



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
Ken Fales
Betty Swift
Kit O'Neill
Brett Frosaker
Eric Larson
Dave Eckert
Pat Cowen
Chris MacKenzie
Neal Lessenger
Adel Sefrioui
Matthew Stubbs
Heather Newman
Ashley Emery

Alternates

Chris Leman
Neal Wechsler
Tom Roth
Larry Sinnott
Brian Ramey
Ruedi Risler
Mark Holden

Ex-Officio Members

Cliff Louie - DON
Theresa Doherty - UW

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY Meeting #80 September 12, 2006 (approved October 17, 2006)

Members Present

Heather Newman, Laurelhurst CC	Kit O'Neill, Ravenna Springs
David Eckert, Roosevelt Neigh'd Assoc.	Chris MacKenzie, Wallingford
Eric Larson, Roosevelt NA	Pat Cowan, University Place CC
Matt Fox, University District CC	Brett Frosaker, Ravenna Bryant
Neal Lessenger, UW-at-Large	
Gail Stygall, UW Faculty Senate (for Ashley Emery)	

Staff Present

Laurie Ames, Department of Neighborhoods, for Cliff Louie
Theresa Doherty, UW Regional Affairs

Others Present

Jan Arntz, UW Capital Projects	Randy Everett, UW Capital Projects
Aaron Hoard, UW	

I. Welcome, Introductions

Matt Fox, co-chair, convened the meeting. Committee members and the audience introduced themselves.

II. Review and Approval of June 13, 2006 Meeting Notes

The June 13, 2006 meeting notes were reviewed. Dave Eckert moved to adopt them as submitted. Theresa Doherty suggested changing "City Advisory Committee" to "Seattle", so there would be no confusion with CUCAC on page 4 first paragraph. Theresa Doherty seconded the motion with the noted change. The motion was passed unanimously to adopt the meeting notes.

Matt Fox switched the third (SR 520) and fourth (Playhouse Project Update) agenda items.

III. Playhouse Project Update

Randy Everett, UW Capital Projects, updated the committee on the progress for the renovation of the Playhouse Theater from the April briefing of the project. He provided a quick summary of renovation. The theater was built in 1931 and located at the intersection of NE 41st Street and University Way NE and occupies a ¼ of the block. The scope of the project is to update the various building systems (electrical, mechanical, HUVAC, etc.) and make it ADA accessible. Through a donor contribution the UW will enhance the auditorium and raising the roof over it, and improve the lobby.

The schematic phase has just been completed and the architects have started the design/development phase. Using a display board Randy Everett indicated that the existing entrance will be moved and it will become the emergency exit. The existing large elm tree will be removed. Four new trees will be added along University Way and a special one along 41st Street replacing the elm. Dave Eckert asked about the utilities and the installation of the new trees along the AVE. A survey has been conducted.

He shared some new information showing a model and the massing of the building viewed from 41st Street and the AVE. New windows will allow greater visibility into the new lobby and have "openness" to the community. Matt Fox asked about an increase in height? Randy Everett explained that the height will remain the same, but the existing one will be a flat one. The gabled end will have a recess to accommodate the cat walk that is above the performing area. Construction is scheduled to begin in July 2007 ending July 2008. The first performance would be winter quarter 2008. The new entrance will have a canopy extending over the sidewalk. New signage for the building and playbill is being examined.

IV. SR 520 – Draft Environmental Impact Statement Discussion

Matt Fox began stating that most people are familiar with the alternatives for replacing SR 520. The UW's request to extend the comment deadline was denied. Theresa Doherty explained that the UW requested an extension of 30 days to October 31, 2006 and added that WSDOT could have extended the deadline less than the requested time. The WSDOT denial was received last week. Kit O'Neil asked if other community groups had filed a request for an extension for 15 days. Theresa Doherty thought the Arboretum, Eastlake Community Council and National Marine Fisheries had requested an extension. She was unsure what community groups submitted an extension request. It was noted that the Northeast District Council requested an extension for comments. Theresa Doherty suggested that CUCAC could send a letter also requesting an extension because the comment period ends October 2. People thought it was strange that a extension was denied, especially from a Federal agency (National Marine Fisheries).

Kit O'Neil motioned that CUCAC send a letter to WSDOT requesting a 15 day extension for the DEIS comment period. Matt Fox noted that if the extended was granted it would allow CUCAC to formulate a position at the next meeting (October 10). The motion was seconded by Neal Lessenger. The motion passed unanimously.

Neal Lessenger suggested CUCAC draft a statement in case the extension is not granted. If the request is granted then the committee can review it again at the next meeting. Matt Fox remarked that people can begin to dissect SR 520 and look at its many impacts, and write a lengthy letter, or craft a simple broad based letter reflecting the general sentiment of the surrounding communities. He opened the floor for discussion on how to approach this issue.

Kit O'Neil said she would like to raise two issues; one being the Pacific inter-change and the second one is how many lanes and what makes sense. She reiterated that there is a four lane option and 2 six lane options. Theresa Doherty explained there are 3 six lane options. There is one option with a 6-lane base; a second one with a 6-lane base with a Pacific Street Inter-change; a third one with a second Montlake Bridge. Although it

seems that one cannot combine elements from the proposals, Kit O'Neil stated what made sense to her was to have a 4 lane option with a 2nd drawbridge across Montlake. Elaborating more, the difference between 6 lanes and 4 lanes is a huge volume increase in SOVs (single occupancy vehicles), and bringing more SOVs into northeast Seattle via I-5 does not make sense. Neal Lessenger agreed with Kit O'Neil. However, being past president of the Arboretum Foundation, he felt conflicted about stating a preference. The Arboretum Foundation is opposed to any alternative that increases traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard, and therefore would be against an the Pacific interchange option. He assumed that they would favor a 4 lane option without a Pacific Street interchange.

Heather Newman asked if lanes can be specified for HOV/transit use only for the 4 lane option? Matt Fox asked for clarification between transit and HOV because each means something different. A discussion ensued about the uses of the four lanes and possible expansion on the pontoons and dedicated transit/HOV uses of the lanes. David Eckert thought with the pontoons that two extra lanes could be added later. Theresa Doherty thought that the 4 lane option had sufficient space for additional lanes. Dave Eckert thought she was referring to the shoulder lanes. His concern is the possible elimination of the west highrise because sailboats over 25' tall would have to sail to the eastside (Medina) to pass beneath the bridge.

Kit O'Neil was concerned that transit options have not been discussed in light of these alternatives, and therefore it is premature to talk about changing SR 520. Heather Newman commented that Councilmember Richard Conlin had attended the Laurelhurst Community Club's meeting last night. She mentioned that he had received a letter from Metro who hoped that there would be a transit center at Pacific Street. The Laurelhurst Community Club is against the Pacific Interchange and prefers the 4 lane option. It was added that the City Council did not favor a second drawbridge and it will state its preference for the SR 520 replacement. Dave Eckert provided a technical explanation for the construction of a new SR 520 and how it is safer than its current construction.

Brett Frosaker thought there would not be a consensus for a single alternative. He suggested rather than debate the pros and cons of each alternative, but to focus on something that the group can influence, namely the opposition to the Pacific Street Interchange, and not necessarily dilute our message with divergent opinions. Eric Larson suggested off the record the group should take a straw vote on the 4 lane alternative to test his hypothesis, adding that the group should address the simple things. In a straw vote a show of hands indicated that eight people representing their respective groups opposed the Pacific Street Interchange (6 lanes) alternative. There was one in favor of the Pacific Street Interchange.

The straw voted indicated that no one supported the 6 lane alternative. Matt Fox asked for a show of hands supporting the 4 lane option and, at this time, how many groups have not taken a position. As members of CUCAC, Matt Fox noted that the Pacific Interchange significantly impacts the University of Washington and we should send a strongly united message. Theresa Doherty listed the UW's major concerns as the impact on the Arboretum, the increase in traffic volume through the University area and surrounding neighborhoods, and the loss of development opportunities (parking lots) around Husky Stadium, and finally the impacts of construction (5 years) – the possibility of closing Pacific Street in front of the hospital - and mitigation for it. Jan Arntz elaborated on these impacts, and the spillover effects on the neighborhoods.

Chris Ward noted the letter written by Greg Hill on behalf of the Wallingford Community Council was sent to Councilmember Jan Drago expressing their concerns about SR 520.

Dave Eckert gave some background regarding a transportation study for the University district sometime ago supporting the Pacific Street Interchange. One of the findings was that vehicular traffic within the study area was ok, but the problem was traffic through the University district coming off SR 520 or traveling to it to get to the

eastside. Dave Eckert did not think there would be any impact of sinking additional pilings for the Pacific interchange. There was some debate about the wetlands being impacted by this alternative.

Chris McKenzie (?) thought the City was planning to use 45th Street for transit and use 50th Street for east-west traffic. With the Pacific Street Interchange traffic would be dumped into 40th Street that doesn't have the capacity. She talked about another spillover effect of the existing eastbound traffic at the 45th Street interchange, where drivers cut through the neighborhood near John Stanford School to get to 40th Street leading to SR 99. A discussion ensued about the increased capacity for vehicular traffic with an expanded SR 520, and the capacity of the City grid of streets remaining the same in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Kit O'Neil from her understanding stated that the 6 lane Pacific interchange option does not allow for light rail. The schematic drawings for this option would not allow for the construction of light rail transit. Theresa Doherty thought Sound Transit is looking at Interstate 90 for light rail, not SR 520. With any alternative the Museum of History and Industry disappears.

Neal Lessenger asked Kit O'Neil if she wanted to make a motion regarding the Pacific Street Interchange. Brett Frosaker motioned that the Pacific Street Interchange option be opposed. Heather Newman seconded the motion. Matt Fox proposed that a simple letter be drafted stating CUCAC's position. Neal Lessenger offered a friendly amendment that this letter would be sent if an extension is not granted with the understanding if one is granted, then the letter could be revised. Matt Fox stated that CUCAC will send a letter requesting an extension for public comment. He reiterated the motion of opposing the Pacific interchange with the acceptance of the friendly amendments.

Suggested Joint Statement:

CUCAC is opposed to the Pacific Street Interchange proposal because it is overly large and expensive, and has unacceptable impacts on the Arboretum and its wetlands, Union Bay, the University of Washington, and the surrounding neighborhoods, increasing Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV), and does not include mass transit.

Matt Fox said he would draft a letter. Heather Newman also wanted to add noise and traffic impacts.

Dave Eckert asked whether Metro or Sound Transit has any proposal for the Pacific interchange option. Theresa Doherty said the University is working with Sound Transit to draft a final agreement to have a light rail station, but it will not be an intermodal terminal for a park and ride center. It was mentioned it does not make sense to have an intermodal station because riding on a bus from the eastside to go downtown, then transferring to a train (light rail) will not generate additional ridership.

Matt Fox called for the vote on the motion opposing the Pacific Street Interchange. There were eight votes in favor of the motion and two abstentions.

Kit O'Neil asked about the UW Faculty's position about SR 520. Jan Arntz explained that the Faculty Senate meets six times a year and it needs sufficient time to craft a response. She thought most faculty members were opposed to the Pacific interchange, and no one had proposed a Class C resolution.

V. Boat Street Marina Update

Jan Arntz distributed a handout. The question asked at the previous CUCAC meeting was how big the restrooms are. It is 330 square feet. The restrooms will be located at the end of the marina dock, not on land as they previously had been. The reason for moving the location of the restrooms was to ensure

that there is adequate parking. The old floating building will be removed. There is a continuing discussion about shoreline restoration with the Muckleshoot Tribe and State Fish and Wildlife once the marina is built. She continued to explain the site plan drawing. Eric Larson asked if the restrooms will be open to the public and or solely for the marine users. Jan Arntz said they are still exploring that idea. The agreement for the car top marina did not include a public restroom. The whole facility will only be 330 square feet.

VI. North of 45th Street Report

Aaron Hoard briefed CUCAC about the set of ten recommendations. A handout was provided of only the 10 recommendations developed by the North of 45th Street Working Group. The Committee met last spring and was charged with addressing issues, e.g., related to student conduct, housing, crime, etc. north of 45th Street. Most likely the group will be re-constituted in the fall to implement the recommendations. Aaron Hoard highlighted and expanded on elements for each recommendation.

The following recommendations are the following:

1. Develop and Ongoing Committee and Create a Campus-Community Coalition
2. Strengthen Police Coordination and Enforcement
3. Student Conduct Code
4. Amend and Enforce Land Use and Housing Codes
5. Purchase Property in the Area
6. Establish a Housing Quality Assurance Program
7. Enhance Educational Efforts
8. Develop and Support an Ongoing "Adopt an Area" Program
9. Improve Safety and Student Welfare
10. Encourage Communication between Students and Residents

Matt Fox expressed some concern about the wording in recommendation number four that may reflect an "anti-poor person" stance, but moderated his concern because of the term, "nonconforming dwelling unit." Other comments were regarding student parking, the quality assurance program for housing, etc.

VII. SAFECO Building Update

Theresa Doherty distributed two handouts. One a timeline regarding the purchase of the Safeco properties, and the second one showing an aerial photograph of the Safeco properties with a property summary table indicating the rentable square footage and type of uses. She said Safeco offered all of its property as a complete package. The Board of Regents has approved the purchase of the Safeco properties. At this time the University does not know what it will do with all the property, but the real estate office will determine the use for the balance of the property. The University will not be moving into the tower (buildings C,O and S) until January 2008. Safeco will be leasing them back from UW. The real estate office and other departments will be determining who moves into them. The current thinking is to consolidate existing leased space in the Northgate and Downtown neighborhoods and other areas. The University presently leases one million square feet of office space throughout the City, and half of it is in the University district. She mentioned other administrative functions as possible candidates. Future uses of the parking lots and parking garage is undetermined. Theresa Doherty

added that technically the purchase of the properties has not closed that will most likely occur at the end of the month.

The I-HOP restaurant has been given notice by Safeco to vacate. There was discussion about the I-HOP site being used as a staging area by Sound Transit for the construction of the Light Rail station at NE 45th Street and Brooklyn Ave. A positive note about UW purchasing the Safeco properties is that Sound Transit will be able to construction a Light Rail station in the vicinity, whereas, if Safeco stayed they were considering building another tower.

Questions were asked about the surface lots, and if they would be developed. Or will the University of Washington sell these lots? Matt Fox understands the UW logic for purchasing the property and consolidating office space, and doing more academic building on campus. The question was asked how any future development will effect the lease lid. Theresa Doherty said that the lease lid was eliminated. Will a comprehensive plan be developed for these properties? Jeanette Henderson in the Real Estate Office will most likely lead such an effort, if not be a part of the discussion. The name on the building (Safeco Tower) will likely be changed.

Kit O'Neil asked when the master plan expires. Theresa Doherty said that when the allowable square footage (3 million) has been built out then a new master plan will be developed. Since this property is outside of the master plan campus boundary, it has no relationship to the current master plan.

Neal Lessenger asked hypothetically if UW constructed a building on surface lot 2 related to academic/research use would that development count against the 3 million SF in the master plan? Theresa Doherty responded no because it is outside of the campus boundary, however any development would have to conform to the zoning code of the Seattle Land Use Code.

VIII. July 2006 Semi-annual Report

Aaron Hoard read from the executive summary noting that UW has added 5,890 square feet and the number of employees has remained the same at 1,734. Within the core - University District Northwest Urban Center Village (UDNUCV) – the UW is now leasing 494,376 SF. The University expects to add approximately 11,750 SF to their leased space in the coming year.

Meeting was adjourned