



City of Seattle

Department of Neighborhoods

Yvonne Sanchez, *Director*

Gregory J. Nickels, *Mayor*

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting #52

September 24, 2002

Members Present

Jim Moran – Alternate - Greater University Chamber of Commerce
Susan Baker – Roosevelt Neighborhood Association
Don Argus – Montlake Community Club
Jack Lynch – University At-large
Matthew Fox – University District Community Council
Susan Torrence – Laurelhurst Community Council
Pat Cowan – University Park Community Council
David Thorud – University Faculty Representative
Daniel Kraus – University Staff Representative
Hans Aschenback – Alternate -Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance
Justin Anderson – UW Students

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods
Theresa Doherty – UW Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs
Jan Arntz – University of Washington

Others Present

Kara Hedrick
Willie Williams – University Park Community Council
Leah Weatherstoy
Bob Morgan – Seattle City Council Central Staff
Bob Scales – City of Seattle, Office of Policy and Management

I. Opening and Housekeeping

Steve Sheppard, committee staff-person, opened the meeting at 7:08. Mr. Sheppard noted that both of the co-chairs were unavailable for the meeting and

asked that a member volunteer as acting chair for the meeting. Jack Lynch volunteered. Introductions followed.

II. Development of CUCAC Positions Concerning the Seattle City Council's Preliminary Decision Concerning the University of Washington Master Plan

A. Plan Flexibility

Theresa Doherty was asked to identify those issues that the University of Washington objected to in the Seattle City Council's Preliminary Decision concerning the University of Washington Master Plan. Ms Doherty passed out a Regent's response to the City Council resolution that will be forwarded to the City Council (along with a cover letter from her) before the October 9th deadline.

Ms Doherty noted that the first issue of concern for the University is the degree of specificity. The City Council has recommended that a detailed development program similar to that in the current General Physical Development Plan be developed and included as part of the new Campus Master Plan. The University is proposing that the Master Plan that was originally forwarded to the City be amended to include four campus sectors and that the 3 million square feet of development potential be split between the sectors in proportion to the amount of development potential in each sector. Each sector would have the following number of square feet of development assigned to them:

Central Campus	1,595,978 GSF
West Campus	850,161 GSF
South/Southwest Campus	414,023 GSF
East Campus	140,739 GSF

The University is also asking that total development be allowed to exceed the amount of space allocated to each sector by up to 20% so that for example east campus development might go as high as 168,887 GSF. If the University wanted to exceed 120% of the sector allocation, it would have to request a minor plan amendment. Ms Doherty noted that this would be similar to the current situation. There would also be a process included in the plan that would involve CUCAC in review of potential specific site proposals, prior to being chosen by the Board of Regents. Ms Doherty noted that the University has already begun to fashion this process and that CUCAC has been briefed on this draft site review process already.

Matthew Fox stated that he appreciated the University proposal and that it is a careful compromise between the GPDP-style process and the original University proposal. However, he stated that he felt that requests to exceed 120% of the sector allocation should be a major, rather than a minor plan amendment. He noted that there was at least one instance where transfer of square footage between sectors was a major amendment. Steve Sheppard stated that the Major Institution Code did not identify a shift of square footage between sectors as a major amendment. Traditionally, transfers of square footage have been

proposed as a minor amendment and CUCAC has then commented on whether or not it was minor or major. Theresa Doherty noted that the City University Agreement identifies a major amendment as a change to the Master Plan that: 1) would have significantly greater impacts than those contemplated in the EIS for the Master Plan; 2) change the Master Plan development standards, conditions, location or size of open space; 3) go beyond the minimum change necessary to afford relief and would be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity in which the major institution is located; or 4) would be in conflict with the adopted goals and objectives of an adopted neighborhood plan. Certain actions are automatically major amendments. These include increase in a height designation or expansion of the MIO District Boundary or a reduction in the housing stock within the primary or secondary impact zones for the University. She noted that the process for granting a major amendment could extend for up to two years.

Matthew Fox stated that he was still uncomfortable with endorsing the University proposal with the 20% allowance above the sector allocation. Theresa Doherty responded that the 20% allowed flexibility and that this proposal represents a major concession on the part of the University. Ms Doherty also noted that the only major amendment to the current plan was the indoor practice facility and that this was triggered because of the requirement to change the height designation for the indoor practice center. Hans Aschenback suggested that the allowance for added capacity above the sector allocation be reduced to 15%. Jan Arntz noted that CUCAC has approved many transfers of development capacity between the existing campus sectors and that this has been greater than 20% for some sectors.

Matthew Fox moved that:

CUCAC endorse the proposal of the University of Washington to allocate development capacity between four campus sectors as follows:	
Central Campus	1,595,978 GSF
West Campus	850,161 GSF
South/Southwest Campus	414,023 GSF
East Campus	140,739 GSF
with allowance for development to exceed these initial allocations by up to 15% without the necessity for the University to seek an amendment to the Master Plan.	

The motion was second, and passed 7 in favor 3 opposed 1 abstaining.

B. University Property Acquisition

Ms Doherty stated that the University disagrees with the retention of limits on the University's acquisition of property within the primary and secondary Impact zones. While the University agrees that limiting use is a City function, limiting ownership would appear to be illegal. Ms Doherty stated that it is the position of the University that it and any other individual or corporate owner should have the

right to purchase property anywhere so long as the use complies with all other regulations including underlying zoning.

Matthew Fox stated that he believes that CUCAC erred in not commenting on this issue. If he had realized what this issue was, he would have actively opposed any change. Pat Cowen noted that the issue had been briefly discussed at the last meeting and that the issue was that the University was different from other institutions and that some restrictions would be appropriate. Hans Aschenback noted that the University has the right to condemn property and for that reason is distinctly different from other possible owners. Matthew Fox suggested that since CUCAC was silent on this issue previously it consider remaining so at this point. He also noted that his issue was that property acquisition should not be used to acquire property along the edge of the MIO and then come back and request that the MIO be expanded to cover the acquired properties. He noted that this concern was most focused on West Campus and that CUCAC had previously indicated a concern over this issue.

After brief further discussion, Matthew Fox moved that:

CUCAC's comment letter to the Seattle City Council shall re-iterate its concern that property acquisition not result in the expansion of the MIO boundary, particularly in the Brooklyn Neighborhood, over the life of the Plan.

The motion was seconded and passed 11 – 0

C. Elimination of Patients and Visitors From Trip Cap Restrictions

Ms Doherty stated that the University is unwilling to include patients and visitors in the trip caps but is willing to agree to increased remedies in the event that the trip caps are exceeded. However, Ms Doherty noted that the remedies in the city Council Resolution were cut and pasted from the current GPDP and are no longer legally defensible. The State law has changed with adoption of the Growth Management Act. Matthew Fox stated that he wanted to clarify statements made in various forums that CUCAC took no position on this issue. In fact, CUCAC took the position that the trip caps should remain. He also observed that what seems to be at issue is the statement in the City Council Resolution requiring that in the event that the University exceeds its trip cap that MUP and Building Permits shall not be issued until it has been demonstrated that mitigation measures will keep the University-generated trips to the baseline levels or below. He offered the opinion that the University is hoping to be subject to less rigorous concurrency standards in the Growth Management Act.

Hans Aschenback asked for clarification on the methodology that would be used to adjust the trip caps when patients and visitors are eliminated. Ms Doherty responded that the trip caps would be adjusted to eliminate that portion of the baseline trips that were considered to be patients and visitors. The Plan requires that this adjustment be validated to the satisfaction of the City Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use and The Seattle Department of

Transportation. Mr. Aschenback observed that the University's papers state that this validation process has been completed.

Bob Morgan with the City Council Central Staff stated that the City system of transportation concurrency has no connection with trip caps. It is based on screen lines across the Montlake Bridge and other places and has its own measurements. When those are exceeded, concurrency requirements are triggered. There is nothing that would trigger that if the University of Washington's trip caps were exceeded. If the remedies in the current GDPD were eliminated, there would be no remedies if the trip caps were exceeded. Matthew Fox stated that he preferred that there be independent consequences for exceeding the trip caps and that if the ones listed in the City Council Resolution are difficult then the attorneys should work out some other arrangement. Mr. Fox then moved:

CUCAC endorses and supports the Proposals of the Seattle City Council Clarifying that 1) the trip caps and remedies in the GDPD will continue; 2) trips generated by the University shall not be allowed to increase beyond levels defined in the resolution; 3) that the UW shall provide an annual report to the City concerning transportation issues; 4) that MUP and Building Permits shall not be issued until it has been demonstrated that mitigation measures will keep UW-generated trips to the baseline levels or below; and 5) requiring that the UW participate in the costs of improvements to the street system within the primary and secondary impact zones.

The motion was seconded and passed 6 in favor 4 opposed and 1 abstaining

D. Maintaining the University Cordon Count and Continuing to Include Patients and Visitors in Trip Calculations

Theresa Doherty stated that the University continues to maintain that visitors and patients should not be included in the calculations of the trip caps. However, the University does state that it will create a demand management program tailored to patients and visitors that recognizes the critical transportation needs of these populations. Ms Doherty stated that this means that the University will work with the hospital and conferences to make them aware of other transportation options. However, the University is not proposing that it commit to reductions in visitor or patient trips. Jack Lynch stated that it would seem appropriate to have accurate information of what was happening with visitors and patients.

Hans Aschenback stated that there were really two issues: 1) should visitors and patients be included in trip calculations and 2) should the cordon counts be retained. He noted that he is not so concerned whether visitors or patients are included in various TMP efforts so much as how eliminating these groups might effect the trip cap calculations. He noted that the existing baseline and cordon counts both included visitors and patients. For that reason, visitors and patients should be counted until a new methodology for calculating both the baseline and current conditions are completed. Ms Doherty noted that CUCAC has voted to

exclude patients and visitors from the new calculations. Matthew Fox noted that CUCAC also stated that the cordon counts should be continued until a new methodology has been validated.

Mr. Aschenback noted that the University has been using the cordon count to estimate whether the various U-Pass programs and other TMP actions have kept campus trips below the agreed to baseline levels. In 1999 the University was still below the baseline but was coming very close to exceeding the baseline in the PM peak. The University is proposing a new methodology. Mr. Aschenback stated that when methodologies are changed, the new methodology would not necessarily approximate reality in the same way as the old methodology. However, when comparing trends over time it is important that the methodology be consistent. Mr. Aschenback stated that the process of validating one methodology to the other is critical. He stated that the validation is not valid in his opinion. The University has maintained that the new methodology was validated twice in 1997 and 1999 against the cordon count. However, when Mr. Dewey was asked to provide details on the statistical test he stated that what he had meant was that there was "no big difference between these two methodologies. Mr. Aschenback offered the opinion that the two methods could not be reconciled since the new methodology only focuses on AM data. No PM data is available to compare to the old cordon count. However the PM levels were those where the trips were approaching the limits.

Ms Doherty stated that the Seattle Department of Transportation also opposes continuing the cordon count, partly because they consider it to be dangerous. Ms Doherty further noted that if the cordon count was expanded to ask whether trips were by students, faculty, staff, visitors or patients, that the time surveyors were out in traffic would increase. This would result in even greater safety concerns.

Matthew fox moved:

That CUCAC reiterate its position that: 1) the University Cordon Count should be continued until any new replacement methodology is statistically validated by corroborating the results of a new methodology against a simultaneous cordon count; 2) that in the meantime, the University should continue to count patients and visitors although the results of these counts need not be counted against the trip caps; and 3) that any new methodology for estimating campus trips be reviewed by CUCAC.

The motion was seconded. Continued discussion followed. David Thorud and Theresa Doherty both stated that they continue to be concerned that the cordon count is dangerous. Ms Doherty stated that statistically validating the new methodology prior to abolishing the cordon count may be acceptable, but doing both simultaneously is a problem. Mr. Aschenback stated that he believes that you must do both to be able to show that a forward forecast by the new methodology matches the cordon count.

The motion was defeated 5 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstaining.

Mr. Fox then re-moved his original motion without reference to doing simultaneous counts as follows:

That CUCAC reiterate its position that: 1) the University Cordon Count should be continued until any new replacement methodology is validated; and 2) that in the meantime, the University should continue to count patients and visitors although the results of these counts need not be counted against the trip caps.

The motion was seconded and passed 8 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstaining.

E. Height Rezones

Ms. Doherty stated that the University will agree to forgo rezones for 34W, 35W or 33W but will continue to push for the rezone to allow for the construction of the fence for the Golf Driving Range. The University has reduced the height rezone to 80 feet. Susan Torrence stated that she continues to believe that the rezone for the Golf Driving Range should be denied and that CUCAC should support the City Council position. Ms Doherty noted that the actual design of the Golf Driving Range is not before CUCAC at this time but only the rezone.

Susan Torrence moved:

That CUCAC support the position of the City Council that the rezone for Site 57E (Golf Driving Range) should be denied.

The motion was seconded and passed 6 in favor 5 against.

Editor's Note: The vote count at the meeting was initially considered as a tie at 6 in favor and 6 opposed. However, only 11 eligible voting members were present and careful reconstruction of the vote showed that the UW student representative vote was incorrectly cast twice. With the concurrence of the University and the Acting Committee Chair, this vote was eliminated from the official tally and the vote is, therefore, as shown above.

F. Residential Parking Zone Enforcement

Ms Doherty stated that the University is agreeing to pay for one Seattle Police Parking Enforcement Officer. Hans Aschenback stated that he agreed with this but wanted to assure that the City would not reduce its contribution to parking enforcement as the University's increased.

Matthew Fox moved:

That CUCAC commend the University of Washington for its willingness to contribute to the costs of enforcing the RPZ and that this enforcement capacity shall be in addition to the current City-provided enforcement which shall not be reduced.

The motion was seconded and passed 11 in favor none opposed.

G. Housing Issues

Ms Doherty stated that the University is objecting to the establishment of an off-campus housing quality assurance program. The University is not legally able to enforce housing codes off campus. The University is willing to participate on a task force that would include members from the ASUW, GPSS, fraternities, sororities, landlords, and community members to look at all of these issues. The University considers this to be a much broader issue than should be dealt with in the Master Plan.

Justin Anderson, UW student representative stated that he resides in Wallingford and that he agrees with the University position. There are serious housing quality issues in private housing around the University. However, he noted that he previously worked for the City of Seattle Department of Design, Construction and Land Use and that he understood the legal issues in that the City and not the University has the authority to enforce Land Use and Building codes. Pat Cowen noted that the surrounding neighborhoods have worked for years to see this issue addressed. However, to date little has been accomplished and there continues to be overcrowding in substandard housing throughout the area. Theresa Doherty responded that the University has no authority to regulate private housing in the area.

Willie Williams noted that the Master Plan does deal with housing. He noted that CUCAC and others have questioned the sufficiency of quantity of University-provided housing proposed under the plan. He noted that recently a three-bedroom, two-bath home sold showed up four months later advertised in the University of Washington Daily with 10 bedrooms for rent. This creates an unstable situation. Private landlords are both creating overcrowding and reaping huge financial benefits marketing to students, often through University publications such as the Daily. He stated that, in his opinion, the University is acting as de-facto sub-agent for these private landlords.

It was noted that both the Daily and the Housing Office are student government run organizations. They gain their funding from student funds and are not parts of the University administration. Justin Anderson stated that he would be willing to discuss the issue of housing quality with the ASUW.

Justin Anderson moved that

CUCAC oppose the City Council recommendation that a housing assurance policy be established as part of the Master Plan.

The motion was seconded and failed on a tie vote 5 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstaining.

The motion was also re-stated in the affirmative and failed on the same vote.

Ms. Doherty noted that the University is going to establish a good neighbor policy and intends to initiate this program now rather than waiting for Master Plan adoption. The University opposes having this included as a requirement of the Master Plan.

Justin Anderson moved:

That CUCAC endorse development of the good neighbor policy but that it need not be a portion of the Master Plan.
--

The motion was seconded and failed 5 votes in favor, 5 votes, 1 abstaining.

H. Other Issues

Matthew fox noted that CUCAC should reiterate its initial proposals the 30W 46W and a portion of 49W.

III. Adjournment and Future Meetings

Willie Williams asked that the good neighbor program or housing quality assurance program be included on the next agenda. No further business being before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.