



City of Seattle
Department of Neighborhoods

Bernie Matsuno, Acting Director

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

City of Seattle- University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC)

Members

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
 Daniel Kraus (Co Chair)
 Caroline Colon
 Mark Holden
 Ken Fales
 Betty Swift
 Kit O'Neill
 Brett Frosaker
 Eric Larson
 Dave Eckert
 Pat Cowen
 Chris MacKenzie
 Neal Lessenger
 Adel Sefrioui
 Matthew Stubbs
 Ashley Emery

Alternates

Chris Leman
 Heather Newman
 Neal Wechsler
 Tom Roth
 Larry Sinnott
 Brian Ramey
 Ruedi Risler

Ex-Officio Members

Cliff Louie - DON
 Theresa Doherty - UW

**CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
 COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**DRAFT
 MEETING SUMMARY**

Meeting #78

May 9, 2006

(approved June 13, 2006)

Members Present

Mark Holden, Laurelhurst CC
 Brett Frosaker, Ravenna/Bryant
 Eric Larson, Roosevelt NA
 Matt Fox, University District CC
 Matthew Stubbs, Eastlake CC
 Rudi Risler, University Park CC

Kit O'Neill, Ravenna Springs
 Ken Fales, Montlake CC
 Dan Kraus, UW
 Caroline Colon, University Chamber
 Betty Swift, Portage Bay Roanoke
 Neal Lessenger, UW-at-Large

Staff Present

Cliff Louie, Department of Neighborhoods
 Theresa Doherty, UW Regional Affairs

Others Present

Eric Smith, UW Capital Projects
 Jan Arntz, UW Capital Projects
 Dana Robinson-Slote, UW

Paul Roybal, UW
 Helen Shawcroft, UWMC

I. Welcome, Introductions

Matt Fox, co-chair, convened the meeting at 7:05 PM. Committee members and the audience introduced themselves.

II. Review and Approval of April 11, 2006 Meeting Notes

The April 11, 2006 meeting notes were reviewed. Betty Swift moved to adopt them with noted corrections, and Caroline Colon seconded the motion. With the changes, the meeting notes were approved unanimously.

III. 2005 U-Pass Report

Paul Roybal provided an update of the 2005 U-Pass Report produced by the Transportation Office. Copies of the report were distributed to committee members. He presented highlights of the annual report. He stated that the transportation patterns have not changed greatly from the previous report (2004) because his office surveys staff, faculty and students every other year. No additional information was collected because 2004 was the last survey year. What does change is the number of people who are on campus (in 2005) and that affects the total number of vehicle trips made to campus.

He noted that the number of vehicle trips to campus in 2005 was slightly less than in 2004. Also mentioned is that vehicle trips made by visitors to campus or by patients to its medical facilities are not included in the estimated vehicle trips for 2005. Because there have been less vehicle trips (17% under the campus limit) to campus, there is some flexibility to grow, stated Paul Roybal. But the University doesn't want to encourage more trips; however being under the cap can allow more people on campus. He suggested the reduction in the number of trips maybe attributed to the decline in the number of employees on campus. These employees have moved off campus to the new research facilities at Lake Union.

Another measure for vehicle trips is looking at the utilization of on campus parking. Currently campus parking occupancy is at 72% of capacity that is down from 77% from the year before. Another reason for a decline in vehicle trips maybe the rise in gasoline prices.

The University has seen an increase in the use of Metro transit service and accommodates this shift of transportation mode before fall classes begin. Community Transit has seen a 15% increase in ridership, and Sound Transit has also seen an increase.

The 2005 U-Pass program has seen a slight increase last July. The University manages the demand for parking by keeping the U-Pass for faculty and staff (\$57/quarter) and student U-Pass (\$41/quarter) significantly lower than quarterly parking fees (\$232.86).

Another strategy of the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is to emphasize bike riding and walking to campus. There was a bike challenge to encourage and reward people in January with over 800 participants. This event was to challenge the stereotype of biking to campus during the rainy season. And a walking campaign was initiated four years ago.

Rudi Resler asked about the impact of the expansion of the medical center. Paul Roybal said the University counts only faculty, staff and students, not patient or visitor trips to the University Medical Center. UW does measure parking lot occupancy, and most of the demand is generated from employees in this sector of the campus.

IV Boat Street Marina

Jan Arntz mentioned a positive change for the Boat Street Marina. One will eliminate a structure at the end of the dock. However, two small bathrooms will be built on the upland part of the marina. Now people who will be using the car top boat marina will now have access to the two bathrooms.

She wanted to inform CUCAC that the University will pursue obtaining a master use permit (MUP), even though it will not pursue the construction of the golf driving range. The University will continue the process to secure a permit, since they have invested so much time and money already.

In a similar fashion the University will secure a construction permit for the West Campus Parking Garage, even though the bid was 40% over the construction budget. Neal Lessenger asked how long a MUP good for? Jan

Arntz responded that the permit is good for one year, and if there is active pursuit of funding for the project, then it can be extended for another year.

A request was made to provide show a sketch of these two bathrooms. They are required to have a bathroom for men and women, and be handicapped accessible.

V. UW Medical Center – Proposed Minor Amendment

Theresa Doherty wanted to quickly review the handout from last month's meeting that outlined why the UW considers their UW Medical Center expansion a minor amendment. The University considers the amendment minor because it is consistent with the goals of Campus Master Plan, meets the criteria of a minor plan amendment, does not have significantly greater impacts as outlined in the Master Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and finally the University will not be exceeding the three million square feet of space. The amendment will add one development site that will be called 69S which will add 226,000 square feet of space with a maximum height of 105' in the south/southwest sector of campus. This development would have a general use of academic and transportation. She pointed out that the location of the proposed medical center expansion is on the front page of the May 8 letter. It is contiguous to the existing medical center and near to Columbia Road.

As part of the background information on page 2 of the letter, a table showed the proposed development projects, the site number, and square footage. Each sector is allowed to increase its square footage by 20% of the allocated square footage. Only one site, the office space of 12,000 SF associated with the West Campus Garage, has been proposed. The May 8 letter outlines the proposed minor amendment, provides background information and gives an analysis under the Campus Master Plan and City-University Agreement.

Ken Fales asked about the 50S and 51S sites? Theresa Doherty said those sites will remain. The medical center expansion will add a site (69S) in that sector. And those sites may not be developed because UW can only develop X number of square feet in that sector. UW Medical Center considered those sites.

Helen Shawcroft explained that 50S and 51S sites and others were considered. The proposed site is more desirable because it is contiguous to the existing UW Medical Center and meets its needs by allowing it to expand the diagnostic imaging and the operating room without patients going from one separate building to another.

Matt Fox asked if Columbia Road will be vacated or built over. Jan Arntz said Columbia Road is a campus street, so there is no need to vacate it. Whether it is built over or vacated that issue will be part of the transportation study. Matt Fox raised associated issues of transportation and circulation through campus and whether they are consistent with the goals, policies and other parts of the master plan. Kit O'Neil asked for an explanation of the term, academic and transportation, and how it relates to "hospital beds?" Theresa Doherty explained that perhaps there could be some parking beneath the facility. And academic includes medical facilities under development standards. Parking square foot is not counted against the allowable 3 million square footage of development. Matt Fox said that they "blew it" when the CUCAC discovered only 12,000 SF of the West Campus Garage's approximate 126,000 gross SF counts against the developable square footage in that sector. Jan Arntz clarified that for all major institutions parking square footage is not counted against the developable square footage.

Rudi Resler asked if transportation issues will be examined. Jan Arntz responded that transportation issues will be studied and included in the Environmental Impact Study (EIS). The transportation study will be site specific

review and look at Columbia Road and traffic. Theresa Doherty asked Helen Shawcroft will there be new employees or will they be coming from other medical facilities? Helen Shawcroft responded that there has not been an analysis, but there could be an increase of employees.

Matt Fox stated that the UW PowerPoint handout was not verbatim of what is in the City-University Agreement. He thinks there is a lot of room for interpretation in this agreement, especially when the amendment is not explicitly called a major amendment, and then it is a minor amendment. Matt Fox read verbatim from the agreement regarding minor amendment and criteria for its consideration. He considers what defines a master plan is the number of sites, the amount of buildable space and the amount that can be built. He contended that "dropping" in building sites will set a precedent as a minor amendment, and that the accumulative impacts have not been addressed in the EIS. Matt Fox also stated that he thought the UW was "clever" in terms of only verbal commitments of identifying these development sites with X number of buildable square feet and only building 3 million square feet because it needed flexibility. If the UW had proposed the expansion as a major plan amendment, he would be the first one to sign a letter supporting it. Since the expansion is internal it will not have any impact to the neighborhoods, and there would no view blockage except for the campus itself. The process is really troublesome for him, and this is not a minor amendment when you start adding building sites. He suspects that if the expansion is approved as a minor amendment, the committee will have to return to review additional minor amendments of similar nature. He is not against the UW Medical Center expansion because it does excellent work and is important to the region. He firmly stated that in the campus master plan there is a certain number of building sites and certain number of square footage allowed, and the UW should stick to the fixed number of building sites.

Matthew Stubbs agreed with Mat Fox that is issue is a slippery slope. This minor amendment can make the site based campus master plan useless and community input nullified. And he would be inclined to view the expansion as a major amendment. Kit O'Neil expressed her concern that there is a dense concentration of development in this sector. Additionally, she said how "magically" the numbers add up to zero with the 20% increase. Daniel Kraus asked how many minor amendments have been approved under the new master plan. Since the master plan had been approved in 2003, Theresa Doherty said there have been no minor or major amendments. There have been 8 or 9 minor amendments to the GPD.

Mark Holden asked for further clarification of the process. Theresa Doherty replied that a letter is sent to the Director of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD). There is a 45 day period for CUCAC to comment within the window of 75 days. She said that CUCAC can look at the merits of the UW's request and send its comments to DPD, as to whether the amendment should be considered minor or major. She mentioned that CUCAC should be writing something, whether it is a majority report with a minority report, between this meeting and the next, then review it at the June meeting.

Rudy Risler asked what is a major amendment. Jan Arntz explained that a major amendment could be a two year process. Theresa Doherty said the major amendment process is outline in the City-University Agreement. Certainly that would be a concern for the University, plus the UW does not think it is a major amendment.

Matt Fox asked if the University builds more than 3 million square feet, then would that increase be a major amendment. Yes, it would be a major amendment, responded Theresa Doherty. In kind, if there are more than 60 building sites, wouldn't that be a major amendment, asked Matt Fox. Theresa Doherty said no, because the UW would be not exceeding 3 million square feet. If the University builds 226,000 SF in this site, there would one or two sites of the 60 sites that we would not build on, replied Theresa Doherty. If the 468,000 SF in the South/Southwest Sector is exceeded, Theresa Doherty said at this time it is unclear whether it would be a minor or major amendment. She further added that at the time of the development of the master plan, the University

did not know what the medical center needed. She emphasized that UW will not exceed the 3 million SF of developable space.

Kit O'Neil stated that the master plan will remain in effect until the 3 million GSF are built or within the planning context assumptions change that may warrant the development of a new one. The aging population – the baby boomers – is the major justification for this expansion. This fact is well known. Theresa Doherty said that with the addition of this site it does not change the planning context or assumption.

Mark Holden suggested that with the addition of this new site, then UW should eliminate a site. I can assume that may happen replied Theresa Doherty. The Laurelhurst Community Club (the Board of Trustees) considers it a major amendment. The University could negotiate with CUCAC to eliminate one site in exchange for its approval of the minor amendment.

Daniel Kraus expressed his concern over the concept of the number of sites versus square footage. It is obvious that many sites will not be developed given the fact that all the sites add up to 8 million square feet. Daniel Kraus asked if this site was in the master plan, would people object to this site. Matt Fox said that the concern of one site goes beyond this single issue. Eric Larson asked if another site is added, then what prevents the University from adding another that could impact the neighborhood. What is the value of the master plan for the surrounding communities, if the University can add sites when it suits itself? Theresa Doherty explained that when the medical center brought up this expansion issue, it needs the site to expand. In the end the UW knew the expansion would cause these problems.

Betty Swift asked in a new master plan would the unused sites be retained. Unused sites, answered Theresa Doherty, certainly could be included in a new master plan, or may not be considered. Who knows what the assumptions maybe. Matthew Stubbs asked about the undeveloped sites in the sector once the maximum gross square footage was built. In that sector (South/Southwest) those sites would remain on the map, but could not be developed technically, Theresa Doherty answered.

People asked about the parking garage. Jan Arntz said the West Campus garage is only considered parking, and the office space could be counted against the allowable square footage in that sector.

Matt Fox contended that he has not read in the City-University Agreement where the review process for a major plan amendment takes two years. Jan Arntz said that the University has no way of controlling when the Hearing Examiner or City Council would meet to make a decision. After Theresa Doherty read from the ordinance, the part for a major amendment to an adopted master plan, Matt Fox understood the possible length of time. Theresa Doherty outlined and added the various timelines and when coupled with hearings before the Hearing Examiner and City Council, and the publication of an EIS, the process is well over a year.

Brett Forsaker outlined a choice available to CUCAC of writing a letter to DPD and to contest it and/or to recommend mitigation by way of eliminating a site. We should be on record opposing the request. Matt Fox continued to contest the issue quoting from the master plan that states the theme of the master plan is to preserve and enhance open space on campus by identifying 60 potential development sites. Kit O'Neil motioned that CUCAC recommend that the UW Medical Center expansion be a major not a minor plan amendment and send a letter to the Department of Planning and Development. Brett Forsaker seconded the motion and asked if conditions of mitigation can be added. Neal Lessgener offered to amend the motion that CUCAC (letter) would be satisfied with the request for a minor plan amendment if other sites of equal size would be eliminated from the plan. Brett Forsaker added that this request should not be construed as a precedent for adding future building sites. Kit O'Neil said she would consider the amendment friendly. Kit O'Neil wanted to add another condition to the motion that the square footage not exceed the 20% above the sector allocation. Theresa

Doherty explained that City Council amended the proposed master plan by adding the four sectors. The UW recognizes that with the medical center expansion that it would make it more difficult to develop sites in that sector (South/Southwest). Master plans are difficult internally as well as externally.

Matt Fox asked for a clarification of the motion. He stated what he thought - CUCAC considers the proposed medical center expansion, as presented by UW, a major plan amendment ; but would entertain a proposal as a minor plan amendment, if the University remove some building sites in the master plan. Matt Fox suggested, as a starting point for considering potential sites to eliminate, using the CUCAC letter that recommended certain development sites to be removed from the campus master plan. Neal Lessenger proposed "removal of other sites," not specifying sites until the hearing before the Hearing Examiner. Matt added what Brett Forsaker proposed about not setting a precedent of adding future building sites as minor amendments.

Matt Fox asked the person (Kit O'Neil) who initiated the motion, if she would accept the friendly amendment. The motion made by Kit O'Neil and seconded by Mark Holden and it was restated by Matt Fox as the following: CUCAC will send a letter to DPD indicating that the UW Medical Center expansion proposal is a major plan amendment; a friendly amendment was made by Neal Lessenger proposing that some development sites in the CMP would be removed in exchange for CUCAC to consider the amendment minor and that this proposal not be used as a precedent for adding future sites as minor amendments, and this sector (South/Southwest) not be permitted to grow beyond the maximum square footage, plus the 20%.

Kit O'Neil was troubled that there was not a faculty member representative on CUCAC for review. The Faculty Council has been briefed of the proposed medical center expansion, responded Theresa Doherty, and she elaborated on the role of the University in the review process. Ken Fales asked about the review by CUCAC. Matt Fox explained that a draft will be made for CUCAC's review and comment at the June 13 meeting when changes can be made. Caroline Colon offered her opinion that 20% is a separate question and the UW expansion proposal is a minor amendment.

The motion as been moved and seconded as described by Matt Fox, he called for the question and the vote. The vote was nine (9) in favor of the motion and three (3) opposed. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM