

*SECTION IV*

**MAJOR ISSUES**

## **SECTION IV**

### **MAJOR ISSUES**

The following section discusses major issues identified by agencies, community groups and the general public during the comment period for the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* and the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (Draft EIS). Major issues include Phasing/Timing/Priorities/Use for Master Plan Development; Transportation Management Plan including cordon counts and trip limits; Street/Alley/Aerial Vacations; and Implementation of UCUC Plan goals. Many of the responses to comments provided in Section V (*Volume II*) of the Final EIS refer the reader back to appropriate portions of this section for a detailed discussion of the issues raised.

#### **A. Phasing/Timing/Priorities/Use for Master Plan Development**

##### **Background**

The *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* identified 60 potentially developable sites containing a total of approximately 8.3-million sq. ft. of building area, however, the University anticipates the development of approximately 3-million sq.ft. of building area<sup>1</sup> during the life of the plan. Because future funding levels and program needs are fluid and cannot be exactly defined for master planning purposes, the individual sites to be developed to achieve the 3-million sq.ft. of building area have not been determined. Hence, development could occur on any of the development sites, but all of the sites would not be developed.

The environmental analysis contained in the *Draft EIS* analyzed the development of up to 3-million sq.ft. of building area, and assumed the potential for development on any of the 60 identified new sites.

##### **Issue**

Section II.A. of the *1998 City-University Agreement* provides that the Master Plan and EIS will include:

- Proposed development phases, including development priorities, estimated timetable for proposed developments, and proposed interim uses of property awaiting development (Section II.A.1.i.)
- Information on its proposed developments, including proposed development schedule in sufficient detail to permit analysis of impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and City facilities and services. (Section II.A.2.)

---

<sup>1</sup> – In addition to the eight GPDP projects that are currently either in design or under construction and the approximately 300,500 sq.ft. of remaining GPDP development capacity (described in Section IIC. of this Final EIS).

- The general use and location of any proposed development and proposed alternatives. (Section II.A.1.c.3)

In addition, comments received on the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* and *Draft EIS* indicated the desire for more detailed discussion on proposed phasing, timing, priorities and uses for proposed Master Plan Development.

## **Response**

As indicated above, because future funding levels and program needs are fluid, it is therefore difficult to accurately project future development for a 10-year time period. The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* addresses phasing, timing, priorities or uses for campus development by the following provisions.

- The *Annual Report* and its process will be used to identify (1) those projects and their likely locations that are known, for which funding is available or has been or is being requested, either in the most current biennial request to the State Legislature or from private donations, and where planning will begin within the next biennium; (2) other sites for which preferred uses are known. Each *Annual Report* will include the list of projects in planning and for which a request is made in the 6-year capital budget.
- A statement indicating that until funding is obtained for development, building sites will remain in their current use, has been added to the *Master Plan Seattle Campus*.
- An estimated schedule indicating that the University assumes its yearly development under the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* will be phased in at approximately 600,000 gsf per every two years. However, the actual development schedule may vary. Some years may have more construction and other may have less. Unused development capacity rolls over to future years.
- An additional column has been added to the Potential Development Site matrix that now identifies the general uses for each potential development site.

## **B. Street, Alley and Aerial Vacations**

### **Background**

The *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* proposed the vacation of the following streets and alleys:

- Campus Parkway
- A portion of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE
- Site 31W alley
- Site 32W alley
- Site 35W alley
- Site 36W alley
- Portage Bay Vista Pedestrian Bridge
- Montlake Blvd. Pedestrian Bridge

In addition, both the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* and EIS discuss the concept of bridging a portion of Pacific Avenue with a building site and plaza (“Pacific lid”), however, the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* indicated that the aerial vacation request for the Pacific lid would not be part of the University’s initial street vacation petition.

Issuance of the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* and Draft EIS provided an opportunity for the University to engage in a dialogue about the future of the campus and to test new “urban form” ideas. Within that framework, the University proposed two ideas for change on the Campus. One was the consolidation of traffic on Campus Parkway to increase the useable open space and the other was the Pacific lid to knit the Central and South campus area together with a green plaza creating connections and open space in the South Campus. In addition, the Draft CMP included other street and alley vacations, as well as two pedestrian overpasses.

Subsequent to the issuance of the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus*, concerns regarding the Campus Parkway reconfiguration, alley vacations and the NE Pacific Street aerial vacation (Aerial Plaza) were raised in comments received on both the Draft CMP and Draft EIS as well as comments made during meetings with City Council members, City Departmental representatives, Department heads and the City’s Design Commission.

## **Response**

In response to concerns raised by the community and the City of Seattle regarding the proposed street, alley and aerial vacations included in the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus*, the vacations are not proposed in the *Master Plan Seattle Campus*. The vacations are now included in the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* for purposes of disclosure only, in order to identify the range of alternatives that may be pursued during the term of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus*. All of the vacations are potential – none are imminent and none are essential to implementation of the Master Plan. No petitions or applications are pending. This EIS discusses the range of potential impacts associated with possible future vacations; however, subsequent environmental review would be conducted if and when a project-specific proposal is pending. No *Master Plan* amendment would be required unless a street vacation proposal is made, which is outside the range of alternatives that are discussed in the *Master Plan Seattle Campus*.

To provide guidance for the possible future vacations, Chapter VI of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* includes a work plan of additional study that would be implemented for each potential vacation before any vacation petition is filed with the City of Seattle. The elements of additional study included in the work plan include: public participation plan; traffic and circulation; utilities; design and environmental studies; landscaping; and, public benefits.

In addition to the work plan, *Chapter VI* of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* contains considerations to be addressed for each specific potential future vacation. For example, in evaluating the various Campus Parkway reconfiguration alternatives, the following should be given consideration: relationship to the UCUC Plan; circulation and access; light, air, open space and view; design; pedestrian environment; land use; and, public benefits. In evaluating the potential aerial plaza over NE Pacific Street, the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* includes consideration of the following: pedestrian environment; public benefits; light, air, open space and view; UCUC Plan; circulation and access; and, land use. Refer to Chapter VI of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* for detail.

## **C. Transportation Management Plan**

### **Background**

The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) at the University of Washington was first developed in 1983 with the intent to expand commuting options for university students, staff and faculty, shifting them away from single occupancy vehicle trips. The primary goal was to reduce the number of peak hour vehicle trips at the University of Washington and provide a limit on the number of student, staff and faculty trips generated by the University. The existing TMP, including the U-Pass Program, parking management, ridesharing, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, is acknowledged as one of the most successful campus transportation management programs in the country. With the TMP, as the population of students, faculty and staff has risen over the past decade, the number of motor vehicle trips to/from the University has decreased.

### ***Visitor and Patient Trips***

The University of Washington provides many facilities serving the community. These facilities include the University Medical Center, Burke Museum, campus library system, Kane Hall (lectures and programs), and numerous other public use facilities. These community service facilities generate visitor vehicle trips to and from the campus.

In its proposals on trip limitation, the GPDP did not distinguish between trips of students, staff, faculty, patients and visitors. Accordingly, when monitoring activities and conditions for approval were identified, *all* trips were limited.

The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* proposed excluding visitors and patients from the trip limit because: (1) controlling the travel behavior of visitors and patients present access barriers to campus, conflicts with the public service mission of the University, contrary to City interests in encouraging public use of campus; and (2) limitation on trips of customers is not required of other Major Institutions. Further, few tools are available to limit vehicle trips of visitors and patients without discouraging community use of the medical center, libraries, museums and other public facilities on campus. The existing TMP has successfully focused exclusively on limiting the trips of students, staff and faculty.

### ***Cordon Count***

The University District Cordon Count (cordon count) was established as a condition of approval of the GPDP. Once every two years, a team of workers hired by the City interviews a sample of vehicle occupants entering a perimeter around campus to identify whether an occupant is “going to or from the University of Washington or its facilities”. Based on the survey, a percentage of University-related trips is estimated. This percentage is then multiplied by all peak hour vehicle trips and a total of University related trips is estimated. The cordon count procedure does not distinguish between trips of students, staff, faculty, patients and visitors. This is the only cordon count conducted in the City that uses interviews to estimate vehicle trips.

The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* proposed ceasing the cordon count because the University believes it has developed a better methodology for modeling and identifying the number of vehicle trips to and from the campus.

## **Response**

As proposed in the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus*, this *Master Plan Seattle Campus* proposes to limit peak hour trips of faculty, staff and students, but cease limitations on the trips of visitors and patients. Excluding visitor and patient trips from the trip limitations will allow the University to continue to provide community services without limiting access, and focus TMP measures to the campus populations most susceptible to TMP measures. The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* also proposes that the University and the City cease the biennial cordon count, and substitute it with a vehicle trip model that estimates peak hour and peak direction trips of students, staff and faculty. The model, which would more accurately quantify vehicle trips to and from the campus than the existing cordon count, would be based on five data sets derived from the following TMP monitoring measures:

1. An annual campus traffic count to evaluate the number of vehicles entering and leaving campus.
2. A biennial telephone survey of students, staff and faculty. Based on the results, the number of trips generated by students, staff and faculty would be calculated. If these trips increased, additional elements of the TMP would be implemented to prevent trips from exceeding the goals established in 1991.
3. Biennial transient parking survey that identifies and tracks non-permit parking inventory usage.
4. Annual bicycle rack utilization surveys would be conducted. The location and quantity of bike racks would be modified to accommodate demand.
5. Supplemental counts and surveys to better understand segments of the University market that use various TMP elements would be conducted.

The results of this model would continue to be made available to the public in the form of the annual campus traffic count, biennial telephone survey and the U-Pass Annual Report. These reports are also posted on the web.

Because the proposed model would compare estimated peak hour and peak direction vehicle trips of students, staff and faculty to corresponding vehicle trip estimates for 1990, exclusion of visitor trips from the trip estimates would not result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips allowed to/from the campus as established by the *1998 City-University Agreement*.

## **D. Relationship to the University Community Urban Center Plan**

### **Background**

Since early 1995, neighborhoods throughout Seattle have engaged in efforts to plan their communities' growth. These neighborhood planning efforts represent an innovative, grass-roots approach to growth management that supports neighborhood residents, business owners, and other community members in planning their future. The neighborhood in which the University of Washington is located is the University Community Urban Center (UCUC). This urban center includes two urban villages – the University District NW Urban Village and the Ravenna Urban

Village. Students, staff and faculty from the University of Washington were actively engaged with the community and City in drafting the neighborhood plan for the University Community Urban Center. In March of 1997 President McCormick met with members of the community and outlined the University of Washington's support for efforts to revitalize the Ave and surrounding neighborhoods. In May of the same year, the University of Washington Cascadia Institute sponsored an Economic Forum that focused on the jobs and economic vitality of the Ave. In addition, students and faculty from the University of Washington College of Architecture and Urban Planning (CAUP) spent three months, during a studio project, creating a lot-by-lot photographic record of the Southwest Quadrant area with analysis of key open spaces and design issues. During another University of Washington CAUP studio, students took the goals of both the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* and the *University Community Urban Center Plan (UCUC Plan)* and created development proto-types that could meet the overall goals of both planning efforts and analyzed their financial feasibility for implementation within the UCUC planning area. The University has a long history of being involved in the development of the *UCUC Plan* from many avenues. At the present time, members of the University of Washington are involved in an effort being lead by the City called the "Ave Stakeholders Forum", which is a group of citizens, property owners, and local businesses in the area who are committed to working towards implementation of the *UCUC Plan*.

The *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* stated that the goals of the *UCUC Plan* are considered to be integral elements of the *Master Plan*. The "commonalities" between the *UCUC Plan* goals and the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* goals were highlighted in Chapter IX of the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus*. The general relationship of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* with the *UCUC Plan* was described but the *Master Plan Seattle Campus* did not discuss how any of the specific projects related to UCUC Plan goals and objectives. In addition, the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* contained no discussion about any development outside of the UW Major Institutions Ordinance (MIO) boundaries that relates to the UCUC Plan goals.

Public comments received on the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus* and *Draft EIS* indicated that more specificity on the relationship between the *Master Plan* and the goals and objectives of the *UCUC Plan* should be provided.

## **Response**

In response to comments received on the *Draft Master Plan Seattle Campus*, the *UCUC Plan* and the associated Adopting Matrix were thoroughly reviewed and from that review came a revised and expanded UCUC Plan – Master Plan Seattle Campus commonalities chapter of the *Master Plan Seattle Campus*. The chapter looks at both the overall objectives of the *UCUC Plan* as well as the specific action items and identifies with words and pictures, where the University can implement the *UCUC Plan* goals as development occurs on campus.

Some examples are:

### Goal A-2

**Summary:** *Help retail districts meet needs and opportunities consistent with sound environmental and urban planning principals.*

- *Policy A-2.1 – Objective: Link University Avenue to the campus and ensure multi-modal circulation.*

**Discussion:** The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* includes opening up the campus to the community along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE through eliminating portions of the existing wall as new development occurs, designing new buildings with entrances on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and enhancing pedestrian connections to the campus.

### Goal A-3

**Summary:** *Support long-term commercial redevelopment to maintain the UCUC's diverse economic base.*

- *Policy A-3.2 Create a vital mixed-use commercial/residential center with master planned development, integrating open space and pedestrian connections.*

**Discussion:** The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* recommends university mixed-use development on university property in West Campus, new open space integrated with the Burke-Gilman Trail, Campus Parkway, and entrances to campus at 15th Avenue NE, pedestrian connections between the campus and the University District along 15<sup>th</sup>.

- *Policy A-3.3 Encourage redevelopment that supports and derives benefit from public transportation systems, including bus and rail transit.*

**Discussion:** The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* includes bus shelters and pedestrian connections to campus linked to potential Sound Transit station locations.

- *Policy A-3.4 Explore innovative parking measures such as a joint-use policy, off-site parking, and parking structures.*

**Discussion:** The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* recommends parking as part of the development program for many new potential building sites as well as some stand alone parking structures.

### Goal A-4

**Summary:** Maintain and enhance stable residential neighborhoods.

- *Policy A-4.5 Strengthen and enhance the mid-rise residential neighborhood south of NE 43<sup>rd</sup> Street between Roosevelt Avenue NE and Brooklyn Avenue NE*

**Discussion:** The *Master Plan Seattle Campus* includes recommendations for university mixed-use residential development on University property in this area.