



City of Seattle

Department of Neighborhoods

Yvonne Sanchez, *Director*

Gregory J. Nickels, *Mayor*

DRAFT

MEETING SUMMARY

CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting #50

June 11, 2002

Members Present

Margaret Hornbaker – University of Washington Student Representative

Fred Hart – Greater University Chamber of Commerce

Don Argus – Montlake Community Club

Matthew Fox – University District Community Council

Susan Torrance – Laurelhurst Community Council

Hans Aschenbach – Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance (Alternate)

Ken Fales – Montlake Community Club (Alternate)

Pat Cowan – University Park Community Council

David Thorud – University Faculty Representative

Karen Buschow – Wallingford Community Council

Eric Larson – Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance

Betty Swift – Portage Bay Roanoke

Michael Bitner – Ravenna Bryant Community Association

Bryan Ramey – University District Community Council (Alternate)

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods

Stephanie Haines – City of Seattle, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use

Peter Dewey – University of Washington

Theresa Doherty – University of Washington Assistant Vice President For
Regional Affairs

Others Present

Bryan Hall – University of Washington Capital Projects Office

John Shaw - City of Seattle, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use

I. Opening and Housekeeping

Fred Hart opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Introductions followed. The minutes from Meeting 49 were approved with the following changes: 1) to add the following sentence at the top of Page 3 – Chris Leman and Hans Aschenbach noted that the cordon count had been discontinued. CUCAC members expressed surprise and consternation concerning this; and 2) to amend the last sentence of Paragraph 2 page 8 to Read This issue has also been raised to DCLU previously. The agenda was modified to add a short discussion of the Husky Football Transportation Plan, combine several topics and change the order of some items on the agenda.

II. Project Update on the Life Sciences Building

Theresa Doherty introduced Bryan Hall from the University of Washington Capital Projects Office to discuss the Life Sciences and Genetics Sciences Building (shown on plans as the Life Sciences II and III Buildings) that is to be located on site 48S. The project is currently in pre-design. One of the key elements of the Southwest Campus Plan that effects this project is the portage Bay Vista. It is codified in that plan as being 115 feet wide minimum and 1.5 acres minimum. Because of this the building envelope is constrained by the Portage Bay Vista, 15th Street, the 200-foot shoreline setback on the south, and the 65-foot height limit.

Brian Ramey asked for clarification concerning the effects of this building on views. He noted that it appeared to him that when looking south from University Way, these buildings would block the views of Jensen Boats and Portage Bay. Mr. Hall stated that he was unsure how much this building would block that view and that this issue would be covered in the project level Supplemental EIS. Mr. Ramey stated that this would seem be too late for CUCAC to effectively address any concerns about view blockage. Theresa Doherty stated that the Master Plan looked at the programmatic level EIS so these buildings were contemplated in the overall EIS. Mr. Ramey asked what the purpose of this briefing was if the site and size of the building was already a done deal.

Mr. Ramey expressed concern over the process. He stated that in the event that the Master Plan shows a footprint of a building and the University then comes back to CUCAC or the community, that the University might say that the entire building envelope is already approved so that the University presentation is just a courtesy visit. Ms. Doherty responded that the presentation is intended to give an update on the use of the building sites, what the programs are, and what the public benefits are as related to the Portage Bay Vista. She also noted that all of these elements were approved in the Southwest Campus Plan, but that the University would come back with more on what the building might look like and what some of the landscaping might be. Mr Ramey again asked whether this

meant that there would be an opportunity to comment on building height and view blockage. Ms. Doherty stated that the height was already established in the Master Plan and as Mr. Hall stated would not exceed the 65 feet allowed by that plan. Mr. Ramey noted that in the event that CUCAC determined that the view down University Way was worth preserving, it is really too late to change the allowed bulk and height of the building.

Mr. Hall stated that this is a very significant building and that view studies will be done from several viewpoints. Mr. Ramey asked what would be done if these studies showed significant view blockage. Mr. Hall stated that he was unsure what would be done. This issue will be coming back to CUCAC shortly.

III. Cordon Count Replacement Methodology

Theresa Doherty stated that she and Peter Dewey had attempted to meet with all of the members of CUCAC to go over the method that the University is proposing to replace the cordon count. The University is proposing to eliminate visitors and patients from the University's overall vehicle trip count. The presentation to CUCAC is informational at this point and no specific action is being requested.

Peter Dewey summarized the proposed alternative count methodology. Under the previous master plan the cordon count was developed as a way to estimate trips to and from the University. It is a sampling of trips to campus and not a total count. The University is proposing a different sampling and has tried to verify estimates using this new method against the exiting cordon count method and have found that the two methods seem to correlate well. Mr. Dewey stated that the City currently pays for 50% of the cost of the cordon count but would not be picking up any of the cost of the alternative method. Metro funds a part of the U-pass survey.

Mr. Dewey was asked if Metro and others wouldn't want to know information concerning visitors and patients. Mr. Dewey responded that the University collects this information, and others are interested in it, but that the University is not proposing that these trips be covered under the trip limits.

Kasren Buschow stated that with the City collecting the cordon count, there appears to be some neutrality and objectivity that might be lost if the University is using internal data only. She suggested that the City remain a funding and evaluation partner in this process. Mr. Dewey responded that the City would not be excluded from this process. Steve Sheppard stated that he understood the intent of the question as addressing the concern that the City's involvement is important to assure that the data is honestly collected and interpreted. He noted that this concern has not driven City evaluations and that the City does not appear to have had any reason to suspect that the University is attempting to manage the data. The City will be involved. John Shaw stated that both Department of Design construction and Land Use and the Seattle Department of

Transportation staff would continue to be involved in the ongoing development and evaluation of the methodology.

Fred Hart noted that the survey would be done by an outside agency, but observed that we do know that agencies can be encouraged to find the desired results. Theresa Doherty responded that she hoped that Mr. Hart was not implying that the University would do this. Mr. Dewey stated that while you can hire a consultant to say whatever you want them to say, King County Metro administers the survey and they have an interest in showing that there are a lot of transit riders. However, since the University has to pay for those riders, it has an opposite interest. The University pays \$1 per trip or \$9 million for transit use now. Brian Ramey stated that this makes it appear that the University has an interest in reducing transit use. Peter Dewey responded that the University simply has no interest in "cooking the books" for the purpose of overstating transit use.

Brian Ramey stated that the contention that visitor and patient trips are excluded because limiting them would conflict with the University's public service mission and that similar limitations are made of no others is a blatantly false statement. Everyone who does a master plan must show what their attraction to outsiders other than employees and staff is going to be and the tips that they will generate. Failing to divulge this information to the community seems inappropriate.

Peter Dewey responded that the University, like any other developer, needs to mitigate project-specific development impacts. The University has no purpose in trying to not mitigate the impact of visitors and patients to the University. CUCAC, the City, the University, and DCLU all concluded that limiting those trips is not in the best interest of all of the stakeholders. The University is not trying to hide these impacts but is proposing that the trip limitations that were established in the General Campus Physical Development Plan be changed to focus on faculty, staff, and students, and that the University use other mechanisms to deal with patients and visitors.

Hans Aschenbach stated that there does not seem to be a consequence to the University if it fails to meet its 1990 goals. Peter Dewey responded that if the goals were not met that the University would be forced to implement additional measures until the goals were met. Matt Fox also stated that he did not see major consequences for failure to meet the 1990 goals. Mr. Aschenbach stated that the consequence is just to "try harder" and that one of the major efforts or actions would be further increases in parking charges and that there is no financial or construction consequence under the current scenario. He stated that the Northeast District Council will testify to the City Council that there should be a financial and development consequences for failure to meet goals. If consequences are established, then there might be a need for an independent agency to do the evaluation to avoid "cooking the books".

Ken Fales asked for clarification on both the purpose of the cordon count and who would use it. Mr. Dewey stated that the purpose is to track trips to the University against the goals established in 1990 and would be used to evaluate success in meeting those goals. Mr. Doherty noted that the evaluators include CUCAC.

Peter Dewey noted that the cordon count showed that traffic volumes were split 1/3 to 2/3 with the 2/3 generated by non-university trips. Others on the committee noted that this was an issue for discussions with the City and asked what consequences there were to this traffic growth. Hans Aschenbach stated that while the University might generate only 1/3 of the traffic, it is the largest institution in the City and it is the entity that drives everything around the University District. It is important for the University to be at the forefront of mass transit use.

IV. Husky Stadium TMP Parking Fee Increase

Ken Fales noted that there is a notice for a public meeting concerning increased parking fees for increased fees associated with Husky Football Stadium parking. He asked how this would effect the various RPZ's around the Stadium. Peter Dewey noted that this is being done under the Husky Stadium TMP that is a separate process from the general TMP. Ken Fales responded that he was concerned that notice for public comment was too short. Theresa Doherty noted that she had asked for volunteers for the Husky Stadium TMP Committee and that Mr. Fales volunteered for this position.

V. Emergency Power Plant Renovations and Stevens Way Re-paving

Theresa Doherty stated that there would be two projects that will result in road closures that might negatively effect traffic patterns on campus. The first is internal remodeling of the Emergency Power Plant that will result in a closure of Jefferson Road. This will not have a major effect. The second closure will be for Steven's Way. Steven's Way is the central road through campus. The second phase of this will be ongoing during the summer and will result in re-routing of traffic and may have some traffic impacts. In response to questions Theresa Doherty stated that she would try to determine what effects this will have on bus re-routings or use.

VI. Future Meetings and Adjournment

There was a discussion of the need to discuss issues related to the provision of student housing and noise ordinances at a future meeting. July was suggested as a possible date. Theresa stated that she and Steve Sheppard would get together concerning possibly scheduling a meeting to discuss this issue. It was determined that there would be no August meeting.

No further business being before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.