



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

TBD
Eastlake Community Council
Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership
Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club
Tomitha Blake
Montlake Community Club
John Gaines (Co-chair)
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
Joan Kelday
Ravenna Springs Community Group
Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
Amanda Winters
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council
Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council
Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council
Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large
Bry Osmonson
University of Washington Students
Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty
Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff
Alternates
Timmy Bendis
Eastlake Community Council
Louise Little
University District Partnership
Leslie Wright
Laurelhurst Community Club
Miha Sarani
Montlake Community Club
Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
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 Rislér
University Park Community Club
Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council
TBD
University of Washington At -Large
Osman Salahuddin
University of Washington Students
Rick Mohler
University of Washington Faculty
TBD
University of Washington Staff
Ex-Officio
Maureen Sheehan – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods
Sally Clark – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

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

**Meeting Minutes
Meeting #164
May 9, 2017
Adopted July 11, 2017**
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Matthew Fox	Barbara Krieger (Non-voting Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	Natasha Rodgers (Alt.)
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Rick Mohler (Alt.)
Joan Kelday	Kerry Kahl	John Berkedal (Non-voting Alt.)
Brett Frosaker	Jan Arntz	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Theresa Doherty

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. John Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

There was a motion to adopt the April 11 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

Mr. Fox mentioned that the discussion about selecting a volunteer to attend a meeting about the renewal and review of the TMP (Transportation Management Plan) at Husky Stadium will be moved into new business.

III. Public Comment (00:03:23)

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

IV. Updates to the CMP (00:03:36)

Ms. Theresa Doherty mentioned that the Campus Master Plan (CMP) will be published on June 19th instead of June 2nd. Due to the schedule change, CUCAC will now have 56 days to review beginning June 19th through August 15th, excluding the 4th of July holiday, and the City has 120 days to review beginning June 19th through October 19th. After the City's review period, it will send a draft report to CUCAC and the University.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan noted that there is a regular scheduled meeting on June 13th and an additional meeting on June 27th. She suggested that the Committee can cancel the June 13th meeting and have a meeting on June 27th instead. Mr. Fox mentioned that further discussion about the meeting schedule to review the CMP plan be moved into new business.

Ms. Doherty introduced Ms. Caitlyn Clausen from Sasaki Architects and Ms. Jeanne Acutanza from Transpo Group to provide a high-level overview of the changes that were made in the CMP in response to the comments received.

Ms. Doherty commented that one of the comments they received in the CMP was around the 10-year concept plan and the long-term vision. Both pieces are in the CMP because the long-term vision establishes development sites while the 10-year conceptual plan is what the University will be requesting the City Councils approval on.

The long-term vision on the October draft has 12.9 million net new gross sq. ft. and for the East Campus there was 4.7 million sq. ft. of development potential, and the University is asking for 750,000 gross sq. ft. in the next 10 years. The reduced square feet are due to the lowering of several buildings and additional development sites.

The University has taken the Computer Science and the Engineering building site and Population building site out of the long-term and 10-year conceptual plan since both will have been approved by the Board of Regents by June.

Ms. Clausen began her presentation on the changes to the CMP including structural changes and items that will remain unchanged.

There will be an emphasis on the 10-year conceptual plan, adding a separate section about innovation activities based on requests for greater clarity. Also, a reorganization of the development standards with greater clarity and focus on specific requirements as well as a separate section for the Transportation Management Plan (TMP).

The items that will remain unchanged are the growth allowance request of 6 million net new gross sq. ft. and the overall enrollment projections.

The vacation of Boat Street that was originally in the West Campus green was removed, and the right of way will remain as is within the June Final draft. They also added an additional graphic that focuses on the unique and significant landscapes that would be in the "proposed" section as well as the existing conditions framework.

The University received several comments about the Open Space commitments, and they arrived at a strategy that the design and implementation for the West Campus green and West Campus section of the trail will align with the development of 1 million gross sq. ft. The West Campus green will align with the 3 million net new gross sq. ft. of development for the West Campus within the 10-year conceptual plan.

She presented a diagram on how the South Campus green will align with the Open Space commitments and these were broken down into two sections: lower and upper section of the South Campus green.

The East Campus land bridge is not part of the 10-year conceptual plan and that the existing pedestrian overpasses in that area will be sufficient to accommodate the 750,000-gross sq. ft. of growth allowance for East Campus.

She talked about how the continuous waterfront trail will align with the development of site E60 and how the construction of the trail in each of the sectors will align with the construction of the West Campus and South Campus green and development of the 750,000-net new gross sq. ft. in the East Campus. She also added that they are currently developing a Public Access Plan that aligns with the Continuous Waterfront Plan.

She talked about Brooklyn Avenue and the City of Seattle has designated Brooklyn Avenue NE, 43rd and NE 42nd as neighborhood green streets. The U District Green Streets Concept Plan will articulate a voluntary design intention for each street. She added that the University will strive to follow the guidance provided in the U District Green Streets Concept Plan and the street right of way will be preserved, wide enough for cars and large trucks, and the Public Realm Allowance will be increases by 1.5' to be consistent with the U District Green Streets Concept Plan.

Ms. Clauson talked about the mid-block passages, and the draft CMP encouraged the use of mid-block passages, but did not require them. The two mid-block passages will be required in the West Campus, and will be identified in the Final CMP. The mid-block passage will maintain a width of 25'.

She began to summarize the building heights and massing for each of the four sectors. She showed a diagram that compares changes from the October draft CMP and the June Final CMP.

V. Q&A (00:36:15)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for comments and questions regarding the presentation.

A comment was made about when a project timeline be released that indicates the priorities after the CMP. Ms. Doherty mentioned that the timing and process all relates to funding and need. The University goes to the legislature and ask for funding for some of the buildings, and the University does have a six-year capital plan. These two items inform the needs and the sites are.

A comment was made if there is a sequencing plan for the projects and priorities, and Ms. Doherty mentioned that it is the six-year capital plan.

A comment was made that CMP is about zoning and describes what and how much you can build. The Capital and Development Organization puts together a plan and takes it to the University President and the Board of Regents who decide which buildings will be built when funding is available.

Mr. Fox commented that he would like to see more details, but noted that some of the changes were responsive to the comments but he remains concerned that the high rise zoning on the Ave has not changed.

VI. Results of Analysis on Transportation Measures (00:44:00)

Ms. Acutanza began her presentation on the CMP and EIS Transportation analysis and measures.

She mentioned that one of the comments they received was to look at all modes of transportation and analyze them. Last year, the Light Rail station opened, and the team has been collecting data and it has been helpful to get an idea of how impactful the light rail has been.

The 2003 goal was to limit peak-period, peak-direction vehicle trips made by faculty, staff and students at or below the 1990 levels. It was a laborious process for collecting data.

The 2018 goal will be like other Major Institutions in the area which is a 15% SOV or drive alone rate by 2028 which applies to the whole campus. Currently, the University is at 17% since the Light Rail opened. It was at 20% previously.

She summarized the components of the UW TMP which includes: U-Pass program, Transit, Shared-Use transportation, Parking Management and RPZ's, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Marketing and Education, Telecommuting and Institutional policies.

She showed a diagram about how the UW SOV rate compared to other Major Institutions, Universities as well as other Seattle neighborhoods.

She showed recent changes with Link Light Rail and an increase in transit mode as well as the U-Pass influence on mode split trends towards A.M vs. P.M peak hour.

She noted that the campus mode split since 2010 has been stagnant at 19-20% and recently had a good bump due to light rail, rapid transit and the new Metro plan. Light Rail and its new, fast, reliable and convenient access will lower the drive alone rates.

She showed a graph of the U-Pass influence since it was implemented for the average A.M. morning trips and peak trips inbound as well as the P.M. Peak outbound and it showed the changing trend.

She reiterated that the UW's TMP goal for SOV is 15% by 2028 and it will be monitored and reported in the CMP and annual report.

She showed the CMP trip caps and how it changed over the years for A.M. peak inbounds as well as P.M. peak outbound, as well as comparison to other peer universities parking ratios.

She showed estimated 2028 daily trips by mode and alternative that estimate net new future vehicle trips.

She briefly described the methodology, approach and the results of the transportation analysis. They used a conservative analysis of 20% SOV and a future build out of 6 million sq. ft. They also considered multimodal measures as well as the approval of the U-District upzone in March 2017. They also assume that the regional and state investments have been approved and funded.

Mr. Gaines commented about the methodology and survey and how many times the study and analysis was made. Ms. Acutanza mentioned that they did the study once a year during the fall when it was the busiest.

VII. Q&A

Mr. Fox commented about Metro's Rapid Ride and its route. Ms. Acutanza noted that Rapid Ride will run through 15th, 45th, Pacific and Montlake and along the University according to Metro's long range plans.

Ms. Acutanza added that Rapid ride is version of bus rapid transit that provides real time information on when and where the bus will come.

Mr. Brett Frosaker commented if there will be dedicated lanes for the rapid ride, and Ms. Acutanza noted that in the long-range plans, 15th will be a high transit corridor, but these are just ideas and there has been no commitment from Metro.

A comment was made about the SOV goal of 15% by 2028 and why was it not aggressive enough. Ms. Doherty noted that the University has been at 20% for a long time and they want to meet the goal of 15%.

VIII. New Business (01:32:03)

Mr. Fox mentioned about having a representative from this Committee to attend an advisory group meeting to discuss the Husky Stadium Transportation Management Plan (TMP). Ms. Sheehan noted that Ms. Clark presented on the Husky Stadium TMP and that CUCAC has a seat in the advisory group. She added that if any Committee member is interested in participating on this committee, to reach out to her or Ms. Clark. It will be a daytime meeting, but the meeting has not been scheduled.

A link to the background and information can be found at this link: [2015 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan & Transportation Management Program](#).

Mr. Fox suggested that representatives from immediate neighbors such as Montlake, Laurelhurst, and University Park that will be impacted should consider volunteering, and would report back to this Committee.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that any recommendations that would come out from this advisory group will go to the City Council for the final decision.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned cancelling the June 13th regular meeting and rescheduling the meeting for June 27th since the Final CMP/EIS is now scheduled to be published on June 19th instead of June 2nd. She said to let her know if any of the neighborhood community representative cannot attend the June 27th meeting.

Mr. Fox suggested to have the documents available electronically so it can be downloaded by members for review.

Ms. Doherty and Ms. Sheehan mentioned that hardcopies of the CMP, EIS, and TMP will be made available prior to the meeting.

VI. Adjournment

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