



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
Don Argus
Betty Swift
Kit O'Neill
Brett Frosaker
Eric Larson
Dave Eckert
Pat Cowen
Chris MacKenzie
Neal Lessenger
Becki Frestedt
G. Ross Heath

Alternates

Chris Leman
Fred Hart
Heather Newman
Kenneth F. Fales
Tom Roth
Larry Sinnott
Brian Ramey
Ruedi Risler
Zenaida Olivas

Ex-Officio Members

Cliff Louie - DON
Theresa Doherty - UW

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting #72

June 14, 2005

(Adopted September 13, 2005)

Members Present

Daniel Kraus, U.W. Representative
Brett Forsaker, Ravenna/Bryant
Heather Newman, Laurelhurst CC(alt)
Pat Cowan, University Park CC
David Eckert, Roosevelt Neighb. Assoc.
Ruedi Risler, University Park CC (alt)
Betty Swift, Portage Bay/Roanoke
Neal Lessenger, UW, At-Large

Kit O'Neill, Ravenna Springs
Chris MacKenzie, Wallingford
Chris Leman, Eastlake (alt)
Mark Holden, Laurelhurst
Matt Fox, University District CC
Eric Larson, Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance

Staff Present

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

Others Present

Anne Eskridge, UW Bill Tally, UW Steve Tatge, UW
Deb Brown, UW Everett Spring, UW Paul Roybal, UW
Douglas Wadden, UW Walter Stamm, UW
Mary Catherine Snyder, Seattle Dept. of Transportation

I. Welcome, Introductions and Approval of April 12 2005 Meeting Notes

Daniel Kraus, co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:03PM. Introductions followed. Cliff Louie introduced himself and informed the group he would be replacing Steve Sheppard as a result of work assignments regarding the staffing of major institutions. Theresa Doherty asked that her updates be moved to last from third on the draft agenda. Betty Swift motioned to accept the meeting notes with a second from Neal Lessenger. The notes for the April 12, 2005 (# 71) meeting were approved with minor changes.

II. Update on the University Trees

Bill Tally, UW Campus Landscape Architect, handed out a map of trees locating trees that have been removed or will be removed. The handout had photographs showing rotten trees that are hazardous. After a quick overview he asked Deborah Brown, UW

arborist, to provide more detail on identifying and removing hazardous trees on the campus. Deborah Brown gave out the Tree Hazard Evaluation form and explained the criteria for tree removal to the group. Safety is the number one issue for removing a tree. However, removing a tree is the last resort for the University. We first look at defects or a potential target (a building or person) of a tree. The first step is to provide some mitigating action, such as pruning the tree or removing the target, i.e., a bench. Once the tree is removed because of serious decay, there is a tree replacement program. The replacement tree may not be planted where the hazardous tree was removed.

In the beginning in the summer the University will begin an inventory of all trees. The inventory will help track the condition of the trees and ensure that a diversity of trees is maintained on campus. The University does accept donated trees, if it is a species it does not have and if the caliper of the tree is small. Mature trees are not accepted. Bill noted that five schools use trees for their courses for plant identification. There are thirty replacement Cherry trees that will be planted.

Rod White talked about the Cypress trees that have a fungal disease in the Montlake area near the stadium. For thinning purposes that will allow the remaining trees to remain healthy 76 will be removed after July. Incense Cedar trees are being considered as replacement trees.

III. Regional Biocontainment Laboratory (RBL) Siting

Professor Walter E. Stamm, Co-chair, and Professor Douglas J. Wadden, Co-chair, of the Joint Faculty Senate/Provost RBL Siting Committee introduced themselves and said that they would respond to questions about the RBL. Matt Fox asked that in the future reports be posted in HTML format rather than just in a PDF format, to accommodate people who have slow computers.

Eric Larson asked about item three, page 1, in the May 23 letter report addressed to President Emmert, which states that nine RBLs have been constructed to date across the nation, with "apparent satisfactory resolution of community concerns". He stated he found that statement quite an assertion without backup material in support of it. He wanted them to expand and clarify this claim. Douglas Wadden stated that the committee members conducted phone interviews with people across the country and the statement reflects what the committee members were told but that as chairs, they did not have time to substantiate the information given to them by committee members. When the committee surveyed the various RBLs, half of them reflected similar conditions (urban) to the University of Washington. The people they talked to had the same type of campus concerns. Did the community process for these other RBLs result in relocation or redesign, asked Eric Larson. Walter Stamm said "I do not know." With our resources and the time, we were only interested in the conditions and the circumstances of other sites and whether they resemble ours.

Kit O'Neill noted Eric's concern was with one part of the sentence being undocumented. She took issue with another phrase, "constructed to date." She said that she has not found that any of the RBLs awarded funds in September 2003 have been completed yet. Citing Duke, as an example, it is scheduled to open next year. The Colorado State facility, not on campus, is scheduled to be finished in 2007 so she finds that statement misleading. "Do you know if any of them have been built," she asked? Douglas Wadden responded and said that Kit was correct that they are under construction, and none have been completed. We did not have enough time to obtain all the necessary information. "I'm not sure the others are even under construction," and added she saw a huge problem with that portion of the report. She asked if they were willing to retract the statement that is incorrect. Walter Stamm said, "perhaps we should." Eric Larson noted that if President Emmert is taking this report and using it "to guide his decision-making," then it behooves the committee to be more careful in choosing language for the report. Douglas Wadden said that the language was attempting to characterize what plans have been proposed where there were decisions

made to build facilities. Matthew Fox interjected that “constructed to date” does not mean “approved” or “under construction” or “under planning,” and added that the report tries to paint a very rosy picture. He elaborated that perhaps the people you spoke to were researchers, and not people in the community who had issues with them. Douglas Wadden clarified that some of the committee members were highly skeptical of the proposed siting. The interviews conducted were verbal with no written documentation, asking interviewees to profile the status of the project: where it is located, what the impacts are, and community concerns of security access and traffic. The telephone surveys were very quick. Kit O’Neill stated that in her research on the 9 RBL sites she did not find one that was a comparable site to the U.W., i.e., in the middle of an open urban campus in the middle of a city.

Pat Cowan pointed out that the proposed site is currently occupied by the Fishery Program and it would be displaced. Where are they going to go? There are other buildings available. Douglas Wadden noted that the report did look at impacts upon other programs. The pros and cons section of the report did detail the impacts on the site and alternative sites. They did speak to people in Ocean and Fisheries.

Chris Leman called attention to item 7 on page 2 of the report noting the siting locations for the 9 RBLs and raising the issues of proximity to an urban area and safety questions compared to a remote rural location. The University of Chicago RBL facility, Argonne National Laboratory, is approximately 30 miles away. Chris Leman cited a statement that a remote location “would likely disable the research program entirely.” What did the University of Chicago tell you that disabled their program? As Wadden/Stamm explained, Argonne is a very large research facility, so it is not a stand-alone facility. Matthew Fox noted that Fort Lewis is also approximately 30 miles from Seattle. Chris Leman requested the profiles of the 9 RBL sites surveyed. Douglas Wadden stated that there is no written copy; all surveys were verbal discussions. A discussion ensued about proximity to an urban area versus a remote site.

Douglas Wadden emphasized the expressed need to be close to both patient care and research labs because there is a close knit set of relationships. Proximity seemed to matter more, in terms of relative proximity. Chris Leman thought there were a lot of secure sites within 30 miles of here, as on the Kitsap peninsula.

Pat Cowan asked about this necessary relationship between patient care and research. Why not an option of allocating three days for research and two days for patient care. Such a scenario may work and it would mean that they do not need to be on campus, if the distance was reasonable.

Douglas Wadden stated if the RBL site is an hour away from an urban area, it does not remove the public concern of safety anxiety from the equation. Unless you make it truly remote, all the questions and concerns are just transferred to another community. However, Pat Cowan countered that there is a larger population here than if it were located at Fort Lewis with a less dense population. Matthew Fox pointed out that it is a lot easier to drive a U haul filled ammonium nitrate fertilizer onto Boat Street than into Fort Lewis. Douglas Wadden’s response was that preventive measures such as the blast proofing design, the construction of the building, take that into account.

Kit O’Neill relayed two comments from the Montlake Community Club meeting last week. One comment indicated that the requirement the building should be bomb and earthquake proof implies that it should not be sited on any campus. Second, one member had contacted someone who works in the field of infectious disease, asking how often a clinician and a researcher are the same person, and whether there would be a lot of traffic back and forth. The response was very very rarely. The implication of bomb proofing the building is that the adjacent buildings will not be bomb proofed. Douglas Wadden pointed out similarities between the committee’s conversations and community discussions, that in each case people are drawing

conclusions using assumptions based on their point of view and experience. Brett Frosaker asked are they presenting a letter to the University President based on assumptions and conversations? Brett Frosaker asked about the option of telecommunication and that there is not more discussion of that option. Ruedi Risler expressed that their letter to the President should be more fact driven based on higher standards, than how our community members or associations feel. Additionally he thought that feelings are being stated as facts. Douglas Wadden said that the people they spoke with characterized their assumptions based on behavior. Walter Stamm stated that the committee interviewed as many people as possible and obtained their input to write the report, and most of them are knowledgeable in their field. We did not have the budget to visit individual sites.

Matt Fox offered an opinion that the whole process, including this report, seemed directed to arrive at a conclusion that we need to build a RBL on campus. In particular, having received a Regional Center of Excellence grant doesn't necessitate building such a facility since the RCE was awarded before a building was proposed or considered. According to Matthew Fox, President Emmert seems to defend the proposal and tacitly acknowledges it going forward. He pointed out that only 10% of the total infectious disease funding of \$100 million is directly associated with the RCE grant and that 90% of that funding is not contingent on the funding of this project since it was granted before the RBL was under consideration and will continue "as it has without getting into this whole bio-defense business." Walter Stamm offered some clarification about the NIH grant and its conditions (could not clearly hear his full response).

Kit O'Neill said that there are 10 Regional Centers of Excellence; and four did not receive grants in 2003 for RBLs or NBLs. Six of the ten will have RBLs or NBLs, but they are not all under construction. Four RCEs are planning to get by without RBLs. Walter Stamm agreed that not all centers have to have RBLs. Another question is the size of the RBL being proposed here, which is twice the size of other RBLs. Kit O'Neill asked, why is 55,000 square feet being proposed here? Walter Stamm explained that the exact square footage is not finalized .

Daniel Kraus noted that the RBL discussion has taken an hour and there is a full agenda to get through.

Heather Newman asked whether, if the RBL is built on campus, would community members be on the oversight committee? Walter Stamm agreed it is a good idea and definitely there should be community input, but he will not be making that decision. Theresa Doherty cited that the President had talked about expanding the community representation on the University Institutional Biosafety Committee and that others had mentioned the Cambridge model and that President Emmert expressed his intention in a June 7 letter for an independent assessment of safety and security issues. She thought a recommendation to the Regents regarding the grant would not be made until late summer or early fall. Copies of the President's June 7th letter were distributed. Kit O'Neill quoted a news report that the preliminary ranking of the University of Washington's proposal was "very good". Walter Stamm provided more details on the ranking system.

Matthew Fox challenged how the public meetings were portrayed in the Olswang report, although he thought the speakers' arguments were characterized well. Theresa Doherty disputed this interpretation and thought that the report clearly stated that the testimony received during the public outreach was overwhelmingly opposed to the RBL. Kit O'Neill thought that the general impression of the report did not focus on what the people said at the public forums. Chris Leman asked if there would be any followup to the questions raised at this meeting. Kit O'Neill asked if the statement about 9 constructed RBLs will be changed? The language can be clarified to be under construction, stated Douglas Wadden. Eric Larson suggested developing a matrix for these 9 RBLs and their status for the President, rather just providing

impressions of sometimes personally-interested experts. Douglas Wadden said that they were trying to be honest brokers of very divergent views.

Daniel Krauss closed off discussion on the RBL siting report.

IV. Environmental Sustainability: Facilities Services

Ann Eskridge, UW Transportation Services, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the University of Washington's efforts on environmental sustainability. She distributed copies of the booklet, Facilities Services, Focus on Environmental Sustainability, which mirrored her presentation. The presentation highlighted five major areas: landscape management, building management, transportation management, recycling programs and utility management.

V. Capital Projects Updates

Steve Tatge provided an update for the Golf Driving Range project and the ICA Facilities Assessment. He said that the scope of work has not changed when it was presented to this committee. The University has completed 25% construction documents and there are some budget issues. Once the construction documents are finished, then they will apply for a building permit. As part of this process there will be a draft EIS and that will be published for comment. There would be a comment period for 30 days. There will be a bird study as part of the draft EIS. Steve Tatge thought the draft EIS amendment would be published more likely in mid-July. CUCAC members will be notified and a meeting will be convened to allow members to comment on it within that time period, noted Theresa Doherty. So there would be a August CUCAC meeting to review the document assuming the publication date does not slip beyond July.

The University hired HOK Architects, as consultants, to do an Intercollegiate Athletic (ICA) feasibility study. The study, in accordance with the master plan, would include site planning (the east village), landscaping, open space, pedestrian and vehicle circulation, signage and entrances. The study will also examine particular buildings for short-term and long-term improvements that might be necessary. The second component will be a conceptual design for Gray's Annex that is located behind Hec Ed. A consultant to HOK Architects, as part of the third component, will perform a market study for Husky Stadium asking the public (season ticket holders) about adding particular amenities, such as premium seats and suites. There will be a conceptual design for improvements to Husky Stadium. There will be design options and associated cost for them. The feasibility will take approximately in 6-7 months and should be completed after the first of the year.

VI. Mechanical Engineering Feasibility Study

Everett Spring of UW Capital Projects Office updated the committee on the proposal for a new mechanical engineering building and distributed a handout summarizing the project. There are two potential sites (14c – Capital Projects Office and 16c – More Hall Annex) that are in compliance with the master plan. The new facility would provide faculty and staff offices, research and laboratory space, student project space, lounges, storage and conference rooms. The projected total cost estimate is \$60 million dollars. At this time the preferred site is the More Hall Annex, since it is less expensive to build on. The impacts are the same for both sites. At this time the project is not moving ahead, until the University gets a commitment from a donor. There have been some initial conversations with a potential donor and the desire to have it fronting on Stevens Way. The initial feasibility study did not closely examine the affects of Light Rail on the building, but acknowledged there would be some. The University did set some standards for both electro-magnetic and

vibration interference. Theresa Doherty mentioned that Sound Transit has said that one of their mitigation options to meet the UW EMI threshold, is to slow down the trains to 30 miles per hour.

VII. Parking Pay Stations Installation

Mary Catherine Synder from Seattle Department of Transportation explained the City's ongoing replacement of individual parking meters with paystations. The University District is the next neighborhood to have parking paystations installed that will occur in summer 2005. Other communities that have received paystations are Pioneer Square, Downtown, Capitol Hill, Pike/Pine, First Hill and Belltown. She handed out a brochure that explained the new technology with a map indicating what streets in the University District would have paystations installed. The brochure also illustrated a how-to-use step-by-step procedure for the paystations.

VIII. Husky Stadium 2004 TMP Report

Paul Roybal, UW Transportation Services, summarized an update of the 2004 Husky Stadium Parking and Transportation Management Plan Report. He distributed a one-page summary of the report. The random survey was performed on November 6th for the Oregon State football game. He noted that in 2004 the University exceeded its goal of encouraging alternative modes of transportation to Husky Stadium. He pointed that in 2004 there was sharp increase of estimated vehicles parked (3,900) in surrounding neighborhoods from 2003 levels (2,100). Information of parking citations during this game could not be obtained from the City. The University is working to address this issue for the 2005 season.

IX. General UW Updates

Theresa Doherty give updates for several projects. She passed out a summary of the Community Partnership Town Meeting Survey that was held on May 24 that was attended by 150 people. She reviewed quickly what major issues were identified from the survey.

The feasibility study has been completed for the Public Health and Community Medicine Building and site 52-S near the Health Sciences Center has been reserved for them.

The UW Medical Center has hired a consultant to examine their space needs. The original study was to look at internal expansion, but the consultant, NBBJ, recommended looking at potential expansion. The UWMC Board will review this recommendation and make a decision in October. After the UWMC facility planning study has been completed, it will be presented to the Board of Regents and Provost to discuss building concepts and initiate the University's internal assessment which includes review and comments from CUCAC and the Faculty Committee on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS).

Concerning the West Campus Garage, the environmental document is still not complete. When this report is issued it will be issued with plenty of time for CUCAC to review and comment on.

In the May meeting notes, Kit O'Neill referred to her question if a shuttle bus between the south and east campuses would be considered given the fact that there is an under utilization of parking according to the U-Pass Report. Theresa said she would follow-up and get back to committee members.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM.