

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FINAL CAMPUS MASTER PLAN AND EIS**

**CITY/UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CUCAC)  
FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**AUGUST 30, 2017**

This report is produced pursuant to Ordinance #121688 Sec 1.B.6. The intent and purpose of this report is to make recommendations to the City for modifications to the 2018 University of Washington Campus Master Plan (CMP)

## SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

### Overview

The Final Proposed Campus Master Plan (CMP) for the University of Washington has been reviewed and commented on by CUCAC in this report.

The University and City of Seattle in partnership have provided a facilitator to help organize the thoughts and ideas presented by CUCAC during the review of the draft and proposed final. CUCAC chose to work in topic focused subgroups and bring thoughts and feedback to the larger group to discuss. Minutes from those large group meetings are attached to this report.

CUCAC provided formal comment on the Draft CMP, attached to this report. The University was able to address some of these comments in the Proposed Final, but large overarching questions still remain. We urge adoption of the CMP with the changes and modifications set forth in this report.

### Continued Disagreement between the University of Washington and CUCAC

1. Transportation planning
2. Delivery of proposed Open Space
3. Excessive height and bulk where campus and community meet
4. Livability

## SECTION II: COMMENTS

### 1. Proposed Open Space

The University is making commitments to provide important community benefits, in part to mitigate impacts from growth, as part of its proposed CMP. The University's prior CMPs have also included commitments for mitigation, such as promised new open space, that have not been delivered. In its initial comment letter, CUCAC requested mechanisms be put in place by both the City and University to ensure the vision is realized. It is vital that the CMP and City-University agreement include provisions for accountability and transparency to ensure the University's progress and fulfillment of its commitments in the proposed CMP.

**Recommendation #1:** construction of the West Campus Green shall occur, at the latest, when either: a) the adjacent development sites are completed (W29, W33 and W34), b) 2.5 million square feet of development is completed in the West Campus sector, or c) by December 2028, whichever is earlier.

**Recommendation #2:** The University must report annually the progress made in meeting the conditions of master plan approval, describing actions taken in the year and status of completion of three open space commitments: 1) West Campus Green, 2) South Campus Green, and 3) continuous waterfront trail. This includes but is not limited to major planning and

development milestones completed to date, and milestone target dates for the next two years.

**Recommendation #3:** When planning the West Campus Green, the University and City need to be sensitive to long-standing marine businesses and kayakers using their own kayaks who need parking near the water at Portage Bay Park. At the very least, convenient pickup and drop off facilities should be provided.

**Recommendation #4:** The University and City need to make a commitment to the Native American History that is especially rich around Portage Bay. Signage along the waterfront trail should echo the existing historical Chihuahua trail signs around Lake Union.

## 2. Multinodal Growth

The University's response that the proposed CMP does not consider development outside its MIO boundary is not acceptable. CMP Guiding Principle #2 Learning-Based Academic and Research Partnerships (p 89) identifies multiple entities with which it is now connected such as South Lake Union, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. This picture, however, is missing a major connection with Harborview Medical Center and the research/teaching facility there which has regular shuttle service to move faculty, staff, and students to and from. The University is also growing its presence on the eastside with the new GIX center in Bellevue and the Eastside Executive Center in Kirkland. To say that dispersing some of its future growth outside the MIO boundaries would not meet the mission of the University is patently false. Such development is already occurring, and the University growth adjacent to the MIO boundaries makes the same contribution to the University's cumulative impact on the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones as growth within the MIO.

Clearly, there are limits to growth. Once the proposed 6 million GSF of the proposed CMP are built out, and assuming its growth continues for decades to come, the University has only one more round of CMP proposal development before it will be forced to look for other locations to continue to fulfill its mission. Now is the time to begin a process which looks realistically at where and when some portion of future development will be located outside the University District, preferably taking advantage of the significant light rail and other transit development that will be available over the next 25 years.

Within the MIO boundaries, the University has refused to study (via EIS scoping alternative) any plan which focused its growth in the east campus rather than the west campus. All 5 EIS alternatives assume that most growth will occur on west campus, so advantages and impacts of growth focused elsewhere in the MIO are not explored. The University should be required to explore other internal growth options.

Significant lead time is required to engage all stakeholders, on and off the campuses, to identify potential areas of academic, instruction and research, administrative, clinical and service programs which are priority candidates for future development in a dispersed, multi-nodal approach. A commitment to start that work is necessary now. Including CUCAC in

updates to the One Capital Plan and each biennium UW Planning & Management ensures advanced notice of planned development, well before new projects are initiated.

**Recommendation #5:** The University must begin a planning process to study growing its physical presence and mission critical programs outside the boundaries of its current MIO and Primary and Secondary Impact Zones. Part of such planning must identify the benefits remote communities will gain where such programs are located. Such new locations will benefit from University employees who must live long distances from the Seattle campus due to housing costs.

**Recommendation #6:** Growth within the MIO must be made conditional upon the exploration of other growth options. The University must report annual progress made in meeting these conditions of master plan approval, describing actions taken in the year ended. Further, no work on developing the CMP subsequent to this 2018 plan may begin without the University providing CUCAC and the City with a long-range plan for including multi-nodal development as well as internal growth options for a significant share of all future growth.

**Recommendation #7:** The University must provide reports to CUCAC as it updates the six-year One Capital Plan, and in each biennial cycle of approving its Capital Budget.

### 3. Affordable Childcare

CUCAC originally requested that the University find ways to support all employees by offering assistance for those who commute to jobs on campus, such as affordable childcare. The University's response references information in FEIS, but no information about addressing childcare needs is included in the proposed CMP. CUCAC applauds President Cauce's access initiative, which will lead to the additional childcare slots; however, childcare costs in Seattle continue to rise, perpetuating long-term socioeconomic inequities. According to Child Care Aware of Washington's 2017 publication of costs in King County, median childcare costs are anywhere between 9-23% (or \$585 - \$1,456 monthly) of median income depending on setting and child's age.

**Recommendation #8:** Incorporation of the University's stated goal in the FEIS (vol. 2 p 4-46) as a commitment to provide an increase in on campus childcare capacity by at least 350 slots when 5 million square feet of development is completed, or by July 2026, whichever is earlier.

**Recommendation #9:** A commitment to partner with the City on any new University District Child Care voucher fund or create a new subsidy program that includes off-campus child care costs (via voucher or a similar system) beyond the boundaries of the University District for faculty, staff, and students, similar to peers like the University of Chicago. This program should be approved by the Seattle City Council prior to initiating developments covered under the proposed CMP.

**Recommendation #10:** Annually report the progress made in meeting these conditions of master plan approval, describing actions taken in the year ended and status of increasing childcare slots; and reporting on outcomes, plans and future University actions resulting from City of Seattle Childcare Assessment (FEIS vol.2 p 4-47).

#### 4. Affordable Housing

The University anticipates 20% growth in their campus population, which appears not to include innovation district employees not associated with the University. The University fails to propose substantive new mitigation methods, and instead relies on City and County strategies, including LINK, the University District Rezone, and Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA). The University must take leadership role on housing affordability in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.

The University response to CUCACs original comment references information in FEIS including additional background on their housing choice analysis, but offers no new mitigation strategies within the proposed CMP.

**Recommendation #11:** The University must create a thoughtfully developed plan to address housing affordability prior to initiating development under the proposed CMP, using some combination of the suggested mitigation strategies:

- a) Pay MHA fees on all new development covered by the CMP to be used in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.
- b) Develop additional Bridges@11th-type projects with deeper affordability targeting faculty and staff earning less than 60% of AMI.
- c) Create a need-based housing assistance program for faculty and staff, with eligibility for rented units.
- d) Partner with nonprofit housing developers in transit-accessible locations.
- e) Ensure pay scales keep pace with increased cost of living expenses in the Seattle region.

**Recommendation #12:** City of Seattle must partner with the University and others to address the needs for affordable housing. This includes the City fulfilling its obligations in the City-University Agreement: “The City will report on the progress of housing development in the University District Northwest Urban Center Village (UDNUCV), including the number and types of units built, the number, types and affordability of units lost through demolition, conversion, or change of use and whether such units are replaced with comparable units in the UDNUCV; the jobs/housing ratio in the area; progress in meeting City housing and job targets in the UDNUCV and send that information to the University for inclusion in the report. (Sec II.D.1.i)”

#### 5. Planning Framework – Circulation and Parking

We applaud the University's efforts to date to limit increases in car trips to campus despite increases in campus populations. TDR Appendix D identifies a transit agency stakeholder group but does not identify who leads this group. The University has the most to gain by its

success and lose by its lack thereof. In addition, the University, given its mission, has a moral obligation to lead in this effort.

**Recommendation #13:** Due to the complexities of multiple agencies at the city, county, regional and state levels we believe it is critically important that the University take the leadership role in ensuring that effective transportation coordination be realized.

## **6. Planning Framework – Parking**

We recognize that the 2003 CMP established the precedent for the exclusion of above ground structured parking as developable square footage. However, due to the amount of surface parking that may be replaced due to eventual east campus development and the fact that this parking may be difficult to construct below grade, this may yield a substantial amount of building bulk not currently represented in the plan.

**Recommendation #14:** Below grade parking should be strongly encouraged to realize the admirable goals of the plan. Excluding above grade parking as developable square footage does not do so.

## **7. Innovation District**

The proposed CMP description of the innovation district violates standing principles of the Brookings Institute's study (Katz, Bruce, Jennifer S. Vey and Julie Wagner. One year after: Observations on the rise of innovation districts. Washington D.C. Brookings Institute. 2015) says an innovation district should be based upon quantitative measures of the project's assets and targeted strategies, realizing competitive advantages for particular industries and economic sectors, for the path forward. The proposed CMP, despite its desire to attach itself to the Innovation District model, does none of this, nor does it describe strategies for place making and community building, another essential element of this model.

**Recommendation #15:** The proposed CMP plan should be modified to fill in the specifics of the University's plans, rather than simply provide an explanation of how nice the concept of an Innovation District is. Only with these elements can this plan be judged or endorsed.

## **8. University Community Development Strategy**

Membership in neighborhood organizations is not a strategy for community development. The University's good intentions and participation has always existed, but is not sufficient. This fact is made clear by the neighborhood's current state of disrepair. New strategies will be required to ensure that neighborhood development meets the community's needs in a time of rapid economic and physical growth, growth spurred by the University.

**Recommendation #16:** Approval of the proposed CMP should be contingent upon the University explaining its place-making strategies for the neighborhood of which it is a part, but which exists outside the MIO boundary. This work is also an essential element of the

Innovation District model as described by Brookings where placemaking to make a livable 24-hour neighborhood for all people is an essential element of the Innovation District model.

## **9. Independent Small Businesses**

The University district contains over 300 small retail businesses many of which compete with the UW's Housing and Food Services. These small businesses and the University operation are thereby forced to up their games. Bringing small business competition into the University MIO will ensure the commercial vitality, and the small business competitiveness, expected in an Innovation District. The University's membership in community organizations which "support" small businesses does not address the issue raised here.

Sea-Tac airport has shown the way on this issue. Building upon retail vendor agreements in its terminals, Sea-Tac has created diversity in retail ownership, including minority and women owned businesses. This collection of airport vendors provides a unique and local shopping experiences which would not be otherwise available to the flying public.

**Recommendation #17:** Approval of the proposed CMP should be made contingent upon creation of a plan to integrate small business into the footprint of the University campus physical expansion.

## **10. Planning Framework – Transportation Management Plan**

For the proposed CMP to succeed, it is essential that all city departments and area transit agencies collaborate with one another and the University to fulfill their responsibilities as stated in CUCAC's review of the Draft CMP on December 18, 2016. Collaboration with other agencies must yield concrete mitigation projects to improve transit rider, pedestrian, and bicyclist experiences.

**Recommendation #18:** The development in the proposed CMP should be contingent upon the required transportation and mobility infrastructure, both on and adjacent to campus, being in place or fully funded with a clear timeline for implementation. The University must lead in this effort by committing the necessary resources and leveraging its political influence to ensure that this occurs in a timely fashion.

**Recommendation #19:** CUCAC encourages the University to include an employee transit pass as a Universal employee benefit.

**Recommendation #20:** The University must add a section in its annual reports on the CMP that outlines the ongoing procedure for monitoring the progress of mobility and transportation infrastructure improvements both on and adjacent to campus. The proposed CMP must stipulate that proposed development is contingent upon concurrent implementation of mobility and transportation infrastructure improvements and that failure to maintain this concurrency will cause a delay or termination of proposed campus development.

We applaud the University's efforts to date to limit increases in car trips to campus despite increases in campus populations, however, with current investment into Seattle's transit network, we believe the University can do better.

**Recommendation #21:** The SOV rate should be reduced to 12%. This will demonstrate that the University is striving to eliminate all unnecessary SOV trips to campus in the long-term, and we believe that this is a goal that the University should strive for. We believe that this is achievable over the course of 10 years, since Sound Transit is expected to open the Lynnwood Station in 2024, well before the 2028 expiration of the CMP.

**Recommendation #22:** We believe that the University should reduce the number of SOV trips gradually over the course of 10 years, with a reduction from 20% to 12% reviewed biannually. If the University does not achieve 18% SOV campus trips by 2022, 16% by 2024, 14% by 2026, and 12% by 2028, master use permits and building permits shall not be issued within the MIO until this is achieved.

Performance measures for pedestrians and transit riders remain inadequate, and do not characterize the quality of the pedestrian experience. For instance, most pedestrian screenline volume evaluations result in a Level of Service A for all CMP alternatives. This does not reflect the fact, for example, that the transit rider experience at the University light rail station is inadequate due to a weak connection between Link light rail and King County Metro bus routes. Another example would be the poor quality of the sidewalks on 17th Ave NE. Metrics that include *qualitative* aspects of the transit rider and pedestrian experience must be added to the quantitative metrics in FEIS Appendix D.

**Recommendation #23:** Improve the pedestrian and bicyclist experience within the MIO and Primary and Secondary Impact Zones and have metrics to show progress.

## 11. Height, Bulk, & Scale

CUCAC's original comment asked that the Final CMP/EIS discuss how the proposed heights of the types of buildings the University is likely to construct in the MIO, primarily office buildings rather than the more slender residential towers that would be permitted under the new University District zoning, would compare to the zoning outside of the MIO. In other words, the University is asserting that since there are 240' heights allowed in the areas adjacent to the MIO, the 240' buildings they propose to construct are consistent with that. However, this would only be true to the extent that the University built the slender residential towers that are allowed to achieve those heights. The heights in the University District upzone that apply to commercial/office type buildings similar to those that the University is proposing to develop are much lower.

**Recommendation #24:** CUCAC remains concerned that the new zoned heights in west campus are not consistent with those in the surrounding neighborhood.

CUCAC commends the University for reducing some of the building heights in the south campus along Pacific Ave NE to 200' from the initial proposal of 240'.

**Recommendation #25:** We believe that while this does not guarantee that the concern we raised in our initial comment about the potential for an unrelieved wall of buildings along NE Pacific St., it does go a long way toward addressing this, it is still unclear how view points and pedestrian connectivity will be maintained between S45 & S46, S40 & S41 and S47 & S48. It should also be noted that the heights called out Fig 168 do not match the reduction in height shown on Fig 164.

Unless we are mistaken, we note that our recommendation that the impacts on local businesses of vacating N. Northlake Place be studied was not responded to and/or implemented.

**Recommendation #26:** The impacts on local businesses of vacating N. Northlake Place should be studied.

Notwithstanding the University's assertions to the contrary in the EIS (Volume 1, page 3-6-56), the proposed upzone of W-19/Schmitz Hall is simply incompatible with the current zoning on University Ave, and will remain inconsistent with the possible increase to 85' now being contemplated there. In addition, the proposed FEIS and CMP cite the addition of upper level setbacks as "mitigation" for this out-of-scale building, but the illustration on p.179 and the massing study on p.191 of the proposed CMP both seem to indicate that the building will be, if anything, blockier and bulkier than the unacceptable proposal put forth in the draft EIS and CMP.

**Recommendation #27:** CUCAC strongly recommends that the existing zoning along University Way NE be retained at W-19 and W 20. Conditioning sites down to 90' still leaves open the possibility to build up to 240' in the future. If the University has no need to build beyond 90', the permanent underlying zoning should reflect that. Therefore, Site W-20 should remain at 105', site W-28 should be reduced to 90', and site W-22 should be reduced to 160' per CUCAC's original recommendation.

## **12. Leasing and Acquisition**

The City-University Agreement as amended is insufficient to address the University's impacts in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.

In the past ten years, the University has doubled the number of FTEs working in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones, from 1,900 to over 3,800. Two thirds of those FTE are in University owned facilities. This represents a substantial increase in University facilities over the 3 million GSF allowed under the current CMP. If such growth outside MIO continues under next ten-year plan, the University's growth will well exceed the 6 million GSF requested, with

no mitigation proposed for increased impacts on transportation, parking, utilities and other conditions in Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.

**Recommendation #28:** CUCAC urges the City to address the need for Primary and Secondary Impact Zones mitigation, and condition approval of the proposed CMP to identify and address all impacts in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones resulting from University development, including:

- a) The proposed 6 million GSF of net new development includes any and all University facility growth, whether through new construction, acquisition, or leasing, in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones as well as within the MIO boundaries.
- b) The proposed 6 million GSF includes any new above ground parking structures; a building is the same impact whether used for offices, research, student housing or parking.
- c) CMP Development Standards (p 233) are revised so that “Exceeding GSF in one sector: The net new square footage of growth allowance may exceed the allocation for each campus sector [add: except west campus] by up to 20% on a cumulative basis over the life of this Plan without a Plan amendment.”
- d) The University annually report its progress towards developing and engaging its industry partnerships, and adds an assessment of industry FTEs as part of its proposals for any new development project whether in MIO or in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.

### **13. Development Standards – Light and Glare**

The south campus newer, higher and denser buildings will form a “wall” facing the University’s neighbors to the south and onto the water. While the new waterfront trail is an attempt to soften that wall and is welcomed, there will be many new labs and high terraces as shown on p 181. While “dark sky” language has been added, we are asking the City to require that the University diminish lighting parallel to ground, shining harshly across Portage Bay. New buildings are shown as reflective (p181), and if they contain many windows, all that window area will blast out at night with unacceptably garish lighting 24-hours a day.

**Recommendation #29:** We ask the City to require something akin to privacy glass so that, particularly the Portage Bay neighborhood residences and boaters traversing Portage Bay at night, are not blinded by new south campus buildings.

### **14. Development Standards – Site Design Standards**

CUCAC appreciates the expansion of the public realm allowance along Brooklyn Ave NE.

We do not believe that the new view corridor at the north end of the University Bridge proposed in the proposed CMP is adequate to protect the existing views to the west that would be blocked by the building proposed for Site W-37.

**Recommendation #30:** The reduction in height at this location from 200 to 130 feet is not sufficient to protect the existing panoramic views to the west that would be blocked by the building proposed for Site W-37 and should be further reduced.

### **15. Development Standards – Tower Separation**

CUCAC remains concerned that the proposed tower separation of 75' is not adequate

**Recommendation #31:** CUCAC recommends that SDCl consider increasing this distance in key locations in the east, west and south campus that will help ensure variations in height, adequate building spacing, and modulation along the edges of the campus.

### **16. Stormwater Runoff**

The various stormwater outflows, and combined sewer overflows (CSOs) in Section 3.15, the proposed EIS and CMP do not appear to reduce these increased flows which will occur from planned from new buildings and hard surfaces. The City has promoted a land owners' program called Rainwise wherein residences in certain parts of the city, especially along Portage Bay and near CSOs, can call designers and contractors to install rain gardens to hold and slowly release stormwater to specially designed basins that are attractive and become part of the green landscape.

**Recommendation #32:** The City should require not only that the University expansion NOT increase storm water runoff and sewer capacity, but rather that the University show leadership in design and building of forward looking green practices for storm water and sewer management that exceed code requirements, where appropriate.

**Recommendation #33:** The City should require that the University do better, i.e., instead of using the CSOs, the University should take a leadership role in showing best practices for rain garden design, pervious surfaces and designing for climate change (likely increased storm rainfall), etc. The University prides itself on being green – see [http://green.uw.edu/news/uw-named-green-honor-roll-7th-straight-year?utm\\_source=UW+News+Subscribers](http://green.uw.edu/news/uw-named-green-honor-roll-7th-straight-year?utm_source=UW+News+Subscribers).

## **SECTION III: CONCLUSION**

Much has changed since the last CMP was approved and the stage is set – through rezoning, economic growth and investment, enhanced public transit and the University's growing partnerships – for even greater impacts on the University District and all surrounding communities than have been experienced in recent years.

Some CUCAC recommendations are intended to increase University transparency and accountability through regular reporting to demonstrate its progress on proposed mitigations. Other recommendations are approaches for additional mitigation to address significant impacts from the proposed CMP.

While some of CUCAC's specific recommendations will be challenging to implement, this does not diminish their importance given the severity of the impacts which CUCAC finds to be inadequately addressed in the final CMP and EIS.

We urge the City to ensure these impacts are adequately addressed and mitigated in the Final approved CMP.

Attached:

CUCAC Draft CMP/EIS Comment Letter

FINAL Minutes July 11, 2017

FINAL Minutes July 25, 2017

DRAFT Minutes August 8, 2017

DRAFT Minutes August 22, 2017



**City of Seattle**

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

**Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

Kathy Nyland, Director



**UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON**

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

## MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez  
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

Scott Cooper  
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

Pamela Clark  
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Natasha Rodgers  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Amanda Winters  
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader  
University District Community Council

Ruedi Ritsler  
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

December 16, 2016

Julie Blakeslee  
Environmental and Land Use Planner  
University of Washington  
Box 352205  
Seattle, WA 98195  
via e-mail: jblakesl@uw.edu

Dear Ms. Blakeslee,

The City University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) appreciates the opportunity to review the Draft Campus Master Plan (DCMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). CUCAC is made up of community council representatives and neighbors of the University District who care deeply about the University and surrounding neighborhoods. The following comments are provided, consistent with the City University Agreement, Ordinance 121688.

### GENERAL

The University should recognize that it is first a learning institution for future generations and it sets a model for future generation as to how educational institutions interface with the community and its social fabric. The nexus between the community and institution is an opportunity for the University to show students how the two can productively co-exist.

While this is a University CMP, the City and other agencies have responsibilities as well, particularly regarding transportation and housing, that must be fulfilled.

We endorse the vision of a West Campus and University District that is vibrant, supports mixed uses, and student focused. However, mechanisms must be put in place by both the City and the University to ensure this vision is realized. Without this, the University District risks becoming a high-tech office park that operates only during the day catering only to high income earners.

The University should consider developing a dispersed, multi-nodal growth plan. By locating facilities and/or departments within communities outside of the University District or even the city, it may allow students, faculty and staff to work closer to more affordable housing options and may economically benefit more communities within Seattle and/or other regions within the state. The University must find ways to support all employees by offering assistance for those who commute to jobs on campus, such as affordable childcare and U-pass transit subsidies.

University employees of all income levels must be able to live within a reasonable commute time from their place of work and have access to services and amenities such as childcare, open space, and affordable housing within the walk-shed, as well as commercial and institutional services. The University's vision for an innovation district must be balanced with other essential aspects of integrated urban life if it is to be successful.

This may be the last CMP to be developed within the current planning format. Beyond the 2018 CMP, growth may need to be accommodated in Central Campus by infilling open space, building below grade and replacing existing buildings with taller buildings. Outside the Central Campus, larger towers built closer together may be needed, or the campus may need to expand further into the surrounding neighborhoods. None of these options are appealing and, in several cases, they are unfeasible. To adequately address these issues conceptual planning for growth beyond the 2018 plan must commence soon as it will be a lengthy process with requirements for legislative action and guidance.

## **DRAFT CAMPUS MASTER PLAN**

### **CHAPTER 5 – 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan**

#### Planning Framework – Public Realm

Green streets are a welcome introduction. CUCAC supports pockets of greenery and pedestrian plazas in addition to the proposed nine acres in larger plots across campus.

Open space needs to be added to the north end of the University Bridge. The high apartment buildings north of 40<sup>th</sup> and Roosevelt, and development sites W-38 and W-25 as well as the dorms along Campus Way create a canyon-like effect that could be relieved with additional open spaces.

Consider landscaping the "cloverleaf" exit off the University Bridge northbound, turning east, and using as public open space. Connecting the cloverleaf area to the Peace Park at the north end of the University Bridge (near the Burke Gilman Trail) would make the open space feel more impactful than the actual open space footprint.

#### **Open Space and Landscape Features**

##### West Campus Green and Plaza

- The design for the West Campus Green/Portage Bay Park is appealing because of its shore access for people, non-motorized boat access, and wetlands with walkways. We urge that the West Campus Green be designed to prevent crime and camping (crime prevention through environmental design) and promote safety in all public amenities, such as public restrooms and picnic shelters. Parking should be included in the design to expand the range of users.

##### East Campus Land Bridge

- The planned East Campus Land Bridge links well to both the proposed development area and University Village. When developing East Campus, balance development with preservation of the Union Bay Natural Area.

##### Continuous Waterfront Trail

- We applaud the continuous waterfront trail along East Campus. The University must ensure the public's access to it will be well-signed and obvious. A good model to follow is the Chesahud Lake Union Loop.
- A continuous Waterfront Trail is important open space not only for campus, but for the public that wishes to enjoy the campus and the waterfront. The Waterfront Trail signage should be coordinated with adjacent neighborhoods such as Portage Bay/Roanoke Park and Montlake who are planning a "water trails" kayak journey with WSDOT and the City of Seattle.
- Signage on the Waterfront Trail should reflect the important role of the Native American people and their land along Portage Bay on both the south and north shorelines. Signage and monuments/gardens should be coordinated with the City of Seattle.

## **Additional Landscape Improvements**

### Stevens Way Improvements

- p. 101 – Stevens Way Improvements – the last sentence should read "Stevens Way **will be** considered for potential bike improvements."

## Planning Framework – Circulation and Parking

### **Transit Network**

- p. 108 - There are three instances of the word "should" that need to be replaced with "shall" or "will": Sidewalks shall be designed to meet capacity needs...Bus improvements shall be explored...Improvements along NE 45th St and Montlake Blvd. NE shall also be explored.

### **Vehicular Circulation**

- Montlake Blvd. NE serves approximately 3,000 vehicles per hour north of NE Pacific St. and 4,000 to 4,500 vehicles per hour near the SR 520 interchange. It is essential that the University partner with SDOT, Metro and Sound Transit to ensure the increases in campus population yield increases in pedestrian, bicycle and transit mode-shares rather than increased vehicular traffic.
- The University must develop an EIS alternative for the West Campus Green that does not require the vacation of Boat Street.

### **Parking**

- All above-ground structured-parking should be counted toward the developable square footage.
- Surface and underground parking should be excluded to encourage its incorporation into new structures.
- Detail How the 800+ parking spaces currently located on East Campus will be replaced when new development sites are utilized.

## Planning Framework - Sustainability

- p. 128 – 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point should read “Strengthen the effectiveness and relationship between South Transit, **King County Metro**, and UW.”

## Planning Framework - Innovation

- An innovation district needs to be more clearly defined by the University. Identify its defining characteristics and goals and present examples from other universities or areas to illustrate them.
- Describe an effective strategy for engaging developers in the broader University District community. The UW must exert its influence so that independent academic programs and developers work cooperatively and in a coordinated way to mitigate commercial and residential displacement and ensure that the University District evolves as a vibrant, mixed-use community that serves the University and its neighbors.
- Independent small business inclusion in campus growth should be integral to the campus master plan. Small business is integral to the economic fabric of the University District area and a vital contributor to Seattle’s unique identity. Small business inclusion in University development is especially important in the West Campus area adjacent to the University District neighborhood business area and should be included to serve the retail, shopping, café, and food service needs of the University community.

## Planning Framework – Utility

### **Primary Campus Utilities – Steam and Chilled Water**

- The University must evaluate the feasibility of expanding and modernizing the existing district energy systems to incorporate renewable resources for heating and cooling.

### **Primary Campus Utilities - Primary Power**

- Electrical power provision needs to be expanded to accommodate the proposed new 6 million sq. ft. Under the proposed plan, the increased shading of buildings would prevent effective use of photovoltaics for generation of electricity. The University should orient all new buildings to not preclude new development from utilizing photovoltaics. Commitment to solar energy, passive as well as photovoltaics, will greatly mitigate the environmental impacts of the University's development.
- The University should follow best practices regarding energy conservation and efficiency in new developments.

### **Primary Campus Utilities - Sanitary Sewer & Storm Drainage**

- During the development of each University expansion and/or building project, the water, sewer and sanitation infrastructures need to be evaluated for age, condition, possible additional lines, connection points, and ability to support proposed population growth, as well as sustainable future improvements. Solid waste review should include data on the number of vehicle runs per week, recycling procedures and education, additional vehicle trips during semester ends, spring/fall move-in, and pest control.

### **Primary Campus Utilities - Storm Drainage**

- The University must take the lead and work towards developing a storm water collection system that protects adjacent bodies of water. It must follow best practices that go beyond current regulations.
- Green roofs do not appear to be explicitly considered for heavy rain mitigation and sewer overflow to Seattle's sewer system, Lake Washington, and Portage Bay. Green roofs should be included in the design standards for the current CMP.

## Planning Framework – Transportation Management Plan

### **Background**

- The 2018 CMP forecasts greatly increased populations on and around the University. While we applaud the University's commitment to minimizing the use of automobiles by capping parking on campus, this is not nearly enough to address the challenges, including micro-housing, that includes little or no parking. The University must engage at an unprecedented level of negotiation, coordination and collaboration with SDOT, Metro and Sound Transit if the plan is to succeed. While the University's transportation goals are admirable they must yield actual strategies, plans and results which can be measured against pre-defined mode shift goals. A strong cooperative effort is required to:
  - Restore or implement new east/west transit routes within the primary and secondary impact zones, including south of the Montlake Cut, as soon as feasible and before the scheduled opening of the University District Light Rail Station in 2021.
  - Prioritize transit/bicycle routes connecting East and West Campus and the University District.
  - Restore or introduce new east-west transit/bicycle routes to residential areas between NE 65<sup>th</sup> St. and NE 45<sup>th</sup> St.
  - Increase north/south use of the University of Washington station by implementing alternatives to a 12-minute walk from bus stop to station. This is a hardship for the elderly, handicapped, other physically challenged commuters and families.
- Performance measures are poorly chosen and only consider distance of new campus facilities to transit as described by a 10-minute walk-shed. Other quality metrics must be added: convenience of access, number of

obstacles such as street crossings, pedestrian safety, adequate lighting, protection from the weather, frequency and reliability of the transit mode, and the capacity and crowding of buses and rail cars. Rather than just showing "Potential Transit Improvement Strategies" in the CMP, a set of specific goals and metrics should be included. Data must be collected to measure use of transportation facilities, such as number of boardings/disembarkments, wait times at crosswalks, wait times for transit, travel time for buses along specific corridors (e.g. NE Pacific St.). This data must be used to determine problem areas and guide future improvements.

- The University should provide alternative mode incentives to encourage populations not already included in the University trip counts, such as, but not limited to: UWMC patients, prospective students, innovation district tenants, etc.

### **Transit**

- Consider improving safety around bus stops by removing foliage and install shelters and benches for the disabled, elderly and others waiting for buses.
- The University of Washington Rail Station should be better integrated with a bus transit center on the east side of Montlake Blvd. NE. A kiss-and-ride drop-off area should be included if feasible.
- Potential Transit Improvement Strategies: #6 – University District Station should be explicitly called out as a focus for future efforts with regards to multimodal access. Include specifics about bike access, bike parking, bicycle path lighting, pedestrian access, safe street crossings, integration with bus system and bike share, etc. (p 145)

### **Parking Management**

- Potential Parking Management Improvement Strategies are overly generalized. The University has considerable historical data and experience, more detail should be provided.

### **Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ)**

- While University support for RPZ permits is welcomed, a more thorough discussion of existing and prospective RPZ program impact areas based on historical data and observation should be included. Additional details concerning the City's RPZ review intentions are also needed. It is understood that the burden for seeking/extending city-approved RPZs falls on unidentified neighborhood sections in the primary and secondary impact zones, and that the University's participation is largely financial. Areas such as Wallingford are currently non-RPZ designated neighborhood areas and are likely to be impacted by University-destined parkers. The proposed East Campus development has potential to generate spillover parking and as a result, an increase in pedestrian traffic safety concerns. The University must be prepared to support RPZs in the areas south of NE 75<sup>th</sup>, west of 35<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and east of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE as it has in other neighborhoods, should this prove to be necessary. The University's financial contribution to RPZs should not be constrained by the primary and secondary impact zones, and should be increased as needed.

### **Bicycle**

- Potential Improvement Strategies: #1 should read "Plan **and build** a comprehensive on-campus bicycle network that provides desirable **and safe** bicycle facilities, **including lighting...**".
- Potential Improvement Strategies: #5 should read "**Increase** the capacity of the Burke-Gilman Trail".

### **Pedestrian**

- Potential Improvement Strategies: #2 - Remove "Work to" from the first sentence.
- Illustrate the current pedestrian connectivity across NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. at the Pend Orielle gateway and commit to improving access to and from campus and University Village at this point.

## **Bicycle & Pedestrian**

- Bicycle safety needs to be addressed where bicyclists and pedestrians share communal paths. Rules of the Road must be posted addressing safety and appropriate behavior by all parties. Allocate separate lanes for cyclists and pedestrians on the Burke Gilman Trail, especially at the University of Washington Light Rail Station and at all pedestrian cross-trails and Blakeley/25<sup>th</sup> Ave NE where two senior citizen homes are located. Safety signage should have top priority since co-use problems already exist.
- East/west travel along the major corridors of NE 45<sup>th</sup> and NE 50<sup>th</sup> Streets is particularly congested. Bicycles and pedestrians are unsafe on these roads. Analysis of innovative pedestrian solutions, including all way pedestrian crosswalks, along NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. at pedestrian choke points is recommended.
- A pedestrian/bicycle bridge across I-5 must be considered in transportation planning and the University must be a financial partner in this plan.
- The CMP and EIS should include more specifics on pedestrian and bicycle safety and improvements, including lighting, in the primary and secondary impact zones.
- The CMP focuses on vehicles coming to campus, but data on bicycles and pedestrians must be gathered and analyzed as well, so that adequate resources for access, safety, and parking are provided for these alternative modes.
- Define LOS for pedestrians and bicycles. How do you measure the quality of transportation for pedestrians and bicycles. Substantial analysis has been provided for vehicles. Equivalent analysis needs to be provided for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

## **CHAPTER 6 – Campus Sectors**

The height allowable in neighborhoods adjacent to the MIO is dependent upon the type of development together with height bonuses for public benefit resulting in a range of possible heights. In order to provide a fair comparison between zoned heights in the MIO and adjacent neighborhoods, the EIS and CMP should show both the upper and lower height limits of the adjacent neighborhoods.

Variation in height, adequate building spacing, and modulation along the edges of campus, where the public generally interacts with the campus, such as 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, NE Pacific St., and Montlake Blvd. NE should be required, and not just a goal, so that amenities beyond the buildings are visible and accessible to the public. The primary concern is the “wall of buildings” along NE Pacific St. is not replicated when this area is redeveloped.

The CMP recognizes there are tradeoffs to preserve the Central Campus character, one being density in West and South Campus. CUCAC supports preserving Central Campus, in conjunction with better development of waterfront edges in South and West Campus.

### West Campus

- W-21 & 22: existing zoning shall be retained.
- A recognizable gateway into campus is needed at the west end of Campus Parkway. Add sidewalks between building sites W-24 & 25 to address pedestrian and bike safety.
- W-24: lower to 160'
- W-25 development site should be carefully planned so that it is a gateway to the campus. Sites that are potential gateways should be designed as such.
- W-28 & Gould Hall: lower to 200' from 240'
- W-30: lower to no more than 90' to respect the historic status of the College Inn along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE and University Way
- To transition to University Ave, the height in zone H should be 105' or no higher than the current maximum height, not 240'

- The University should study the impacts of the loss of parking on existing maritime businesses along Boat St. and Northlake Pl. If a decision is made to vacate Boat St., a condition should include a plan for public access, including parking.

#### South Campus

- Implement varied heights, modulation, and building spacing along NE Pacific St. in South Campus to avoid an unrelieved wall. The height is acceptable in return for pedestrian pass-throughs to the water from Main Campus, creating a “porous” building environment.
- Maximize building spacing to allow for additional light and space between buildings S-42 & 46, S-43 & 47, and S-45 & 49.
- Verify that development site S-58 is not in the Mt. Rainier view corridor.
- p. 198 - South Campus parking should be broken down by development site to be consistent with all other campus sectors.

### **CHAPTER 7 - Development Standards**

#### Historic Preservation Policies and Practices

The plan acknowledges the value of the historic central campus by limiting the number of new structures as well as their height and maintaining green spaces.

#### Leasing and Acquisition

When the University is acquiring property off-campus, it should be required to provide substantial financial contributions to be used to develop public benefits directed to the neighboring communities, in lieu of property taxes, for the benefit of the community. This is intended to mitigate the loss of taxable property.

#### Light and Glare

- The current glare and light shining out over Portage Bay and to Laurelhurst is disruptive to birds and wildlife, as well as garish for neighbors to observe. The proposed additional building heights and waterfront trail activities will add to this effect. It is important that additional lighting, including lighted streets and pathways, be soft and directed down to light paths and pedestrians - not out, towards the water, or residential areas. This type of lighting is generally referred to as 'Dark Sky' lighting and is increasingly mandated by code.
- Building surface materials should be attractive and welcoming, and reduce glare and recede into the greenery, rather than stand out. Studies should be done from the view-point of communities off campus looking at the buildings, e.g. Portage Bay, including views from the water, as part of planning for each new building.

#### MIO

The purpose of the CMP process is to capture the impacts of University growth on the surrounding communities. If calculations exclude part of that growth, the University’s growth and its impacts are not accurately captured. All University owned and leased off-campus space within the primary and secondary impact zones should be included in calculating the University’s development capacity limit as stated in the CMP. Cumulative impacts should be considered even when that development is happening outside the MIO.

#### Review Process - Departures

Departures from design standards as defined in the CMP shall be required to go through the minor plan amendment process.

#### Structure Height Limits

CUCAC recognizes the University’s request for height is predicated upon the University being able to provide open space, as well as other public benefits. This commitment must be detailed in terms of the specific public benefits, including, but not

limited to, the West Campus Green and the Burke Gilman Trail, to be provided simultaneously with and in relation to the execution of new development.

#### Site Design Standards

**Mid-Block Passages** - Careful consideration of bulk, scale, and transparency at street level as well as designs that provide pedestrian thru access are critical to the CMPs success - especially in West Campus. Some of the new student housing along Campus Parkway – particularly Lander and Maple Halls and the reopening of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE - provide an outstanding precedent and should be emulated. It must be embedded in design guidelines and standards

**Protected View Corridors** - A designated view corridor should be added at the north end of the University Bridge looking to the west and the height of development site W-38 should be limited to preserve that designated view corridor.

A view study of Montlake Blvd. NE looking to the south from street level should be completed.

**Public Realm Allowance** - The public realm allowance of 22' along Brooklyn Ave. NE and 24' along NE Pacific St. are not large enough. At a height of 240', the setback should be increased to ensure a positive pedestrian environment.

**Tower Separation** - Tower separation of 75' should be increased to 125' minimum separation on West, East and South Campuses.

### **DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)**

#### **CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES**

The EIS is flawed in that it does not analyze the impacts of locating all or part of the proposed innovation district in a geographic area other than West Campus. The EIS should analyze the impact of the 3 million GSF proposed for West Campus on the primary and secondary impact zones, and the alternative impacts of locating some or all square footage in other areas of campus. While we understand the University's interest in creating an innovation district that is integrated with the city, siting it on West Campus will have a dramatic impact on the University District's already significant housing and transportation challenges. These impacts should be compared to those resulting from locating the innovation district on East Campus and/or other locations. With or without using the West Campus as the primary growth zone, West Campus growth should be evaluated in relation to its cumulative impacts with the expected growth of the University District, including the upzone.

#### **CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS**

The CMP focuses primarily on existing and projected vehicle traffic levels and congestion during peak times in the study area. However, there is substantial off-peak traffic into and through campus affecting surrounding neighborhoods. Traffic congestion can be severe on the major through routes (e.g. Montlake Blvd. NE, NE 45<sup>th</sup> St., and NE Pacific St.) The EIS must include a discussion of congestion on heavily traveled roads with mitigation measures to improve transit reliability in these corridors.

Potential cumulative impacts must be analyzed for all elements of the environment, especially utilities. (Draft EIS Chapter 3)

#### **EDITORIAL**

- The Master Plan lays out well the University's vision of campus to 2028. Illustrations, maps, and tables, etc., are generally plentiful and helpful however many of the viewpoints are presented from high up or do not reflect the experience from ground level. Locations where views would be blocked are not reflected in the illustrations.
- Add names of streets immediately outside MIO borders to aid identification of location on maps with small print.

- The design of the CMP documents is excellent - information is accessible and well-illustrated through use of graphics and maps.
- DCMP p. 227 - University is misspelled
- DCMP p. 240 - Add a graphic for smaller sites on upper level setbacks
- DCMP p. 240 - Upper level setbacks are very confusing and should be clearer. More explanation is needed so it can be understood to a lay person.
- The University's substantial widespread efforts to obtain feedback on the Master Plan and EIS are appreciated and highly commendable.
- The University should have built a scale model of the proposed plan and had it on display.
- DCMP p. 252 - The North of NE 45<sup>th</sup> St. Group, convened by the Office of Regional and Community Affairs, provides a very valuable communications link between immediately adjacent neighborhoods and the University's administration. departments, offices, and services.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the documents. We look forward to working with the University to create an effective and useful tool for both the University and the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,



Matt Fox (Co-chair)



John Gaines (Co-chair)

cc: Sally Clark, University of Washington



**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

Jean 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

TBD  
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 Risler  
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 #166  
July 11, 2017  
Adopted July 25, 2017**

UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**Members and Alternates Present**

Doug Campbell	Barbara Quinn	Timmy Bendis (Voting Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Voting Alt.)
Matthew Fox	Kerry Kahl	Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
Amanda Winters	Jan Arntz	Rick Mohler (Voting Alt.)

**Staff and Others Present**

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
-----------------	-------------	----------------

(See attached attendance sheet)

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

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

**II. Housekeeping**

There was a motion to adopt the May 9 and June 27 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

**III. Public Comment**

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

**IV. Final CMP/EIS Review**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS.

Ms. Theresa Doherty mentioned that there are two volumes of the EIS. Volume I contains the same information that and any additions to the plan is bolded. Volume I also contains all the appendices and analysis referred to the EIS. If anyone is interested in the Transportation Discipline Report, she has the hard copies available. Volume II contains the comments, letters, emails, etc. and the University's response. The University's response is correlated to the number on each of the paragraphs. She added that they looked at all the comments and created key topics at the beginning of Volume II. The information was consolidated in a commonly asked question for each category.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan consolidated all the Committee's comments and the responses from the University in a matrix for reference. She asked Ms. Doherty to stay for a short while to clarify any commentaries from the Committee regarding the EIS.

**V. Final CMP/EIS Working Groups (00:12:12)**

Ms. Sheehan introduced Ms. Kjristine Lund to discuss next steps.

Ms. Lund began that there will be four meetings scheduled to understand, and assess the University's response to the comments and formulate a consensus and submit their report by August 30<sup>th</sup>. The report from this Committee will be addressed to SDCI and any recommendations will be consolidated with the SDCI's recommendation report that will be submitted to the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. King confirmed SDCI will maintain an open record until the time SDCI submits its recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, and the Hearing Examiner augments the public record.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal for tonight is to familiarize oneself with the documents, break into small groups by topic areas organized for the draft, reconvene and talk about what was discussed in the subgroups. At the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, the group will have the opportunity to discuss and prioritize the issues on how to respond to them. Ms. Lund suggested to have all the group's comments be combined and have reached a consensus for the final letter at the August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Lund mentioned that Ms. Sheehan prepared a matrix that shows the Committee's comments and the responses from the University. It also shows if the responses from the University has adequately resolved or satisfied the comments.

A question was asked about the meaning of "is noted" by the University on the document. The word "is noted" meant that the University read and acknowledged the comment. Ms. Clark added that for some of these comments that were listed cannot be resolved by the University until the actual CMP is acted upon. Ms. Doherty added that some of the comments that were noted were referred to a reference chapter in the CMP/EIS.

## **VI. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion**

Ms. Lund opened the discussion by breaking into small groups to review the final CMP/EIS.

The subgroups were divided into the following: transportation; open space and landscaping; development standards, design guidelines, height, bulk, scale; and University property ownership, etc.

Ms. Lund suggested that each group to focus on the important topics that can be incorporated to the final comment letter or requires further clarification.

### ***(Editor's Note: The Committee broke into their subgroups for discussion)***

Ms. Lund asked the subgroups about which comments were resolved and satisfactory based on the response from the University that needs to further discussion.

Group #1 noted that Comment #4 is resolved. Group #2 noted that Comments #7, 8, 10, 12 and #13 were satisfactorily addressed by the University.

There was further discussion among the subgroups about Comments #11 and 12 and Ms. Lund suggested to hold the discussion on these two comments.

Group #2 noted that Comment #13, 35, and 36 were resolved by the University.

A comment was made about Comments #17 through #21 were satisfactory, and added if any of the subgroups would like to add comments to provide additional expertise.

Ms. Lund asked about the potential roadblocks the subgroups would like to address and other challenges that they may encounter when they are reviewing the documents.

Ms. Doherty addressed the issue on housing and she mentioned that the University included a section in the CMP about housing as well as additional information in the Volume One of the EIS.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that there were comments regarding the view corridors, night glare, etc. and these were addressed in the design and development standards.

Ms. Lund commented about any clarification between the University's 10-year commitment versus the plan beyond ten-years particularly in East Campus.

Ms. Doherty noted that the City University Agreement requires a long-term vision plan for the entire campus. She added that in addition to the plan, a 10-year conceptual plan was developed based on the

2003 CMP. She mentioned that the long-term vision for East Campus shows the entire build-out while the 10-year conceptual plan identifies what the University thinks they might develop.

The Transportation subgroup commented about the University's responses about stronger language on transportation plan, and the need for having constant collaboration and participation among other transit agencies are important.

Ms. Doherty commented that there is detailed information about the University's approach to transportation in the EIS. She added about comments regarding initiating a leadership role by the University in these issues, and looking at the role of the stakeholders and collaborating with them is also essential.

A comment was made about preserving the historic buildings and properties around campus and Ms. Clark mentioned that there is a separate round table that discusses historic preservation.

Mr. Fox commented about the issue on Cloverleaf Green and Ms. Clark noted that she will invite a representative from SDOT to discuss the status about Cloverleaf Green.

Ms. Doherty mentioned that she heard numerous comments about transportation plans and she encouraged the Committee to read the EIS sections that talk about transportation.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal of the next meeting is to hear back from the subgroups, gathering information and clarification about the University's response.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that they cannot meet with more than 9 members any decision making through email.

#### **VII. New Business**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

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



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
- Jean 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
- TBD  
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 Risler  
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 #167**  
**July 25, 2017**  
**Adopted August 8, 2017**  
UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Non-Voting Alt.)
John Gaines	Kerry Kahl	Rick Mohler (Non-Voting Alt.)
Matthew Fox	Ashley Emery	Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
Barbara Quinn	Jan Arntz	

### Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King	

(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 July 11 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

### **III. Public Comment (00:05:17)**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments.

Ms. Abigail Doerr, is the advocacy director at Transportation Choices Coalition. They advocate for more reliable transportation option for the state of Washington and the Puget Sound region. She commented that they were pleased with the goal of the MP to attain a 15% SOV by 2028. However, they do not believe that the solutions that were laid out in the MP were significant for the ambitious target, but believed that there are realistic solutions.

She commented that the Master Plan could provide details on how the University will prioritize a sustainable subsidized U-pass programs for all students and staff in order for the SOV goals to be realized. The current U-pass program for students is very successful, however, the opt-in options adoption rate is lower among faculty and staff which is the reason why the faculty and staff SOV rate is much higher. In order to attain this SOV goal, it is critical to have the U-pass be universal for faculty and staff.

She also added that there should be interim goals for the 15% SOV 2028 target. The current plan states that if the University does not meet the target by 2028, it can be denied building permits. It appears that most of the 6 million sq. ft. of development will be built by then, and there is no sufficient

accountability or incentive for the campus to meet the target. She requested the Committee include in their comments that there should be one or more interim goals and an accountability provision in the CMP. She also mentioned that they will be submitting additional comments that relates to race and social justice, integration with bike and pedestrian mobility and connectivity in the U-district.

#### **IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS.

Ms. Kjrjris Lund commented that the format for tonight's meeting is to begin identifying any issues for the final letter to be submitted.

She asked the Committee if there were any follow-up questions that arose from the group work at the last meeting.

Mr. Matthew Fox commented about the W20 and W28 zoning sites and inquired about what "conditioned" down to 90 ft. mean when the underlying zoning is 240 ft., and how binding it will be for future decision makers. Ms. Theresa Doherty commented that condition down means they can only build to whatever the number is; meaning it can only go as high as 90 ft. With regards to how binding it is, she added that as long as the University is operating under this Master Plan it will be binding because it is a standard and not a guideline.

Ms. Lund noted at the last meeting, the groups were reviewing the chart and identifying if there were issues that need to be resolved. She added that the group should not be just looking at the EIS, but at the Master Plan as well. Most of the comments were specific to the EIS, and she wants to make sure that they are also tracking on what is on the MP since it has been modified since the Draft.

MR. Rick Mohler asked about any implications of the recent State Supreme Court. Ms. Sally Clark responded that a State Supreme Court decision about the landmark codes and the UW/City of Seattle Campus. She noted that they are in the process of incorporating language in the EIS and Master Plan that reflects the recent decision.

Mr. Reudi Risler asked how minor sentences and typos in the Master Plan should be dealt. Ms. Jan Arntz noted that there will be an addendum that will identify the errors, and any errors found should be compiled and shared with CUCAC comments.

#### **V. Final CMP/EIS Working Groups (00:12:12)**

*(Editor's Note: The Committee broke into their subgroups for discussion)*

#### **VI. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion**

Ms. Lund opened the floor for group discussion.

She added that the final plan may look different depending on the City Council's conditions. These conditions will be based on the recommendations and comment letters from City staff, including CUCAC. If The Committee can recommend how to mitigate impacts and the City is required to incorporate or respond as part of the plan. She reminded the group that if the original comments and concerns were adequately addressed by the University, that is fine, but if they were not, they can encourage the University to strongly respond to it.

Ms. Lund mentioned about a question from the transportation subgroup about access to the letters that were written by other agencies. Ms. Doherty noted that all the letters and the University's responses to these letters and comments can be found in Volume Two of the EIS.

Group#1 reported that many of the responses were referencing the sections in the EIS. They commented that they should look at the specific words in the EIS and determine how to provide conditions especially on the issue of child care.

Ms. Doherty commented that the EIS is a disclosure guide while the Master Plan is a reference for the Land Use Code and buildings.

Ms. Lund reminded the Committee that Group #1 is dealing with the aspirational and visionary notion of the University and the discussion is focused on the preamble to the original letter.

Group #2 commented that the recurring theme in the comments was asking the University to play a bigger role in the transportation coordination because there are so many different players, it will be beneficial for the University to take the lead. They added that regarding pedestrian realm and access to transit and felt that the University's responses were quantitative and what they were looking for is a strong commitment to pedestrian's urban design.

A comment was made about how he was surprised when reading the transportation appendix on the degree on how the faculty were lagging behind students and staff in SOV travel on to campus. Mr. Reudi Risler commented about having the University provide additional resources and use the available campus land for bus lanes.

Ms. Lund mentioned that the more specificity they could provide on the comments will be helpful for those receiving the comments.

Group #3 focused on light from the new buildings in south campus and do not believe this was adequately addressed by the definitions in the EIS and Master Plan. The group felt that the University has not responded about the glare at night from the new construction. Group #3 added about the storm water issue was not clearly stated and whether the storm water flows on site to a rain garden.

Ms. Lund commented if there is a code requirement that is available for review. Ms. Lindsay King mentioned that there is an analysis of impacts and mitigations in the EIS.

Group #4 mentioned that they spent most of their time reviewing Comments #43 through #56, along with #57 and #61. Mr. Fox noted that the University did not address their concerns about more building height. The group felt adding upper level setbacks to mitigate the effect of a 240-ft. height on the Ave. and the W41 parking lot were not addressed.

Mr. Fox mentioned that there were areas the University did a satisfactory job including the lowered heights on Pacific. The group was satisfied with the mid-block pass throughs, and the east-west pedestrian pass through between Pacific. They brought up a technical error on the map on p.207 that still showed a 240-ft. height. The group felt that there were still concerns in the West Campus area and the language around the University's role in property taxes that were cited elsewhere in the document.

Mr. Fox commented about their concern about design departure standards and felt that there should be language that if there are any significant changes that a process should involve CUCAC's input.

He commented about the view study of Montlake Blvd. looking to the South at street level was not addressed completely. He also added that Comment #61 is a concern because it does not show in the EIS on how it would look at ground level.

Ms. Clark asked about the comment regarding the study of the Montlake Blvd. NE looking to the south if there is a point the group is looking at. Mr. Fox mentioned that he did not phrase the question well so he will go back and do more analysis on the response.

Ms. Lund commented about the pedestrian experience and since there are members of the Committee who are bicyclist if the issue of the bicycle and pedestrian experience has been addressed. Mr. Fox commented that they looked at the pedestrian experience aesthetically but not from a mobility perspective.

Ms. Lund commented about the next steps in drafting the written comments. Ms. Sheehan noted that the subgroups made a list of comments and submitted it to her. She suggested to do a similar approach of submitting and responding to the comments and she will compile them, and have it available for the next meeting. Mr. Fox added that it will be nice to have a rough draft of the document to review in advance.

Ms. Sheehan asked if the group can submit their comments by COB August 7 so she can compile the proposed responses for the next meeting.

## **VII. New Business**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

**VI. Adjournment**

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



**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  
TBD  
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 Risler  
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 #168**  
**August 8, 2017**  
**Adopted TBD**  
UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**Members and Alternates Present**

Timmy Bendis	Matthew Fox	Natasha Rodgers
Doug Campbell	Barbara Quinn	Barbara Kreiger (Non-Voting Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Brian O'Sullivan	Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
John Gaines	Kerry Kahl	Rick Mohler (Non-Voting Alt.)
Amanda Winters	Jan Arntz	

**Staff and Others Present**

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King	

(See attached attendance sheet)

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

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

**II. Housekeeping (00:12:51)**

There was a motion to adopt the July 25 minutes, and it was seconded. The majority of the Committee members present voted with one abstention, the motion passed.

**III. Public Comment (00:01:30)**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for public comments.

Mr. Bill Roach is a representative of Sierra Club and a nearby neighbor. He commented about his concerns for the University's proposed growth plan and its 15% SOV goal and its impacts. He suggested of adjusting the SOV goal to 12% and provided a letter that summarized how the University can achieve this goal.

Mr. David West of the University District Alliance commented that there had questions that came up in the past meetings about whether CUCAC can make recommendations that deals with University employees, U-pass programs, childcare and housing subsidies. He noted that a typical answer they would get is any issues relating to employees is subject for labor negotiations, employment management and cannot be included in the plan.

He noted that is it not accurate and cited one of the State Supreme Court decision about the City's preservation ordinance and the nuclear reactor made clear that the City has complete authority to issue regulations that are based on the State's Growth Management Act (GMA). The City has sections in their comprehensive plan that deals with issues including transit, transit viability,

equity, reducing the SOV rate, as well as child care and working with institutions such as Universities to provide more affordable housing to faculty and staff.

Secondly, he noted that when the City of Seattle adopted its higher minimum wage ordinance, the University complied with that and decided not to deal with a potential legal battle with the City and this was based on another court case that dealt with the City of SeaTac on whether they could regulate a minimum wage and other employment standards within another municipality (Port of Seattle).

#### **IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion (00:14:00)**

Ms. Kjrystine Lund opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS comments.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal for tonight's meeting is to go through and review all 60 comments and have the Committee to agree or disagree with the comments and have further discussion.

##### **Group #2:**

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on Group #2 report on Transportation.

The Committee voted that they would like Comment #9 to be included in the letter.

The group would like to encourage the University to build below grade parking instead of above grade parking garages. If they build a below grade parking, it is not included in the square footage development. The Committee voted with a majority in support of the comment.

Mr. Ruedy Risler noted on Comment #22 that there should be incremental progress to the SOV goal of 15% before any proposed development project. The Committee voted with a majority. Mr. Timmy Bendis and Mr. Doug Campbell commented about reducing the SOV goal below 15% as a possible option. Ms. Sheehan suggested to have further discussion to determine the goal percentage later.

A comment was made about the lack of funding with regards to the commitments the University made on transportation projects on Comment #24. Ms. Lund noted that this was stating a factual observation. The Committee voted to include this to the letter.

Mr. Doug Campbell suggested on adding conditions where the City and the University could agree on making sure these transportation projects are funded before Master Plan approval. Mr. Bendis commented that it will be challenging for his group to put conditions on issues that the University has no control over. He noted that the main theme of their comments is for the University to take a lead role in communicating with other transit agencies about the ongoing transportation issues.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee agrees that there are ongoing issues and suggested members of the Committee identify these significant issues and present them at the next meeting.

Ms. Arntz clarified that the reason she voted down on this comment is not about the conditions, but rather the scope of the statement. Ms. Lund suggested to revisit Comment #25 for further discussion.

Mr. Risler commented that performance measures should be included for transit riders, bike and pedestrian experiences for Comment #27. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Ms. Lund noted that Comment #28 is about a condition that there should be a threshold in place before any future development takes place. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Ms. Jan Arntz commented about asking the University to do tasks that are beyond their control. She worked with the City and Sound Transit to have a bus staging for the station and they lost. She suggested having the City and County, and other agencies look at what the community and neighborhood would like instead of having the University do their task.

Ms. Lund suggested we revisit any transportation coordination issues and formulate an overarching comment that captures these issues. Ms. Sheehan asked a few Committee members to work and further develop the overarching comment.

Mr. Bendis commented about having the University pursue other transportation management programs, and expanding U-pass availability to University faculty and staff for Comment #29. The Committee voted and agree on the statement.

Mr. Bendis noted that Comment #30 was related to what Ms. Arntz was discussing and suggested to revisit along with the overarching comment.

Ms. Lund commented about Comment #34 regarding RPZ permits and subsidies and the Committee decided to revisit that topic.

The group mentioned that Comments #34, #37, #40, #42, #59 are resolved.

Mr. Bendis noted that Comments #38, #39, and #41 will be included in the overarching comment.

#### **Group #4:**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on Group #4 report on Land Use.

Ms. Lund commented that the first part of Comment #43 shows CUCAC is concerned that the new zone heights in West Campus are not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox noted that the University captured what the group was asking for regarding building height modulations along Pacific. Mr. Gaines commented that the University clarify connectivity and viewpoints along Pacific. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Ms. Lund commented that Comment #45 states that CUCAC strongly recommends that the existing zoning along University Way NE should be retained and the University should assess the impacts to local businesses. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox suggested a language change from design to development standard and have gross sq. ft. and lot coverage as minor plan amendments based on the City and University Agreement for Comment #47. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox commented that Comment #52 regarding open space commitment and phasing at the West Campus green is resolved.

Mr. Fox and Mr. Gaines commented that Comment #53 regarding site design standards is resolved.

Mr. Fox mentioned that Comment #54 about the designated view corridor was not adequately addressed by the University. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Mr. Fox commented that the view studies at street level in Comment #55 should be addressed by the University by providing a long-term vision and plan. The Committee voted and did not support the comment.

Mr. Fox noted that he agreed the University addressed the expansion of the public realm allowance, but noted that they should have done more along Pacific. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Mr. Fox commented to revisit Comment #57 regarding tower separation and add definite language.

Mr. Fox commented that the underlying zoning sites and how their comments are tied to Comment #45. Ms. Lund suggested to revisit Comment #45 and add additional clarification and information about the building height reduction. A suggestion was made to add the paragraphs back to the letter that was omitted in Comment #45.

#### **Group #3:**

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will rephrase the language on Comment #5 about convenient pick up and drop off along Portage Bay park for marine businesses, kayakers, etc. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

A comment was made about keeping the trail signage along the waterfront trail. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment regarding light and glare and the University's response to minimize these conditions.

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment about how the University conforms with the campus storm water code and its impact where it is appropriate.

**Group #1:**

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment at Comment #1 as summarized by Mr. Kerry Kahl.

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment regarding the University's approach to affordable childcare.

Mr. Campbell proposed developing affordable housing units within the primary and secondary zones. The Committee voted and agreed with the recommendation.

Ms. Lund summarized the following key mentions that describe multi-modal growth within the campus. These include that the University should begin a planning process, any growth within the MIO should be made conditional and further development should report to CUCAC. The Committee voted and agreed with the recommendation.

**Next Steps:**

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will provide an updated document for the Committee to review next week. She also reminded the members who decided to work on the transportation issues to provide her with a document to review at the next meeting.

Mr. Campbell suggested to the Transportation group if they could include a statement about achieving a level of coordination and agreement among the transit agencies as a condition to approve the Master Plan. Mr. Bendis noted that he will draft a statement and will work with other members of the Transportation group to address this issue.

**VII. New Business**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

**VI. Adjournment**

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

## Statement on UWTMP before CUCAC August 8, 2017

I'm Bill Roach, representing the Sierra Club and a nearby neighbor. I am a retired manager from KCMetro and while there worked with both Mike Williams and Dr. Scott Rutherford representing the University to develop the first UPass program for the UW in 1991.

Although I join the University to be proud of the impact of the existing UPass on this community, I am deeply concerned about the proposed growth plan, its 15% SOV goal and its impacts. I find the proposed Transportation Management Plan wholly inadequate to effectively meet the proposed growth. I think we can do much better....better for the community and better for the University!

A telling but simple indicator can be found buried on page 10-2 of the TDR Appendices: Traffic Analysis of 15 key impacted intersections. Today 2 out of 15 intersections are LOS F or extremely congested with extended delay

In 2028, even with a SOV reduction to 15%, 13 out of 15 key intersections will suffer LOS E or F, a totally unacceptable and unwanted condition!

How can the the University do better?

IF, the University adjusted it's SOV reduction goal down to 12%, it could successfully mitigate all 5630 new SOV trips and maintain present flow.

To meet that 12% SOV goal the UW commits to:

- Join other major Seattle employers and fully subsidize the UPass to faculty and staff. Only 6% of students drive by themselves to campus while 31% of faculty and staff are SOV. Since 2002 staff use of UPass has grown only 2%. In 1991 a quarterly UPass cost \$27. Now it is \$150. (A cost of living increase would make it only \$48!)
- Eliminate the discounted monthly parking pass and charge a daily rate
- Charge a higher parking rate where the demand is higher
- Rightsize the 1984 parking cap to reflect change in demand downward due to successful TMP's since 1991

If there is one thing we learned from the successful beginning of the UPass program is parking pricing, location and availability are powerful determinants of mode choice!

Also, commit to strategies to enhance the people who would like to bike to campus. In a recent UW biking survey, safe access and safe and secure bike parking were top incentives to bike commuting.

- Fund and complete the upgrade of the Burke/Gillman trail within the Campus boundary....not "if funding is available" as stated in the CMP
- Establish Bus/Light rail transfer facility within University campus @ Husky Stadium
- Establish Stevens Way as Bike/HOV/Disabled access only
- Achieve 50% covered and secure bike parking in each campus quadrant

Establish TMP SOV goal benchmarks:

- 2018 18%
- 2020 16%
- 2022 14%
- 2024 12%

If the University doesn't meet benchmarks, additional mitigation will be required including specific funding partnerships for additional facilities and services with City of Seattle, KC Metro

**Table 10.1**  
**SOV SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS AT KEY IMPACTED INTERSECTIONS**

Intersection	Existing (2015)		No Action		Alternative 1 at 20% SOV		Alternative 1 at 15% SOV	
	LOS <sup>1</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>1</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>1</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>1</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>
16. 9th Ave NE (South)/NE 45th St	E	38	E	41	F	67	F	65
29. Montlake Blvd NE/Mary Gates Memorial Dr NE	D	54	D	50	E	56	D	55
30. Roosevelt Way NE / NE 43rd St (East)**	D	28	F	793	F	978	F	950
31. Roosevelt Way NE / NE 43rd St (West)	E	36	F	74	F	113	F	109
32. 11th Ave NE/ NE 43rd St	B	14	E	72	F	110	F	102
47. 12th Ave NE / NE 41st St	E	41	F	52	F	602	F	532
49. University Way NE / NE 41st St	F	*	F	*	F	*	F	>180
51. 7th Ave NE / NE 40th St	E	37	E	44	F	58	F	55
57. 6th Ave NE / NE 40th St	F	60	F	107	F	133	F	102
63. 6th Ave NE / NE Northlake Way	C	25	E	38	F	109	F	67
67. 15th Ave NE / NE Pacific St	D	38	D	37	E	72	E	60
69. 15th Ave NE / NE Boat St	B	15	C	18	F	95	E	76
72. Montlake Blvd NE/ IMA exit	D	34	D	34	E	43	E	41


Source: Transpo Group, 2016

\* Volume exceeds capacity and Synchro could not calculate the delay.

\*\*Evaluated in HCS because Synchro could not calculate the delay.

1. Level of service. 2.Delay in seconds

As shown in Table 10.1, generally there is a decrease in delay between Alternative 1 at 20 percent SOV and 15 percent SOV. Additionally, at 15 percent SOV the impacts at the Montlake Boulevard NE/Mary Gates Memorial Drive NE would be resolved and the intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS D with a 5 second increase in delay over No Action.



Source: UW Transportation Services

We posit that even if the CMP SOV mode split assumption holds true, 20% of 15000 is still 3000 new drivers per day to the already overcrowded streets surrounding the University. Even if the CMP's highly optimistic 20% SOV mode split holds true, the UW still fails in its responsibility to prevent gridlock in the University District.

Also notable is that the University of Washington's employee transit subsidy is below average amongst other large Seattle employers. This was looked at by the faculty/staff UPASS subcommittee in 2015. One survey done by Transportation Services in Fall 2015 yielded the following comparisons:



**City of Seattle**

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

**Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

Kathy Nyland, Director



**UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON**

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

**MEMBERS**

Timmy Bendis  
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

TBD  
Ravenna Springs Community Group

TBD  
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

TBD  
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery  
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz  
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Yvonne Sanchez  
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 Risler  
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 #169

August 22, 2017

Adopted TBD

UW Tower  
4333 Brooklyn Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98105  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### Members and Alternates Present

Timmy Bendis	Matthew Fox	Jan Arntz
Doug Campbell	Barbara Quinn	Jon Berkedal (Non-voting Alt.)
Kay Kelly	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Kreiger (Non-Voting Alt.)
John Gaines	Kerry Kahl	Reudi Risler (Non-voting Alt.)
Amanda Winters	Ashley Emery	Rick Mohler (Non-Voting Alt.)

### Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Kjristine Lund
Theresa Doherty	Lindsay King	

(See attached attendance sheet)

### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

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

### **II. Housekeeping**

There were no meeting minutes to approve at tonight's meeting.

### **III. Public Comment (00:01:41)**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments.

Mr. Bill Roach commented that he spoke two weeks ago before the Committee to consider adjusting the University's SOV to 12% instead of 15%. A copy of the letter summarizing how to achieve this goal was made available to the Committee at the last meeting. He summarized the studies and analysis made by their Transportation Consultant reinforcing and confirming the need for an aggressive 12% SOV goal.

### **IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion (00:14:00)**

Ms. Kjristine Lund opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS comments.

Ms. Lund commented that the goal of tonight's meeting is to vote on the final recommendations. She also wanted to make sure that the correct representatives from the different community groups are seated at the table for the final voting.

Ms. Lund began by reviewing the outstanding items on the matrix that need to be discussed and asked representatives from the working groups to discuss their comments. She mentioned that the Committee have voted on the items on the matrix and agreed that these comments will go into the final letter.

Mr. Reudi Risler commented about the RPZ and he was not clear about the University's position. Mr. Gaines commented that the RPZ's depends on the University's primary and secondary impact zone boundaries. Ms. Lund noted that Mr. Risler's is recommending that they do not have any further comments about the RPZ in the letter. A majority voted not to include the RPZ comment in the letter.

Ms. Lund noted that Comment #55 was voted not to include in the letter. She added that there is further discussion regarding the tower separation.

Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Lund began the discussion on the issue of affordable housing. The majority voted to change the reference to HALA to MHA (Mandatory Housing Affordability) fees for Recommendations #11 and #12.

A comment was made about the conversations they have had with the community around housing and they came up with ideas on how can the University advance the housing affordability in the area and noted that businesses and housing developers already pay MHA fees.

Mr. Doug Campbell recalled voting on this and adding an amendment that MHA fees be allocated to support housing in the primary and secondary impact areas.

Mr. Campbell commented about the innovation district and recommended to add a reference to the Brookings Institute article on what an innovation district would look like. A majority voted to include a reference in the letter.

Ms. Lund noted that the introductory paragraph on Comment #8 will be modified by removing the reference to specific organizations, and the recommendation will stay as written. A majority voted to modify Comment #8.

Mr. Campbell and Mr. Bendis commented on adding a language about integrating small businesses within the University campus to provide opportunities for students and staff. A majority voted to integrate the language.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on leasing and acquisition. A comment was made on recommending a 3 million sq. ft. development cap on the West Campus. (Recommendation #28)

Mr. Gaines asked if University employees are counted in the TMP for the industrial partnership growth in the West Campus. Ms. Theresa Doherty confirmed that they are counted.

Ms. Lund commented that Recommendation #28 contains multiple items and have asked the Committee if it is comfortable to vote the recommendation. The Committee decided to vote and voted in the majority for all items on Recommendation #28.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on transportation. Ms. Sheehan noted that the Committee struggled on how to approach Comment #10 and five Committee members worked over the past two weeks to organize and summarize the specific details of what Comment #10 would like to achieve. Ms. Lund mentioned that there were eight comments embedded in Comment #10 and the opening paragraph is about encouraging the University to work with City Departments.

Mr. Bendis commented that his group encountered challenges because they could not illustrate the comments individually but rather an overarching approach since it covered different topics. He recommended to read Comment #10 as one. Mr. Bendis commented that Comment #18 should have a language that shows that the University has funding available for transportation projects. The Committee voted with a majority.

Ms. Lund commented that there was different focus on outcomes as well as edits on Recommendation #19. She suggested that the Committee vote on as currently written with the only change about the term staff, faculty and employees. The Committee voted and it did not have a majority. Mr. Bendis suggested to have further discussions on Recommendation #19.

Ms. Jan Arntz noted on Recommendation #20 about calls for more reporting. She commented that these will result in money spent hiring a transportation consultant to produce more reports instead of using the money for transportation mitigation and improvements. The Committee voted with a majority to include Recommendation #20 as written.

The Committee voted with a majority to have Recommendation #21 as written.

Mr. Bendis commented that Recommendation #22 is about setting up conditions for Recommendation #21.

Mr. Fox commented that adding time markers on Recommendation #22 is good, but felt less comfortable with the demands as stated.

Mr. Campbell commented that he prefers the idea that Mr. Gaines recommended about adding a condition based on the square footage percentage that is being developed.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the Committee's discussion by stating that further issuing development permits will be delayed until the SOV goals are achieved. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the statement.

Mr. Bendis commented that Recommendation #23 lacks performance metrics for pedestrians, and noted that having adequate metrics to measure pedestrian and rider experience is essential.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the discussion by stating that improving the pedestrian and bicycle experience within the MIO and the primary and secondary impact areas with performance metrics. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the statement.

Mr. Risler commented on adding a sentence to Recommendation #18 that states having collaboration with other transit agencies must yield concrete mitigation projects to improve the transit rider, pedestrian and bicycle experience. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the addition.

Mr. Fox commented and reaffirmed that W-28 be reduced to 90 ft. and W-22 to 160 ft., and that W-19 and W-20 will be retained along the existing zoning for Recommendation #27. The Committee voted with a majority and approved the edited statement.

Mr. Fox noted that any changes to the development standards under the City/University agreement be considered as a minor plan amendment.

Ms. Lund noted that a proposal was made to delete Comment #14 from the letter because the City/University agreement already provided a role. The Committee voted unanimously to delete the comment.

Mr. Fox commented about tower separation and recommended that SDCI consider increasing the distance in the east, west, and south campus to ensure variations in height and spacing. The Committee voted with a majority and agreed with the statement.

Recommendation #19 was voted down and Ms. Clark suggested to have someone introduce an alternative as a substitute. Mr. Campbell proposed a recommendation that states that the University provide a transit pass to all University employees and staff as a standard employee benefit package. Mr. Campbell made a motion to include the that CUCAC encourages the University to include an employee transit pass as a universal employee benefit package. The Committee voted with a majority and agree with the statement.

Ms. Sheehan noted that she added an overview section for the letter that highlights the areas of disagreement and will continue to discuss regarding transportation planning, delivery of the proposed open space, excess height and bulk along where the campus and the community meet, and a livable university district.

She reminded that Committee that she will have a final document by the end of the week.

After the Committee reviews the final document, Ms. Sheehan will submit it to SDCI no later than August 30<sup>th</sup>. SDCI will take the document into consideration for their final recommendation before it goes to the Office of the Hearing Examiner around December. A representative from this Committee is encouraged to attend the hearing to provide a synopsis and answer questions. Ms. Clark noted that the Committee's co-chairs will be asked to attend.

Ms. Lindsay King added that beginning October, SDCI is required to submit their draft to the University and CUCAC before the final recommendation is published.

Ms. Sheehan noted that the process is not over and reminded the Committee members to be active through the implementation of the future Master Plan.

**VII. New Business**

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for new business. Ms. Clark mentioned that the agenda for the next meeting in September will be light, and there will be a Population Health project check-in presentation scheduled for October's meeting.

**VI. Adjournment**

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

DRAFT