



City of Seattle

Department of Neighborhoods

Yvonne Sanchez, *Director*

Greg Nickels, *Mayor*

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting #47

March 12, 2002

Members Present

Margaret Hornbaker – University of Washington Student Representative
Fred Hart – Greater University Chamber of Commerce
Michael Bittner – Ravenna/Bryant Community Association
David Thorud – UW Faculty Representative
Don Argus – Montlake Community Club
Karen Buschow – Wallingford Community Club
Pat Cowen – University Park Community Club
Matthew Fox – University District Community Council
Susan Torrance – Laurelhurst Community Council
Kit O'Neill – Ravenna Springs Community Group
Eric Larson – Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
Jack Lynch – University at Large
Betty Swift – Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
Daniel Kraus – University of Washington Staff Representative
Chris Leman – Eastlake Community Council

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods
Jan Arntz – University of Washington
Marilyn Cox – University of Washington Capital and Space Planning
Ron Edlick – Sound Transit Authority
Tracy Reed – Sound Transit Authority
Peter Dewey – Manager, University of Washington Transportation Office
Jerri McCray – University of Washington, Associate Vice President, Facilities
Services

I. Opening and Housekeeping

Fred Hart opened the meeting at 7:10 PM. Introductions followed. The minutes from meeting 46 were approved without substantive change.

II. Merrill Hall Update (Pending Street Vacation)

It was noted that Theresa Doherty was ill and that Jan Arntz would therefore make the presentation on this issue. Ms. Arntz noted that CUCAC had been previously briefed both on the Merrill Hall designs and this street vacation issue, and that the University would like to obtain CUCAC support for the Merrill Hall street vacation. This issue is 18 years old. When Merrill Hall was originally constructed, the University of Washington sought street vacations. At that time the University had to pay compensation. This is no longer. At that time the City and University had agreed to an exchange of properties. Originally four properties were involved. However at the last minute in the process Councilmember George Benson asked that a fifth parcel be considered. This parcel was over near the Washington Park Arboretum and was to be used for a connecting bicycle path to the Broadmore area. There were some problems with the timing of this fifth parcel exchange, but eventually property was exchanged and the city issued permits for the construction of the original Merrill Hall.

Shortly after the arson fire at Merrill Hall the University was conducting property research in preparation for obtaining the permit for the reconstruction of the facility. The University found that while the City now has title to the University properties, no street vacation appears to have been completed. Apparently there was some misunderstanding concerning the fifth parcel. Records indicate that it was never a formal part of the negotiated exchange. The property eventually proved to be unneeded. The bicycle path was dropped and the parcel is a designated wetland.

The design is a simple reconstruction of the original building and a formal filing of the street vacation is needed. The University needs to have this process completed. The University could technically withdraw its original vacation application and file a new application. No compensation would be required and technically the University might be able to recover the properties it deeded to the City. However an entire new process would take a considerable time.

Mathew Fox stated that while he is sympathetic to this request, he would like to make sure that the City is in agreement before a final CUCAC endorsement of the vacation request. He noted that the City attorney is reviewing this now and that he would prefer a delay until that review is completed. Others noted that it might be possible for CUCAC to endorse the vacation subject to the City's confirming that this is in essence a technical oversight. Susan Torrence stated that there was some conflicting information on the degree to which the City

actually wanted to pursue a fifth parcel and that she would therefore have to abstain from any vote on this.

Jack Lynch observed that the City both allowed construction of Merrill Hall to proceed previously and has never raised the issue of a fifth parcel at any time since its construction. It is therefore very doubtful that the city Attorney's Office would raise problems now. David Thorud noted that the project has already been delayed because of this issue. This delay has the potential of harming fund raising efforts. Kit O'Neill asked for clarification concerning the process. Jan Arntz stated that this was being considered as a final action of an otherwise completed vacation process and not a new action. The Transportation Committee would actually just move on the old 18-year old ordinance.

Karen Buschow moved that CUCAC:

CUCAC provisionally supports the finalization of the pending street vacations associated with the construction of Merrill Hall, except that in the event that there is an adverse ruling from the City Attorney's Office the CUCAC endorsement shall no longer apply.

The motion was seconded and passed 12 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstaining.

III. University of Washington Capital and Space Planning.

Marilyn Cox, Director of Capital and Space Planning for the University of Washington was introduced to give a presentation on this issue. Ms. Cox stated that her office prepares the Capital budget for the University and manages about 16,000,000 square feet of space. This includes leased space.

The current capital budget this year is a supplemental budget to the one adopted in 2001. The 2001-2003 capital budget is the current document that covers the University. Projects that are in the current capital budget are as follows:

The first group of projects is those that the University considers its core elements. These are projects of critical importance to the University. They include:

1. Nuclear Reactor Decommissioning – This project has been on the table for some time. The initial decommissioning was done some time ago. This included elimination of any hazard. The remaining work is to remove some concrete from the building and reconstruct the floors. This project was not funded.
2. Emergency Power Expansion, Phase I and II – Phase I was approved this biennium and will involve the construction of significant new emergency

generators. \$11,700,000 will be spent on this project in this biennium. Phase II will be funded the next biennium and will involve completion of the distribution system to extend emergency power to about 60 buildings that lack this service today.

3. Suzzallo Library Renovation – The Suzzallo Library renovation is currently under construction. It is intended to assure that the building remains for many years. At the present time \$4,563,000 is allocated to this project in this biennium.
4. Minor Repair Projects – the University asked for \$50 million and the legislature allowed only \$20 million. Of this \$20,000,000 \$19,000,000 is self generated University funds and only \$1,000,000 is actual funding from the legislature.
5. Code Related Projects –These are projects required by code to assure continued operations of buildings. Two million dollars is allocated to these projects in this biennium.

All together these core elements will receive \$38,263,000 in this biennium.

Additional projects include:

6. Deferred Renewal and Modernization – There projects are generally a large collection of small maintenance and modernization needs. The University has built up a large backlog of these small projects. The University originally requested \$40,000,000 for this purpose and was allocated only \$10,000,000 from the legislature and directed to allocate an additional \$10,000,000 from local University Funds.
7. Wire Plant Upgrade – This will allow the development of technology development. This would allow replacement of various cables for transmission of data. \$2,500,000 is allocated to this purpose in the current biennium.
8. Condon Hall – This project actually includes three sections: 1) renovation of Condon Hall as surge space; 2) the interior renovation of Guggenheim Hall; and 3) the interior renovation of Johnson Hall. Uses in both Guggenheim and Johnson Halls would be temporarily located in Condon during their renovations.
9. Life Sciences – this is a combination of several small projects
10. Gould Hall Addition would include remodeling the old Architecture Hall for Psychology

11. Bioengineering building is listed at \$69,025,000. This is actually simply authority to issue bonds against future revenues that would be generated from grants to programs located in that facility.

The total UW State funding this biennium to the University of Washington was only \$64,000,000. This as a ten year low.

In planing for the future, the University will begin to focus on renovation and modernization of existing buildings.

IV. General Site Approval Process

Ms. Cox also gave a presentation on the General Site Approval Process for the University. She stated that this process has been drafted and has been discussed with the faculty senate. Under the old GPDP both building sites and specific uses. Under the master plan only sites are identified. The University is developing a process to work with all of the stakeholders to identify what building might go on which sites. CUCAC's review is now being sought on this process.

The initial proposal for a new building almost always comes from the colleges. These initial ideas are routed to the Provost and the Executive Vice President for an initial review. If initial proposal seem viable, then the Provost and the Executive Vice President and the Capital Facilities Committee would ask their respective staffs to work together to look at sites. A list of site options would be developed at this point and then be reviewed by the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) which would report to the Capital Facilities Committee. The Capital Facilities Committee would then identify a preferred Site and a project agreement would be developed and signed. The project would then be reviewed with the University Architectural Commissions who would complete an Architectural Opportunities Report and recommend possible architect selection. This report goes back to the Board of Regents. If the project is deemed viable by the Regents – that is that there is both a need, a possible site and likely funding - then the project is moved forward to pre-design.

The pre-design study looks at site alternatives and program ideas. At this point further review is done. This would include review and comment from CUCAC on the pre-design study. The project would then go back tot he Capital Facilities Committee for approval of the pre-design study and final site approval.

Mathew Fox stated that he believes that the initial CUCAC review should occur either concurrent with, or immediately following Architectural Commission review at the earliest. Mr. Fox noted that he has seen few site moved or changed following identification of a preferred site. In essence, if CUCAC review remains after the start of the pre-design study, then a preferred site and use would have already been chosen and CUCAC comment would really be limited to design

details. He noted that often the design details are less important from a community standpoint than the actual site and use choice.

V. New U-Pass Report and Other Transportation Programs

Peter Dewey, Manager of the University of Washington Transportation Office gave the presentation on this issue. In the last year there has been an extraordinary growth in the population at the University. This is due in part of the exceptional number of acceptances of new students at the University. There was therefore a sharp growth in student population. The total campus population increased by about 4% or about 2000 more people.

The University has completed surveys that now include this 4% increased population. U-Pass use has increased by 8% and even more to the University district. This was a greater increase than the increase in student population. During the last year construction of new buildings reduced the inventory of available parking was reduced by about 730 parking spaces. Long term these spaces will be replaced by parking in structures. Fortunately the number of cars on Campus decreased by 5.6% or 568 cars. This is consistent with the increase in transit use and indicates a likely mode share shift. However data of mode share is done on even years so we can not confirm this likely mode shift at this point.

Committee members noted that it appears that parking is tighter in the surrounding neighborhoods and that it may be that drivers are no longer parking on campus but instead in the surrounding areas. They suggested that the University do a survey in the neighborhoods concerning spill-over parking and off-campus parking. Mr. Dewey noted that the upcoming U-Pass survey will ask about off-campus parking and that the University does support various residential parking zones (RPZs). Pat Cowen responded that the major problem with the RPZs is that enforcement is too lax. Steve Sheppard noted that CUCAC has had City officials come to CUCAC repeatedly on this issue. Chris Leman stated that he felt that the issue was well understood and that simply having the City come out again would not solve any problems. He further noted that the only RPZs citywide that are being expanded today are those that are being subsidized by the University of Washington.

Mr. Dewey stated that he was interested in expanding the U-Pass beyond a reliance on Transit to create conditions that are more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle commuting to the University. Mr. Dewey noted that there are 1,300 persons living within a mile of the University who normally drive alone to campus. The hope is to get a portion of these 1,300 persons to walk or bike. Removing various impediments to walking might do this.

Jack Lynch questioned this strategy. He suggested that current impediments to walking did not appear to be a major issue and that instead, the University might focus more on the provision of additional housing opportunities on or near

campus. Mathew Fox agreed. He stated that the true impediments to walking are the weather and topography and that the development of more housing developments seems critical.

VI. Sound Transit: North Alignment Options

Ron Endlich, Sound Transit Manager for the Northlake Study and Tracy Reed were introduced to discuss the north alignment. He stated that Sound Transit is currently evaluating routes that would go north from downtown. Environmental analysis is ongoing. The Sound Transit Board has narrowed the alternatives to three for further consideration. These include one crossing at Montlake and two farther west. Choices will be further narrowed over the next couple of weeks. The goal is to select a preferred route soon.

Tracy Reed passed out alignment and station plans. She noted that there are four options. The first three cross the ship canal west nearer to Lake Union and the fourth Option crosses near Montlake bridge. Ms. Reed stated that Option 4 (Montlake Tunnel Route) has already been moved forward for further evaluation. The Montlake tunnel route would have a station under Drumheller Fountain and would include a turn around. It would be built cut and cover.

The remaining options are each near the University Bridge and involve shallower tunnels than before. Alternative three has only one station that surfaces at 43rd and Brooklyn. That alternatives major shortcoming is that it only has one station and therefor loses between 3,000 and 4,000 riders. Options 1 and 2 both have two stations, one between N.E. Pacific St. and N.E. 40th St. near Brooklyn Avenue N.E. and one just north of N.E. 45th Street. The major difference between routes 1 and 2 concern the orientation of the stations. In alternative 1 both of the stations are placed under mid blocks and the tunnel alignment curved to accommodate this. This allows less disruption to streets and in the case of the northern station would allow an entrance to the station directly off of University Way N.E. (the Ave.). Alternative two places both stations under Brooklyn Ave. N.E. Alternative three would have only one station just south of the Meany Hotel on Brooklyn Ave. N.E. It was noted that the station locations have been chosen to impact parking facilities rather than buildings as much as possible.

Estimates for the number of riders for each alternative also vary. Both option one and two are estimated to have between 22,000 and 25,000 riders per day, alternative three has the fewest at about 18,000, and alternative four has the highest at about 26,500 per day. Higher number of riders for alternative four is mainly attributed to better access to the University Medical Center.

Fred Hart stated that the University District Chamber of Commerce was recently briefed on the alternatives. There was a great deal of interest in alternative one. It seems to provide some real opportunities to improve access to the Ave. The biggest concern was over the loss of parking, especially for the churches near

the N.E. 45th St. station. There was little or no support for the one station alternative.

Mr. Endlick stated that he was not asking for CUCAC review or comment at this point. Once the alternatives for environmental review are chosen and the draft environmental impact statement completed, then there will be formal opportunity for comment.

VII. Adjournment

Nor further business being before the Committee the meeting was adjourned.