



City of Seattle

Department of Neighborhoods

Brent Crook, *Acting Director* Greg Nickels, *Mayor*

MEETING SUMMARY

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting #45

January 8, 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
Kenneth Fales – Montlake Community Club
Karen Buschow – Wallingford Community Council
Pat Cowen – University Park Community Club
Matthew Fox – University District Community Council
Susan Torrence – Laurelhurst Community Council
Susan Baker – Roosevelt Neighborhood Association
Kit O'Neill – Ravenna Springs Community Group
Chris Leman – Eastlake Community Council
Eric Larson – Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods
Theresa Doherty – University of Washington
Jan Arntz – University of Washington
Stephanie Haines – City of Seattle, Department of Design Construction and Land
Use
John Lebo – University of Washington Capital Projects Office
Bill Talley - University of Washington Capital Projects Office
Tom Ryan – University of Washington Project Manager – 43rd Avenue Entrance
Project.

Others Present

Hans Aschenback
Jeannie Hale
Jean Colley

I. Opening and Housekeeping

Margaret Hornbaker opened the meeting at 7:10 PM. The Agenda was amended to move the discussion of the Golf Driving Range to the front of the agenda. The minutes for meetings 43b and 44 were approved without changes.

II. Reconsideration of the CUCAC Position on the Golf Driving Range

Michael Bittner moved reconsideration of the CUCAC position on the University Golf Driving Range (Site 57E). He noted that he had voted in favor of the previous of position and was therefore allowed under Robert's Rules of Order to move reconsideration. The motion was seconded. Discussion commenced.

Mr. Bittner stated that since his original vote, he has had lengthy discussions both with his community council board and the boards of adjacent community organizations. His board has concluded that there are still many unresolved issues and has instructed him to support reconsideration of CUCAC endorsement of the Golf Driving Range. Susan Torrence stated that Laurelhurst has also looked at the proposal and believes that there are many issues that need consideration. For instance, she stated that Laurelhurst has concluded that the change of fencing material from a soft netting to chicken wire will seriously effect migratory birds. In addition this development will further worsen the already bad traffic situation on 25th Avenue. Lighting is also an issue given the cumulative effect of addition of night lighting in this area.

Theresa Doherty stated that the City/University Agreement outlines the process for CUCAC's development of its position on the Master Plan. Under that provision, the report was finalized and forwarded to the City on November 5th. She stated that it is unfortunate that CUCAC is considering changing their position after one and a half years of deliberations on the issue. If Individual community councils desire to reconsider this issue would appear to be a better direction.

Mathew Fox stated that while he sees some logic in Ms. Doherty's position, he believes that CUCAC has the right to send a clarification and re-consideration of its position to the Hearing Examiner. Steve Sheppard stated that there is no provision to rescind the final report. CUCAC can send a follow-on letter but that would not technically change the CUCAC report which would stand. David Thorud stated that he was concerned that this change of position would undermine the credibility of CUCAC. Kit O'Neill stated that she felt that there was new information concerning the effect of the fencing on birds and that this

alone justifies reconsideration. John Lebo noted that all of these issues have been discussed with CUCAC previously and would be addressed further in the EIS

Michael Bittner noted that the motion on the floor is that CUCAC reconsider the position. Once that motion is voted on then CUCAC would have to vote on its position. He urged that CUCAC vote on the question of whether to reconsider this position or not. Steve Sheppard was asked to restate the Motion. He stated the motion as follows:

Moved that CUCAC shall reconsider its position on the University of Washington Golf Driving Range.

The motion passed 7 in favor, 5 opposed and 1 abstaining.

The committee then moved on to discussion of the possible CUCAC position. Steve Sheppard was asked what the process would be for notifying the City of whatever the new CUCAC position would be. He stated that the CUCAC report would stand, but that a supplemental letter stating CUCAC's new position would have to be sent to the Hearing Examiner. How the Hearing Examiner might respond to such a letter would be unclear. It would not have the effect of withdrawing the current CUCAC position, but would simply be forwarding additional information. Theresa Doherty stated that the City University Agreement simply states that the CUCAC position was produced on December 5th and that the individual community councils should go to the Hearing Examiner Hearing rather than have CUCAC somehow reverse its position on what would be a very close vote. Ken Fales agreed that the position outlined by Ms. Doherty would be preferable.

Steve Sheppard noted that CUCAC had been presented with two alternatives during meeting #43 on 9/23/01. Alternative 1 retained the existing fence height and eliminated the height rezone. Alternative 2 conditionally approved the height rezone. During that meeting Jack Lynch moved adoption of alternative 2 which was approved on a vote of 7 in favor 3 opposed. With its approval no specific vote was taken on alternative 1. Fred Hart noted that the issue is really the rezone. Mathew Fox stated that if CUCAC votes to overturn its previous position it would be in effect adopting alternative 1. Jeanie Hale stated that Laurelhurst has struggled with this and that she sees nothing wrong with sending supplemental information to the hearing examiner stating that CUCAC needs more information prior to coming up with a final position. Mathew Fox stated that the issue is really reconsideration of the position and not a general call for more information.

Jack Lynch asked for clarification concerning the actual vote. If CUCAC votes to overturn the CUCAC position, then would CUCAC have to then re-vote on the issue of alternative 1 vs. alternative 2. Steve Sheppard stated that the proper

procedure was first to re-vote on the motion as presented at meeting #43, which was:

That CUCAC approve alternative two in the Draft CUCAC report.

In the final report that recommendation was as follows:

CUCAC urges that the City conditionally approve the height rezone needed to allow the expansion of the Golf Driving Range. Conditions should include: 1) time limitations on any night lighting on the field; and 2) development of a detailed work program to obtain review and agreement with CUCAC concerning design.

Following a vote on that motion, then CUCAC could vote on Alternative 1 as presented at that meeting.

Susan Baker stated that she was uncomfortable with alternative 1 since it simply declines the rezone and that she would prefer a total reconsideration of the issue. She stated that there may be some compromise that CUCAC could support.

The question was called and upon reconsideration, the motion to adopt alternative 2 as the CUCAC position failed: 6 in favor 7 opposed. With this vote CUCAC rescinded its previous approval of Jack Lynch's motion at meeting 43.

Mathew Fox moved adoption of alternative 1 as presented at Meeting 43 and that a letter be sent to the hearing examiner. The recommendations from alternative 1 were as follows:

Recommendation 12 Amend the discussion of site 57E (Golf Driving Range) page 115 to revise the statements concerning fence height and second-story addition as follows:

~~Increase Retain a fence height ranging from 80' to 100' of 37' at the driving range. Primarily to improve site safety and to accommodate partial second story. If a second-story addition is considered, explore other mechanisms to protect against golf balls escaping the range area.~~

Recommendation 13 In order to support this position, amend the height limit map page 130 to eliminate the H-9 designation that is applied to the Golf Driving Range site.

Recommendation 14 In order to assure that all references to development on Site 57 E are consistent, amend table IV-2 page 84 – Preliminary Square Foot Estimates to indicate in column 3 under Site 57E that the site shall have an

*estimated 2 stories of development and in column 4
that the Maximum Envelope shall be 15,000 square feet.*

The motion was seconded.

John Lebo stated that in his opinion the assertion that there is new information being presented is misleading and that the University has addressed these issues in detail to CUCAC and would continue to be dealt with during the environmental review.

The question was called and passed: 7 in favor, 6 opposed, none abstaining.

Jan Arntz stated that the University would issue an EIS scoping notice for the Golf Driving Range EIS very soon and that CUCAC will have an opportunity to comment on it.

III. Campus Landscape Issues Near the Surgery Pavilion

Bill Talley was introduced to briefly discuss this issue. Mr. Talley stated that the University has been attempting to retain two redwood trees near the intersection of Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard. This is proving difficult, but will still be done. The trees will have to be dug up and put back in place. They may be relocated very slightly. The general area will also receive an extensive landscape treatment.

Ken Fales asked for clarification concerning the closure of the sidewalk in the area during construction. He noted that this sidewalk provides the only access to the Bus stop and University. Bill Talley responded that this issue would be addressed once the final plan is established.

IV. Brief Project Updates

Jan Arntz was introduced to lead brief discussion on several UW development projects.

- a. **Merril Hall** – The current activity focuses on matching the project scope to the budget. The project is facing a tighter budget than anticipated. One these issues are dealt with the project will come back to CUCAC for further review. It is currently anticipated that this will occur in February of possibly March.
- b. **Conibear Shellhouse** – The EIS comment period ends on January 10th. To date no comments have been received.
- c. **43rd Street Entrance Project** – Tom Ryan was introduced to discuss this project. He stated that the project was previously presented to CUCAC as part of the 15th Avenue Improvement Study. The project involves the re-

development of the area into the campus that would extend from NE 43rd Street. The area is presently shared by pedestrians and vehicles. Changes would be made to eliminate this conflict and return this area to primarily pedestrian use. Jan Arntz noted that the grade is relatively steep and that extensive re-grading would be done to accommodate ADA concerns. Tom Ryan stated that this project would eventually connect with the planned plaza along 15th Avenue NE that would be improved as part of the Sound Transit project. In the meantime temporary sidewalks will be installed in the vicinity of the future Sound Transit Plaza. There will be an environmental process (presently envisioned as a declaration of non-significance) primarily because of the amount of excavation involved.

Editor's Note: Additional discussion of the drawings presented at the meeting ensued. This discussion could not be summarized verbally.

- d. Lighting on the Outdoor Practice Field – A declaration of Non-significance will be issued soon for this project.

V. Other Issues

Eric Larson stated that the Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance is planning to present a letter raising concerns with the University TMP in light of the increasing likelihood that sound Transit will not be constructed to the University District over the life of the proposed Campus Master Plan. He introduced Hans Aschenback, Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance Transportation Chair to discuss this issue.

Mr. Aschenback stated that until recently it was assumed that Sound Transit would arrive on Campus within the life of this plan. However this is not now anticipated. In light of the delay in sound Transit the Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance has concluded that there is relatively little proposed as additional mitigation for the increased student and faculty population on the University Campus. He stated that he hoped that CUCAC could support or endorse Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance's call for the development of additional mitigation measures.

Mr. Aschenback stated that without Sound Transit the keystone of the University TMP is gone. Instead the entire TMP would consist of "tweaking" the existing U-pass program. He stated that the Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance does not consider this sufficient mitigation. He asked that CUCAC consider endorsing the Alliance's letter or even forwarding it as a supplemental CUCAC position. This letter asks: 1) that the University be required to provide specific action items with its enhanced TMP rather than broad guidelines; and 2) that the University should plan and budget now for incorporation of sound Transit onto Campus in the Future.

Theresa Doherty responded that the TMP commits to take actions to assure that the University states that it will not increase its trips. The first item mentioned is

increasing parking pricing and that if this does not work other actions will be taken. The University is holding itself accountable to meeting this promise.

Committee members noted that since no letter is available, it is not possible to establish a CUCAC position at this time.

VI. Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee the meeting was adjourned.