



**CITY OF SEATTLE – UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

SUMMARY

Meeting #75

December 13, 2005

Approved as Amended January 10, 2006

Members Present

Kit O'Neil, Ravenna Springs
Mark Holden, Laurelhurst CC
Brett Frosaker, Roosevelt
Matthew Fox, University District CC
Caroline Colon, Greater University Chamber
Ken Fales, Montlake CC
Pat Cowan, UPCC
Eric Lason, Roosevelt Neighborhood Alliance
Matthew Stubbs, Eastlake Community Council
Dan Kraus, UW
Brian Ramey, U District Council
Neil Wechsler, Montlake CC Alternate
Chris MacKenzie, Wallingford CC

Staff Present

Sally Williamson, Graduate /Professional Student Rep.
Jan Arntz, UW Capital Projects
Peter Dewey, UW Transportation Services
Randy Everet, UW Capital Projects
Helen Shawcroft, UW Medical Center Theresa Doherty, UW Regional Affairs
Ovid Thompson, substituting for Cliff Louie, City DON

Others Present

Brian Berard, Project Mgr., Marina
Steve Kennard, Architect, Marina

I. Welcome, Introductions

Daniel Kraus, Co-chair, convened the meeting at 7:00 PM. Members and the audience introduced themselves.

II. Review and Approval of the November 8, 2005 Meeting Notes

The meeting notes for November 8, 2005 were approved as amended.



III. Capsule Summaries of the 12/13/05 Meeting Topics (*a more detailed summary follows this section*)

Car Top Boat Launch Marina Update

1. The car-top boat launch is the result of an agreement between the City and the University that allowed the University to vacate a portion 15th Avenue. 2. The University is proposing to move the site designated in the agreement (1101) to the new renovated marina at 1401 NE Boat Street. Discussions are underway with the City's transportation department (SDOT) to determine if this is a minor amendment. 3. The advantages to relocating the boat launch from 1101 to 1401 include a) a safer launch for kayakers and canoe-ers, b) less soil disturbance (and contamination) in order to install the required ADA ramp, c) the 1401 site's proximity to Agua Verde allows for greater synergy with small rental boaters. 4. Some members expressed concern that parking for boat owners (non-permit holders) has not been adequately addressed.

Draft Letter for review re: Supplemental EIS West Campus Garage

A letter signed by Matthew Fox and Daniel Kraus, co-chairs of the CUCAC, in response to the supplemental EIS for the West Campus Garage was given full committee endorsement.

U.W. Medical Center Master Plan Assessment

Helen Shawcroft stated the case for the University Medical Center expansion citing the need for additional beds and space for patient care for the next 10 to 20 years. She suggested several possible sites for expansion. Some committee members were reluctant to comment until the University determines if the expansion is a minor or major amendment to the City/University Agreement (Master Plan).

IV. Car Top Boat Launch Marina Update

Steve Kennard stated that the new docks will consist of steel using high-density polyethylene product, essentially plastic. Translucent and fish friendly, the new marina would be even more boater and kayaker friendly. The schedule for completion is being pushed back a bit due to deciding which choice of materials to use. Nothing has changed relative to the campus master plan.

Shoreline mitigation will return the shoreline to a more natural state. The marina shoreline now has some concrete bulkheads that will be removed. The plan is to line the shoreline with natural plants. Brian Berard stated that the thought is to bring the walkway in closer to the parking lot, to have benches and a seating area. Landscaping would provide an aesthetic backdrop to the Dept. of Fisheries.

Q: Is the bulkhead there to prevent erosion? Brian stated the intent is to take the bulkhead out to create a natural shoreline. Special soil materials will be compacted to (address) the erosion issue. In consultation with the Dept. of Fisheries and other biologists, the long-term goal is to restore the shoreline a little bit at a time and give the fish a break. The area is about 120 feet back without the concrete bulkhead. Steve stated that the combination of restoring the shoreline to a more natural state and a reduction in the number of pilings in the current marina with light penetrating the decking will make the new marina more fish friendly. The mitigation will allow the university to move forward with its plan to remodel the marina.

The new renovated marina will extend exactly the same distance out over the water as the current one. The existing site is approximately 13,700 sq. ft. and the new site will be approximately 11,000 sq. ft. (The new marina) will reduce the actual over-water coverage and (with the new light-penetrating grating) effectively reduced it even more.

In the previous meetings we talked about renovating the marina office building, but the budget does not allow for that (office renovation) at this time. Because of the shoreline mitigation requirements removing the office building now will preclude future replacement of it.

Q: How many boats are you expecting to accommodate, it looks like lots of big slips (instead of little ones)? Ken answered that at our first presentation, the group pointed out that we were reducing the number of small slips. The first plan had one main dock with a lot more big slips, 40-foot slips. The 40-foot slips were removed and reconfigured to 25-foot slips. But the number of slips to accommodate larger size boats remains the same. In fact, the slips to accommodate the 20 to 29-foot boats (which are considered small in the boating industry) have increased. The only area in which we have lost (slips) where we had the under 20-foot boats (most are the 17 to 18-foot boats) (is where) we can't reproduce the dock section. They are old cedar logs with 2 by 10's the width of the walkway. So the cluster of less than 20-foot boat slips can't be reproduced. They are not legal anymore. But compared to other marinas undergoing redevelopment such as Shilshole we have a lot higher percentage of small slips.

Q: So what's the count? The old marina had about a 100, but this is difficult to count because they had long sections that you can't break up into smaller slips. The new marina has about 70 which means we lost about 30 of the under 20-foot boats. (Contributing to the reduction) is the requirement for wider waterways and wider dock sections. So even if we had tried to reproduce the old marina exactly as it was, we would not have been able to.

Comment: Actually it was a substantial redesign coming closer to the spirit of maintaining a place where ski boats and small sail boats could be stored within the constraints of the new regulations.

Steve stated that they are talking with Agua Verde about increasing the amount of kayak rentals in this area. In a previous meeting someone talked about having more rental boats in this area. Talking with Agua Verde would be a natural way to do it since they already have a substantial operation. They have talked with us about improving a section (of the marina) to increase the number of kayaks. This leads into the car-top boat launch discussion.

Steve asked the members to look at a representation of the boat launch. In its agreement with the City in 2000, that allowed it to vacate a portion of 15th Avenue, , the University agreed to a number of deliverables. One of the deliverables was to build a car-top boat launch. The site the City referred to is the one outlined in blue on the map (1101 site). The agreement required the launch to be completed within 18 months of the Sound Transit realignment.

The basic requirements of the car-top boat launch are pedestrian stairs and ramp for hand-carried boats from Boat Street (to launch), hill side landscaping, a load and unload zone, and fixed and floating docks. "The University is proposing a minor change to the PUDA. We're having discussions with SDOT (Seattle Department of Transportation), the agency that will determine if this is a minor change. The change we're talking about is moving the launch site to a better site, the one outlined in yellow on your map (1401 site)."

The reasons we think this is a good idea he said are (1) from a kayaker 's perspective when the marina is reconfigured, it will have motor boats and larger boats on only one side. The other side is houseboats. So when you launch your boat, you will not be faced with a gauntlet of powerboats. The old site has powerboats on both sides. (2) The 1101 site has a contamination problem. (3) (Pointing to another map,) Steve said the picture shows the slope of the 1101 site

and where he sketched in an ADA ramp. To install an ADA ramp here would require significant soil disturbance.

*Q: A member noted that his question may be beyond Steve's purview, but the Jensen Motor Boat Co. has been there for years putting who knows what into the water. Are you concerned about what the disturbance will cause (from) the project in general? The closer you get to the Jensen's the closer you getting to stuff you don't want to kick up.

Steve said that's an issue we are going to deal with through the environmental team. There's an existing dock that runs right along side of the existing marina- A-dock. There are pilings there that are going to have to be pulled out or cut and capped. So whatever the fish and wildlife people agree is the best approach is the one we will use. And sediment (contamination) is one of the things we will have to be worried about.

Q: Will both sides of the boat launch be available for hand carried boats? Yes, this whole site will be just for hand-carried boats. Instead of having to walk down an ADA ramp or stairs as you would at the other site (1101), you'd be able to drive and unload in an area next to the launch and walk about 8 feet to get to the launch. The old site may be renovated at some future date as well.

Another issue we think we will (look into) is the idea that people recognize that there is a certain synergy between people who own kayaks and people who rent kayaks. If you own a kayak and you have a friend who wants to kayak (but doesn't own one), you want to go where you can launch your kayak and your friend can rent one. We are excited about having the car-top boat launch in the same area as they are being rented in. We think it's a natural fit that way.

Q: Will anyone be able to use the dock? A: Yes.

Q: How long is it? A: 25 feet.

Q: Could you launch a single or a double shell? A: Yes. The launch needs to be close to the water.

From shore to water the drop is about 20 inches, so we needed to make this hinge so when the water drops during the winter (the launch ramp will adjust).

Q: what are the rules for parking in the lot after you have dumped your boat? Can you leave your car there?

A: Right now the lot is shared by Agua Verde and the marina patrons. We don't have plans for boat rental parking in the area.

Q: how would people have parked at the other location? A: Same thing: people would pull up, drop their boat, then parked their cars.

Q: What if you are launching a boat all by yourself? You put your boat in then you have to park your car pretty far away.

A: It's not that unusual to drop your boat then park your car some distance away.

One person added that there is lots of parking spots available on the weekends (when most launches take place)

Q: Would marina patrons be allowed to park in the new parking garage, the one that's being talked about?

A: No. The garage is University parking and is closed on the weekends. It's gated.

Parking is available on the street or in the public parking lot. The tradeoffs of having the boat launch at the (1401 site) was better than keeping it at the 1101 site.

Q: Is there a possibility of another car-top boat launch at the old site (1101)?

*See January 10th meeting notes

A: The old site presents a very steep slope. Access has gotten stricter over the years and you have this huge ramping system which isn't going to work.

Q: The question becomes if you have to drop your boat (and not put it in the water) then go park your car, do you have a resting place for the boats?

A: There is a load and unload area. A boat could be set on the gravel walkway. Between the shoreline and the parking lot, we are proposing a gravel walkway, so you could just sit it on the side of the walkway. You could also sit your kayak on the dock that's six feet wide.

Theresa Doherty said in wrapping up that it sounded like parking is one issue. Are there others? Do people think this is a good idea or a bad idea?

Comment: (The new site) is a good place for it.

Steve said his recommendation is to move it (the boat launch) for all the positive reasons. The new site would accommodate more users, be more accessible. Working with Agua Verde we see that over the years the kinds of boats people use have changed from rowboats to kayaks.

Nowadays when people want to get on the water more and more use kayaks.

SDOT will consider if this is a minor change to the PUDA i.e. moving the boat launch from 1101 to 1401.

Q: Why was (the 1401 site) chosen when it is so close to Agua Verde?

A: There are only so many places on the shoreline that would fit this in. Agua Verde may not have wanted the launch closer to them anyway.

V. Draft Letter for review re: Supplemental EIS West Campus Garage

Daniel Kraus directed the members attention to letter drafted by Matthew Fox. Matthew stated he sent around a letter for the members' review. In recapping, he stated that last month he raised a lot of issues about the proposal to extend the West Campus parking garage. He took a letter that had been written for the community council and explained that the language may be considered tough but it's a tough project. Pointing to the site map, he indicated that development has occurred quickly. The site has been identified as one of the only spaces along Pacific Ave in the Master Plan as open space. If the West Campus garage goes forward, the possibility of preserving open space will be lost forever. He further stated that this is the first project since the adoption of the University's Master Plan that he has had an outright objection to. In referring to the Master Plan, he noted that it is a little contradictory. In one place it indicates enhanced open space, in another it points to the possibility of a building there. But it's also in a place where one of the maps distinguishes a building with parking and a parking structure. He noted that inserting office space into a building intended to be a parking garage does not make it a mixed-use building. Establishing this point will help in future discussions about the Master Plan. For these reasons he favored adoption of the letter.

Additionally, he noted that the University was marketing the West Campus garage to general commuters. In addition to permit parking, the University was offering the parking to the public. There were essentially no further comments. **The motion to send the letter to the addressees was passed unanimously.**

VI. U.W. Medical Center Master Plan Assessment.

Helen Shawcroft conducted a power point presentation of the UW Medical Center Facility Planning Study. Helen explained that the purpose of the presentation is to share the study's findings, review the site options available for the Medical Center's expansion and to hear the committee's comments on the site options under consideration. Helen noted that the study is driven by the need to accommodate continued growth of services to the region and significant space shortages. She is hearing that there is inadequate teaching space for today's needs caused by changing technologies and facility obsolescence. Additionally, the expansion is needed to

help the University remain competitive in the market. Expansion is hampered by limited site availability.

The 4 major stages in the planning process are the data collection phase, analysis, alternatives, and the recommended plan.

The consultants, NBBJ, collected data: they talked with the staff and teachers in the school of Medicine about their vision, services, goals, objectives as well as the facility condition. They had thought about internal renovation. NBBJ proceeded to analyze that information and project how the region would grow over the next 10 to 20 years. They compared this study with other hospitals in the area. The consultants did workload projections with alternative scenarios. It became clear at this point that we needed to look at options other than renovation. Finally, NBBJ recommended a plan to the Medical Center board. The board took 6 months to do an additional study.

One of the key findings was that the MC was short of space today. The MC is about 150,000 to 200,000 square feet short of current needs. The need will grow to additional 600,000 square feet by the year 2025. Furthermore, more teaching space is needed to support training programs and there is not enough adjacent space for expansion.

Q: How do you figure out you are (so many) square feet short right now?

A: The square footage needs were based on workload calculations that included how many admissions we would have, how many CT scans, how many MRI's. They also included how many prescriptions needed to be filled, laboratory tests that need to be preformed. Based on that data and their experience across the country, they could figure out how much square footage would be needed.

Q: Is Harborview included in this calculation?

A: No, Harborview is not

Helen explained that the hospital operates pretty much like any other hospital in the area. They receive only a small amount of funds from the state legislature. They have to generate their operating revenue just like Swedish Hospital and others. It has to be run like a business.

Q: Is this strictly patient care based? This does not include office space unless it's directly supports patient care?

A: Yes.

Helen pointed to the chart forecasting the MC bed needs up to 2025. The assumption is that the bed needs would grow as the region grew. Also put into the calculation was the way people in this region use hospital services. Need forecasts for 26 different services were developed. The forecast was based on a significant decrease in the average length of stay.

Q: In your previous visit you stated that you were closing down the east wing for patient care?

A: You are referring to the Pacific Tower. Yes we will be closing some of the areas for patient care.

Q: So how many beds are you losing now?

A: Until UWMC does more detailed work, that question can't be answered precisely. The University has an agreement with the City that provides for early consultation. The site selection process tempers the answer to that question.

She stated that they have shared their results with the staff, the faculty, the board, and the campus administration. Assuming the Provost accepts the recommendation, she will select the site. The Medical Center will hire an architect.

In continuing to answer the question as to where the Pacific Tower beds will go, Helen stated that the final site selected may determine the answer to that question. The question may be answered in the continuing presentation.

Helen said the consultants projected the need for operating rooms to the year 2025. Also an assessment of the clinic, diagnostic and treatment, and support space revealed an increased workload for diagnostic and interventional imaging; space needs for the pharmacy, food service, and laboratory medicine. Space shortages were noted in other areas as well.

In summary, she said we have shortages now and they will become more severe in the future. The older buildings some constructed in 1959 have varying degrees of usefulness. Many buildings cannot be expected to continue to be utilized until 2025 without an upgrade or replacement or significant compromise.

They also looked at relocating services off-site but could not move enough to solve current and future space needs.

NBBJ concluded that the current and future needs of the MC could not be accommodated within the configuration of the existing facility. They recommended the MC proceed with the expansion.

Helen then stated their thoughts on the alternatives to expansion: they looked at upgrading or replacing existing facilities on campus. They looked at limited off campus relocation services and expanding on campus as well as relocating to a new campus.

NBBJ's recommended option: expansion on campus and limited renovation of existing facilities.

Helen then directed the committee's attention to the stacking diagram and explained the uses of each floor in the new building, the Pacific Tower and the Muilenburg Tower. Phase I would be a 60 bed addition. In their Phase II recommendation, contingent on financing, NBBJ said additional beds should be added. Helen stated they are not looking at doing Phase II immediately. Helen used a aerial view to orient the committee to Medical Center and South Campus site. Next steps include the completion of the campus site selection process, and RFQ for an architect, and the appointment of the architect in March 2006.

She showed a map of the 5 sites that are under consideration for MC expansion.

Matthew Fox stated that the sites under consideration have no relation to the Master Plan. Helen stated that it was her understanding that this would be a minor amendment to the Master Plan.

She further stated that when the University's master plan was being developed 7 or 8 years ago, hospital planners did not foresee a need for growth in in-patient care space. The UW was not alone in this assessment---most hospitals thought the growth would be in out-patient care.

Theresa added that they tried to write a Master Plan that would be very flexible and that would have a lot of holes in it but only one of the sites considered is in the Master Plan. However, the CUCAC agreement does allow for minor amendments and this proposal should fit within that agreement. One member felt the projections might be a little low if only 2 floors for inpatient beds are proposed. Additional comments suggested that the University is running out of space for future expansions. Helen responded that those are some of the tough questions the campus officials will have to consider. One member question whether we were getting a little bit ahead of ourselves talking about site selections, etc. when we haven't considered the proposal in light of the Master Plan. Theresa responded that they have a client that needs to expand and that the most obvious choice would be the space next to them, but that the other sites considered are not/have not been designated in the Master Plan. She acknowledged that their interpretation of the agreement is that the proposal would require only a minor amendment, but agrees that further comment is necessary from DPD and CUCAC. The Provost is the one who selects a preferred site and she has not seen the comments from the various groups consulted in the site selection process. A member stated the site map would be easier to read if it showed the shoreline. However, none of the buildings shown is within 200 feet of the shoreline. Helen stated that patient proximity to related services is important emphasizing the need for nearby expansion. There was considerable agreement that the proposed sites should have some correlation to the Master Plan before the committee can offer a meaningful opinion. Theresa added that the consultants look into the future was done as professionally as they could, that phase I could possibly be done now, phase II later (when financially feasible).

In response to a question about a rumor that new dorms are being built, Theresa answered that the university wants to look at the undergraduate experience in total. A committee was formed to

consider the undergraduate experience and one of the questions on the table is what would be the effect of having all freshmen live on campus. (Somehow that question morphed into the rumor that the University will build new dorms.)

Agenda items for the January meeting may include a briefing from Washington Department of Transportation on the 520 bridge and whether the hospital expansion requires a minor amendment to the agreement.

The meeting was adjourned.

Amendments to the 12-15-05 meeting notes

1. Matthew Fox clarified his comments regarding the UW Medical Center's expansion (Section VI): "The site selection process ought not to proceed at all until the sites are in the master plan"
2. UW edits of Section VI. U.W. Medical Center Master Plan Assessment are included in this account of the 12/15/05 CUCAC meeting.