facilities and services supporting both existing neighborhoods and projected new development.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

While the individual recommendations in this strategy are close by one another, there are two very different purposes behind them. The proposed residential rezones and land use code changes are intended to foster a certain housing type and community character. The community facilities and services recommendations are intended to build a “connected and coordinated complex of community facilities.”

**Community Facilities:** The City's approach to the community's goal for this area would be to focus first on recommendations pertaining to existing facilities—enabling the YMCA to expand and securing University Heights for long-term community use, whether or not the City purchases the facility. New facilities, or new programming in existing facilities, can follow as resources become available.

**University Heights:** While the City recognizes the importance of this building to the community, many unknowns must be investigated before the City can commit to its purchase. The Association that leases the building appears to be meeting the community's goals of use of the building for education and community-oriented functions. Now that a long-term (ten year) lease is being established between the Association and the School District, City purchase of the property may not be needed. The City will pay particular attention to the School District's Long-range Facilities Master Plan as it pertains to University Heights and help facilitate community-School District communication.

Department responses included below: SEATRAN, Parks, DCLU, DHHS, SPD. Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** DON

**Participating Departments:** SPO, DHHS-ADS, ESD-CBO, DCLU, DON, SEATRAN, DPR

**Activities Already Underway:**

1. Signal improvements, new pavement, sidewalks, wheel chair ramps and lighting and drainage upgrades will enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety and convenience on NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. between 7<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Aves. NE.
2. In August 1997, residents in the area bounded by NE 45<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> Sts., Roosevelt Way NE and I-5 petitioned for an expansion of zone 10. The zone 10 extension signs were installed during November 1997 along 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 47<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> Sts., along 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 47<sup>th</sup> and 48<sup>th</sup> Sts., along NE 48<sup>th</sup> St. between 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Aves. NE, and along 7<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 47<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> Sts. These signs read “2 Hr 7am-6pm, No Parking 6pm-12am.” Signs reading “No Parking 2am-5am” were also installed on the west side of 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 48<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> Sts. to deter vehicles from parking overnight. Any further expansion of the RPZ would have to follow the criteria-based process established by the City Council.

**Tasks to be Undertaken in 1998-2000:**

1. Feasibility Evaluation Tasks:
  - a. Determine University Heights building condition and evaluate if any major maintenance projects would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy, assuming a long-term lease between the Association and School District is signed.
  - b. Develop preliminary project budgets or cost estimates or scopes for individual items in the strategy (mostly physical improvements) and deal with them as a package.
  - c. Based on preliminary project budget, identify which other elements of the proposal, if any, would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy.
  - d. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - e. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.
2. In 1999, identify specific site improvements for University Heights, such as painting, site planning, upgrades to the University Playfield, landscaping or removing the fence, that could be candidates for Neighborhood Matching Fund grants. Help the community find funds for these purposes.
3. Coordinate with Sound Transit station area planning and City’s station area planning (1998-1999).
4. Consider a systematic approach to rehabilitation of existing housing stock in the area, using DHHS’ single family and multifamily rehabilitation and weatherization funds. Consider making single family rehabilitation funds available for construction of ADU units and making DHHS single family funds available to owners of rental properties in addition to home owners, which would allow DHHS funds to assist in the rehabilitation of renter-occupied single family homes.
5. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

**Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy**

<b>C. Northern Tier</b>						
#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response
<i>Land Use and Economic Development</i>						
A1	Change zoning in a portion of the residential area north of NE 52 <sup>nd</sup> St. from L-2 to L-1 to encourage the rehabilitation of housing stock with some additional		Implement a rezone upon adoption of the urban center	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	Community, DCLU, SPO.	Rezoning recommendation can be adopted as part of approval of the UCUC plan. See also Tasks above re: rehabilitation of existing housing stock.

<b>C. Northern Tier</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Est.</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
	accessory units (see rezone action A-1). Community will do analysis and preliminary validation as part of the NPO process. City will undertake a formal process.		plan.			
<i>Transportation</i>						
B22	RPZ Expansion. Establish event parking controls for football game days (zones 6 and 10).		Very near. 1999-2000	Game day controls accomplished through UW traffic management.	Initiated by community with SEATRAN. UW, SEAHAWKS	The Executive needs a clearer statement of the desired action in zone 10. CUCAC, the community councils in zones 6 and 7, UCUCA and the UW will deal with this issue as part of the UW Master Plan and TMP. From a parking enforcement standpoint, RPZs are labor intensive and seem to promote the fraudulent use of zone passes. Additional resources will be needed for enforcement. SEATRAN is committed to process all RPZ requests in accordance with the guidelines established by the City Council. The "funds" mentioned would be requested from the UW as "mitigation" to offset the cost to residents who would need to purchase permits (which pay for the administration and enforcement of the RPZ program).
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>						
D1	Acquire University Heights for permanent community use.	H	Highest priority. University Heights Assoc. is negotiating long-term lease, but City acquisition will be necessary.	This is the highest priority for acquisition funds.	ESD, DPR, Seattle Public Schools, Community.	Early in the lease period for University Heights, the City will work with the community, the U. Heights Association, building tenants and the School District to determine: a) the ownership or management plan that best meets the community's goals, and b) the best long-term programming for the facility. If this analysis shows that City ownership is the best strategy, and the School District ultimately proves willing to sell the site, funds to acquire it must be found.
D2	Create a community open space at University Heights south of the building to be used for the Farmers' Market and a variety of formal and informal activities. The design should combine softscape and hardscape, passive and active spaces. Enhance the edges around the University Heights site.	H	Protection of the site for open space purposes is the highest priority. Site improvements are tied to the Center Development Strategy.	This is the highest priority for acquisition funds.	University Heights Center, Community, Seattle Public Schools, DPR.	This project may be a good candidate for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant. DPR is interested in assisting with site planning, if resources are found.
D30	Support the YMCA expansion in	H		DPR	YMCA, Community,	OED may be able assist with a YMCA mixed-use

<b>C. Northern Tier</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Est.</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
	coordination with the University Heights Center and Seattle Parks Department as a way to fulfill indoor recreation needs. Consider incorporation of an expanded YMCA as part of a mixed-use development. Consider developing an off-site parking garage to serve several needs.			resources may be involved.	DCLU, DPR, University Heights Center, UDPA.	development by exploring the use of federal loans if the project can provide jobs for low and moderate income individuals. DPR can have preliminary discussions with the YMCA about expansion and program coordination.
D34	Maintain and improve community open space at University Playfield. Add additional climbers and toys. Finish up-grading Gorilla sculpture/climber with platform and access. Enhance the edges (fence) around University Playfield.					This project may be a good candidate for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant.
<i>Social Services</i>						
F1	Establish a community-based outreach, information, and referral service, including a "volunteer bank" in coordination with existing services. This may be co-located at the Neighborhood Service Center and/or other facilities. Community would supply volunteer aides; City would supply paid staff.		Desired immediately.		Community, DON.	The Neighborhood Service Center currently provides social services information and referral.
F2	Establish a new learning center for youth to house the Working Zone (an employment project), the UDYC School, and a new shop/machine/tools (voc/tech) training area. Such a training area shall not be located in a residential area. The project would be a joint effort of the School District, City, local nonprofit service providers, and UW students and faculty.		Desired immediately.	Requires financial and resource assistance from public (federal/state/local) sources, private fund raising and School District involvement.	Seattle School District, UW, DHHS.	OED: The Manufacturing Strategies Sector can provide information to enable the University District Youth Center to develop a relevant and viable vocational/ technical youth employment training program. Note: the \$300,000 Work Zone grant is due to expire November, 1999.
F3	Establish somewhere within the University Community a state-licensed shelter for 6-10 youth, a safe place where youth under 18 can stay for a few weeks, rather than just overnight.		As soon as possible.		State of Washington, Community.	No City role is specified for this activity. DHHS will review any proposals for a youth safe place through its existing competitive funding processes. DHHS can provide staff support for program planning if the community wants it. It is highly unlikely that such a project could be implemented

<b>C. Northern Tier</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Est.</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
	The State should provide funding and licensing. Community will provide volunteer help and donated goods and services (e.g., UW hospital for clean sheets and blankets).					without additional funding. Even if State funds would be available, which is doubtful, it would not be likely to cover the full cost of development or ongoing operation. DFYS does not currently have any resources to fund such a project. However, the project would fit with Homeless Advisory Group recommendation to increase shelter beds with youth as a highest priority.

C. Northern Tier - Council Action Taken: Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action with following additions:

1. The Executive shall take a leadership role in actively assisting the community in securing the use of the University Heights facility as a community center. The Executive's efforts should include working with the School District to encourage a long-term (25-year) lease or sale of the University Heights facility and working with the community to identify public and/or private resources and partners to lease, purchase, renovate, and/or maintain and operate the facility. The Executive shall provide the Council with a status report and recommendations no later than June 1999. The Executive report shall include: 1) a review of citywide community facility needs and priorities; 2) an ownership and management plan that best meets the community's goals for this facility; 3) the best long-term programming for this facility; and 4) a cost/benefit analysis of lease, purchase, renovation, and/or maintenance and operation of this facility.
2. As DHHS considers whether to adopt a systematic approach to rehabilitation of housing stock, DHHS shall identify policy and legal issues related to uses of specific funds sources, explore the use of other possible fund sources or tools for rehabilitation of housing stock, consider whether a systematic approach can or should be applied in other areas of the City; and coordinate review of this issue with any other efforts to review the City's policies for rehabilitation of housing. DHHS shall report its findings, analysis and recommendations to the Council no later than June 1999.
3. The Executive shall work proactively to respond to the community's requests for RPZs. This response shall include working with the community to clarify the requests, processing the requests, and assisting the community in its discussions with UW and the Seahawks regarding funding for RPZs.
4. The Executive shall work with the community to respond to the request to preserve the buildings in Greek Row and the brick multi-family structures south of NE 45th St. This effort should include exploration of the development of a conservation plan and the use of incentives (such as transfer of development rights in the multi-family zone) to encourage preservation of such buildings.



## D. UNIVERSITY GARDENS MIXED-USE CORE DEVELOPMENT

---

### ***Description***

This area, extending generally from Brooklyn Ave. NE to 7th Ave NE and from NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. to NE 43<sup>rd</sup> St. (See map III-1 in plan for better detail of planning area), encompasses the core of the urban center's western commercial district. Today, the area consists mostly of parking lots, automobile dealerships, and a variety of commercial uses sprinkled with a few apartments and old residences. While there are several landmark businesses, such as the Meany Hotel and Safeco Insurance Co., much of the land has minimal improvements and may be available for future development. Participants in the planning process recognized that the "University Gardens Core"—so named because the early plat descriptions refer to the "University Gardens" District—represents the best opportunity to accommodate new residential and commercial growth in a positive manner.

The vision for the University Gardens Core is its redevelopment into a more intense pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use complex, with amenities, open space, and transit accessibility supporting a wide variety of compatible activities. The plan envisions this area as an ideal location for new knowledge-based business centers that might branch off from university research, and as a likely setting for university off-campus activities. The University Gardens Core is also seen as a strong multifamily residential neighborhood, with pleasant streets, open spaces, and amenities.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

This strategy is consistent with the urban villages strategy. One important facet of the proposal is a package of land use and zoning recommendations to facilitate an urban center type of development in this currently underutilized area. Another facet involves improvements to public spaces, the pedestrian environment and parks and open spaces. Where the land use code is a vehicle for improvements to public space, the two facets reinforce each other. This strategy represents an opportunity to bring together a variety of resources and programs to concentrate on housing to help implement the Mayor's Housing Action Agenda. Options might include: DHHS programs such as down payment assistance; working with lenders to focus attention on this area; employer-assisted housing with the University of Washington; and development of a pilot project.

This strategy could be implemented incrementally; individual recommendations are not dependent on one another.

Keys to success for this project include:

- Taking advantage of the important opportunity that the KC/Metro bus layover project represents.
- Creating a strong but flexible development capacity to focus on this area, most likely through an existing private nonprofit organization.

Department responses included below: SEATRAN, Fire, DCLU, DHHS. Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** DON

**Participating Departments:** DCLU, SEATRAN, DON, SPO, ESD-CBO, DPR.

### **Tasks to be Undertaken in 1998-2000:**

1. Feasibility evaluation tasks:
  - a. Prepare feasibility analysis of City participation including: a) timing and scope of KC/Metro bus layover project; and b) relationship to Sound Transit station area planning. Use this project as a pilot for partnership development with Sound Transit and KC/Metro.
  - b. Develop preliminary project budget.
  - c. Prepare preliminary timelines.
  - d. Prepare scopes of work and preliminary cost estimates for recommended transportation improvements.
  - e. Based on preliminary project budget, determine which elements of the project would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy in 1999 (e.g., open space acquisition, some transportation improvements).
  - f. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - g. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.
2. In 1998, the City will investigate how other jurisdictions handle neighborhood-based or neighborhood-serving community development efforts to develop new models for Seattle.
3. In 1998-1999, work with the community to strengthen its organizational ability to implement this and other UCUC strategies. Many experienced and highly competent nonprofit housing development corporations currently active in the city may want to participate in the UCUC Plan implementation.
4. DCLU will work with the community to craft guidelines covering the issues of most concern to the community in relation to the proposed rezones. DCLU staff is actively working with the community and expects to bring a proposal to the Council in late 1998 or early 1999 for Council consideration. The proposed guidelines need to be edited to: eliminate overlap between the existing citywide guidelines and the proposed changes; distinguish additions and changes to existing guidelines; and be written as statements of intent rather than prescriptions.
5. Address balance of design guidelines and code amendment proposals, if any, in 1999-2000 as part of a coordinated effort to implement neighborhood-specific design guidelines citywide.
6. In 1999, evaluate the feasibility of a “payment in lieu of open space program.” If deemed effective, apply it in urban centers or other villages that do not meet Comprehensive Plan open space goals that include such a program in their neighborhood plan. Begin development of a funding strategy for land acquisition with City resources. Use contributions from developers over time to make improvements to these sites. Examine other options to increase open space supply including, for example, Transfer of Development Rights, or dedication of private land for public open space.
7. Coordinate with Sound Transit station area planning and City’s station area planning (1998-1999).
8. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

## Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy

<b>D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame (Years)</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
<i>Land Use and Economic Development</i>						
A6	Rezone the commercial area on the south side of NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. from 9 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to the freeway from NC-3 (40) to NC-3 (65) (see rezone action A6). Community will do analysis and preliminary validation as part of the NPO process. City will undertake a formal review process.		Upon adoption of plan.	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	Community, DCLU, SPO.	Rezone may be adopted upon approval of the UCUC plan.
A14	Refine design guidelines in NC-3 areas where the ground floor commercial use requirement is relaxed and in MR zone to increase open space visible and accessible from the street. Open space requirements could be met through a contribution to an open space acquisition fund, as in Denny Regrade.		1 yr., Community and City are exploring this now.		Community, DCLU, DPR.	See comment in narrative above.
<i>Transportation</i>						
B8	NE 47 <sup>th</sup> St. between 7 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and 22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE. Install pedestrian bulbs and other amenities including improved sidewalks, lights, and street trees, where possible. (See B11)			Development pays a portion of it.	SEATRAN.	Pedestrian amenities must be designed to permit emergency vehicle access. The University area is the busiest district for emergency services outside downtown (e.g., 739 incidents in 1996 in the 20-block area between NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 50 <sup>th</sup> Sts. from NE 12 <sup>th</sup> to 19 <sup>th</sup> Aves.). Since this is a local street, no federal or state money is anticipated to be available for this type of improvement. Therefore, "local" funds need to be allocated to this project to supplement funds from private development. These improvements could be candidates for either the matching fund or the neighborhood bond or levy.
B11	Upper UCUC East-West on NE 47 <sup>th</sup> St. Establish an east west bicycle street between 8 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and 22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE with signage linking it to other bicycle streets.			In conjunction with Sound Transit station planning, campus master plan, and the Ave improvements. Potential Sound Transit mitigation.	SEATRAN.	It is City policy not to sign most streets used by bikes. Many signs create visual clutter and increase ongoing maintenance costs. Direction signs can be placed at key junctions. The over-use of signs creates visual clutter that reduces the effective use of signs for transmitting information (they eventually become unnoticed due to the competition for attention). SEATRAN does not believe this is

<b>D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame (Years)</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
						the most effective use of scarce resources for sign installation and maintenance. Physical improvements that make streets better for bikes are more of a determining factor in mode choice than signs.
B17	Transit Staging. Provide adequate (preferably off-street) staging facilities to serve transit demand. Pursue mixed-use transit staging facility between 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE and NE 45 <sup>th</sup> and 47 <sup>th</sup> Sts.	H		Development in conjunction with demand.	KC/Metro, with meaningful input from community.	Beginning in 5-7 years, KC/Metro Transit's University Transit Staging Project recommends two off-street staging areas be developed near the urban center: a) Husky Stadium and b) between 11 <sup>th</sup> , 12 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE and NE 45 <sup>th</sup> and 47 <sup>th</sup> Sts. The second site will require collaboration with private property owners and developers.
B21	Consolidation of parking. Modify code requirements to permit community-parking structures in non-residential and MR (for residential uses only in MR) zones only west of 22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave NE. Community will do analysis and preliminary validation as part of the NPO process. City will undertake a formal process.				Council, SEATRAN, DCLU.	DCLU will evaluate this potential code amendment in 1999 as part of an urban center implementation project.
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>						
D24	Partner with KC/Metro to develop open space in association with KC/Metro's bus staging/parking structure (see B16, B17 in The Ave/15 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE Key Strategy)			Undetermined (see B17).	DPR, KC/Metro, Community.	See comment for H2, below.
D31	Identify key open space opportunities associated with new development. Institute workable development incentives for developers to provide open space.	H		Staff resources only.	Community, DCLU, DPR.	See narrative of Task #5 in Tasks to be Undertaken in 1999-2000 above. Neighborhood should consider a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant to continue open space planning.
D32	Create a local neighborhood open space fund to provide a pool of money to secure open space as opportunities arise. Pursue Conservation Futures funds and other grants to contribute to the account. Seek City and other resources to establish and increase the amount. Evaluate the feasibility and desirability of having project proponents contribute to the account a specified amount as <u>partial</u> fulfillment of open space requirements, in addition to ground-related open space.	H		\$500,000 for open space purchase revolving fund. Repaid through a LID or by grants, bond issues, and contributions in lieu.	DCLU, DPR, Community.	See narrative of Task #5 in Tasks to be Undertaken in 1999-2000 above re: payment in lieu of open space.

<b>D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame (Years)</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
<i>Community Coordination, Communication, and Participation in Decision Making for Plan Implementation and Redevelopment Activities</i>						
H2	Determine the need for a nonprofit community development corporation for management of complex, mixed-use housing and other development projects (such as envisioned in University Gardens Core) working with area property owners and the community.	H	Urgent. Key for University Gardens Core.	Start-up money needed (approx. \$100K/year for 3 yrs).	Community, OED, and local organizations and institutions.	The City and community representatives have started discussing options for achieving the goals of a CDC, such as partnering with existing CDCs, PDAs and non-profit housing providers. OED can work with developers to identify and provide development incentives for mixed-use development projects in this area, and to explore use of HUD Guaranteed Community Development Loans (Section 108 Loans) and CDBG Float Loans, as long as projects benefit low- and moderate-income Seattle residents, aid in the prevention of slum and blight or meet particular urgent community development needs.

**D. University Gardens Mixed-Use Core Development - Council Action Taken:**

Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action with following additions:

1. The Council supports SEATRAN's current policy of only signing key intersections for bike routes, but directs SEATRAN to make sure that the policy is in writing and is shared with all neighborhood planning groups so that they can be aware of the policy and anticipate the Executive's response to requests for bike signs.
2. As the Executive reviews and responds to Activity H2 (CDCs) and similar requests from other neighborhood plans, the Executive shall provide a report and recommendations to the Council with a summary of the options for addressing these requests from the various neighborhoods by June 1999.

## E. THE AVE/ 15<sup>TH</sup> AVE. NE CORRIDOR

---

### ***Description***

Encompassing the properties on both sides of University Way NE (the Ave) and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, the Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE corridor includes the community's most lively pedestrian-oriented retail strip, two important north-south transit routes, and the western edge of the UW campus. Situated between the campus and two residential neighborhoods as well as the mixed-use core, the Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE corridor is a kind of keystone, important in tying other activities together. Over the past decades, the Ave has experienced decreasing retail sales and a lack of property and business investment. However, during the past few years, local merchants have formed a Business Improvement Association for increased cleaning and security, and the University Saturday Market attracts visitors from throughout the region. These and other efforts have had a positive impact. New, high-quality businesses have opened, and retail sales have risen. Looking to the future, new Sound Transit stations planned under 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE at roughly NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. and NE Pacific St. will increase the area's role as a transportation hub and promise to bring significant changes and opportunities to the community.

The community sees this area as a vibrant retail shopping district, with both regional attractions and local services. With the Burke Museum, the Henry Gallery, Meany Theater, and other attractions, it is also the focus of cultural activities. Finally, its role as a regionally important transportation hub should be explored, but not allowed to overrun its role as a community and retail focus.

The community's vision for this area includes:

- Improved sidewalks and street infrastructure on the Ave from NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. to Campus Parkway to make it a more effective and attractive pedestrian/transit corridor.
- Efficient intermodal bus/light rail transfer stations.
- Upgraded streetscape and campus edge along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.
- Improved east-west pedestrian connections at NE 43<sup>rd</sup>, 42<sup>nd</sup>, and 41<sup>st</sup> Sts.
- Attractive development (but not higher than 65 feet) to take advantage of the new light rail access.
- Mid-block east-west pedestrian pathways.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

The Ave is the central artery through an urban center. Improving its look and function as a vibrant retail shopping district is essential to the success of the urban village strategy in this urban center. 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE is the boundary between town and gown. The community's desire to soften that boundary, and to strengthen the ties between the UW and the surrounding community is a laudable goal that will also contribute to strengthening the University Community's role in Seattle's growth management strategy.

Department responses included below: DCLU, SEATLAN Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** SEATLAN

**Participating Departments:** DCLU, SEATLAN

### **Activities Already Underway:**

1. Development of an overall conceptual design is currently underway along NE 43<sup>rd</sup> St. with a one block demonstration project to improve the pedestrian link between the Ave and the campus on NE.
2. A six-month pilot project testing the effectiveness of bus bulbs on the Ave at NE 42<sup>nd</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> Sts.
3. The City has received funding for an overall conceptual design of a street improvement project that envisions constructing pedestrian and transit improvements along University Way NE, between approximately NE 50<sup>th</sup> St. and NE Pacific St. Improvements include: wider sidewalks, repair of the sidewalk surface, constructing sidewalk bulbs at selected intersections, upgrading lighting, constructing bus bulbs, and consolidating bus stops. The project design will be evaluated and refined once the first block is constructed. Construction of temporary bus bulbs is now complete.
4. The community has completed and Council approved a preliminary street design plan for the Ave. SEATRAN and SPU are in the process of refining cost estimates for desired street improvements.
5. Signal improvements, new pavement, sidewalks, wheel chair ramps and lighting and drainage upgrades will enhance pedestrian/bicycle safety and convenience on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. and NE Pacific St.
6. The King County Council has adopted transit service changes for Seattle's north end that will take effect this fall which will likely address some of the community's concerns.

### **Activities to be Undertaken in 1998-2000**

1. Feasibility evaluation tasks:
  - a. Prepare scopes of work and preliminary cost estimates for recommended transportation improvements.
  - b. Based on preliminary project budget, identify which elements of the proposal, for example, physical improvements to the Ave or green street improvements on the cross streets, would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy.
  - c. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - d. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.
2. In 1999, identify a project manager to work with the community to develop local matching resources (e.g., Local Improvement District, UW contribution as well as City contribution). The Neighborhood Business Council, through its contract with OED, may be able to facilitate the participation of local businesses in some of the recommendations for the Ave improvements.
3. Coordinate with Sound Transit station planning and the City's station area planning in 1998-1999, especially in the evaluation of the area's transit corridors (NE Pacific St., NE 45<sup>th</sup> St., NE 50<sup>th</sup> St., 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, and University Way NE), transit facilities and staging issues.
4. Encourage UW to soften the campus edge and provide open space enhancements on the campus at NE 45<sup>th</sup>, 42<sup>nd</sup>, and/or 43<sup>rd</sup> Sts. Coordinate with UW Master Plan process in 1998.
5. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

## Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy

<b>E. The Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
<i>Land Use and Economic Development</i>						
A7	Rezone properties on both sides of University Way north of NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. from NC-2 (40) to NC-2 (30) (see rezone action A7).		Rezone upon adoption of plan.	Staff work.	Community, DCLU.	Rezone may be adopted upon approval of UCUC plan.
<i>Transportation</i>						
B1	Transit Corridors. Evaluate the existing operations and future conditions (including Sound Transit station and increased service) of the key UCUC transit corridors of NE Pacific St., NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St., NE 50 <sup>th</sup> St., 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, and University Way NE and develop a set of strategies that will improve transit speeds under future conditions.		Plan provides scope of work.	\$50K to 100K for study. Must be part of Sound Transit station area planning.	KC/Metro, SEATRAN, Community, UW.	Strategies to improve transit speeds can benefit response times for emergency vehicles, something the Fire Department is currently interested in for this part of the city.
B5	University Way NE. Move forward with the construction of wider sidewalks, installation of bus bulbs, and other features as outlined in The Ave Street Design Plan.	H	Plan ongoing.	Approximately \$5.5M Multiple sources.	SEATRAN.	Funding must be identified. SEATRAN is working with KC/Metro as a partner to identify funding.
B6	NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. between the Ave and the campus. Improve the pedestrian link between the Ave and the campus on NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. without closing the street and maintain alley access. Study in conjunction with the Sound Transit station design to determine the scale and scope of improvements. (See D8)			Could be developed in conjunction with station area planning, UW master plan, and the Ave improvements.	SEATRAN, UW, Sound Transit. Coordinate with abutting property owners.	Can be addressed as part of station area planning and the UW Master Plan process.
B7	NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 41 <sup>st</sup> Sts. between the Ave and campus. Add pedestrian bulbs and other amenities where possible. (See D8)			Could be developed in conjunction with station area planning, UW master plan, and the Ave project.	SEATRAN, UW.	Can be addressed as part of station area planning and the UW Master Plan process.
B9	NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> and 45 <sup>th</sup> Sts. between the Ave and Roosevelt Way NE. Install pedestrian bulbs and other amenities where possible. Provide a traffic signal for pedestrian crossings at NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. and Roosevelt Way NE. Add a pedestrian crossing at			Could be developed in conjunction with development on Roosevelt.	SEATRAN.	Neither intersection at NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. and Roosevelt NE currently meets warrants for a signal. These locations will be reviewed periodically to see if signal warrants are met. Due to the volume of traffic on NE 45 <sup>th</sup> and 8th, pedestrians should use the signalized crossing at



<b>E. The Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
	NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. and 8 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.					45 <sup>th</sup> /7 <sup>th</sup> .
B16	Transit facilities. Using existing and projected ridership volumes, design and construct inter-modal facilities at key transfer points on NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St., University Way, and in conjunction with Sound Transit station entrances. Note: A list of planning assumptions and EIS scoping issues has been prepared through this planning process.			Could be developed in conjunction with Sound Transit station planning. (See B1)	KC/Metro, Sound Transit, Community.	This issue can be addressed as part of station area planning.
B18	Transit Service. Improve transit linkages to community destinations, including University Village, Ravenna Urban Village, the UW campus, the Ave, and Sound Transit stations, through shuttle bus service and/or the use of existing KC/Metro bus routes to provide frequent, convenient and economical service within the UCUC. Conduct a headway analysis for KC/Metro bus routes that provide parallel or substitutable service along the same corridor whenever there is a schedule change. Headways between route pairs should be as even as possible in order to achieve shuttle service to destinations within and outside the Urban Center.			Could be developed in conjunction with mitigation for Sound Transit LRT station.	KC/Metro, UW, private business.	See comment for B16. The City will forward the request for a headway study to KC/Metro and encourages the interested community members to follow up with KC/Metro directly.
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>						
D5	Improve 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE with landscaping and transit amenities. Encourage the UW to soften the UW campus edge and provide open space enhancements on the campus at NE 45 <sup>th</sup> , 42 <sup>nd</sup> , and/or 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. Do not reduce transportation capacity.	H	Coordinate with Sound Transit and the UW campus master plan.	Undetermined; depends on the scope, campus master plan, Sound Transit design, and KC/Metro system.	SEATRAN, KC/Metro, UW, Community, Sound Transit.	Can be addressed as part of station area planning and the UW Master Plan process.
D8	Improve NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. from I-5 to the campus as green streets. Focus special attention on sections between the Ave and the campus. (See B6, B7, B9)	H	Timed with Sound Transit station development.	Undetermined; depends on the scope of the improvements.	SEATRAN, Sound Transit, KC/Metro, UW.	Both NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> and 43 <sup>rd</sup> Sts. are designated as key pedestrian streets in Seattle's Comprehensive Transportation Program. Designation as a "green street" or "key pedestrian street" does not automatically mean that physical changes to the street will occur. A detailed streetscape plan first has to be developed, usually by the community. Other neigh-

<b>E. The Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
						borhoods have used Neighborhood Matching Funds for design. Next, funding has to be identified from new private development, a public agency, or a LID for installation of improvements. improvements provided by new development may not be contiguous or extensive.

---

E. The Ave/15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE Corridor - Council Action Taken: Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action.

## F. RAVENNA URBAN VILLAGE

---

### ***Description***

The easternmost section of the University Community Urban Center, Ravenna Urban Village, is named for the Town of Ravenna, which was incorporated in 1887 when the University of Washington was still located downtown. The shape of this urban village, which includes that former town, is related to its geography: the steep Ravenna Springs hillside on the west and the former shoreline of Union Bay once paralleled by the Seattle Lakeshore & Eastern Railroad. The railbed has become the Burke-Gilman Trail, which curves around the current commercial district. Ravenna Park is adjacent to the urban village on its northwest edge. Clockwise, the boundaries are, starting from the north, NE 55<sup>th</sup> St. east to 25<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, south to the Burke-Gilman Trail, east to Union Bay Place NE curving south to NE 45<sup>th</sup> St., west up the viaduct to 21<sup>st</sup> Ave. NE and then north to NE 55<sup>th</sup> St. again.

#### **Fundamental elements/aims:**

- Decrease presence and reliance on single-occupancy vehicles. Increase use and availability of transit: KC/Metro and shuttle in the near-term, Sound Transit and additional shuttles in the longer-term. Monorail relationship is unclear.
- Add definition to neighborhood with gateways from the north, at NE 55<sup>th</sup> St. , and the south, south side of the NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. viaduct.
- Create and enhance a neighborhood Main Street, on 25<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between NE 55<sup>th</sup> St. and NE Blakeley St., with potential for extending further south along 25<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.
- Increase pedestrian connections and amenities throughout.
- Preserve existing green space.
- Daylight Ravenna Creek, creating a (blue) greenway.
- Preserve small-scale housing along Ravenna Ave. NE and the integrity of the steep slopes of Ravenna Springs by downzoning, while allowing controlled higher density in an area better able to handle it (Park Triangle). Zoning changes can be used to retain these cottages on Ravenna Ave. NE, promote affordable housing and rent stability, and foster a sense of community.
- Adopt neighborhood customized design guidelines relating to trees, transition, and the Burke-Gilman Trail.

### ***Integrated Executive Response***

The vision for Ravenna builds on the area's history. "Aims" listed in the description to increase transit and pedestrian connections, retain current scale of residential development and enhance the neighborhood shopping area form a vision for the area that is consistent with the urban village strategy.

This strategy consists of projects that could be implemented incrementally; individual recommendations are not dependent on one another.

This strategy contains one recommendation that the Executive partially endorses: Daylighting Ravenna Creek. The Executive supports that part of the project that daylights the creek within Ravenna Park. It provides an amenity within the park, and avoids the technical issues associated with other segments of the project.

Department responses include: SEATRAN, DPR, DCLU, ESD-CBO. Compiled by SPO.

**Lead Department:** DON

**Participating Departments:** SEATRAN, DCLU, DPR, SPU

**Activities Already Underway:**

1. A pedestrian connection at 27<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to the Burke-Gilman Trail has been designed and will be constructed this summer by the SEATRAN Ped/Bike Program with ISTEPA funds, partially implementing one of the recommendations of this strategy (D22).
2. The City has received Pedestrian Facilities Program Funding for the section of NE Blakeley St. from 25th to 29th Aves. NE. The project will construct approximately 910 feet of 6-foot wide concrete walkway along the north side of NE Blakeley St. This project will be the first phase in closing a substantial gap in the sidewalk system (B2).

**Tasks to be Undertaken in 1998-2000:**

1. Feasibility evaluation tasks:
  - a. Prepare scopes of work and preliminary cost estimates for recommended transportation improvements.
  - b. Determine status of development project on Ravenna Woods site. Confirm status of private donation.
  - c. Based on preliminary project budget identify which elements of the proposal would be good candidates for a neighborhood bond or levy.
  - d. Identify alternative funding sources.
  - e. Prioritize with strategies from other neighborhood plans.
2. DCLU proposes to conduct a code development project as part of its 1999 work program to create a master plan program. This project will likely have citywide applicability and the scope of the project will include the items in recommendation A21 (University Village Master Plan).
3. In 1998, the Executive will discuss funding of the Ravenna Creek Daylighting project with King County and consider including it in the City's 1999-2004 Capital Improvement Program.
4. OED supports efforts to enhance the commercial business district in this area. The Neighborhood Business Council (NBC), through its contract with OED, can assist this area with some of the recommendations. In addition, OED and the NBC are hosting a series of neighborhood business district workshops in 1998 available to all Seattle area business districts.
5. The City is actively exploring several options to assist the community in meeting its objective of preserving Ravenna Woods, including the identification of private and public sources of funding, providing acquisition services, and funding operations and maintenance.
6. Identify next steps for continued implementation.

***Specific Activities Associated with Key Strategy***

**F. Ravenna Urban Village (RUV)**

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Estimate	Implementor	Executive Response
A10	In Ravenna Urban Village, institute a residential zoning change package for designated areas: a) L-3 to L4 and L4/RC within the Park Triangle with specific exemptions to allow cafes fronting Ravenna Park (see rezone action A10); and b) L-3 to LDT along Ravenna Ave. NE (see rezone action A10a).	key	Implement a rezone upon adoption of the urban center plan.	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	DCLU, Community.	The rezone may be adopted upon approval of the UCUC plan. The L4/RC zone allows small commercial uses on the ground floor of residential structures, not limited to cafes. Therefore no specific exception is required.
A11	Change zoning of designated area from C-1(40) to L-4 (see rezone Action A11).		Implement upon adoption of the plan	Staff analysis.	DCLU, Community.	The rezone may be adopted upon approval of the UCUC plan.
A12	Create a P2 overlay for 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE in NC2 area north of NE Blakeley St. to create a "neighborhood Main Street." Also change the zoning from NC2-40 to NC2-30 along 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, limiting the maximum building height between NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. and NE Blakeley St. to 30 feet (see rezone action A12).	key	Implement a rezone upon adoption of the urban center plan.	Staff analysis.	DCLU, Community.	The rezone may be adopted upon approval of the UCUC plan.
A21	University Village proposes to work with the community and the City over the next twelve months to develop a master plan. The plan will be developed according to a process (either existing or to be developed) that speaks to the needs of all parties. This process will address parking, transportation, offsite impacts, mitigation and meaningful community participation. The process will incorporate predictability, flexibility, fairness, appropriate development standard departure, vesting, and will minimize delay. Master use and other construction permits for specific University Village proposals may be proposed, evaluated, and issued prior to and during master plan review and approval.	key		Some City procedural costs.	DCLU, University Village and Community.	See comment in Task #1 of Tasks to be Undertaken in 1999-2000 above.
B2	Blakeley/Union Bay Place. Establish parking controls, construct sidewalks, improve drainage, install traffic calming and lighting, and modify intersections and access drives to improve pedestrian circulation and safety while maintaining access to local businesses.	key		Immediate: sidewalks along north side of NE Blakeley St. Next stage: \$10K to \$15K for overall concept study.	SEATRAN in conjunction with Community.	SPU would provide appropriate drainage facilities to support street improvements when they are made. See Activities already underway, above, for transportation activity.
B3a RUV	25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE center lane conflict resolution. Reduce the potential for vehicle conflicts by consolidating driveways and restricting left turns in selected areas on 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.		Near		SEATRAN, local businesses.	SEATRAN will perform an operational analysis on 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to recommend specific changes in 1999. Fire vehicles need to be able to turn left on 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE.

<b>F. Ravenna Urban Village (RUV)</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implementor</b>	<b>Executive Response</b>
						Local businesses would be involved in this process since existing on-street parking or access to properties may be affected.
B10	University Village Access. Maintain controlled access at the 'north gate' connecting through UW family housing to Burke-Gilman. Improve pedestrian and vehicular safety at access drives on south side and east side of Village. Investigate ADA access from 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to University Village parking lot. (See also B3, A21)	key		Private improvements.	University Village, SEATRAN, UW.	These locations will be reviewed by the SEATRAN Pedestrian Program.
D4	Daylight Ravenna Creek.	key		Approximately \$7M; \$3M allocated by the County and remainder due by year 2000.	King County, SEATRAN, DPR, SPU, DON, DCLU, Community.	See comment in narrative above.
D18	Acquire Ravenna Woods as a natural area.	key	Threatened by development.	Appraised at \$300K. A \$50K donation is on the table.	City, King County, or private donors.	The City encourages the community to continue its fundraising activities. The City is actively exploring several options to assist the community in meeting its objective of preserving Ravenna Woods, including the identification of private and public sources of funding, providing acquisitions services, and funding for operations and maintenance.
D22	Develop publicly-owned triangle formed by 25 <sup>th</sup> to 27 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE between Blakeley St. and the Burke-Gilman Trail, into Blakeley Crescent, a passive park (see also B+2/RUV, B12).	key		Minimal.	SEATRAN, Community, DON.	This project may be a good candidate for the Neighborhood Matching Fund.

**F. Ravenna Urban Village (RUV) - Council Action Taken: Approve Exec.'s Recommended Action.**

## II. Specific Activities For Implementation

The activities listed in this section are not directly associated with a Key Strategy. For each activity, the City has identified next steps as a part of the City's work program in response to the neighborhood plan. Many of the next steps are actions to be taken by the City, but in some cases, the neighborhood or other agency will be able to take the next steps. As with the activities listed for each Key Strategy in Section I, these activities are intended to be implemented over the span of many years.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
<i>Land Use and Economic Development</i>								
A+1 RUV	Develop design guidelines for transition buffer between NC-2 and SF zones.					DCLU will work with the community to craft guidelines covering the issues of most concern to the community in relation to the proposed rezones. The proposed guidelines need to be edited to: eliminate overlap between the existing citywide guidelines and the proposed changes; distinguish additions and changes to existing guidelines; and be written as statements of intent rather than prescriptions.	Recommendation will be considered, pending completion of further analysis in 1998 and 1999. DCLU staff is actively working with the community and expects to bring a proposal to the Council in late 1998 or early 1999 for Council consideration.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: identify and address citywide issues.
A5	Within non-commercially oriented areas of the core, modify the NC-3 requirements for commercial uses on the ground floor. Refine guidelines to allow options such as pedestrian-oriented open space to fulfill the requirement (see Comprehensive Plan ordinance).		Upon adoption of plan.	Staff work to implement a formal rezone process.	Community, SPO, DCLU.	DCLU: It is the City's understanding that the community's intention is to allow single purpose residential development outright in this NC-3 zone, as opposed to a conditional use. This can be accomplished with adoption of the neighborhood plan. DCLU will work with the neighborhood to articulate problems and issues related to open space and set goals for a code development project to be carried out in 1999/2000 as part of an urban center implementation project.	Single purpose residential: Recommendation may be implemented with approval of the UCUC plan. Open space development standards: Recommendation will be considered in 1999-2000.	C2 and C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: DCLU to provide the Council with a list of proposed urban center implementation projects for early feedback on policy issues and prioritization of issues.
A13	Institute special design guidelines for the Ave. Amplify citywide design guidelines for the University Urban Center.		1 year.		Community, DCLU.	DCLU will work with the community to craft guidelines covering the issues of most concern to the community in relation to the proposed rezones. The proposed guidelines need to be edited to: eliminate overlap between the existing citywide guidelines and the proposed changes; distinguish additions and changes to existing guidelines; and be written as	Recommendation will be considered, pending completion of further analysis in 1998 and 1999. DCLU staff is actively working with the community and expects to bring a proposal to the Council in late 1998 or early 1999	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following additions: The Executive will: 1. ensure the City's review of proposed

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
						statements of intent rather than prescriptions.	for Council consideration.	design review guidelines includes adequate opportunity for public review and comments, 2. identify and address citywide issues, and 3. recommend that the commercial area north of N.E. 50th Street have a unique set of guidelines. The property owners, tenants and merchants for the commercial area north of NE 50th Street should form a Task Force with at least six property owners, tenants and merchants to develop recommendations for design review guidelines, if any, for that commercial area. The Task Force should submit a report with recommendations to the UCUCA as soon as possible for consideration by the UCUCA as it develops proposed design review guidelines for the University Community Urban Center.



#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
A15	Institute design guidelines for "detached accessory units" in multifamily zones to ensure impacts to neighboring properties are minimized (see A1). Note: Community had included this in Key Strategies for Northern Tier and the Ave/15 <sup>th</sup> NE.		Immediately; timed w/ citywide housing initiative	Explore citywide. UCUC could be a case study. Fund through City Housing Action Plan.	City with community review.	The Executive moved this activity to Section II: Specific Activities for Implementation, so that the policy issues pertaining to the extension of design review to this type of development in such zones can be examined. What the neighborhood wants is multiple units in separate buildings in MF zones. Development standards such as lot coverage and setbacks are preventing the creation of this type of housing. This idea could work well as one of the Mayor's demonstration projects.	Recommendation may be considered in the future. Citywide implications must be evaluated. DCLU will be proposing demonstration ordinance which includes design review.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following additions: explore potential code changes that could be used on combination with design review.
A16	Develop design guidelines for tree preservation and planting on 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and in Ravenna Urban Village area in general.					This issue can be dealt with as part of design review, assuming this is a location where new development will occur. The citywide design guidelines already contain landscaping guidelines that the community might want to propose modifying. The Executive is working on tree preservation mechanisms that would be applied citywide. The City Arborist, in SEATRAN, is involved in the tree preservation work and would be involved in review of any tree-related neighborhood design guidelines from UCUC. DCLU will work with the community to craft guidelines covering the issues of most concern to the community in relation to the proposed rezones. The proposed guidelines need to be edited to: eliminate overlap between the existing citywide guidelines and the proposed changes; distinguish additions and changes to existing guidelines; and be written as statements of intent rather than prescriptions.	Recommendation will be considered, pending completion of further analysis in 1998 and 1999. DCLU staff is actively working with the community and expects to bring a proposal to the Council in late 1998 or early 1999 for Council consideration.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: identify and address citywide issues.
A18	Designate the UW campus as a major institution within the Urban Center.			Staff time.	UW, SPO, Community	SPO: Our understanding that the community proposes to remove the urban center village designation from the UW, yet still recognize its role in the city's growth management strategy as an employment center through this designation. The UW is already designated as a Major Institution in the Land Use Code. The UW is a not a neighborhood, and while people both live and work there, it is not an urban village. The urban center village designation can be	Recommendation can be implemented, as part of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan ordinance for the UCUC plan.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
						removed as part of the adoption of this plan.		
A20	Modify notification requirements for master use permits to ensure that local residents affected by the development are notified. Require three-week notification to parties within a 500-foot radius. Include local community organizations in notification.		Timed with citywide action.	Some City procedural costs.	DCLU.	DCLU does not support this proposal for several reasons: Issues of public notice are regularly examined. The City Council and the public recently considered changes to notice requirements as part of implementing regulatory reform. Current 300-foot radius is a balance between notifying those most affected by a development and the cost. Increasing the radius will exponentially increase the number of mailings. The UCUC plan has not demonstrated that increasing the radius will cause significantly more people to participate. Additional mailing costs will increase development fees. Other methods of notice exist, e.g., signs at permit application sites, neighborhood newspapers, and the Land Use Bulletin (a.k.a. GMR), which is also posted on the City's web page.	Recommendation will not be implemented.	C5 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
A22	Study the means to conserve the architectural qualities of Greek Row south of NE 50 <sup>th</sup> St. between 16 <sup>th</sup> and 22 <sup>nd</sup> Aves. NE.			Staff time.	Community, DON-Urban Conservation.	DON: Recommendation could be a good candidate for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant or King County Heritage grant for the survey work that is part of any nomination application. The Urban Conservation Division is available to community members to assist in researching and writing any landmark nomination application.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending completion of additional research. Neighborhood must take the next step to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: Executive to work with community to explore means to conserve buildings.
<i>Transportation</i>								
B+1 RUV	Pedestrian linkages: 1) Crosswalk and curb bulbs between Ravenna Park and the intersection of NE 54 <sup>th</sup> St. and Ravenna Pl. NE 2) Sidewalk on west side of 30 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE between Blakeley and NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. which winds around existing trees, with drainage and curb bulbs at		Near	1) Part of the Ravenna Creek Daylighting Project. 2) To be determined.	SEATRAN, Community	SEATRAN: 1) The recommendation can be reviewed as part of the Ravenna Creek Daylighting project. 2) 30 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE is a local street. City policy is to fund such improvements on local streets through private funding; therefore, an LID or an adjacent new development will be needed to provide a pedestrian facility at that location. Funding improvements on local streets is a budget decision on the use of local funds (NMF or the Neighborhood Street Fund) since state and federal	1) Recommendation will be considered in the future, as part of Ravenna Creek Daylighting project. 2) Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of a private fund source.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	Blakeley.					funds are not available for these type of improvements. Other alternatives are formation of an LID or waiting for redevelopment to construct the improvements.		
B+2 RUV	Parking Regulations. Review parking regulations in Ravenna Urban Village toward setting a four hour limit, including at Blakeley Crescent (D22, B12).		Near	Staff time.	SEATRAN, Community	SEATRAN: Requests for time limit parking for select locations or wide areas can be made directly to SEATRAN Residential Parking Zone Program.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending specific request by neighborhood to SEATRAN. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate the project.	C2/C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B3	Montlake Boulevard. Improve drainage between NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. and Montlake Bridge on Montlake Boulevard, a state highway.				WSDOT, KC/Metro, SEATRAN, SPU, local property owners.	Montlake Blvd. is a State Highway which is maintained by WSDOT. The City supports the State making drainage improvements as needed. Further investigation is required to evaluate the extent to which the drainage problem is related to the pavement. The problem may also be related to as yet uncompleted KC/Metro combined sewer overflow/ storm water control in the area. The State and Metro are in the lead. If and when they tackle this problem, then SPU will be available to work with them. If it turns out that some piece of the problem is related to City system, then SPU would evaluate the situation and propose a solution. SPU is not aware of anything at this time. SPU doesn't have a role or power to bring things to WSDOT, maybe OIR can help. SPU can provide technical help.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending action by WSDOT and KC/Metro, completion of additional research and identification of a fund source.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: OIR to work with SPU to transmit community's request to WSDOT and KC/Metro.
B+3 RUV	Traffic calming along NE Blakeley St. and Union Bay Place NE.		Near		SEATRAN.	SEATRAN: Concept OK. Coordinate this conceptual design study with the Pedestrian Facilities Program (PFP) project on NE Blakeley St. The City has received PFP Funding for the section of NE Blakeley St. from 25 <sup>th</sup> to 29 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. The project will construct approximately 910 feet of 6-foot wide concrete walkway along the north side of NE Blakeley St. This project will be the first phase in closing a substantial gap in the sidewalk system.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, in conjunction with PFP project. Conceptual design for traffic calming will need to be funded through another fund source, but will be coordinated with PFP.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B4	Signal Timing Refinements. Establish new signal timing programs in conjunction with			In conjunction with	SEATRAN, KC/Metro, Sound	SEATRAN has funding to install new controllers at 39 signalized intersections, interconnect signals and upgrade "walk/don't walk" signs in the University	Recommendation is already being implemented.	C1 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	the planned replacement of signal controllers. New timing programs should be based on traffic volumes, turning movements, pedestrian volumes, and transit routes. Deactivate pedestrian-activated signals unless there is a compelling reason to the contrary.			the controller replacement.	Transit.	District. The hours during which pedestrians need to use push buttons at intersections along NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. will be reduced, so that the buttons do not need to be pushed for most of the day.		following addition: SEATRAN to work with community to define "most of the day" so that hours pedestrians don't need to push buttons reflects flow of pedestrians at appropriate times.
B+4 RUV	Street closure of NE 54 <sup>th</sup> St. at intersection with Ravenna Place NE: deadend NE 54 <sup>th</sup> St. on east side of Ravenna Place.		With Ravenna Creek Daylighting.		SEATRAN, Community, private property owners.	The Fire Department does not approve the closure for the following reasons: 1) the structures are high density apartments which require as much road access as possible during emergencies; 2) the only access westbound from Station 38 is NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. In the event of a closure/accident, NE 54 <sup>th</sup> St. is used by emergency vehicles and closure will result in delays.	Recommendation will not be implemented.	C4 Do not approve Exec.'s rec. action: SEATRAN shall explore alternatives to full street closure to address concerns of community.
B8a	Provide new stairs east of 22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave NE in the NE 47 <sup>th</sup> St. right of way to establish a link with 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE.					A conceptual design is necessary to determine whether ADA requirements applied to this location for a proposed stairway would make this project unfeasible.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source and completion of additional planning and design.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B12	Burke-Gilman Trail improvements. Establish a pedestrian intersection at 27 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to allow north-south access across the Trail, in conjunction with redevelopment of Blakeley Crescent (D22). Provide lighting and audible signal at the Trail crossing at 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and improve lighting at the 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE crossing.			Spot improvement, Neighborhood Matching Fund.	SEATRAN, UW, private property owners.	SEATRAN: A pedestrian connection at 27 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE to the Burke-Gilman Trail has been designed and will be constructed this summer by SEATRAN Ped/Bike Program with ISTEAF funds. SEATRAN has recently completed construction of spot safety improvements between 25 <sup>th</sup> and 30 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE near the UW and University Village. Improvements included: widening a 12-foot trail and a 5-foot sidewalk, new curb bulbs at NE Blakeley St. and Ravenna Pl. NE, improved curb ramps, improved lighting, and an improved trail crossing at NE Blakeley St. and 30 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. The UW will continue the trail widening from where this project finished to where the UW recently widened this section of the trail.	Recommendation already being implemented by Department initiative.	C2 and C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B13	Access Across I-5. Improve			As	WSDOT,	SEATRAN: Sound Transit development may create	Recommendation will be	C4

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	access across I-5 at NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. by providing signage, bicycle and pedestrian refuges, railings, and other improvements that would reduce the potential for vehicle-bicycle conflicts at this location.			needed for citywide system.	SEATRAN.	new opportunities for improving non-motorized access across I-5 near NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St.	considered in the future, as part of station area planning.	Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B14	Shoreline/Campus Trail. Establish a bike route through the UW linking the planned bicycle lanes on NE Boat St. with an underpass at Montlake Boulevard on the north side of the Montlake bridge.			UW project.	SEATRAN, UW.	SEATRAN: Bike lanes are striped in the new section of NE Boat St. from the Brooklyn Ave. NE intersection to the east. West of Brooklyn Ave. NE, the street is not wide enough without the removal of parking.	NE Boat St. to Brooklyn Ave. NE: Recommendation has been implemented. West of Brooklyn Ave. NE: Recommendation may be considered in the future, if support for removal of parking by adjacent property owners and tenants is documented.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B15	Montlake Underpass. Construct a bicycle and pedestrian underpass on Montlake Boulevard just north of the Montlake Bridge. Fund as part of improvements to provide ambulance access.				UW, SEATRAN, Army Corps, WSDOT.	SEATRAN: Concept OK. Issue should be addressed as part of the UW Master Plan process.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, as part of UW Master Plan process. The City has a major role in the master plan process, and therefore, a role in the evaluation of the idea of an underpass.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B19	Brooklyn Ave. NE north of NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. Reduce speeds by providing pedestrian bulbs at intersections.			Approximately \$10K per bulb.	SEATRAN.	SEATRAN: Concept OK. Community needs to determine priority locations. Further planning could be supported by a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant. Demonstrate support of adjacent property owners, residents and businesses.	Recommendation may be considered in the future, pending identification of a potential fund source, completion of additional planning, and documentation of community support. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
B20	Intersection of NE 52 <sup>nd</sup> St. and 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. and 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. Provide traffic circles at these intersections.			Approximately \$14K each.	SEATRAN.	a) SEATRAN: NE 52 <sup>nd</sup> St. and 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE is a high priority for a traffic circle due to accident experience. This circle is likely to be funded in 1999, if the support of adjacent property owners, residents and businesses is documented. b) NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. and 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE: The low accident	a) Recommendation can and will be implemented. b) Recommendation may be considered in the future, pending coordination with all other neigh-	C2 and C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
						rate at this location suggests that it would not compete well for the City's Neighborhood Traffic Control Program funds. Neighborhood Matching Fund might be a possibility. Under the NTCP, accident rates (in conjunction with other measures) are used to rank traffic circle requests in order to allocate limited annual construction dollars. SEATRAN does not object to the installation of traffic circles where there has not been an occurrence of accidents if funded outside of the NTCP, construction is technically feasible, the Fire Department can negotiate around the circle, and there is sufficient community support (60% by petition).	neighborhood plans. Neighborhood may elect to pursue funding through Neighborhood Matching Fund.	
B22a RUV	Develop procedure and implement football game day RPZ in the Ravenna Urban Village area.		Very near. 1999-2000		UW, Seahawks.	SEATRAN: City Council has established a criteria-based process for formation and expansion of RPZs that the community can follow to apply for an RPZ for this purpose.	Recommendation may be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source. Neighborhood must take next steps to initiate this project.	C4 The Executive shall work proactively to respond to the community's requests for RPZs. This response shall include working with the community to clarify the requests, processing the requests, and assisting the community in its discussions with UW and the Seahawks regarding funding for RPZs.
B24	Urban Center Transportation Programs. Study the feasibility of developing a transportation management program for the UCUC under the stewardship of a broadly-based community				Community SPO, SEATRAN, WSDOT, UW, Sound Transit,	No Executive response because this item was moved to this Section (from Section III) by the Council.	No Executive Recommended Action because this item was moved to this Section (from Section III) by the Council.	C4 The Executive will assess the feasibility of development of a TMP for the UCUC

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	planning association (see H-1). Assist the community in developing and implementing this transportation program. Elicit the involvement of other governmental transportation and transit agencies in this process, and ensure that those agencies coordinate their efforts on all transportation projects in the UCUC.				KC/Metro Transit, Comm. Transit, etc.			with involvement from community-based organizations, including contiguous communities. The Executive will report to the Council on this item no later than May 1999.
B25	Ride Free Zone. Establish a ride free transit zone within the UCUC, including Ravenna Urban Village. Alternately, establish a shuttle system(s) to cover specific needs - link to Sound Transit, ride home from (grocery) shopping, etc.			Unknown	KC/Metro, DON.	DON: This issue can, and should, be dealt with through the UW Master Plan process.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, through UW Master Plan process, University Village Master Plan process, and Sound Transit station area planning.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
<i>Housing</i>								
C1	Institute an employer assisted housing program in which major employers (e.g., UW) encourage employees to locate in the community through reduced loan fees and closing costs. UW has already agreed to make a program available to employees.		As soon as possible.	No City costs.	UW, DHHS.	DHHS staff are already working with the UW on this effort. DHHS has made presentations on this topic to the UW. The UW is planning to issue a Request for Proposals for private partners in the near future.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
C2	Institute a shared equity housing partnership program in which an institutional investor (limited partner) provides a share of the equity needed for an employee home purchase in exchange for a share of the resale price.		City-wide initiative.	Unknown	DHHS, SPO.	DHHS staff is interested in exploring a pilot project with one major employer. If the UCUC has a major employer in mind, DHHS would be interested in pursuing the possibility with them.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of willing community partner.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
C3	Encourage a co-housing		City-	Little City	DHHS,	DHHS, SPO: The City supports the concept of co-	Recommendation will be	C4



#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	program in which small owner units are built with shared kitchen and recreation facilities. Owners form an association to design and manage the development. City help will be needed for land banking.		wide initiative.	cost.	DCLU.	housing and may in the future undertake activities to facilitate co-housing developments, such as examining the land use code for barriers to this type of development. The notion of the City getting involved in land banking would have to be examined carefully to understand the costs and benefits.	considered in the future, pending identification of willing community partner, and potential fund source.	Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
C4	Encourage co-op and mutual housing in which a housing association owns the units and members lease. Members (tenants) form association and develop the housing. City assistance may be needed for land acquisition.		City-wide initiative.	Little City cost.	DHHS, ESD.	DHHS multifamily housing development staff currently works with nonprofits that develop and support mutual housing. Assistance for purchase and rehabilitation of low- to moderate-income mutual housing is available on a competitive basis. Specific projects in the UCUC may be considered in the future if project applications are submitted.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of willing community partner.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
C5	Institute a Land Trust housing program in which a land trust retains ownership of the land in order to keep lease rates lower. Private developer or association builds the unit on land trust land. Public or contributed funds are necessary to acquire the property.		City-wide initiative.	Unknown	DHHS.	DHHS, SPO: The City is in the early stages of researching Land Trusts for housing for low- to moderate-income households. There are some existing program funds to support the creation of Land Trusts.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending completion of additional research.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
C6	Develop an apartment building rehabilitation loan program to assist low-income households by providing low interest loans to correct building code deficiencies and undertake improvements. City would need to direct interest rate buy-down funds to SRO projects.		City-wide initiative.	Funding must also be identified for construction and/or permanent financing	DHHS.	DHHS: City multifamily rental preservation and rehabilitation loans are currently available to owners of multifamily rental properties on a competitive basis. Resulting units must be made available to low- and moderate-income renters. DHHS and City Light have weatherization funds available. The City continues to rehabilitate SRO units. Specific projects in the UCUC may be considered in the future if project applications are submitted.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.



#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
C7	Enhance funding available for gap financing, including prime loan reduction and interest rate buy downs.		City-wide initiative.	Unknown	City, financing agencies, and banks.	DHHS: City multifamily rehabilitation programs make funds available at very low interest rates. For first time home buyers, State programs make available funds for down payment assistance and/or mortgage assistance to moderate-income home buyers.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
<i>Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Design Features</i>								
D10	Encourage the UW to consider incorporating open space into UW development between 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> Aves. NE just north of NE 41 <sup>st</sup> St.		Part of the UW master plan.	Undetermined	UW.	This issue should be addressed as part of the UW Master Plan process.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, as part of UW Master Plan process.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D11	Install sidewalks, lighting, and street trees on 7 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE connecting the Burke-Gilman Trail to the shoreline.			Street improvement funds and development requirements.	SEATRAN, DPR, local property owner contribution	SEATRAN: Concept OK. Design needed consistent with Shoreline Street End guidelines. Street tree planting is a good community-based project, with Neighborhood Matching Fund support a possibility. SEATRAN Arborist's office or SCL's Urban Tree Replacement Program may be able to assist. SCL: Lighting technical assistance is available for a community-based project. For more street or alley lights, the neighborhood is encouraged to develop a lighting plan with Seattle City Light's North Service Center. Include property ownership, location of lights, type of fixtures and lighting calculations. Costs of installation, fixtures and electricity are the responsibility of the adjacent property owners.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source and completion of additional design and planning. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D12	Explore various ways to upgrade Campus Parkway to increase useable open space.			Depends on the scope.	Partnership : DPR, UW, KC/Metro, SEATRAN, and Sound Transit.	This issue should be addressed through the UW Master Plan process.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, through UW Master Plan process.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D14	Encourage the UW to explore opportunities for sharing the Vic Mix Pond area (east of 25th between Silver Cloud Motel and University Village) as part of housing		Part of UW master plan.	Undetermined.	UW.	This issue should be addressed through the UW Master Plan process.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, through UW Master Plan process.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	development or community recreation space.							
D16	Improve sidewalks along NE 50 <sup>th</sup> St. from I-5 to 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE by requiring new development be set back to provide at least 12-foot-wide sidewalks and upgrading lights and pavements.		3-7 years.	Undetermined.	Property owners, DCLU, Community .	DCLU: In principle, DCLU supports this recommendation. Right now, however, DCLU cannot legally require developments to provide wider sidewalks on private property. This problem needs to be solved if this proposal is to be implemented. DCLU will likely explore as part of an urban center implementation project because wider sidewalks are an issue in many locations. SCL: For additional street or alley lights, the neighborhood is encouraged to develop a lighting plan by working with Seattle City Light's North Service Center. (For lighting on arterials, SEATRAN has jurisdiction.) The plan should include location of lights, type of lighting fixtures and lighting calculations. The lighting plan will provide information for a feasibility analysis and cost estimate.	Recommendation may be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source, completion of additional research and resolution of legal issues.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D17	Create a P-patch near or at the small park at NE 43 <sup>rd</sup> St. and 9 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. The community must initiate.				Community , DON.	The wait is at least a year for any of the three gardens in the UCUC. 1) DPR does not feel that the site, Christie Park, is appropriate for a P-Patch due to size and lack of existing parks to serve the general population in the area. 2) Alternative recommendation: Other nearby sites should be identified. Considerations for any new P-Patch include: water and solar access, soil quality, permanence of the site, and whether there is gardeners a group of to see the project though from grant-writing, to building the site and gardening.	1) Recommendation will not be implemented at Christie Park. 2) Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending completion of additional planning and identification of a potential fund source. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D19	Acquire two more P-patches in Ravenna Urban Village. Retain the existing P-patch at NE 52 <sup>nd</sup> St.			Undetermined.	Community , DON.	Potential sites need to be identified. Considerations for any new P-Patch include: water and solar access, soil quality, permanence of the site, and whether a group of potential gardeners exists who could see the project though from writing a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant, to building the site and actually gardening.	Recommendation will be considered in the future pending completion of additional planning and identification of a potential fund source. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D20	Improve NW Heritage Park on				Community	SEATRAN: Property is in the public right-of-way. This	Recommendation is a community-	C4

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	the north side of NE Blakeley St. at 24 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE.				.	project could be a good candidate for the Neighborhood Matching Fund.	based activity.	Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D+2 RUV	Establish Ravenna Place NE as a Green Street Type III.		Near	Neighborhood Matching Fund grant.	DCLU, DON, Community .	SEATRAN: Existing street classification is a collector arterial. The existing ROW is 70 feet. A conceptual design would be needed to determine where it would be feasible to widen sidewalks, provide landscaping and pedestrian amenities. The street would not need the "green street" classification for this to occur. This project is a good candidate for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant for planning and design.	Green street designation is not necessary; recommendation will not be implemented. Neighborhood must take next steps to initiate this project. Pedestrian improvements: Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending completion of design and identification of a private fund source.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D+3 RUV	Create gateways to Ravenna Urban Village at the intersections of 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE with NE 55 <sup>th</sup> St. and NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St.		Near	Minimal.	SEATRAN, Community .	Concept OK. A conceptual design is needed to determine improvements at each location. This project is a good candidate for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant for planning and design.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source and completion of additional planning and design. Neighborhood must take the next steps to initiate this project.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D28	Create a north gateway to the University District at the Ave or 15 <sup>th</sup> St. NE and NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. Consider "UW front door," Burke Museum, Sound Transit potential new development, and KC/Metro improvements.			Depends on the scope.	UW, Burke Museum, Sound Transit, Community , KC/Metro.	This issue could be addressed as part of station area planning.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, as part of station area planning.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D29	Create gateways and/or enhanced crosswalks to the University District at the intersections of NE 50 <sup>th</sup> St. with University Way and Roosevelt Ave. NE, and Roosevelt Ave. NE and NE 42 <sup>nd</sup> St.	H		\$100K to \$200K per intersection.	SEATRAN, Community , Chamber, arts council.	SEATRAN: Concept OK. Conceptual design needed to determine improvements.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending identification of a fund source and completion of additional design.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
D35	Encourage tree planting in the University Urban Center.				Community .	The City has many resources available to support neighborhood-based tree planting projects. SEATRAN Arborist Office is a good place to start.	Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
<i>Arts and Cultural Activities</i>								
E1	Establish an arts council, which will continue to explore and assess community need for support for art and cultural activities and expression. An arts council could deal with such issues as collaborative scheduling, advertising, promotion, and public arts projects. Ongoing activities funded by member dues and contributions. City provides SAC funding. Grants and contributions from special events.				Local, public, private, and institutional arts organizations, SAC, King County, and Washington State Arts Commissions	Seattle Arts Commission may be able to provide advice and Department of Neighborhoods may be able to provide organizing assistance. They have both met with Arts & Culture Committee to share information and explore resources.	Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E2	Promote arts and cultural activities at the University Saturday Market.		Ongoing	None to City.	University Market and UCUCA.		Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E3	Promote Arts and Cultural activities and education at the University Heights Center. This action is dependent upon the survival of the Center (see D27).		Ongoing		University Heights Center and UCUCA.		Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E4	Promote cultural activities at the University Branch Library, such as poetry readings, book groups, children's story time, and activities. Provide information services on cultural events in the Urban Center.				Seattle Public Library and UCUCA.	This is a service provided by the Library on an ongoing basis.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C1 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E5	Ensure that the community plays an important role in selecting and directing the artwork associated with major public projects including improvements associated with:			Funded under the current 1% for the Arts	UCUCA, local arts council and SAC.	SAC routinely involves community members in selecting public art works in their neighborhoods. SAC's structure involves community members in defining scopes of work, selecting the artists and reviewing the art as it develops. SAC works with groups to identify local participants in these	Recommendation already being implemented.	C1 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	the Sound Transit stations, Ave reconstruction, Gateway and sidewalks, Campus Parkway, parks and open spaces, including Blakeley Crescent and P-patches, 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and KC/Metro upgrades.			program.		processes. The broader community is informed through public meetings, community newspaper articles and other media. Projects that are managed by KC/Metro and Sound Transit will have a similar level of community involvement.		
E6	Ensure that the interests of families and children are met with programs for arts and cultural activities.		Ongoing	None explicit (see E2, E3, and E4, above).	Local arts council, SPL, Henry Gallery, Burke Museum, University Heights Center, YMCA, DPR.	This is an ongoing service provided by both the Library and DPR.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C1 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E7	Incorporate arts and cultural affairs into regular business activities and events such as the annual Street Fair and Ravenna Creek Festival.			None identified.	Local arts council and Chamber of Commerce.	Neighborhood Service Centers support community-based events as part of their ongoing work.	Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E8	Coordinate gallery, art, and performance space to provide greater service options for events.		Ongoing	None identified.	Local arts council and participating organizations.		Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E9	Establish a directory for visual, performing and literary arts, artists, art organizations, and space available. Establish additional exhibit space, where possible.			Grants, donations, sponsorship-type advertising, etc.	Local arts council, Chamber, University Heights Center, UW.	An arts directory could be a good project for a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant.	Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E10	Identify historically important			Staff	Community	DON: The Urban Conservation Division would	Recommendation will be	C4

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	buildings and work with arts and government agencies to preserve significant landmarks that contribute to the continuity and character of the community.			time.	, DON-Urban Conservati on.	definitely be available to community members to assist in researching and writing any landmark nomination application. The community might want to seek a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant or King County Heritage grant to do the survey work that would be a part of any nomination application.	considered in the future, pending completion of additional research. Neighborhood must take the next step to initiate this project.	Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
E11	Encourage the UW to employ cultural and public-oriented performances and facilities (such as the Henry Gallery, Meany performances, the Burke Museum, Kane Hall lectures, etc.) to create greater interaction between the community and the university. This can be done through physically timing and orienting features to the community and through programs to give local community members special access.		Ongoing	None identified	UW and the individual facilities, supported by the UCUCA and local arts council.		Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
<i>Social Services</i>								
F5	Over the long term, work with the School District to establish a public school in the area. (See UCUC Plan Policy F-3.1.)		Long term		Community , School District.	The School District is currently updating its Long-range Facilities Master Plan. Over the long-term, the Executive will monitor growth in the University District, and, if warranted, support future development of a school.	Recommendation will be considered in the future, pending completion of additional research and coordination with School District Long-range Facilities Master Plan.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
F6	Work with the School District to ensure that local children receive their "fair share" of resources. If necessary, add transportation services and an "education center." (See UCUC Plan Policy F-3.4.)		Ongoing	As necessary to give local families parity with others	Community , School District.	District funding allocations are driven by student educational needs rather than "fair share" model. The Executive supports the School District's position.	Recommendation will not be implemented.	C5 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
<i>Public Safety</i>								
G1	Integrate security planning with			Modest	DPR, SPD.	SPD and DPR are working to improve coordination in	Recommendation can be	C2

#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	development of parks and open space.			increase in design fees.		this area.	implemented.	Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G2	Explore the feasibility of providing portable wireless CCTV cameras for use in drug-dealing and other criminal activity locations. Equipment purchased by local businesses; locations determined by SPD; installations by City Light.		Immediately	Equipment and consulting paid privately. Operations by SPD and City Light.	Local businesses, SPD, SCL.	SPD: This idea must be considered very cautiously, as it could be interpreted as an invasion of privacy. Street poles are owned by SCL, the US West, KC/Metro or SEATRAN. Approval needs to be obtained from the pole owner. There may be pole attachment requirements and fees.	Recommendation may be considered in the future, pending identification of potential fund source, clarification of any legal issues and evidence of very strong community support.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G3	Explore the feasibility of establishing SPD's car prowling decoy program in the UCUC.		Immediately	Cars and equipment donated. Monitoring by SPD and volunteers.	Set-up and monitoring by SPD and volunteers.	SPD is currently reevaluating the effectiveness of this program, and is not implementing it in other areas. Preventing car prowls is a high priority. SPD is exploring other options for car prowling prevention which could be implemented in the UCUC.	Recommendation will not be implemented, but SPD will consider alternatives to address concerns of community.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G4	Notify the community about current crime problems. Piggyback on other mailers. Send out press releases to local papers.			Preparation by SPD Crime Prevention. Distribution varies.	SPD, DON.	Crime prevention staff are currently co-located in the University Neighborhood Service Center. SPD and DON can increase coordination on this issue.	Recommendation can and will be implemented.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G5	Initiate a publicly-funded alley lighting program for alleys behind commercial uses. Begin with both sides of the Ave.	M		Undetermined.	City Light, Chamber of Commerce, University District Improvement Area.	SPO: This issue can be addressed as part of station area planning. SCL: Under current programs, City Light funds are not used for alley lighting. All hardware, installation and energy costs are borne by the property owners where the lights are installed. For additional street or alley lights, the neighborhood is encouraged to develop a lighting plan with SCL's North Service	Recommendation will be considered in the future, as part of station area planning, and pending identification of a public or private fund source.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.



#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
						Center. The plan should include location of lights, type of lighting fixtures and lighting calculations. The lighting plan will provide information for a feasibility analysis and cost estimate.		
G6	Establish a code requirement for CPTED review of multifamily projects. Establish a roster of qualified security specialists.					DCLU: It is not appropriate to require review in the manner proposed. Alternative recommendation: If, however, development standards in the Land Use Code are in need of amendment to better incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, this could be undertaken on a citywide basis. It would be helpful for the neighborhood to document problems or shortcomings with regard to CPTED to contribute to the scope of a future code amendment project.	Recommendation will not be implemented as proposed. Alternative recommendation: May be considered in the future, pending prioritization with other neighborhood plan recommendations, and identification of potential fund source.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G7	Support existing crime fighting programs, including Block Watch, and the University District BIA.		Ongoing	Resources added as necessary.	SPD, Community	This is an ongoing service provided by SPD.	Recommendation already being implemented.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
G8	Recommend the SARA process as a method to solve public safety problems and issues which divide the community.		As issues develop	SPD, PFY staff time.	SPD, DON (NSC) Partnership for Youth.	The Seattle Police Department is committed to the philosophy of community policing, partnering and problem-solving (which includes the SARA problem-solving process). SPD is currently implementing a SARA problem-solving process for problems identified on the Ave and will use this process on other identified problems, when appropriate in the future.	Recommendation can and will be implemented.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.
<i>Community Coordination, Communication, and Participation in Decision Making for Plan Implementation and Redevelopment Activities</i>								
H1	Empower a coalition of established groups within the urban center to determine how continuation of neighborhood planning, participation in related public decisions, and implementation of approved activities can be monitored including the need for staffing	H		Funding will be necessary for communications and expenses:	Community, individuals and organizations. City funding.	Neighborhood plan implementation will be housed in DON. DON will have staff for neighborhood plan implementation, as well as continuing the ongoing role of providing staff assistance to neighborhood groups. There is no proposed budget to fund a University Community Coalition beyond these staff funds.	Recommendation will be implemented.	C2 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action with following addition: Consider in the context of an overall city strategy for supporting stewardship of



#	Activity	Priority	Time Frame	Cost Est.	Implementor	Executive Response	Executive Recommended Action	Council Action Taken
	and technical assistance. Funded by the City.			approx. \$10K-\$20K/ yr.				plans.
H3	Create a liaison task force of UCUCA Planning Committee members or its successor organization to advise and assist the UW in interpreting the Urban Center Plan as necessary to expedite the UW Master Plan process. This task force would work with campus planners and advisors during the formulation of plan alternatives but would not participate in the formal CUCAC review of the plan.		Prior to UW master plan	Staff time for the City.	UW, Community	DON will coordinate the citizen outreach for the UW Master Plan planning effort following the 1998 City-University agreement and welcomes participation from UCUCA or its successor organization.	Recommendation is a community-based activity.	C4 Approve Exec.'s Rec. Action.

### III. Activities For Longer-Term Consideration

The activities in this section are not yet ready for a detailed City response, for a number of reasons: (1) because the neighborhood needs to develop the idea further; 2) the activities are of interest for the longer-term; and/or 3) the activities were proposed as a result of validation and the City did not have time to develop a detailed response. As a result, the City is not likely to work proactively to implement the activities in this section. Instead, the activities will be included in the City's database for monitoring neighborhood plan implementation. Should an opportunity arise to further develop the activity, the City will work with neighborhood representatives to consider the activities for implementation. Opportunities might include combining the activity with another City project, or finding a source of funding through a new or expanded federal or state grant program. If the neighborhood or City staff further develop any of these activities to a level sufficient for a more detailed City response, they will be considered relative to the neighborhood's priorities for other activities being considered for implementation. For items requiring Council approval, an amendment to the City's approved work program for the neighborhood plan may be presented to the City Council for approval.

#	<i>Activity</i>
B23	Bicycle Parking Areas. Increase the number of required bicycle parking stalls for developments in areas in the UCUC. Authorize, as part of mitigation requirements, the establishment of community bicycle parking areas such as that found in front of the University Bookstore.
B26	Evaluate a tunnel from NE 45 <sup>th</sup> St. in Ravenna Delta to Sound Transit station to west and perhaps beyond. (RNA idea)
D+1 RUV	Establish Ravenna Ave. NE south of NE 54 <sup>th</sup> St. as a Green Street Type II with Green Street Type IV at the street right-of-way at NE 52 <sup>nd</sup> and 47 <sup>th</sup> Sts. on west side of Ravenna Ave. NE.
D21	Study the use of green space at NE 50 <sup>th</sup> St. between 21 <sup>st</sup> Ave. NE and Ravenna Ave. NE for neighborhood open space.
D36	Develop design guidelines to protect the Burke-Gilman Trail, to address issues such as minimal setbacks, shading, driveways, trailside plantings, etc.
F4	Gradually increase mental health and substance abuse (drug and alcohol) services for this area. Desired location: within the University District, maybe co-located with senior services in a new adult services center.
I1	Conduct an urban center-wide transportation analysis of all arterial corridors with the objective of assessing existing capacity issues, forecasting future demands, and establishing implementation policies, funding priorities and strategies in the form of a UCUC Transportation Plan.
I2	Prepare an open space and public facility funding strategy to meet open space needs, especially in underserved and growing portions of the community.
I3	Commit to providing community services to areas with high population concentration and growth.
I4	Periodically monitor housing affordability and develop a phased strategy of steps that can be taken to meet citywide housing objectives.

MUNI13.DOC