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Members and Alternates Present
Matt Fox – U District Community Council
Neal Lessenger – UW At-Large
Pat Cowen – University Park Community Club
Kirstin Curry – Laurelhurst Community Club
Ashley Emery - UW

Betty Swift – Portage Bay/Roanoke
Elaine King – Montlake Community Club
Chris Leman – Eastlake Community Council

Staff and Others Present
Theresa Doherty – UW Regional Affairs
Chuck Budnik
John Lebo
Paul Zoasski – University of Washington

Steve Sheppard, City Dept of Neighborhoods
Dana Miller – University of Washington
Jan Amrz – University of Washington

I. Opening of Meeting/Approval of Agenda/Housekeeping

The meeting was opened at 7:05 by Mat Fox. Brief introductions followed. The agenda was approved without modifications. The Minutes for Meeting 103 were approved unanimously.

II. Husky Union Building (HUB) Renovation Project

Editor’s Note: Much of this discussion related to overhead slides and power point presentations and was not easily translated into a written format.

John Lebo was introduced to give a follow-up briefing to the Committee on the HUB remodeling project. Mr. Lebo noted that this is a planned renovation of the HUB and is proposed to start construction in July 2010 and be completely renovated for Fall Quarter 2012. He noted that he had previously briefed CUCAC June. At that time the project had not yet been approved. The Regents have now approved the funding plan so the project is funded and is moving forward. The University just recently completed what’s called the design development phase which is the end of the design phase and now is moving into development of the construction documents. This is essentially the production drawings for potential contractor to base their bids on.

Mr. Lebo stated that the project was approved as a complete renovation of the HUB. Much of the building will be gutted and rebuilt. The HUB was originally constructed in 1949.
and has been added on to many times over the years. It now contains about 260,000 gross square feet in five floors, two partially or totally sub-grade and three above grade. The result of all of the additions is that the current building is eclectic and with a combination of styles and materials. One of the major goals of the renovation project it to unify the look of the HUB.

Mr. Lebo then presented a series of overhead slides showing the exterior of the proposed renovation. He noted that care was being taken to retain the 1949 and 1952 facades as much as possible. This is the west façade and is in a campus gothic style. Newer architecture will occur on the east and south sides of the building. The north elevation includes both the loading dock and an entry. He noted that the entrance will be double arches and will replace the existing single arch. He noted that the entry arch is intended to be a “lantern” for the building and will be sympathetic to a similar treatment on the south elevations.

Committee members asked if the existing double arch on the north side would be removed. Mr. Lebo responded that the existing arch will be removed and replaced with a new double arch. He noted that part of the reason for that relates to the program for the building and how it works internally and how the existing arch and entry functioned. It was determined that it did not function well. The existing archway neither worked programmatically nor aesthetically. This is an area where there is a need to make a transition between the campus gothic style of the west façade and the newer elements of the building. The concept here is that the glass and brick archways would serve as a sort of lantern or beacon into the building.

Members expressed a desire to either retain the double arches or somehow mirror or mimic them better and noted that they had been there for some time. Mr. Lebo responded that, while the arch appears to be in the 1950’s campus gothic style, they are newer additions. This double arch was added in 1975. Members also asked if it might be possible to salvage the arches and use them somewhere else? Matt Fox noted that this has been done in other situations downtown and that tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of people have gone through those arches and associate them with their UW experience and it seems a shame if they will just be destroyed. If they can’t be incorporated into the building why can’t be moved somewhere else and used in another building or maybe someone would buy them and preserve them.

Pat Cowen suggested that something stylized be done to reflect this arch and act as a transition between the modern architecture of the east façade and the campus gothic. Matt Fox noted that the old Washington Mutual Tower accomplished something similar downtown.

John Lebo responded that the University might be able to make the arches available as part of the salvage. However, as they are not great examples of collegiate gothic, they might not be of great interest to others.

John Lebo noted that the two “lantern stairs” is to anchor the two ends of the central pathway through the building. The idea is to create a “street” through the building. Matt Fox stated that the suggested treatment appeared rather good in his opinion.

Mr. Lebo then went through the floor plans for the building. Matt Fox asked what the respective capacities of the old auditorium and the new was? Paul Zarkowski responded that the existing auditorium is 434 fixed seats and the new auditorium will be able to have a standing room only crowd, SRO crowd of about 700 with about 400 seats for like dinner and banquets. The upper floor will continue to include the ballrooms, meeting rooms, and the administrative and staff offices. The
building will have a sedum green roof. This green roof was one of the things that the students wanted incorporated into the design. The basement will continue to include the games area and the bowling alley. The lanes will be resurfaced with an overlay. This will be done in a way that also restores the daylight into this area.

Mr. Lebo noted that the landscaping will include some removal of trees, retention of important trees, and planting of some new trees. However over time the HUB has become overgrown and the University is attempting to restore the landscaping to what it was originally intended to be. This will require cleaning up the existing landscaping and removal of excess growth. The plan has been presented to the Campus Landscape committee.

Matt Fox asked if the loading dock bigger will be better screened. Mr. Lebo stated that it would.

Mr. Lebo noted that the building would be a bit larger. There are presently has about 260,000 now; in the future it will have about 268,000 square feet. However, the footprint will remain the same. There are additions on the second and third floors which are partially offset by a reduction in the lower floor square footages as a result of the atrium. Chris Leman asked what functions would see their square footages reduced. Paul Zarkowski responded that the HUB will no longer have a separate news stand in the building. This will be replaced by the “Welcome Center”. A commuter lounge will also be added to the upper floors. The footprint of the building doesn’t get any larger, it’s just that in that northeast corner the building was only a couple floors high and then it sort of stepped up as a wedding cake, and the University is infilling in those areas, so the footprint of the building remains the same. As a result the building may appear somewhat larger.

III. 520 Follow up

Chris Leman was recognized to lead the discussion on this topic. Mr. Lehman noted that at the last meeting he had suggested that CUCAC consider a motion supporting further study of a four lane alternative for SR 520 and that members might want to check with their respective organizations to determine what their positions might be. He noted that he had developed suggested language for a CUCAC motion and read suggested wording for a motion forward as follows:

That the City – University Community Advisory Committee requests of Governor Gregoire and WSDOT that a Supplemental SR520 EIS study a transit friendly four-lane alternative that includes any applicable enhancements that were developed for the six lane alternatives.

Mr. Leman formally moved the motion. Neil Lessenger seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

Chris Lehman spoke to his motion. He stated that the motion does not commit anyone to either favor or oppose this or any other alternative, but only requests that a four-lane alternative be studied further with inclusion of all of the enhancements and transit improvement included in the six lane alternatives. Mr. Leman further stated that all of the six-lane alternatives are at least $2,000,000,000 beyond any secured financing. He noted he had discussed this issue with selected legislators and that they had stated that if the six land alternatives proved financially impossible to do, then there would be an “end game” that might include going back to a four-lane alternative. Mr. Leman stated that if that is the case, then a fully developed and vetted four-lane alternative would be prudent or crucial to have on the table.
The floor was then opened to further discussion. Pat Cowen observed that it appeared that the six-lane alternative had been presented to the governor already and asked for clarification on that. Theresa Doherty responded that the SR 520 legislative work group held its last meeting today and had voted at their earlier meeting to endorse option A+ and move this six-lane alternative on to the legislature for action. However, this endorsement was not unanimous but was passed on a 11 to 3 vote.

Theresa Doherty noted that members had been asked to bring this issue to their grouped and asked if that had been done. Members responded that it had. Matt Fox asked if there was any further discussion. Pat Cowen asked for a clarification of what the “applicable amenities” that could be applied to the four-lane alternative might be. Chris Lehman responded that these amenities might include the trails, lids and covers and other things. Neil Lessenger suggested that the motion might benefit from inclusion of a list of possible amenities. Mr. Lehman stated that since it is difficult to determine what that list might be, he thought it best to leave it general and trust WSDOT to develop a list.

The question was called. Motion passed 8 in favor none opposed, none abstaining

IV. CUCAC Annual Report Format

Theresa Doherty stated that at a previous meeting the CUCAC annual report was discussed. She stated that she has worked with staff to develop a possible outline of what the report might look like based on information from the CUCAC By-laws that lay out what the report should include. That states that the report shall include the previous year’s correspondence, meeting agenda and summaries.

Steve Sheppard stated that some have suggested that both a 2008 and 2009 report be done and that the Report and include additional areas of interest in the upcoming year. Mr. Sheppard noted that the by-laws do not require this be included. Matt Fox said he was not opposed to the inclusion of other areas of interest in the report.

Betty Swift suggested that two separate reports be done rather than combining them. Committee members agreed. She also noted that the listing of future items of interest would appear to be essentially a memo to ourselves.” Steve Sheppard said that the listing of items of interest was intended to assist with identifying issues beyond review of individual development projects that could be included on the CUCAC agendas.

Chris Lehman noted that one of his hopes is that the committee might broaden its focus beyond review of the individual projects and particularly on building better community relationships with the surrounding community. In addition reviews of progress on the overall implementation of the comprehensive plan. Matt Fox noted that one of his longstanding concerns has been to be involved in earlier phases of discussions of the use of individual sites. He noted that often it appears that most decisions are made prior to CUCAC being involved. Part Cowen agreed.

Chris Lehman asked for clarification on the role of CUCAC in more broadly reviewing projects in the areas. Mr. Sheppard responded that the
“Purpose” and “Responsibilities statements in the CUCAC by-laws read as follows:

PURPOSE
“The purpose of the Community Advisory Committee shall be to advise the City and the University on the orderly physical development of the greater University area; to encourage the provision of adequate City services to the University and adjacent community and business areas; to assist the University and City in preserving the many positive aspects of the University’s presence in the community; to review and comment upon potential adverse effects of removing aspects of University programs from the University campus; and to assist in the protection of the adjacent community and business areas from the adverse effects of University and City actions.”

Responsibilities
The responsibilities of the CUCAC shall be to review and comment upon the following actions regarding the physical development of the University and the greater University area: the draft and final Master Plans, (including the Transportation Management Plan, policies, development standards, public outreach plan), major and minor amendments to the Master Plan, environmental documents prepared under SEPA, all annual reports and other issues identified by CUCAC members, represented community organizations, the University and the City. CUCAC shall make recommendations to the appropriate decision-making body, individual or responsible official or agency within a specified time period so that such recommendations may be considered before a final action is taken. The appropriate decision-making body, individual or responsible official or agency shall inform CUCAC of its final decision on the action along with its jurisdiction.

To work cooperatively to resolve those issues of mutual interest that arises from development of the University of Washington Campus within the City of Seattle.

Some members were surprised and thought it had a broader scope than they had thought.

Mr. Sheppard noted that one part of the City/University Agreement also refers to a Public Outreach Plan and other items. (cut and pasted below)

2. Therefore, the City and the University will cooperate with the City-University Community Advisory Committee and representatives of the surrounding residential and business communities throughout the planning process whenever actions are proposed which could materially affect those communities. To facilitate this cooperation and public participation, the University will prepare a public outreach plan as part of the development of a draft Master Plan. In addition, depending upon the issue or project, the University may consider the use of other reasonable methods for informing and involving the public, such as: quarterly meeting with community leaders, notification of the news media, public meetings/hearings, public notices, flyers, workshops, signs, newsletters or articles.

Chris Leman asked that a review of the requirements of the Agreement be included on the agenda for the next meeting.
V. Timing for Review of Projects and Issues

Betty Swift noted Matt Foxes statements about earlier review of projects and asked for clarification concerning the point at which CUCAC becomes involved in review of a project. Theresa Doherty responded that there are now 71 development sites. Each of these sites can be developed, so it is not an issue of where building sites are, but which site will be chosen for a specific building and the order in which sites might be used.

Matt Fox noted that a flow chart of the process had been developed and reviewed with CUCAC. He recalled that it identified the time frames for when alternative sites were selected and other steps and suggested that the University find this chart and make it available to CUCAC again.

Chris Leman noted that whenever a new site is listed there has not been a corresponding reduction of overall development sites. He noted that one of the sites that most troubles him is the site that impinges on Denny Yard. Matt Fox also noted that the plan talks about the enhancement and addition of new open space and that this issue should also be discussed with CUCAC.

VI. General Updates

Theresa Doherty stated that, John Wetzel will be back to CUCAC in January 2010 with an update on the Ethnic Cultural Center. The Declaration of Non-Significance should be delivered to members soon, please read and review for your comments. Comments are due December 21.

VII. Adjournment

No further business the meeting was adjourned.