



MEMBERS

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

City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
Meeting # 144
September 8, 2015
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Jean Amick	John Gaines
Brett Frosaker	Eric Larson	Matthew Fox
Brian O'Sullivan	Kerry Kahl	Ashley Emery
Jan Arntz	Chris Leman	Barbara Kreiger (Alt.)
Natasha Rodgers (Alt.)	Ruedi Risler	Jon Berkedal (Alt.)

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Lyndsey Cameron
Alex Pedersen	Cory Croker	

(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

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

II. Housekeeping

Mr. Fox introduced the July and August minutes for review and adoption. After a brief review, the committee adopted the minutes with minor corrections, 9 in favor, 1 abstention (Reudi Risler was not present at the August meeting).

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that she contacted all the presidents of the community councils to verify the members and alternates. This is an annual process and each members and alternates will serve one-year terms. ASUW holds the member seat and GPSS is the alternative. ASUM Director of Government Relations, Kate Graham, will be attending these meetings when classes begin.

Ms. Sheehan noted that the status of the Light Rail Station development letter went out on Friday and currently waiting for a response. She received an email requesting if a member of the Board of Regents could attend a CUCAC meeting in order to discuss the concerns raised about the light rail station and the committee's role in the upcoming Master Plan. Ms. Sheehan noted that she will present a draft invitation letter to Ms. Sally Clark.

A comment was made regarding students from different community organization representatives will be coming back in the next few weeks and anticipate their participation in this committee.

III. South Campus Study – Lyndsey Cameron (00:14:25)

Ms. Lyndsey Cameron provided a presentation on the South Campus Study. She mentioned that this presentation was presented to the committee before and she will provide any new updates on where is the project currently.

The School of Public Health came to the University and wanted to locate a site for a new building. At the first study, the project team asked the School of Public Health their vision space and programming studies and strategy. What came from the study was that the school is too decentralized and spread out and felt there is no heart to the School of Public Health, and they would like to be all in one building (400-500,000 GSF): School of Public Health, Health Sciences, Pharmacy, Social Work, Dentistry, Nursing and other colleges in one location. Perkins + Will looked at the growth projections for these departments and what does that mean to South Campus.

The team looked at some of the different campus locations and determined that the South Campus a viable location. Ms. Cameron mentioned that throughout the early studies and surveys, they determined that people like being on campus and having close proximity to different school buildings in order to collaborate more easily. Space is a major deficiency, which creates problems recruiting faculty and students. The waterfront is a major asset to the University and community, but is underutilized. The plan is to open it up and make it grow and make it some place special.

Each of the schools were interviewed to determine the growth rate. Some of the schools have a small growth rate compared to others, and looking at these growth numbers will determine the approximate space needed. The hospital has an additional scope of work to determine a GSF number, what is the vision for the hospital, what functions can be moved off campus and what is their future, leading up to the Master Plan.

The hospital would like to have the space right now but this study will be looking 10 to 20 years from now. A number of Health Sciences have acquired space, but these were not good space for them, this project includes right sizing their space, which means they may increase/reduce their GSF in order to have space that better fits their needs.

A question was asked about the Master Plan being driven by floor space needs for growth, and how this translates into enrollment. Each of the different schools is unique and it depends on what group it is. The project team met with each of these groups and asked them specific questions to determine their space needs projections, including their projected enrollment.

A question was asked whether this study addresses the need for off campus space required for grant funding. It depends on what type of grant you have, but those needs are addressed in this study. The consensus among the groups is that they would like to stay on South Campus and maintain the adjacencies.

A comment and clarification was made regarding total space needs of an additional 2.1 million sq. ft. for a total of 6 million sq. ft., including moving some functions out of South Campus to renovate and relocate those that need to be in South Campus. The end goal is to increase the capacity on South Campus by 50% as soon as possible, but realistically in a 10-20 years' timeframe.

There is a coverage and height limitation in South Campus, there is not a non-buildable setback; you can build to the water's edge. The Shoreline Management Act, which the University is governed by, permits University uses along the shoreline with height restrictions. However, the planned development has been pushed back from the shoreline to make room for public open space.

Ms. Cameron briefly summarized the guiding principles for the South Campus study: a) improve connectivity to foster collaboration and support diversity; b) create a sense of place and promote a personal well-being; and c) strategically balance existing and future resources. The goals for the project are to: maximize collaboration opportunities, internal connections, inter professional education, adjacencies, connection to adjacent zones, improvements to the public realm, minimize vehicular parking and presence, and ensure feasibility.

Some of the constraints for the study include: phased development overtime, vehicular access and parking, daylight/density, upzoning, Montlake Corridor capacity, timing and extent of funding, and existing infrastructure capacity and condition.

Planning alternatives include: upzoning and proposed building height, and preferred areas to propose this growth are the H3 and H5 areas along Pacific, away from the shoreline.

Three strategies that were explored to achieve the goals and manage the constraints: grid, central green, and open shoreline. A hybrid scenario plan was selected because it was the best alternative in pushing back density and improving connectivity in the area. The strategy was if upzoning is needed to make the area denser, how can it be made better for the public? There are five corridors making a connection from NE Pacific to the waterfront where there are currently none. There was a concern whether these are pedestrian, ADA accessible or only view corridors. Mr. Doug Campbell asked if there were any consideration having Pacific in a trench. It has been looked at and it is too expensive and not feasible.

The team looked at phasing and implementation, focused on making sure that people are not being displaced, addressing parking and open space where buildings could be constructed to then move people around and surge. The team acknowledged that parking proximity to the building is very important for Doctors. Mr. Chris Leman was concerned why Doctors are driving between facilities across the city rather than using shuttles, bike, etc. Parking spots are not given assigned spots.

A question was raised about the number of stories the buildings will be. There are three different upzones, inconsistent with the current Campus Master Plan. 240 ft. would be the tallest and it depends on the type of building because of floor heights. From the fountain you can't see the towers. There was concern that views from across Portage Bay would be significantly impacted with less view of the sky, sunlight, mountains etc. Mr. John Gaines and his community have serious concerns about the upzone in the H5 area to 240 and 160 ft., which will impact views from homes across Portage Bay. Mr. Fox added that the councils should start talking amongst their neighbors to identify these impacts.

In the past, the City of Seattle had discouraged skybridges, but they have not been brought up within this project. Mr. Leman was surprised that more skybridges, especially over the Burke Gilman Trail, were not being pursued.

Mr. Brian O'Sullivan and the community concerns about the growth and development of the South Campus without further looking at the impact of parking at their neighborhood, specifically those not wanting to pay and look for free parking. He suggested that when the study develops growth plans, they should take into consideration the negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The study shows that the growth is modest, if not just right sizing and making more parking will be provided, taking cars off the street. Mr. Frosaker commented that he appreciates having underground parking.

Mr. Leman noted that because of the attractive shoreline park and recreational trail, people will be coming in their cars and want to use it, he suggested the need to further study any potential parking demand and find ways for an appropriate price to provide parking for the public.

Ms. Cameron mentioned that they will make another presentation of the South Campus study as part of the Campus Master Plan.

IV. Final SEIS – Life Sciences Building (01:13:30)

Jan Arntz reported back that two comments received during the comment period. One of the comments was a request to have an archaeologist on site during construction, which was already been proposed and the other comment was the UW Transportation asking for clarification.

Mr. Fox noted that since the committee reviewed this a few months ago, he felt that the committee had nothing more to add or comment on since majority of the members were reasonably satisfied with the document.

V. SDOT Seeks Input on Ship Canal Bridge Openings (01:15:05)

SDOT is soliciting community support to go to the Coast Guard and ask for permission to have scheduled bridge openings rather than on demand openings.

Ms. Jean Amick moved writing a letter to the City recommending strongly that the openings at the Montlake Bridge more regulated and less frequent. The proposal was seconded by Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Larson and Mr. Frosaker each noted that they are not familiar with the maritime laws, ROW of boats, or the history of the bridge, and is uncomfortable endorsing any letter. Furthermore, they would like to

have input from commercial ships before making a comment. A comment was made if there is any way the committee can modify the motion to indicate the concerns whether it is limited to non-commercial vessels.

Josh Kavanagh from Facilities is taking a look at this issue and are making their own vetting process, leaning towards supporting the city. Ms. Clark will share the letter from Mr. Kavanagh regarding the University's position once it becomes available.

Mr. Leman made a motion to hold the decision and continue further discussion at the October meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Frosaker. Motion to hold takes precedence. There were a total of nine members who voted to hold the decision until the next meeting. The motion passed 9-3.

VI. Adjournment

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