

## J. HOUSING

### Affected Environment

#### **Student Housing Supply and Demand**

The University is a primarily non-residential campus with no requirement for students to live on-campus. It does provide some housing as an option for single students and students with families who want to live on campus.

In the Fall Quarter of 1999, the University provided housing for 5,104 single students and 578 families in 16 housing facilities (see Table 18).

**Table 18**

#### **UNIVERSITY-OWNED HOUSING, 1999**

	<b>Unit Type(s)</b>	<b># Units/Beds</b>
<b>Family Housing</b>		
Blakeley Village	2 & 3 Bedroom	84
Laurel Village	2 & 3 Bedroom	80
Sand Point Addition	3 Bedroom	32
Sand Point Homes	1, 2, & 3 Bedroom	200
Stevens Court Addition	1 Bedroom	43
Commodore Duchess Apartments	Studio & 1 Bedroom	139
<b>Total Family Housing Units</b>		<b>578</b>
<b>Single Student Housing</b>		
Haggett	Residence Hall	802
Hanse	Residence Hall	353
Lander	Residence Hall	670
McCarty	Residence Hall	612
McMahon	Residence Hall	1,042
Mercer	Residence Hall	454
Stevens Court	4 & 6 Bedroom	300
Stevens Court Addition	Studio, 2, & 4 Bedroom	224
Terry	Residence Hall	620
2104 House	Residence Hall	27
<b>Total Single Student Beds</b>		<b>5,104</b>
Source: University of Washington Housing and Food Services, 2000.		

Housing and Food Services (HFS) is a self-sustaining department of the University that develops housing, both directly and through public/private partnerships with nonprofit organizations. Revenues from housing and related food sales are the sole source of funds to pay for debt service, capital improvements, and operations. HFS will be able to develop new housing only if financing is available and can be structured to achieve feasibility on a project-by-project basis. Under the partnership agreements, the nonprofit partner secures financing, oversees construction, and is responsible for property management. The University markets the housing and determines resident eligibility.

**University-Owned Housing for Single Students**

Most single student housing is located in the West and Central Campus areas. Single students are housed in residence halls, as well as in two- to six-bedroom low-rise apartments with shared bath and cooking facilities.

Single student apartments have historically operated at near 100% occupancy. Demand for single student housing in residence halls fluctuated dramatically in the 1990's. From 1991 through 1996, residence halls operated at less than 95% capacity, and between 1993 and 1995 HFS temporarily closed a residence hall. Residence halls operated near 100% capacity in 1997 and 1998 (see Table 19), and then in 1999 there was a waiting list of 266 single students when classes started in the fall. (All of those students were offered housing within the first 45 days of classes as space was made available through cancellations and no-shows.) For fall of 2000, HFS provided 5,290 beds for single students and had a waiting list of about 200 students when classes began. Within four weeks of the beginning of Fall Quarter all 200 students on the waiting list were offered housing.

In addition to fluctuating from year to year, demand for single student housing also fluctuates throughout the academic year. In each of the last five academic years, there have been vacancies in the single student housing inventory during the Spring Quarter.

**Table 19**

**SINGLE STUDENT HOUSING, SPRING QUARTER OCCUPANCY**

Year	Total Beds	Spring Occupancy	Vacancies
1996/1997	4,429	3,775	654
1997/1998	4,429	3,909	520
1998/1999	4,429	4,096	333
1999/2000	4,567	4,420	147
2000/2001	5,070	4,655	415

Source: UW Housing and Food Services Department

### **University-Owned Family Housing**

Family housing is provided in apartment complexes located in the west and east campus areas, as well as off-campus in the Sand Point neighborhood. In recent years, HFS has focused on the housing goals of the GPDP to expand the family housing supply and address the conditions of aging properties. Consistent with the GPDP, the Commodore Duchess Apartments, which is located directly west of the main campus on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, was rehabilitated in 1997, preserving 139 family housing units.

The development of an 80-unit, 50,000-square foot addition to Blakeley Village, located just north and west of the Central Campus near University Village, was included in the GPDP. Because financing was never available for this project, it was never constructed. However, the re-development of Sand Point Homes will add about three times the amount of family housing originally planned for the Blakeley Village Addition.

Sand Point Homes and Sand Point Homes Addition (now called Radford Court) are located three miles east of the main campus, near Sand Point Magnuson Park. The 200 units at Sand Point Homes were constructed in 1942. In September of 2000, work began on demolition of the existing units, renovation of 24 of 32 units at Sand Point Addition and construction of 375 new units. The new Radford Court project will open with 188 units, a community center, and childcare center in the fall of 2001. The remaining 211 units and an infant care center will open in the fall of 2002. Completion of Radford Court will increase the family housing inventory by 167 units (125,000 net new square feet).

Between 300 and 400 households were on the waiting list for family housing during 1998 and 1999. Demand is high due to the relative affordability of older, University-owned family housing units compared with market-rate housing in surrounding areas. Table 20 illustrates the difference in rents.

**Table 20**

**1999 RENT COMPARISON (FAMILY HOUSING)**

<b>Units Size</b>	<b>Rent for Older University-Owned Units (Fall 1998 – Spring 1999)</b>	<b>Average Market Rents</b>
1 Bedroom	\$406 - \$526	\$625 - \$730
2 Bedroom	\$538 - \$593	\$750 - \$875
3 Bedroom	\$595 - \$652	\$1,045- \$1,096

Source: University of Washington Housing and Food Services, Dupre + Scott *Apartment Vacancy Report, Spring 1999.*

University rents for family housing are low because they are set to cover debt service payments, operating costs and capital improvements, and are only increased to cover increased costs. While University policy is to provide family housing at below-market rents, relative affordability will likely change as older projects are rehabilitated or redeveloped and rents are raised to cover the costs of the capital investments. For example, one-bedroom rents in the recently renovated (1997) Commodore Duchess Apartments are \$635 to \$690 compared with \$406 in the older units at Sand Point Homes.

### ***Private Market Housing***

The *University of Washington Student Housing Statement of Principles (Principles)* was adopted by the Board of Regents in 1978. It provides policy direction for University decision-making related to the provision of student housing. The *Principles* state that “the primary source for student housing continues to be the off-campus private housing market.” This point of the *Principles* was reaffirmed by the Regents in 1988 and again in 1997.

In 1999 approximately 85% of students lived off-campus.

Table 21 shows the distribution of students based on zip code data from 1998 U-Pass Survey.<sup>15</sup> There is no information on whether those students living off-campus lived with their families, or independently in private housing. However, in the 2000 U-Pass Survey, students were asked if they had changed their place of residence in order to attend the University. Over half (53%) of respondents *did not move* when they began classes at the University.

Clearly, areas north of the Ship Canal provide the most off-campus housing for university students. Fifty percent (50%) of students live in the University District and the neighborhoods directly north to the Seattle City limits. Nearly 70% of students live within the City of Seattle, though only about 13% live south of the Ship Canal. Nearly 90% of students reside within King County.

Based on the U-Pass Survey zip code information, approximately 40% of enrolled students live in the area bounded by 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. NE, NE 60<sup>th</sup>, and Lake Washington (zip code 98105 and the University zip code of 98195). This area includes the University District, as well as parts of the Wallingford, Ravenna, Laurelhurst, and Sand Point neighborhoods. Not counting students living in University-provided housing and those in sororities or fraternities, 5,000 students are estimated to live in private housing in this area.

---

<sup>15</sup> The U-Pass Survey is conducted every two years. It is a random telephone survey of 1,400 students, staff and faculty that includes the zip code of the respondents.

**Table 21**

**1998 DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BASED ON ZIP CODES**

Area and/or Zip Codes	% Students
<b>King County</b>	
East of I-5, North of Ship Canal to 145 <sup>th</sup> (City Limits) (98195, 98105, 98115, 98125) (Includes students living in University housing, sororities, and fraternities)	50%
East of I-5, North of NE 145 <sup>th</sup> to NE 205 <sup>th</sup> (King/Snohomish County Line) (98155)	1%
West of I-5, North of Ship Canal to 100 <sup>th</sup> (98103, 98107, 98117)	6%
West of I-5, North of NE100th to NE 205 <sup>th</sup> (98133, 98177)	3%
<b>Snohomish County</b> (all zip codes)	5%
<b>Subtotal North</b>	<b>65%</b>
South of Ship Canal to Denny Way (including Queen Anne & Magnolia) (98102, 98109, 98112, 98119, 98199)	7%
South of Denny Way to SW 100 <sup>th</sup> and S 100 <sup>th</sup> (approx. south City Limit) (98040, 98106, 98108, 98116, 98118, 98122, 98126, 98136, 98144)	6%
South King County (all zip codes)	8%
<b>Subtotal South</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>Other Areas</b>	
Eastside	7%
Other Counties (e.g. Kitsap, Pierce, Thurston, Skagit)	3%
<b>Subtotal Other Areas</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Total</b> (Some who were surveyed did not know, or wish, to provide a zip code)	<b>96%</b>
Source: University of Washington 1998 U-Pass Survey	

## **Housing for Faculty and Staff**

The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* projects an increase of 5,000 faculty and staff between 2002 and 2012; the projection also assumes an increase of 3,600 staff and 1,400 faculty. Faculty positions include full, associate, and assistant professors, as well as top level administrators, researchers, librarians, lecturers, instructors, senior fellows, and hospital residents. Staff positions fall into one of three categories--professional, classified, and contract. The University does not provide housing for faculty or staff.

The majority of people hired by the University are currently living in the Puget Sound Region. Because these local residents are already housed, they will not create additional housing demand. Typically local residents have filled 80% of new staff positions (about one-third of all professional positions and nearly all classified and contract positions) and 10% of faculty positions. Assuming continuation of this trend, projected growth in faculty and staff will generate about 2,000 new households looking for housing in the Puget Sound market during the 10 years covered by the CMP.

### ***Distribution of Faculty and Staff***

As shown in Table 22, which is based on the 1998 U-Pass Survey zip code data, nearly 60% of both the faculty and staff lives north of the Ship Canal. Nearly 70% of the faculty and 60% of the staff live within the City of Seattle. Compared to the faculty, more staff lives in Snohomish County and in south King County. A higher percentage of the faculty lives on the Eastside.

## **Household and Housing Characteristics of the Surrounding Area**

The area including and surrounding the University (zip codes 98105 and 98195) roughly corresponds to Census Tracts 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 52, 53.01 (See Figure 19, *Section III I.*). While 1990 Census data is dated, it is also the only comprehensive source of certain household and housing information for the area.

The 1990 population of 38,483 was 7.5% of Seattle's population. There were 16,043 households, predominately renters (56%). There were relatively more renters in this area than citywide where 49% of all households lived in rental units. Households were typically small, with just over 70% made up of one or two people.

By federal definition, housing with more than one person per room is considered overcrowded. Citywide 5.6% of rental housing was overcrowded in 1990. In the University area, 6.1% of rental units were overcrowded, likely due to students sharing housing.

**Table 22**

**1998 DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY/STAFF**

<b>Area and/or Zip Codes</b>	<b>% Faculty</b>	<b>% Staff</b>
<b>King County</b>		
East of I-5, North of Ship Canal to 145 <sup>th</sup> (City Limits) (98195, 98105, 98115, 98125)	36%	23%
East of I-5, North of NE 145 <sup>th</sup> to NE 205 <sup>th</sup> (King/Snohomish County Line) (98155)	4%	4%
West of I-5, North of Ship Canal to 100 <sup>th</sup> (98103, 98107, 98117)	11%	10%
West of I-5, North of NE100th to NE 205 <sup>th</sup> (98133, 98177)	4%	7%
Snohomish County (all zip codes)	3%	13%
<b>Subtotal North</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>57%</b>
Ship Canal to Denny Way (including Queen Anne & Magnolia) (98101, 98102, 98104, 98109, 98112, 98119, 98199)	14%	11%
South of Denny Way to SW 100 <sup>th</sup> and S 100 <sup>th</sup> (approx. south City Limit) (98106, 98108, 98116, 98118, 98122, 98126, 98136, 98144)	5%	13%
South King County (all zip codes)	1%	6%
<b>Subtotal South</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Other Areas</b>		
Eastside	18%	12%
Other Counties (e.g. Kitsap, Pierce, Thurston, Skagit)	3%	3%
<b>Subtotal Other Areas</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Total</b> (variation from 100% due to rounding)	<b>99%</b>	<b>102%</b>
Source: University of Washington 1998 U-Pass Survey		

The majority (57%) of the housing stock was built prior to 1950, making it somewhat older relative to housing citywide where 51% of the stock predates 1950. There were 16,635 housing units that represented about 7% of the City's housing stock. Fifty-four percent (54%) of the housing was in multifamily structures compared with 47% citywide. About one quarter of all units was in structures of 10 or more units. Two- and three-bedroom units each made up about one quarter of the housing units.

One measure of growth in the area since 1990 is the number of new housing units. The City's Strategic Planning Office maintains information on housing development by urban village and urban center. A portion of this area is included in the University urban center. In 1990, there were 11,494 housing units in the urban center. Between 1990 and 1999, 595 net new units have been developed. There are two urban villages within the urban center. The Northwest University Urban Village has experienced a net 13% increase in housing units and units have increased by 12 % in the University Village Urban Village.

Another important characteristic of the area is housing cost. In 1990, the median home value in all but one of the subject census tracts, exceeded the citywide median value. The City's Office of Housing reports that in 1999, the average sales price of a single family home in the University area<sup>16</sup> was about \$320,000, up from \$209,000 in 1990, an increase of 53%. Comparatively, the average price of a single family home in the City rose from \$166,000 to \$271,000, an increase of 63%. A household would need at least 120% of the 1999 area median income to afford the University area's average priced single family home.

The Office of Housing also provides information on average rents. The 1999 average rent for all units in the University area was \$699, an increase of 44% over 1990's average rent of \$484. The citywide average rent increased by 60% from 1990 to 1999.

In 1998, the University District neighborhood completed a 20-year plan to guide development in the urban center. The *University Community Urban Center Plan (UCUC Plan)*, includes specific housing goals and policies for the neighborhood, the highlights of which are summarized below.

- Meet City *Comprehensive Plan* goals for development of 2,110 new housing units between 1994 and 2014.
- Create housing for a mix of demographic and income groups, including retirees and middle-income families.
- Maintain the character of predominately single family areas.
- Encourage a stable residential population by increasing homeownership. (The *UCUC Plan* specifically suggests attracting University faculty and staff to purchase homes in the area.)
- Ensure high quality housing design.
- Direct high density housing to mixed-use areas with good transit connections.

The *UCUC Plan* provides the context in which the neighborhood and City will evaluate future growth and development of this area.

---

<sup>16</sup> In this case the University area is a somewhat larger defined by the Dupre + Scott apartment vacancy survey. The area is bounded by NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street, the Ship Canal, Lake Washington, and Roosevelt Way NE.

## Impacts of the Proposed Action

Under the *Proposed Action*, the University would have capacity to add 850 to 1,000 beds for single students. Preliminary planning for a new project that would add between 400 and 500 beds is well underway and feasibility analysis of several additional sites has begun. The University will also continue to evaluate the recommendations of an ad-hoc Housing Task Force exploring ways to assist faculty and staff to purchase or rent homes in close proximity to the campus.

The CMP continues the present policy of relying on the private market for the majority of student housing and all housing for faculty and staff, with an emphasis on managing the traffic and parking impacts generated by both students and employees. The impacts of the proposed action are evaluated primarily as they relate to the area including and surrounding the campus (zip codes 98105 and 98195), but also as they relate to other housing markets, as appropriate.

### **Student Housing**

#### ***University-Owned Single Student Housing***

Single students are housed in residence halls (dormitories) and in single student apartments. Single student apartments have historically had waiting lists, while residence halls suffered from high vacancies in the 1990's.

All University students are allowed to choose where they live. The vast majority of single students *do not choose* to live in University-owned, single student housing. Those who do choose single student housing are primarily incoming freshmen. Historically between 50% and 60% of the freshman class (typically the freshman class has been 4,000 to 5,000 students) apply for residence in single student housing facilities. About another 25% live in fraternities and sororities, and while no specific information is available, the balance are assumed to either live at home or in private market housing off campus.

Besides incoming freshman, the second major component of demand for single student housing are those who were previously housed in one of the University-owned facilities. Between 35% and 45% of residents apply to return. Of students that apply to return, the vast majority, 67%, stay in University-owned housing only one additional year, with 22% staying for two additional years. After that, very few students return to single student housing facilities.

Since the demand for single student housing is made up primarily of incoming freshmen and returning residents, projections of future demand were predicated on estimates of growth in these two groups.

The projected need for 850 to 1,000 new single student beds assumes that:

- the projected increase in enrollment during the planning period is at least 3,000 and no more than 4,000 new students;
- the size of the freshman class is 5,500 students in 2012;
- the recent high levels of applications for single student housing (56% to 58% of incoming freshmen and 38% to 42% of returning residents) continue; and,
- units continue to be developed in the private market consistent with the *UCUC Plan* housing goals.

Production of 850 to 1,000 beds for single students has three positive impacts. *First*, it means that the private housing market would only need to absorb growth in student households that is within the housing and population goals of the *UCUC Plan*. (See discussion of the impact on the private housing market that follows.) *Second*, it would mean an increase of between 17% and 20% in the number of single student beds, and *finally*, even accounting for overall student growth, the University would increase the percentage of students housed.

In 1999, HFS provided housing for 5,104 single students, or 15.1% of total full-time students. In 2000, with 5,290 beds the percentage was 15.5%. Table 23 illustrates the change in housing capacity (expressed as a percentage of total full-time students) that would occur assuming a range of both student growth and new housing development. New development could mean that between 15.7% and 16.6% of full-time students could be housed.

**Table 23**

**CHANGE IN CAPACITY OF UNIVERSITY-OWNED HOUSING**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Full Time Students</b>	<b>New Beds/ Total Beds</b>	<b>% Single Total Students Housed</b>
1999	33,800	5,104	15.1%
2000	34,200	5,290	15.5%
<hr/>			
2012			
3,000 new students	36,800	850/5,950 1,000/6,100	16.2% 16.6%
4,000 new students	37,800	850/5,950 1,000/6,100	15.7% 16.1%

Source: Pacific Development Concepts

Even assuming that all new students were single and wanted to live in University-owned housing, 850 to 1,000 new units would accommodate one quarter to one third of the student growth. This is well above the percentage (15%) of students who have historically chosen single student housing.

Preliminary planning has already been completed for a new single student apartment project at 5000 25<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. The 2.8-acre site is owned by the University and located immediately west of the Blakeley Village Apartments. This site was identified in the GPDP for 50,000 square feet of housing. That housing was not developed because financing could not be identified and the need for family housing was addressed through rehabilitation of the Commodore Duchess Apartments and the construction of Radford Court.

The site is now proposed for development of single student housing in response to projected student growth and demand. As planned, the new Blakeley Village project would be woodframe construction over concrete. It would have 133 units providing between 400 and 500 beds. Parking would be provided in a structured parking garage. Financing options for this project are currently being explored.

Based on a preliminary development schedule, the project would open in fall 2003. A development-specific environmental analysis will be conducted for the project.

HFS is also considering other potential housing sites. Several potential sites have been reviewed that could support development of up to 500 additional single student spaces. Decisions regarding future development will be subject to further analysis, particularly of the ability of the projects to pay debt service over 30 years. Such projects would also require site-specific environmental assessments.

### ***University-Owned Family Housing***

The *Proposed Action* does not include any new family housing. The University's focus under the GPDP, however, has been on the development of family housing. Projects included the rehabilitation of the Commodore Duchess Apartments and the development of Radford Court. Completion of Radford Court will mean a net addition of 167 units. This is more than twice the number of new family housing units contemplated by the GPDP<sup>17</sup> and represents a 30% increase in the total number of University-owned family housing units.

Both the Commodore Duchess Apartments and Radford Court were developed through a public private partnership of the University, a nonprofit organization, and a private developer. The University retains ownership of the land, which is leased long-term to a single purpose nonprofit organization created to develop and operate the housing. The private developer develops the housing under contract to the nonprofit.

Like most other nonprofit housing providers, those developing housing in partnership with the University can charge below market rents because of 1) somewhat reduced development costs (tax-exempt bond financing and no need to purchase land), 2) somewhat lower operating expenses (no property taxes), and 3) the practice of raising rents only to cover increased operating expenses or the costs of necessary capital improvements. However, unlike many other nonprofit-owned housing projects, these are developed without long-term capital or

---

<sup>17</sup> An 80-unit addition to Blakeley Village was proposed in the GPDP.

operating subsidies. Rents in newly constructed or renovated units will be higher than in older units because they must cover the repayment of the debt incurred for the project. Overtime, University rents become more affordable relative to market rents, based on potentially fewer and comparatively lower rent increases.

In 1999, 578 families lived in University family housing and with the opening of Radford Court, there will be 742. The waiting list for family housing has been between 300 and 400 households since 1998. While the waiting list is an indicator of the demand for family housing, one can also assume that those on the waiting list are currently housed and will not represent new households moving into the area.

With the opening of the Radford Court units, residents of existing family units will have the opportunity to relocate to the new units and households on the waiting list will be contacted. There is no way to know how many from the waiting list will be housed either in Radford Court, or in older units vacated by current residents moving to Radford Court. It is also not known how many households on the waiting list will prefer to wait for one of the 207 older, less expensive units in Laurel Village, Blakeley Village, or Stevens Court Addition. If opening the 167 new units at Radford Court allows for an equal number of families from the waiting list to be housed, the number of waiting list households would be reduced by about 42% to 56%. It is more likely however, that the length of the list will remain about the same, or grow, as the affordability of the older units becomes even more attractive relative to market rate housing.

The likely impacts of no additional family housing development between 2002 and 2012 are:

- maintenance of a family housing waiting list of at least several hundred households;
- families seeking housing in the private market (where housing will likely be available, based on housing growth projections, but not necessarily affordable); and,
- families having fewer affordable housing choices near campus.

### ***Private Market Housing***

The private market has, and will, continue to be the source of housing for most students. As noted earlier, the 1998 U-Pass Survey estimated that 40% (36% to 44% considering the survey's accuracy of plus or minus 4%) of enrolled students live in the 98105 and 98195 zip codes. Applying this same percentage to the 1999 student enrollment of 35,000 yields an estimate of 14,000 students living in the area. This zip code includes campus housing, family housing, sororities and fraternities. Not counting students living in those facilities, an estimated 5,000 students lived in private housing in this area.

Students live both alone and in shared housing. Based on 1990 Census data for the area, an average two-person household is a conservative estimate of household size. This means that approximately 2,500 private rental units, or about one quarter of the rental housing in the area, were leased to students.

Assuming 1) the completion of Radford Court, 2) the addition of between 850 and 1,000 beds for single students, and 3) 36% to 44% of all students living in zip codes 98105/98195, 200 to 300 additional rental units could be needed to accommodate the projected student growth. Table 24 illustrates the need for new units depending on the estimated number of students living in the area and the number of new units developed by the University.

**Table 24**

**ESTIMATES OF NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PRIVATE MARKET HOUSING**

<b>%/# New Students Expected to Reside in 98105 and 98195 Zip Codes</b>	<b>Housing Need if University Provides 850 Additional Beds</b>	<b>Housing Need if University Provides 1,000 Additional Beds</b>
36%/1,150	132	75
40%/1,296	223	148
44%/1,442	296	221

Source: Pacific Development Concepts

The 200- to 300-unit estimate assumes the highest numbers of student residents and the lowest numbers of new beds. The Housing Plan prepared as part of the *UCUC Plan* projected an increase of 300 student households between 2000 and 2010, roughly comparable to this high-end estimate.<sup>18</sup> The UCUC Plan also indicates that the private market would respond to provide housing in the University District.

The 20-year (1994-2014) housing development goal for the University urban center is 2,011 net new units. The City's Office of Strategic Planning reports<sup>19</sup> that 411 units were developed between 1994 and 1999. If the housing development goal is met, 1,696 more units would be developed by 2014.

It is likely that 75% of new units will be rental units, assuming the housing mix stays roughly the same as in 1990. Current zoning of sites with potential for redevelopment also suggests primarily multifamily development in the future, although some units might be condominiums for sale to homebuyers. An increase of 200 to 300 student households represents about 16% to 24% of likely rental housing growth, about equal to, or somewhat less than, the current percentage of student households renting in the area.

<sup>18</sup> The University Urban Center does not include all the areas in the 98105 zip code. However, housing in areas that are not included tends to be predominately single family and owner-occupied.

<sup>19</sup> *5 Years After Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, 1994-1999, Preliminary Growth Summary*

It is also possible that future low vacancy rates and high costs for newly constructed units could cause student demand for off-campus housing to shift to other areas.<sup>20</sup> Tables 25 and 26 provide comparative information on vacancy rates and average rents.

**Table 25**

**RENTAL VACANCY RATES**

<b>Neighborhood/Area</b>	<b>5 Year Average Vacancy Rate</b>
North King County	2.5%
Ballard	1.2%
Greenlake/Wallingford	1.2%
North Seattle	2.8%
University	2.6%
Capitol Hill/Eastlake	1.8%
Central Area	3.3%
First Hill	2.8%
Magnolia	2.6%
Queen Anne	1.8%
Eastside	3.2%
South King County (Includes South and West Seattle)	4.5%
Southeast King County	5.5%
Snohomish County	4.1%

Source: Dupre + Scott *Apartment Vacancy Report, Spring 1999*

<sup>20</sup> Vacancy rates are a measure of housing availability. A 5% vacancy rate suggests a balance between supply and demand such that a renter could readily find a vacant unit. Lower vacancy rates mean that housing is harder to find and higher rates are indicative of an overbuilt rental market.

**Table 26**  
**1999 AVERAGE RENTS**

	One Bedroom	Two Bedroom	Three Bedroom
North King County	\$635	\$850	\$1,069
Ballard	\$597	\$790	\$835
Greenlake/Wallingford	\$719	\$1,034	\$1,096
North Seattle	\$625	\$820	\$1,045
University	\$621	\$951	\$1,080
Capitol Hill/Eastlake	\$729	\$1,158	\$1,628
Central Area	\$739	\$1,084	Not Available
First Hill	\$756	\$1,368	\$1,904
Magnolia	\$626	\$910	Not Available
Queen Anne	\$749	1,283\$	\$1,447
Eastside	\$749	\$1,023	\$1,258
South King County (includes South and West Seattle)	\$549	\$741	\$827
Southeast King County	\$556	\$736	\$893
Snohomish County	\$604	\$764	\$925

Source: Dupre + Scott *Apartment Vacancy Report, Spring 1999.*

The University District, like most Seattle neighborhoods, has experienced vacancy rates of much less than 5% over the last five years. Vacancy rates for all north Seattle areas have been roughly comparable. Vacancy rates for Snohomish County and South King County have been closer to 5%.

Housing in areas immediately south of campus (Capitol Hill, First Hill, Eastlake, Queen Anne) is more expensive relative to the University District while housing further north costs about the same, or somewhat less. Probably due to the distance from campus, few students choose to live in areas further south, even though housing is more affordable

Based on current location patterns, vacancy rates, and rents students, who do not find housing in and around the campus are likely to look in areas further to the north and west (Wallingford, Fremont, Greenlake, Roosevelt, Northgate, Lake City). About 15% of current students live in these areas.

### **Housing for Faculty and Staff**

The roughly 2,000 new households that the projected faculty/staff growth will generate are not significant in the context of planned city or regional growth. King County's growth projection is for 185,000 to 212,000 households between 1992 and 2012. Seattle's share of that growth is anticipated to be between 50,000 and 60,000 households. About 30% of Seattle's growth, over 16,000 households, are expected to reside in areas north of downtown where the majority of current faculty/staff live.

Given that faculty and staff growth will not have a significant housing impact, the *Proposed Action* does not contemplate that any housing would be developed for faculty or staff.

However, the University's goal continues to be for employees to live near campus if possible. The University's interests in having available, affordable housing near campus include:

- An ability to recruit faculty and staff, particularly those coming from parts of the Country with relatively more affordable housing and comparable wages
- The management of traffic and parking demand in the University area
- Cooperation with surrounding neighborhoods, particularly the University District, which would like to attract more faculty and staff as homeowners

### **Housing Costs and Salaries**

University salaries have not increased at the same rate as housing costs. University salaries have increased by 27% since 1990, but the average price of a single family home in Seattle has increased by 64% and average rents have increased by 60%. Forecasts are for the local economy to remain relatively strong. And even if it does not, homes are likely to at least retain their current values, but more likely continue to increase at a slower rate. Rents are less predictable, but usually do not drop. Rather property owners tend to offer incentives, such as a free month's rent, to address an increase in vacancies.

Table 27 illustrates the numbers of projected faculty/staff households likely to be local residents (currently housed) or new residents (creating additional housing demand). Tables 28 and 29 show those households by income categories, and the amount of rent or home purchase price supported by their incomes. Average incomes are based on the assumption of a one-income household.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> This is a conservative assumption based on the results of a survey of 500 junior faculty, professional, and classified staff that was conducted by the University Housing Task Force. For all three groups, the household median income was greater than the median University salary, suggesting that many households have two wage earners. However, there is no source of information on the numbers of one- and two-income households among University employees.

**Table 27**

**COMPOSITION OF STAFF/FACULTY GROWTH (LOCAL & NEW RESIDENTS)**

	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Growth Projection	3,600	1,400	5,000
Local Residents	2,860 (contract, classified and 1/3 of professional staff)	140 (10% of faculty)	3,000
New Residents	740	1,260	2,000

Source: Office of Compensation & Professional Staff Programs, Office of Academic Personnel, Pacific Development Concepts

**Table 28**

**INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTED NEW RESIDENTS (FACULTY/STAFF)**

<b>Average Income</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Total</b>
\$35,000 to \$40,000	0	370	370	18%
\$41,000 to \$50,000	740	263	1,003	50%
\$51,000 to \$60,000	0	291	291	14%
\$61,000 to \$75,000	0	336	336	17%
Total	740	1,260	2,000	100%

Source: Office of Compensation & Professional Staff Programs, Office of Academic Personnel, Pacific Development Concepts

**Table 29**

**AFFORDABLE RENT AND HOME SALES PRICES BY INCOME CATEGORY**

Average Income	Affordable Rent*	Affordable Home Sales Price
\$35,000 to \$40,000	\$1,020 - \$1,167	\$107,137 - \$122,422
\$41,000 to \$50,000	\$1,196 - \$1,458	\$125,503 - \$153,053
\$51,000 to \$50,000	\$1,488 - \$1,750	\$185,386 - \$218,100
\$61,000 to \$75,000	\$1,779 - \$2,188	\$221,736 - \$272,625

Notes  
 \* Affordable rent is based on the City standard of paying no more than 35% of monthly income for rent and utilities.  
 \*\* Home sales prices are based on a 30 year, fixed rate mortgage at 7.75% with a 5% downpayment for those earning less than \$50,000 and a 20% downpayment for those earning more than \$50,000.  
 Source: Pacific Development Concepts

All of these households could afford average rents in the area. But, about 88% of the projected faculty/staff growth will be in households making less than \$60,000. If those households are depending only on the income of the University employee, their choices for buying a home close to campus are limited. These households could afford homes selling for about \$185,000 to \$220,000. As illustrated below by Table 30, only 13% of homes in North Seattle sold for less than \$175,000 in 1999. The majority of homes sold for more than \$250,000.

**Table 30**

**DISTRIBUTION OF 1999 HOMES SALES BY AREA**

Home Sales Price Range	<\$175,000	\$175,000 - \$250,000	\$250,000 - \$350,000	\$350,000 +
Seattle North	13%	35%	28%	24%
Seattle South	46%	29%	14%	10%
Eastside	9%	28%	30%	34%
S. King	49%	36%	11%	4%
Snohomish Co.	38%	38%	18%	6%
Total	29%	33%	21%	17%

Source: *Seattle Times*, *Sticker Shock* Series, Pacific Development Concepts

Many of these households would likely be able to afford a condominium, although fewer condominiums exist in the housing supply. In 1999, only 13% of Seattle homeowners lived in a condominium unit. Only 1,701 condominiums were sold in the City in 1999, 182 of which were in North and Northeast Seattle. It is more likely that the largest percentage of the faculty and staff that move to the Puget Sound to take University positions will locate in neighborhoods beyond those that are close-in to the campus.

### ***University Housing Task Force***

In response to employee recruitment and retention issues related to housing cost, location, and accessibility, the University created the ad-hoc Housing Task Force in 1998. The Task Force investigated faculty/staff housing programs of other universities and conducted a survey of 500 junior faculty, professional and classified staff. The survey questions asked for factual information about income, housing cost, and family size, as well as information about the employee's satisfaction with their current housing situation. The survey identified employee concerns about housing affordability and some dissatisfaction with current housing situations.

Findings of the Task Force include:

- Housing cost and location are factors influencing the recruitment and retention of key employees.
- University housing programs in other locales include various forms of assistance from limited assistance with home purchase closing costs, to second mortgage financing, to university-owned housing for faculty and staff.
- Homeownership rates are highest among junior faculty and staff with the longest commutes and the level of dissatisfaction with housing is highest among those living in suburban locations.

The Task Force has considered a variety of ideas for programs that would assist University faculty and staff, primarily with the cost of homeownership in close-in neighborhoods. In autumn 2000, the Task Force recommended that the University administration considered five ideas for housing programs including: interest rate buydowns, mortgage insurance risk sharing, mortgage guarantees, downpayment assistance, and limited housing construction. Based on the recommendations, efforts are currently underway to develop a downpayment assistance program for faculty and staff.

The Task Force has also noted significant obstacles to the University's direct involvement in providing housing for faculty or staff, as has been done at other universities. Per agreement with the City, the University can lease only a limited amount of land, or space, in and around the University (a specific area has been delineated; please refer to the discussion in *Section III G.* of this Final EIS). The agreement would need to be changed before the University could consider certain forms of off-campus housing development. In addition, the State constitutional prohibitions on gifting of public funds and lending of state credit may limit University options in financing housing or providing financial forms of housing assistance.

University employees have taken advantage of City programs aimed at increasing the overall rate of homeownership in Seattle. Since March of 1999, 312 permanent employees of the University obtained discounts of certain fees and closing costs through the Hometown Home Loan Program. Nearly two thirds of all homes purchased were located in Seattle and about one third north of the Ship Canal.

While not required to provide faculty/staff housing in order to mitigate any specific impacts, the University, through the work of the Housing Task Force is investigating ways to assist employees to better afford housing in the region, and live near campus if possible.

## Impacts of the Alternatives

### *No Action Alternative*

The *No Action Alternative* would have the housing impacts that the University is attempting to mitigate with the *Proposed Action*. The principal impacts would be 1) to put pressure on the private housing market in the University District and surrounding neighborhoods to absorb all additional student housing demand, and 2) to ignore the goals of the University neighborhood expressed in the *UCUC Plan* for more homeownership.

### **University-Owned Housing for Single Students**

Under the *No Action Alternative* the demand for single student housing is expected to increase by at least 850 to 1,000 beds. No new housing development would result in students continuing to live at home or seeking housing off-campus. The major impact would be on the private housing market, which is discussed in the "Private Market Housing" section below.

### **University-Owned Family Housing**

The impacts of the *No Action Alternative* are the same as the *Proposed Action* since no increase in family housing is contemplated.

### **Private Market Housing**

The major impacts of the *No Action Alternative* would be on the private housing market. Without the construction of the proposed units/beds, an estimated 1,150 to 1,442 new student households would likely be seeking housing in the 98105 zip code. Based on the assumption of the average two-person household, 575 to 721 new housing units would be needed in the area to accommodate students. While this is still within the 1,696 new housing units planned for development in the UCUC by 2014, it represents 2 to 2.5 times the growth in student households anticipated by the *UCUC Plan*.

This higher level of demand could also drive rental housing costs near campus higher resulting in a larger number of students living further from campus. Depending on the cost of new units, this level of student housing demand could also result in overcrowding of existing older units as more students share housing as a way to reduce housing costs.

## Housing for Faculty and Staff

Under the *Proposed Action*, the University will continue to explore possible activities and programs to assist faculty and staff with housing costs. The goals of this action are to develop and promote choices for faculty and staff to live relatively close to campus.

### *Decentralized/Open Space Alternative*

Impacts of the *Decentralization/Open Space Alternative*, without the lifting of the lease lid, would not differ from those of the *Proposed Action*. The demand for housing, numbers and types of students to be housed would remain the same, as would future actions of the University related to evaluating programs to assist faculty with housing costs.

### *No Street and Alley Vacations Alternative*

The impacts of this alternative do not differ from those of the *Proposed Action*. The amount of housing proposed for construction, the numbers, and types of students to be housed will remain the same under these alternatives, as will any future actions of the University related to evaluating programs to assist faculty with housing costs.

### *Lifting of Lease Limit*

With the lifting of the lease lid, the University would not be limited in their ability to lease building space from private developers or under public/private partnerships in the University District. Demand for housing in the University District could increase if the existing lease lid is lifted. Any University related housing in the University District would be consistent with applicable City of Seattle Zoning standards and could help to implement *UCUC Plan* goals.

## Possible Mitigation Measures

The *Proposed Action* provides capacity for 850 to 1,000 new single student spaces, which would mitigate the identified housing impacts generated by anticipated growth in student population. Growth in faculty and staff would not create impacts sufficient enough to require mitigation.

## Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The only unavoidable impacts are likely to be the construction-related impacts (noise, traffic, dust, etc.) that would occur in the immediate vicinity of housing construction sites. In addition, there is likely to be increased pedestrian and vehicle traffic in the immediate vicinity of new housing projects.