



City of Seattle
Department of Neighborhoods

Yvonne Sanchez, 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
 G. Ross Heath
 Matthew Stubbs

Alternates

Chris Leman
 Fred Hart
 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 #74**

November 8, 2005

(Approved with revisions December 13, 2005)

Members Present

Adel Sefrioui, Student Rep	Kit O'Neill, Ravenna Springs
Brett Forsaker, Ravenna/Bryant	Chris MacKenzie, Wallingford
Ken Fales, Montlake	Chris Leman, Eastlake (alt)
Pat Cowan, University Park CC	Mark Holden, Laurelhurst CC
Brett Frosaker, Roosevelt	Matt Fox, University District CC
Caroline Colon, Greater University Chamber	
Betty Swift, Portage Bay/Roanoke	Neal Wechsler, Montlake CC (alt)
Neal Lessenger, UW, At-Large	

Staff Present

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

Others Present

Jonathan Dubman, Montlake CC	Ken Schubert, Montlake CC
Rob Wilkinson, Montlake CC	Robert Rosencrantz, Montlake CC
Matthew Stubbs, Eastlake	Peter Stoner, Montlake CC
Bryan Jarr, Enviro Issues	Julie Meredith, WSDOT
Helen Shawcroft, UW Medical Center	Peter Dewey, UW Transportation
Jan Arntz, UW Capital Projects	Lee Copeland, UW
Erik Smith, UW	

I. Welcome, Introductions

Matthew Fox, co-chair convened the meeting at 7 PM. Members of CUCAC, as well as people in the audience introduced themselves.

II. Review and Approval of September 13, 2005 Meeting Notes

Neal Lessenger moved to accept the meeting notes, and Kit O'Neill seconded the motion. The meeting notes were unanimously approved as submitted.

Theresa Doherty provided a brief update about the removal of the diseased Cypress trees along Montlake. She noted that Rob White came to speak to the committee on June 14 about removing 75 Cypress trees affected with fungal disease. They will be removed in early December.

III. Architecture on Campus

Lee Copeland spoke first about the Architectural Commission that reviews all development projects, and restoration projects, that have been approved by the University. He explained the role of the Commission which is composed of nationally renowned architects and landscape architects, students, faculty and other staff. The Commission often recommends an architect once the project has been approved. It reviews the project through its various design phases: the pre-design, schematic and the design/development. Architects are selected for their expertise for specific projects, such as for restoration of older buildings, athletic facilities, or medical buildings. Currently, the University employs about 20 architects on various projects. He called people's attention to the design guidelines that were developed three years ago for the recent Master Plan. Intentionally, the design guidelines were written in general terms to allow for flexibility and appropriate response to particular development projects. On page 21 of the 2003 Master Plan, there are eleven guiding design requirements that all new projects must satisfy. Lee Copeland showed slides of various campus buildings to illustrate some of these guiding principles.

Chris Leman asked how UW is responding to the condition in the City's approval of the master plan requiring efforts to re-establish north-south pedestrian corridors through the health complex between Pacific and the shoreline of Portage Bay. Lee Copeland responded that the University is working on strengthening pedestrian access to Portage Bay. The Portage Bay Vista will be 115 feet wide.

Kit O'Neill asked about the bridge he referenced in the slide show. Lee Copeland stated in the master plan (page 95) that the University may consider a pedestrian skybridge alternative linking the proposed Portage Bay Vista to the Physics/Astronomy courtyard.

Betty Swift expressed her concern of the office park - light industrial look occurring in the South Campus looking across Portage Bay. Lee Copeland said that for this area the University did not want to extend the Collegiate Gothic architecture to the South Campus. There was some precedent with some of the buildings having contemporary architecture; and another reason was to thematically express water related themes of the Oceanography and Fisheries Science buildings.

IV. State Route 520 Update

Theresa mentioned that CUCAC had scheduled the SR 520 people to provide an update in the summer, but time ran out. They were rescheduled for tonight's meeting. Theresa Doherty stated that the University has concerns about the Arboretum Bridge alternative, which will increase local street traffic volumes around the campus. She and Peter Dewey will share this information later.

Julie Meredith of WSDOT and Bryan Jarr of Enviro Issues noted that they were here a year ago. She provided the update for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Two handouts were provided: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project dated Summer 2005 and Base Alternatives for the 4 lane and 6 lane alternatives, both published by WSDOT. With the former publication Julie Meredith highlighted the benefits of rebuilding the Evergreen Point and Portage Bay bridges to current standards with either the 4 lane or 6 lane alternatives. This publication mentioned receiving an alternative proposal to construct a high-level structure from the Montlake community. She reminded people of the vulnerable structural points - hollow columns supporting it and below current seismic standards, especially the westside approaches - of the bridge to earthquakes and to high winds. The most recent retrofit added weight to the bridge, and

consequently, it has sunk two feet. With the other color handout Julie Meredith reviewed the improvements, benefits and the estimated cost for the 4-lane and 6-lanes alternatives. Both alternatives will have transit and express lanes. In order to fund either alternative a toll will be charged to use the bridge. She also provided a funding update, as well as a projected schedule. She wanted to focus on the options for the westside (Seattle). Some of the goals were to minimize the footprint in the community and improve transit within the corridor. As part of the draft EIS, she first reviewed the 6-lane option that would have a second Montlake Bridge with 3 lanes eastbound and 3 lanes westbound. The Pacific interchange/Arboretum Bridge option was also discussed that was originally proposed by the Montlake community. It moves the Montlake interchange to above the Arboretum and expands the Pacific and Montlake intersection. The interchange would be constructed east of Marsh Island. She elaborated more on the details shown on the page with the 6-Lane Base compared with the Pacific Street Interchange. With this alternative the footprint of the 6 lane alternative through the Montlake community is reduced. By moving the interchange from Montlake to above the Arboretum it will be easier for traffic to continually flow along the Montlake Bridge, now a bottleneck. The disadvantage of this option is that it widens the footprint along Montlake by creating two new lanes which requires additional property from the University of Washington, and increases traffic at the Arboretum by 49% and changes traffic patterns along Montlake Boulevard, as well as decreasing the volume by 46% on the Montlake Bridge.

All options for the eastside and westside will be included in the Draft EIS to be published in May 2006. The Final EIS will be published a year later in 2007 with the Record of Decision at the end of the year. The preferred alternative will be chosen at the same time the DEIS is published. Advertising for Construction would occur in 2009, but that would depend on funding. She reviewed the projected funding sources with a remaining balance of \$0.5-1.65 needed.

Concerns were raised by several committee members, as well as people from the Montlake community, about increased traffic volume, level of service at intersections, congestion on various neighborhood streets and intersections. Julie Meredith stated that she was not prepared to speak about those issues tonight, but her desire to return and talk about the traffic findings. Kit O'Neill asked her to return and address these issues at another CUCAC meeting.

A woman asked about the impact (loss) on housing. Julie Meredith said that with the second bridge two houses would be lost. With the six-lane option the University of Washington there would property loss in the Arboretum and a parking lot. Theresa Doherty mentioned that the Board of Regents issued a statement opposing the Arboretum Bridge interchange alternative. She stated clearly that it would have a negative impact on the Arboretum and the surrounding University District neighborhoods. Finally there would be no development opportunity with the loss of the parking lot. She pointed out that in the 2003 Campus Master Plan that of the 60 development sites identified, 30 are surface parking lots. Theresa Doherty also noted that ICA and the U.W, Medical Center are looking to expand. The University is concerned about the loss of development opportunities. The Board of Regents were concerned and reacted against the various options because they tend to grow. With a Light Rail option for Husky Stadium, the initial loss of parking was 250 spaces, then expanded to 650.

Julie Meredith emphasized WSDOT's desire to work with the different communities, as evidenced by their consideration of the Pacific interchange option, and will continue to work with the University. Kit O'Neill asked if a tunnel was considered. Julie Meredith explained that a tunnel option was considered, but the overriding issue was cost, and therefore it was eliminated.

A handout by betterbridge.org was distributed that give their perspective on the Pacific interchange alternative. A collaborative approach will best yield a result that is best for the City, the University, the neighborhoods, and for the regional economy, it is this approach that the organization advocates.

"Referring to the Board of Regents' stand against the Pacific Interchange/Union Bay Bridge proposal for the SR520 project, Chris Leman thanked the University for standing up for a livable University District, for Arboretum preservation, and for a rational development of the Husky Stadium parking lot and shoreline area. He urged that the University stand firm, and not allow itself to be pressured for an alternative that is not in the long range interest of either the University or the community."

V. Supplemental EIS, West Campus Parking Garage

Theresa Doherty stated that Jan Arntz is here to take people's comments. Matthew Fox asserted that the garage is one of the most "ill conceived and inconsistent" projects in the master plan. How can this project be called a mixed use, when only 10% is office space. It is strictly a single purpose building to be used as a garage. Citing the master plan the site was originally to be used for open space, or a plaza for a Sound Transit station that did not happen. With the construction of this structure it will complete the wall shielding any views of the water from Pacific Street, with the exception of Portage Bay Vista. Matthew Fox added that the section on views is self-serving. He asked Lee Copeland to respond to U.W. objective as stated in the master to re-open views to the water in the southwest campus area. Jan Arntz interrupted Lee Copeland from responding to the question, stating her purpose is to take comments, not to debate issues. And Theresa Doherty added that concerns will be answered in the Final EIS. Ken Fales supported Matthew Fox's claim of view blockage. Theresa Doherty encouraged Matthew Fox to give Jan Arntz his written comments. Matthew Fox challenged the statement, "Parking is part of the University's long-term program that encourages transit use." How does building 300 parking spaces encourage transit use? He stated that he seen signs for the existing West Campus Parking garage advertising all day parking for \$10, but recently had not seen them. Matthew Fox wanted to know why because his understanding of this garage is for student/employee parking, and not for the general public.

Theresa Doherty emphasized again that process is not to discuss or debate what is in the report, but to listen to your comments and to record them, then ensure that they are responded to in the final report. She suggested forming a subcommittee to draft a letter of concerns about the West Campus Parking Garage expansion. Pat Cowan asked if the University has looked into alternatives to reduce the demand for the garage, such as reduced transit or housing bonus if they move into the area, when new projects are completed and 850 new employees move in. Matthew Fox asked what keeps the expansion from being a commuter parking once a light rail station is established on or near the campus? Again he asked about the advertising for \$10 all day parking for the existing garage? When there was free parking was this an attempt by the University to compete for these public dollars. Chris Leman asked if the University was instrumental in changing free parking in the area to metered parking with pay stations? Theresa Doherty responded that the University was supportive of this change since they believe that students and staff use on street parking in the area, and restricting it would encourage them to take public transit. Betty Swift said she hoped that next time there is not "an arbitrary shutout of discussion," and did not want this to be repeated this again. Theresa Doherty again explained the process, and noted that this project had been brought before the committee for their review prior to drafting the Supplemental EIS.

With some discussion about requesting an extension for comments on the draft EIS, Mark Holden made a motion requesting an extension of 30 days to December 21, and Pat Cowan seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

VI. U.W. Medical Center Master Plan

Helen Shawcroft representing the University of Washington Medical Center briefed the committee about the medical center potential expansion. Originally, UWMC hired NBBJ, an architectural firm, to do an internal master plan. Last spring after further assessment, NBBJ made a recommendation for more in-patient beds, increased teaching space for medical students and additional inter-disciplinary medical space. Then in September the U.W. Medical Center Board recommended further study for expansion of facilities. With this recommendation there now is a campus wide and community process for deciding what sites are best for expansion. With a display board Helen Shawcroft showed possible sites for expansion that NBBJ studied. She clarified when she references medical center that she is talking specifically about the hospital. Using the display she pointed to the hospital buildings. NBBJ identified some possible sites on the southside of the hospital or east of it. One is building over the parking garage (S-1 site) or expanding south of the hospital. Another site is expanding into the Glade area, currently the only open space area in the vicinity, either over it or beneath it. The last site considered was building on the CHDD site. Altogether there are five potential sites for expansion. Theresa Doherty elaborated on the University's internal process, then bringing the proposed expansion and alternative sites to the larger community and before this committee. Helen Shawcroft mentioned that a presentation would be made to the Faculty Senate and to the Board of Regents.

Chris Leman asked if more pedestrian corridors and access to the shoreline. Other CUCAC members made several requests for additional information to Helen Shawcroft when she returns.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.