



MEMBERS

- Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council
- Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council
- Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
- Jean Amick
Laurelhurst Community Club
- TBD
Montlake Community Club
- Jon Gaines
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council
- TBD
Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- Dave Eckert
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council
- Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council
- Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large
- TBD
University of Washington Students
- Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty
- Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff
- Alternates
Chris Leman
Eastlake Community Council
- Louise Little
University District Partnership
- Jeannie Hale & Colleen McAleer
Laurelhurst Community Club
- TBD
Montlake Community Club
- Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council
- TBD
Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Jorgen Bader
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- Natasha Rodgers
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- TBD
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Jorgen Bader
University District Community Council
- Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Club
- Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council
- TBD
University of Washington At -Large
- TBD
University of Washington Students
- TBD
University of Washington Faculty
- TBD
University of Washington Staff
- Ex-Officio
Maureen Sheehan – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods
- Sally Clark – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional
Affairs

**City of Seattle - University of Washington
Community Advisory Committee**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Meeting # 145
October 13, 2015
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Yvonne Sanchez	Doug Campbell	Jean Amick
John Gaines	Barbara Kreiger (Alt.)	Brett Frosaker
Natasha Rodgers (Alt.)	Matthew Fox	Barbara Quinn
Brian O'Sullivan	Jon Berkedal (Alt.)	Kerry Kahl
Ashley Emery	Jan Arntz	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Theresa Doherty
Dale Clark		

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox commented to include a public comment item in the agenda since this is a public meeting and the continuing discussions about the upcoming Camps Master Plan. A motion was made to have a public comment period during the meeting. Mr. Fox suggested to have a time limit of less than two minutes per person, it was seconded. The Committee voted unanimously and the motion passed.

Mr. Fox has a correction on the September minutes, page 3, third paragraph, the word "inconsistent" is incorrect. The Committee voted and adopted the September minutes as amended.

Regarding the Montlake/Fremont Bridge closure, Ms. Maureen Sheehan reported she is waiting for a response from the University as well as from the Laurelhurst neighborhood about their position. Ms. Sally Clark noted that she has not received a response or a letter back from Mr. Josh Cavanaugh on this issue.

Ms. Clark commented that she has no definite answer regarding a member of the Board of Regents attending a CUCAC meeting, but a request has been made.

Mr. Fox mentioned about the need of having a co-chair as outlined in the bylaws and the City-University Agreement. This Committee has not reappointed him for a while and requested for the Committee take a vote. A motion was made to re-appoint Mr. Fox as a co-chair of the Committee; it was seconded. The Committee voted and re-appointed Mr. Fox as a co-chair.

III. Campus Master Plan Kickoff & EIS Scoping Meeting Discussion

Ms. Theresa Doherty provided an update and presentation on the upcoming Campus Master Plan Kickoff and EIS Scoping.

The two public open houses will have the same agenda and the topics. The purpose of these open houses is to ensure the University community at large is aware of the Master Plan, its process, and the timeline.

The Campus Master Plan is a three year process. Currently, the plan is in the discovery and analysis phase. Phase Two of the plan will be preliminary concepts and looking at growth on the campus and potential development in the next 20 years. The draft plan is expected to be published in April 2016.

The EIS scoping includes looking at the elements of the environment for the Campus Master Plan and making refinements to minimize or mitigate the effects on the environment. During scoping, the University will be looking at all elements and this is a good opportunity for the public to comment on the alternatives.

Scoping began on October 6th and the public has until the 26th to submit their comments.

The potential EIS alternatives that will be analyzed are as follows:

- 1) New development in the west and south campus;
- 2) Development distributed throughout the campus;
- 3) No street and alley vacations; and
- 4) No action on the alternatives.

The Committee had some discussion about owned and leased properties outside the major institution's boundary and how they are affected. Ms. Doherty mentioned that any University owned properties outside the boundaries will be develop according to the City's land use code.

Mr. Doug Campbell commented whether this EIS can capture issues and answer the questions on what portion of the University's growth will be happening on this campus rather than the alternative sites. He suggested that maybe the Committee can request this as part of the scoping process.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that there were 68 potential development sites that were identified in the last Master Plan that is about 8.3 million square feet. The team asked the City Council for approval for 3 million sq. ft. and the plan is currently looking at potential sites for approval. The campus is anticipating growth and will be looking at trend lines and reasons for growth.

Mr. Brett Frosaker noted in the previous Master Plan, it has restrictions on what the University can purchase or lease outside its boundaries, and if the new Master Plan will have this as well. Ms. Doherty responded that the new Master Plan will not.

Mr. Fox commented that he would like the Master Plan to restrict the University in buying market area houses. Mr. Campbell commented about the discussion that there should be a planning process that includes the University's impact on the community as a whole that includes both University's owned and leased properties on and off campus.

The majority of the Committee members agreed on that statement. Mr. Fox summarized it by stating that the EIS scoping should address the development alternatives and how it will impact the properties inside and outside the Major Institution's overlay and its interaction on the University and local community.

A motion was made to include the statement; it was seconded and was voted by the Committee.

A statement will be drafted and reviewed by the Committee members for final submission to the University.

IV. North Campus Housing EIS comment period

Mr. John Lebo is the Project Director for the North Campus Housing Project. His presentation will be an update on the North Campus Housing project.

The project will replace several existing residence halls, while retaining Hansee Hall, and McMahon Hall will be up for re-use consideration, whether it's housing, academic, administrative, or demolition. Currently, approximately 2900 students are living in these residence halls. The proposal for Phase 4 of the Housing Master Program (Phases 1-3 is in the West Campus) include an additional 3200 students, an increase in 300 students. The proposed construction will begin on February 2016 last for two years. The occupancy will be on Phase 4a. The second phase of the project, Phase 4b is planned to start after the completion of 4a in 2020.

Mr. Lebo noted that during the process, they will make a presentation to the Board of Regents in November 2015 and will seek approval of the project in January 2016.

The planning principles of the housing program in the EIS is to create a vibrant student community and incorporate other aspects of student activities including: dining, landscape, fitness centers that cater to both passive and active users. It will not only involve the student population, but also the greater campus.

Another important part of the project is to embrace the historic fabric of the campus as it transitions to neighboring areas. The project would embrace the landscape area especially Kincaid Ravine which has not been fully developed and bring the landscape closer to the residence halls.

Mr. Lebo showed a diagram for planning and development purposes (Haggett, McCarthy, Denny Field). He also showed how the integration for pedestrians and services access for the campus by integrating the main campus access and service road behind the buildings.

He described the different brick alternatives and facades for the building that include Native American designs that are common in the Puget Sound area.

He mentioned about building layouts and gathering spaces in the halls where a common community social space exist.

The project is developing certain price points where there will be doubles with a shared bath down the hall. He noted that a room with two bedrooms is about 300 sq. ft. not including the bathroom.

Mr. Fox asked a question regarding tree removal past the ravine area along McCarty Hall. Mr. Lebo mentioned that the project is not proposing any tree removal in the ravine area.

Mr. Gaines asked whether a high rise alternative was evaluated in the EIS. The team did study a high rise alternative at a project level and determined that a high rise is more expensive whether the building is made of concrete or steel. The best way to get more value is to minimize the podium level which creates less of a new footprint and the cost of moving straight up gets mitigated.

A question was asked on how the University determines the number of dormitories needed. Housing & Food Services developed a Housing Plan on campus in 2007 which determined the demand for housing. They did a survey and the result was an estimated 5000 students would want to live in housing if it is available. The campus also looked at multiple price points of the housing. On-campus housing is in high demand.

Mr. Frosaker asked about what percentage of the maximum height is being achieved and per unit cost of this compared to the steel/concrete scenario. 75 ft. is the maximum height due to Code reasons; the height limit in the area is about 105 ft., which results in about 10-12 stories.

A question was raised if there are any underground connectivity. Mr. Lebo mentioned that there is a service tunnel but not for pedestrians.

V. New Business

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for new business. He informed the Committee that if they want to make a comment on the Computer Science building EIS next month, he mentioned that the Committee should comment on the following items:

- a) Building Height and the preferred alternatives to take down the More Hall Annex;
- b) Having More Hall Annex on the National Register of Historic Places.

If the Committee has an opinion or comments on these items to present them at next month's meeting. Mr. Frosaker commented that he has seen this project presented before the Committee and asked whether there was a change in the scope of the project due to a funding problem. Ms. Clark commented that she has not heard any changes in scope design and the project has received all or some that they have asked for.

Ms. Amick asked whether the University has sent a letter regarding the Montlake Bridge. Ms. Clark mentioned that she asked Mr. Josh Cavanaugh about the letter, but he has not yet responded. Ms. Amick went ahead and read a letter to the Committee from the Laurelhurst Community Club in favor of regulating Montlake Bridge openings. She commented that it would be great if this Committee responds to SDOT's request for community support to inform the Coast Guard to have the City bridges on a schedule rather than on demand.

Mr. John Gaines noted that through personal experience, he does not mind about having the bridge opened on demand.

The Committee decided not to continue further discussion about this.

Mr. Jon Berkedal asked about the outcome of the Committee's invitation for the Board of Regents to attend a Committee meeting. Ms. Clark noted that it is still pending and she submitted the request.

Ms. Amick submitted a letter to the Columns Magazine about her response to the Editor, Mr. John Marmor, regarding community spirit and the proposed development above the University Ave light rail station and the University District. The magazine is going to publish it.

A question was raised about the Burke-Gilman and a sign stating it will be closed for nine months. It was thought that the renovation project had been discontinued. Ms. Clark commented that the project went back to the drawing board and now began its first phase of work. The Phase 1 of the project will be at Rainier Vista over to 15th Ave. She noted that she will introduce more information at the next meeting.

VI. Adjournment

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