

**City/University Community
Advisory Committee
CUCAC**

Final Report and Recommendation

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
MASTER PLAN
SEATTLE CAMPUS

November 2001

SECTION I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. Overall Statement

The Final Proposed Master Plan for the University of Washington Seattle Campus is a creative and farsighted document with many new and significant features. These include a careful process of assessing important spaces and vistas on campus, which involved responses from 1800 members of the University and surrounding communities. The City of Seattle/University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) has followed and commented on the development of these and other ideas since the early stages of the development of this plan, and greatly appreciates the openness of this process to public involvement and participation. University personnel and its consultants have been willing to meet anywhere at any time with groups interested in receiving briefings, and have held several open houses and other public meetings during the planning process. Those portions of all CUCAC meetings dealing with review of the draft and final Campus Master Plan are attached to this report as appendix C. In general we urge adoption of the Campus Master Plan with minor changes as set forth in the remainder of this report.

As is the nature of any significant planning effort, CUCAC identified many ideas and concerns. These concerns were provided to the University of Washington as formal comments to their Draft Seattle Campus Master Plan. That comment letter is included as appendix A to this report. To the credit of the University, they were able to adequately address 32 of the 57 areas of concern that were raised, and a matrix showing areas of agreement and disagreement with the initial CUCAC letter is attached as appendix B. None the less several substantial areas of disagreement remain and are the focus of this report.

2. Areas of Continuing Disagreement between the University of Washington and the City/University Community Advisory Committee.

In general CUCAC's area of continuing disagreement with the University of Washington concerning the Proposed Final Campus Master Plan are in the following areas:

1. Level of development proposed, including development priorities, and development of several sites;
2. Anticipated or possible street vacations;
3. University provisions for student housing development;
4. Height in East Campus for the proposed Golf Driving Range;
5. Design of New Buildings in the Historic Core of the University;
6. Transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements;
7. Commitments to meet goals and objectives;
8. Miscellaneous Recommendations

SECTION II SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. Level of development proposed, including development priorities, and development of several sites.

While CUCAC supports the limits of not more than 3 million square feet of new development over the length of the Seattle Campus Master Plan, CUCAC continues to advocate for greater specificity concerning initial development priorities, and future uses and that 4 of the 64 development sites be removed from consideration.

In its initial comment letter, CUCAC requested that the University make a good faith effort to identify proposed development phases, including development priorities, estimated timetables for proposed developments and proposed interim uses of property awaiting development for those sites where that information can be reasonably determined both campus-wide and on a sector-by-sector basis. CUCAC suggested that the University identify: 1) those projects and their likely locations that are known for which funding is available or has been or is being requested, either in the most current biennial request to the State Legislature or from private donations, and where planning will begin within the next biennium; and 2) other sites for which preferred uses are known. In response to CUCAC's comments, the University stated that their best estimate of development was that about 600,000 square feet would be developed each year (the 3 million square feet proposed divided by the number of years the plan is intended to cover). In addition, the University committed to inform CUCAC of sites identified for development both through the Biennial State Budget and its Annual Report to CUCAC and to continue to involve CUCAC in review of projects once they have been developed. However, actual selection of sites for development is proposed to remain an internal function of the University and wider community input in that process would not be sought.

CUCAC acknowledges both that the University has made an effort to address its concerns and relative merits of the University's process of disclosure of development sites. However, CUCAC's continues to believe that the University should go farther. CUCAC recommends that development priorities for campus sectors be identified. This recommendation is driven in large part by CUCAC's assumption that West Campus, where the greatest development potential exists, may see a large portion of actual new development.

Recommendation 1a.	The University Seattle Campus Master Plan should be amended to include an estimate of the total amount of development anticipated for each campus sector over the life of the plan.
--------------------	---

In addition CUCAC proposes that a process to consult CUCAC during the site selection process be instituted. CUCAC's position regarding this issue derives from past experience with several recent University development processes. A good example of this was the process of siting the new Indoor Practice Facility. When the project was initially presented to CUCAC for design review, the committee raised concerns about the effect of the development on Montlake Boulevard. In essence, CUCAC's concerns were related to the nature of the use rather than the actual design of the building. By its very nature the Indoor Practice facility was relatively monolithic. To its credit, the University nearly always goes to great lengths to design attractive and praiseworthy buildings. But in this case the uses match to the site was not good. During review it became apparent that there were other nearby sites that were superior, but that had been rejected for a variety of reasons. After CUCAC involvement one of these sites was chosen and proved acceptable to all involved.

From CUCAC's perspective, discussions between CUCAC and the University prior to initial site selection would have led to an early choice of a better site. This much-needed project would have moved forward more quickly without the delay that the ensuing controversy entailed. It is not CUCAC's intention that it be involved in the consideration of whether a site should be developed for alternative academic uses. For instance whether a building is used for Physics or alternatively Astronomy would probably be immaterial to the surrounding community. Instead CUCAC is recommending a process to inform the committee when several alternative sites are being considered for the same use, and especially when these uses are on the periphery of campus. CUCAC's comments would be focused on identifying any varying effects on the surrounding community that it believed should be considered by the University in final site selection. While CUCAC would appreciate the opportunity to comment on all alternate sites, it would be most important for those sites on the periphery of the campus that effect the surrounding communities most significantly.

Recommendation 1b.	The Seattle Campus Master Plan should include a commitment by the University to develop an early process to notify and consult with CUCAC during the process of selecting uses for development sites.
--------------------	---

In addition, CUCAC identified several development sites that it concluded should not be considered for development over the life of the Seattle Campus Master Plan. In general those sites considered inappropriate for near-term development were those that the community believes are important as open entries and gateways to the University or which preserved view from arterials of the community.

The University has proposed to retain all of these sites for development in order to preserve its flexibility. While CUCAC agrees that flexibility is desirable when selecting future sites, unlimited flexibility can pose problems. CUCAC does not want the University to have the flexibility to develop these limited number of sites and continues to recommend that these sites be removed from consideration as development sites at this time.

Recommendation 1c	The following development sites should be removed from further consideration for development over the life of the plan: 1) site 30W; 2) site 46S; 3) that portion of the area or influence for site 49S that lies northwest of the designated building footprint, solely to publicly accessible open space associated with and improved bicycle and pedestrian pathway, and 4) site 52S.
-------------------	--

Sites 46S and 30W are recommended for removal from future consideration in order to allow development of more open and attractive entries to the campus and preserve better relationships between campus development and the adjacent community. One of the surviving areas of grass and trees on South Campus is on either side of San Juan Road, which runs south from the Columbia Road Gatehouse past the historic and picturesque Harris Hydraulics Lab to the waterfront. Part of this green space was taken a few years ago for a temporary parking area that eventually became the present (permanent) lot S-12. CUCAC recommends that the University remove lot S-12 and forgo building on site 46S, and eventually eliminate lot S-5 in order to create a greenway that would provide an attractive entry to South Campus, and enhance the pedestrian/bicycle path and connections with the waterfront. The total loss of development capacity of 60,500 gross square feet and loss of about 25 parking spaces, appears a modest price to pay for this major improvement.

Site 52S is recommended for removal from future consideration due to its relationship to the possible aerial vacation of NE Pacific Street. Since this vacation is no longer being formally proposed, no such site exists. CUCAC is opposed to this vacation in general.

Site 30 W is recommended for removal from future consideration in order to allow development of the area as a gateway to the neighborhood and as an open plaza and park-like area and amenity for the area at the west terminus of the existing NE Campus Parkway.

2. Possible Future Street Vacations

The University of Washington initially proposed simultaneous Master Plan adoption and street vacation processes and its plan showed development as it would occur with approval of various requested vacations. CUCAC, and

other community organizations, objected to many of the street and alley vacations, preferring instead that the existing street grids remain unchanged. CUCAC objected to the following street and alley vacations: 1) Aerial vacation of Pacific Street to create a plaza; 2) the vacation of the north portion of NE Campus Parkway; 3) the vacation of the north-south alley between 11th and 12th Avenues north of NE 41st Street; and 4) the small section of 11th Avenue south of NE 41st Street.

The University has amended its plan and no longer proposes simultaneous vacation and plan adoption processes. However, the University still includes all of the vacations in the plan to identify those vacations that may be requested during the life of the plan and identifies a work program for possible consideration of the vacations in the event that the University chose to go forward with any of them. However, it is unclear to CUCAC that this change represents a real decision to reconsider the vacations or simply recognition that the City Street Vacation process must be completed prior to the formal vacation of the streets. If this change represents an actual reconsideration of the vacations, then CUCAC would applaud it. However, if this is a mechanism to avoid the immediate controversy associated with these vacations, while building an ongoing case for them, then CUCAC's concerns remain unchanged. For instance in some cases the illustrative development maps in the Seattle Campus Master Plan still show development as if the street and alley vacations were still formally being proposed, rather than showing development without the vacations. This would appear to imply a greater commitment to the vacations than indicated in the University's statement to CUCAC.

In any case, CUCAC's objections to the street and alley vacations remain. While it is appropriate for the University of Washington to acknowledge which vacations they may consider in the future, absent significant changes in CUCAC's positions in the future, CUCAC will likely continue to oppose them through whatever vacation process follows. In addition, CUCAC is particularly concerned that inclusion of the vacations in the plan, even for disclosure purposes only, may be seen as some degree of conceptual approval of the vacations. CUCAC's position is that inclusion should not be mistaken as conceptual approval and that statements to that effect need to be included in the plan and any adoption legislation prepared by the City of Seattle. In addition, CUCAC recommends that illustrative development maps be amended to show development, as it would occur if no vacations were requested.

On the assumption that the University is sincere in its statements that the vacations are no longer being formally proposed and are not considered integral to their plan, CUCAC offers several recommendations. These specific recommendations are proposed to assure that the plan is consistent with the current University position that no vacations are being proposed as part of the adoption of the plan. It is CUCAC's position that if that is actually the case, then all illustrative materials and discussions should show

development as it might occur without any of the possible vacations and simply refer to the street vacation discussion and work plan for evaluation of possible vacations.

Recommendations and discussion concerning the NE Pacific Street aerial vacation and lid.

Recommendation 2a	Figure IV-71 on page 108 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan (Illustrative Development Area S/W-3) should be revised to eliminate the plaza over Pacific Street and all references to site 52S. Instead it should simply be noted that various plaza and aerial vacations alternatives may be requested as discussed in the street vacation section of the plan.
-------------------	--

Recommendation 2b	<p>Amend the second sentence of the first paragraph on the general discussion of South Campus on page 94 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan as follows:</p> <p>An additional pedestrian bridge from the Physics/Astronomy buildings to the Portage Bay Vista, as well as a plaza and building connection that bridges a portion of landscape and other improvements to the existing overpasses across NE Pacific Street, are proposed for future study in Chapter VI. These bridges could will help improve connections between the South and Central Campus and public access between the Burke-Gilman Trail and the waterfront.</p>
-------------------	--

One of the clear intents of development of the plaza across NE Pacific Street is to better integrate South Campus to the Central Campus. While this goal in and of itself is laudable and would obtain some additional development capacity, it would come at too high a price to the broader community. Both at CUCAC meetings, at individual Community organization meetings, and at the public hearings, opposition to this concept has been expressed.

Pacific Street is a major corridor through the community. It is already sometimes referred to as "the canyon" and concerns that its environment not be replicated along portions of Montlake was a part of the motivation behind much of the opposition to the location of the Indoor Practice Facility north of the IMA. Far from improving this environment for the thousands of motorists who use this heavily traveled corridor, a lid would further exacerbate an already bad situation. It provides a building that blocks out the sky along Pacific Street, and makes a narrow street feel even narrower.

Recommendations and discussion concerning possible Campus Parkway vacations and improvements.

Recommendation 2c Amend the discussion of Campus Parkway on page 92 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan to insert a new second paragraph and revise the last paragraph of the Master Plan to read as follows:

Under this plan NE Campus Parkway will remain unchanged except that a plaza will be developed at the location of 30W as a gateway to the community.

~~The Campus Master Plan proposes further study of the Campus Parkway corridor if a street vacation is proposed in order to increase the potential amount of open space and improve traffic flow.~~

CUCAC's recommendation against any street vacation for Campus Parkway is intended to indicate that no major changes in this area should be considered other than landscape improvements within Campus Parkway's existing configuration. A street vacation is not acceptable.

CUCAC makes the following additional recommendations in order to assure that the plan reflects improvements to Campus Parkway in its existing configuration. It is CUCAC's position that the primary focus of the plan in the West Campus should be the improvement of this area without vacations of any portion of Campus Parkway and that the street vacation should be identified as a relatively remote possibility only and not considered either integral to the plan or the preferred alternative.

Recommendation 2d The Seattle Campus Master Plan should be amended to indicate that the University will work with the community and City of Seattle, to identify landscape improvement that will make NE Campus Parkway more attractive, including a significant upgrading of the environment along NE Campus Parkway, within its current configuration, to include new street lights, strain poles, trees, landscaping and other amenities.

CUCAC concurs with concerns that the current environment along NE Campus Parkway should be improved. Retaining the current alignment of NE Campus Parkway, improvements should include adding vertical elements such as more trees, flags and/or lights along the Parkway, and greater active recreation opportunities in the green space adjacent to Terry/Lander Halls.

Recommendation 2e

The Seattle Campus Master Plan should be amended to add statement to Figure IV-69, page 106 - illustrative development Area SW-1- as follows:

Bulk and scale of any new development on the north side of Campus Parkway will be compatible with the existing low-rise 2 and 3 story single family structures to the north through the use of open spaces, step backs to upper floors above 40 feet, modified roof lines, and various other methods to mitigate the dramatic bulk, height and scale change between those areas north of NE 41st and the University property on the north edge of Campus Parkway.

Discussion of Alley Vacations

A full vacation of north-south alley on Site 31W (between 11th and 12th north of NE 41st Street) would have serious impacts on adjacent property. The alley is used for private access to garages and for garbage pick up. The community council representing this area has expressed strong opposition to its vacation and is not interested in having garbage pick up shifted from the alley to the front lawns. If the alley is to be truncated and turn at the site for development, the alley should empty out onto 11th Avenue NE rather than 12th Avenue NE.

3. University Provision for Student Housing Development

The impact of student housing on adjacent neighborhoods is a major issue for the community. In 1978 the University Board of Regents adopted a housing policy that states in part that the primary source of housing for students will continue to be the private housing market. The University essentially de-emphasized future on-campus housing development in favor of accommodating students in the surrounding neighborhoods. One result of this de-emphasis was that all on-campus housing was to be financially self sufficient. Revenues from housing (rents, etc.) and related food sales were to be the sole source of funds for debt service, capital improvements and ongoing maintenance.

This decision may have been appropriate in light of the relatively long period of high housing vacancies and slow growth in the region due to the lingering effects of the Boeing Bust of the early to mid 70's, and may have been financially prudent for the University. It may also have been a boon to absentee landlords and developers. However, today it has proved a problem for the surrounding neighborhoods. Rapid development has ensued and too often student housing in the private market has meant overcrowding parking and other traffic congestion. There have been associated behavior and safety concerns. Recently, housing costs have risen to the point that

students are being priced out of nearby housing which can further exacerbate already difficult transportation problems as an increasing proportion live elsewhere and commute to the University.

Ideally, it would be CUCAC's position that the University Board of Regents reconsider its 1978 position and commit the University to providing a far greater share of housing for its students, faculty and staff on campus. However, given the current University policy that revenues from housing (rents, etc.) and related food sales are to be the sole source of funds for debt service, capital improvements and ongoing maintenance, it is difficult to envision how the University might increase on-campus housing without a subsidy to cover bonding for construction and/or operations costs. Therefore, absent that change, CUCAC makes the following recommendations intended to increase University housing commitments within its current policy framework:

Recommendation 3a	<p>Amend bullet 10 under General Policies on page 20 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan to give greater priority to possible development of additional student housing as follows:</p> <p>The University will monitor student housing supply and demand and may <u>should</u> consider the development of additional housing facilities if community housing availability should significantly decrease or student demand for housing significantly increase. The University's student housing policy is included in the <i>Student Housing Statement of Principles</i>, available as a background document.</p>
-------------------	---

The Seattle Campus Master Plan identifies a need for between 850 and 1,000 more beds for students by 2012 and states that possible sites have been identified subject to further analysis, particularly of the long-term ability of the development to pay debt service. The University has committed to the Blakely Court Addition that will result in some of the needed new housing units. However, CUCAC continues to advocate that the University should produce additional housing above this level to accommodate a significant portion of the additional 2000 to 3000 students and possibly attract a slightly higher proportion of current students to on-campus University provided housing. Additional on-campus housing would reduce overcrowding in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Recommendation 3b	Increase University commitments to produce new student housing from the 850 to 1,000 new single-student beds identified on page 197 of the Seattle
-------------------	--

Campus Master Plan to a commitment to create additional on-campus and off-campus housing to accommodate a significant portion of the anticipated 3,000-4,000 new students.

4. Height in East Campus for Development of the Golf Driving Range

The existing driving range was constructed in 1965 using student fees. Revenues from its operation generates funds for the student association. According to the University it has deteriorated with heavy use and needs to be replaced.

The University has proposed an expansion of this to 80 stalls. This would require addition of a second level of stalls and an increase the height of the surrounding fence from 37 feet to 100 feet that would meet industry standards. Safety lighting at the top of the fence might also have to be included, but that is not decided yet. This project is being proposed for expansion as a way to generate revenues to offset other recreational sports activities and avoid personal injury claims attributed to the golf range.

The Golf Driving Range fence height increase and second-story addition has not met with general approval in the community. There is significant concern over view blockage and safety. Many believe that the location of the driving range, abutting 45th N.E., may make this expansion a safety hazard to drivers on a very busy highway. In addition, the location of the medical helicopter-landing site is directly adjacent to the driving range which further complicates this spot given the height of the fence and the lighting which could compete with the lights on the landing site. This too could become a safety hazard. Rather than increase the height of the fence, consideration should be given to relocation of the Driving Range to another location that offers more safety away from the street and helicopter landing field.

CUCAC formally recommended against the fence height increase in its initial comment letter. Based in part on this recommendation the University amended its proposal to both decrease fence height somewhat and decrease the bulk and visual impact of the lighting and supporting poles for the facility.

The proposal spaces the poles 180 feet on center and 18 inches in diameter rather than the typical design which is 40 foot spacing 30 inch in diameter. This reduces the number of poles from 33 to 11 and significantly reduces their visual effect. Evaluations indicate that it is the poles rather than the rather transparent netting that have the greatest visual impact. Under the previous proposal the poles actually blocked a total of 85 feet of view coverage. The new system only blocks 16.5 feet for a reduction of over 500 percent in visual impact. In addition, it is much more efficient to construct and therefore less expensive.

The fence height was lowered to as little as 8 feet in some areas nearer the tees with 100 feet only in area where right handed golfers would typically slice. The proposed safety fence height along the back end was reduced to 60 feet at the far end of the range with about 80 feet along the west and north sides fronting Montlake Boulevard and NE 45th Street and 100 feet along the east side. The safety net will be heavily screened by trees and the upper tee line has been eliminated from the West Side to allow a lower fence height.

CUCAC acknowledges that the current proposed design is greatly improved over the initial design. The University has made significant efforts to address CUCAC's concerns. However, there is still significant opposition to this project. For these reasons, CUCAC conditionally approves continued efforts to improve the design of this facility so that it might be expanded. Therefore CUCAC makes the following recommendation.

Recommendation 4	CUCAC urges that the City conditionally approve the height rezone needed to allow the expansion of the Golf Driving Range. Conditions should include: 1) time limitations on any night lighting on the field; and 2) development of a detailed work program to obtain review and agreement with CUCAC concerning design.
------------------	--

5. Design of New Buildings in the Historic Core of the University.

Many portion of the University Campus contain clearly historic buildings and environments. The University has shown great sensitivity to preserving these environments. CUCAC commends this practice. However, some of the statements in the Seattle Campus Master Plan appear to indicate that this practice might change as additional portions of the campus age and begin to be considered historic. This is of particular concern in the General Design Policies on page 21 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan where it appears to indicate that additions and changes to existing historic areas should avoid "literal interpretations". In some areas, such as the quadrangle literal interpretation may be appropriate.

For this reason, CUCAC offers the following recommendations.

Recommendation 5	Amend the sixth bullet under Building Design on page 21 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan to indicate a greater commitment to preservation of the historic character of selected portions of campus and selected buildings as follows: <u>Avoid literal interpretation of historically designated buildings when designing new buildings in those portions of the Seattle Campus where newer building</u>
------------------	--

forms predominate such as South, Southwest and West Campus. Additions to existing individual historically designated buildings, or new construction in those portions of campus having a distinct historic character such as the Quadrangle and Rainier Vista, Brooklyn area may shall be similar in character and style to the existing historic buildings or environments and/or should compliment them architecturally and aesthetically.

The guideline as previously written seemed to place too little emphasis on maintaining the design characteristic of historical buildings and environments on campus when making additions to existing buildings or when designing new buildings.

6. Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

The University has demonstrated a commitment to alternative means of transportation. CUCAC commends the University for these efforts. However, in some areas, particularly related to local transit access and bicycle improvements, CUCAC believes that the University could go much farther. For instance, a focus on express transit has resulted in many buses bypassing nearby neighborhoods where affordable housing is available. In other areas, spot bicycle improvements have not been made that might considerably increase bicycle use.

For these reasons, CUAC makes the following recommendations

Concerning local transit access to nearby neighborhoods.

Recommendation 6a	Add a new General Land Use Policy to page 33 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan, as follows: The University will strive to further improve transit service between the Seattle Campus and nearby neighborhoods.
-------------------	---

The intent of this policy is to increase access to areas where affordable housing, retail services and employment opportunities already exist in order to avoid the need to rapidly increase densities directly adjacent or within the University District.

Concerning spot bicycle and pedestrian Improvements

Recommendation 6b	Add a new Specific Objective under East Campus on page 17 to read as follows:
-------------------	---

Improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular travel surfaces that service recreation and sports facilities.

Recommendation 6c Amend bullet one under Bicycle Pathways on page 35 as follows:

Directly connect campus bicycle routes to external routes to facilitate commuting by bike particularly in the vicinity of the University Bridge/Campus Parkway.

The University has proposed improvements to this location, but only in the event that Campus Parkway is vacated. It is the position of CUCAC that this improvement should be done regardless of vacation of Campus Parkway. Serious safety concerns were raised to CUCAC concerning vehicle/bicycle conflicts at this location. CUCAC further recommends that this issue be raised to the City as well for consideration of joint City/University action.

Recommendation 6d. CUCAC is concerned about the safety of the pedestrian overpass that crosses Montlake Boulevard between the Burke Gilman trail and Hec Edmundson Pavilion and requests that the City and the University address the issues of safety and potential replacement or improvements to the overpass.

Recommendation 6e Additional bicycle routes to and possibly through and into the heart of Central Campus should be pursued in the Seattle Campus Master Plan if ways can be found to avoid pedestrian-bicycle conflicts.

The Seattle Campus Master Plan identifies only one proposed improvement, along Pend Oreille Road. However, elsewhere the plan notes that cyclists use other routes as well. The identification of only one improvement appears insufficient, especially in light of claims that this mode of movement is to be encouraged. Access to the center of the Central Campus is particularly lacking and is not addressed by this plan.

Recommendation 6f Amend the illustrative map on page 85 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan to add an additional caption as follows:

Provide bus pullouts at the Sound Transit Station location to assure that traffic on 15th Avenue NE does not become overly congested.

7. Commitments to meet goals and objectives

CUCAC made many comments concerning the University's goals and objectives in its initial comment letter to the University. The University incorporated most of these comments and CUCAC is reasonably comfortable with most of the University's goals and objectives. However, one area of general disagreement remains – the degree of commitment to actually meeting the goals. CUCAC requests that the University commit to progress towards goals and objectives and report on progress or lack of progress. The University maintained that they need somewhat greater flexibility.

CUCAC remains committed to ensuring that reasonable progress be made towards meeting goals and objectives. For this reason CUCAC makes the following recommendations.

Recommendation 7

Amend the introductory statement concerning Objectives by Element on page 10 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan and concerning Objectives by Campus Area on page 11 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan to make compliance with the goals more clearly binding upon both present and future decision makers and require that a full analysis and justification be forthcoming whenever any action is taken that conflicts with the goals as follows:

Objectives by element (page 10 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan)

The Master Plan focuses on three elements: open space, transportation and circulation, and potential development. The objectives that follow represent ideas for change. They also embrace many of the ideas expressed in the University Community Urban Center Plan (UCUCP, August 1998—see Chapter IX). Future Decision-makers should strive to achieve these objectives. Costs and schedule related factors will need to be considered in the decision-making process. In some cases, when conflicts occur, there may be a need to balance these objectives with other factors such as budget, funding, academic priorities and scheduling. In those cases where factors such as budget, funding, academic priorities, and scheduling result in a decision that is not in accord with the goals stated in the Seattle Campus Master Plan, a full justification shall be provided for project reviewers and decisions makers.

Objectives by campus area (page 11 of the Seattle Campus Master Plan.)

The objectives that follow represent ideas for change. They also embrace many of the ideas expressed in the University Community Urban Center Plan (UCUCP, August 1998—see Chapter IX). Future Decision-makers should strive to achieve these objectives. Costs and schedule related factors will need to be considered in the decision making process. In some cases, when conflicts occur, there may be a need to balance these objectives with other factors such as budget, funding, academic priorities and scheduling. In those cases where factors such as budget, funding, academic priorities, and scheduling result in a decision that is not in accord with the goals stated in the Seattle Campus Master Plan, a full justification shall be provided for project reviewers and decisions makers.

8. Other Recommendations

Recommendation 8a. Add a new objective under Transportation and Circulation page 11 of the Seattle Campus Master plan to establish a commitment by the University to ensure mitigation of the impacts of transportation and land use projects for which the University is not the lead planner or SEPA lead agency, but are located on University Property or being built for University Lease and Use. Such planning should involve the active participation of CUCAC.

Recommendation 8b Amend the General Waterfront Policies: In the Conservancy Preservation Zone/Access Policies, in Policy #1 add "boat access points" at the end of the third line (this is intended to address the intrusion of boats into wetland areas on the day of football games).