Members and Alternates Present

Matt Fox               Neal Lessenger
Elaine King           Ashley Emery
Kirsten Curry         Chris Leman
Betty Swift

Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard         Theresa Doherty
Dana Miller, UW          Jorgan Bader for Brett Forsaker
Chip Lydum, UW Athletics  Eric Smith, Cap. Proj., UW
Joel Matulys, Cap. Proj., UW  Helen Shawcroft, UW Medical Center
John Lebo, Cap. Proj., UW     Jan Arntz, Planner

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened at 7:09 by Matt Fox. Brief introductions followed. Steve Sheppard asked that members update their contact information. Theresa Doherty noted that Mr. Miller was attending as he has expressed an interest in possibly serving as the UW’s at large member.

II. Approval of Agenda/Housekeeping

A. Approval of Minutes for Meetings #107 and #108 – The minutes for Meeting #107 were unanimously approved after a few minor language changes proposed by Matt Fox. The minutes for Meeting #108 were approved with Chris Leman abstaining.

B. Approval of Agenda – Theresa Doherty asked if the agenda could be changed to have the UW Medical Center presentation first, followed by the UW/Husky Stadium Renovation presentation second and John Lebo third. The committee approved the changes.
III. UW Medical Center Addition – Helen Shawcroft and Eric Smith

Theresa Doherty introduced Helen Shawcroft and Eric Smith to update CUCAC on the UW Medical Center Expansion. She noted that CUCAC has reviewed this project several times. Construction is now ongoing. The purpose of this presentation is to update CUCAC on the progress of construction progress and answer any questions.

Ms. Shawcroft noted that she had updated the committee several times in 2007 and 2008. Construction began in the spring 2009. The project is now approximately 50% completed. She noted that when the environmental review was completed with the project separated into two phases: Phase I being floors 1 through 5, to include an expansion in the diagnostic imaging area, operating suites and neonatal intensive care unit and oncology unit. Because of a very favorable construction market the UW was able to actually accept all of the bid alternates and were able to build the entire superstructure and skin for both phases I and II at this time. In January 2010, the Board of Regents authorized the construction of the entire project. As a result the University is able to build out the footprint and shell of the entire building at once instead of having to disturb site with large crane twice. It was authorized in January 2010 and we will leave three floors unfinished in the interior.

Matt Fox observed that he would have preferred that this change had come before CUCAC before its final approval by the Board of Regents. Ms. Shawcroft responded that since the EIS had approved the entire project it had not been considered a major change to move forward somewhat earlier with full construction. The final project will be the same as previously approved. The total mass, use and footprint remains unchanged.

Eric Smith then presented a series of slides that showed the building. He noted that these are very similar to the last drawings provided to the Committee in 2008. Little has changed.

Editor’s Note: The next part of the presentation is related to slides and was not easily translated into a written format.

IV. Montlake Triangle/Husky Stadium

Mr. Smith also asked that he be allowed to update CUCAC on the relationship of this project to the Montlake triangle area and the Stadium. He presented a series of drawings showing how the area will look at the end of construction, which is expected late summer 2012. He noted that there are a considerable number of activities ongoing simultaneously in this area. These include:

- Medical Center expansion timelines;
- Sound Transit activities shown;
- UWMC project goes out into the third quarter of 2012;
- Sound Transit tunneling going on and work goes into the third quarter of 2013 with overlapping activity where the station is actually being built.
- First quarter of 2015 Sound Transit starts the commission and signalization of the tracks and put it into service in 2016.
- Stadium, Chip will brief you in a little bit, but it will overlap with the Medical Center quite a bit.
- Stadium renovation finish date August 1, 2013 right in time for the start of the football season.
Triangle Bridge and Rainier Vista – still working on funding issues, so it’s not certain, but if everything goes well they will start right after the Montlake Pedestrian Bridge is completed. The plan is to have everything completed by the time Sound Transit is put into service in 2016.

Jan Arntz noted that all of the ongoing activities entail a great deal of coordination between the University, Sound Transit, and WASDOT.

Chip Lydum, Associate Athletic Director for the University of Washington was then introduced to provide an update on the proposed renovations/expansion of Husky Stadium. He noted that he is the lead on this project. He noted that the University had previously sought State funding for this project and had partnered with a developer (HOK). The University was unsuccessful with this effort and re-bid the project. A new partnership is in place. This includes Wright Runstad who will be the lead on the project and will pursue the permits, Turner construction who built Qwest Field and 360 architects from Kansas City.

Wright Runstad took a look at the project and proposed demolishing the south grand stand, demolishing the current bowl (which was built in 1920), bringing it up to all life safety codes, accessibility improvements from 2 to 10 elevators. The Stadium capacity is now 72,500. Under the new proposal the stadium’s capacity actually is decreased slightly to 70,000 seats. This reduction in seating is the result of more attractive seating and the inclusion of more suite and club seating. With failure to obtain any State funding, this was made necessary in part by the need to generate more revenue to support the program.

He noted that a major part of the project will be to lower the field 4 ft, eliminate the track and extend seating out much closer to the field. This will require the rebuilding of the lower bowl and south grand stand. A new track facility will be constructed as part of this project. The project will also include construction of new facilities for the football offices and training rooms, and making the east bleacher into permanent grandstands. Mr. Lydum then walked through the schematic plans for the Stadium.

Wright Runstad recommended that the 277 parking spaces inside of the fence on the south side of the Stadium be removed and replaced by about 200 spaces that would be located under the stadium. The project may also include some general retail space that would relate to the Sound Transit station. He noted that the stadium will be able to host NCAA or Collegiate soccer events but it will not meet FEFA international standards. He noted that use of brick on portions of the exterior are intended to better relate to the adjacent Hec Edmondson Pavilion. Mr. Lydum also noted that the University is still looking at landscaping plans. At one point there was consideration of a green screen (plantings up the side of the stadium0, but this was eliminated for a variety of reasons including concern about maintaining planting to six stories. Members noted that it was unfortunate that the demolition of the south stands would eliminate the “iconic spiral ramps”.

Elaine King noted that the elimination of parking associated with both the Husky Stadium and sound transit projects has already displaced parking to Montlake, and suggested that this situation be addressed.

Chris Leman noted that there had been discussions in the press concerning whether it might not be better to hold husky football games at Qwest Field and thus forgo the expenses of renovating Husky Stadium. He asked if consideration had been given to this possibility and if so why it was not chosen. Mr. Lydum responded that the decision was driven in part by economics. As a second tier tenant at Qwest Field, the University would have to pay for use of the stadium. The University needs to generate ongoing revenues from use of their own stadium. In addition shifting the games away from campus would reduce connections with the students and break a long and much valued traditions. Husky Stadium is considered
one of the finest locations for a Stadium in the nations and every televised game is in essence a commercial for the university.

Editor’s Note: The next part of the presentation is related to slides and was not easily translated into a written format. No effort has been made here to record the verbal descriptions of the floorplates, perspectives and elevations.

The present plan is to start demolition and construction November 7, 2011 with a 21 to 22 month construction period. The intention is to see the Stadium completed by August 2013 in time for the 2013 football season. In the interim, the University will play the 2012 season in Qwest Field.

V. Student Housing – Jon Lebo

Editor’s Note: This part of the presentation is related to slides and was not easily translated into a written format.

General Presentation

John Lebo was introduced to continue discussions of the student housing project. Mr. Lebo walked the Committee through preliminary schematic designs the existing project with a focus on site 29C Mercer Hall area. He noted that the site is relatively steep and this affected the design somewhat. Mr. Lebo noted that there had been questions about massing of the project as it related to the Burke Gilman Trail. He noted that the designers had evaluated several options and eventually chose the configuration presented at the last meeting. The major considerations that drove the proposed design had to do both with openness to the Burke Gilman and creating a sense of community. The design that was chosen creates series of central courtyards or arcade and a central plaza arrangement. They are both linear and bounded by the buildings at either end. In addition there is transparency through the south building to the Burke Gilman. The intention is to have a sense of enclosure but still maintain keyhole visibility to the Burke Gilman Trail. He also noted that there will be other public spaces opening off of the plaza.

Mr. Lebo then went through each of the courtyards and noted that each is a bit different. One of the courtyards may include an urban garden and one may retain the beach volleyball site. The furthest west courtyard has a significant grade change and is therefore passive. The East Plaze has much less grade change and is therefore more public and active.

Mr. Lebo noted that the materials used for the buildings will vary between areas. There will be brick bases and then at the pedestrian plaza levels color will be introduced. At the present time the idea is to have a metal skin at the plaza levels and above. The idea is to have a kind of “curtain feeling”. This is meant to be a changing flowing surface treatment. Mr. Lebo presented various option for how this metal siding might work.

Members expressed general agreement with the direction that the massing was taken. Matt Fox and others expressed concern over the metal skin and asked in other materials could be considered. Chris Leman suggested consideration of concrete. Mr. Lebo noted that cost considerations preclude this. The project is wood frame above the first floor. This is the only type of construction that is cost effective and can be constructed at costs that will allow their costs to be covered from operating revenues.

Minor Amendment Requests Associated with the Project
Mr. Lebo noted that there will be several minor amendment issues. He noted that there are three elements to the minor amendment:

1. **Transfer of Square footage from the Central to West Campus** – The Campus Master Plan allocates 870,000 square feet out of 3 million total square feet allowed on campus. Construction of new student housing halls in this sector will bring the total up to 1.4 million. The University is requesting that some of the development authority allowed on the Central Campus be transferred to west Campus. The Master Plan allows a transfer of up to 20% from one sector to another, but in this case the total is above 20%. The 20% would be to 1,044,000 and the University needs 1,486,000.

2. **Addition of an additional building site and clarification that existing building sites are allowable sites for new buildings** - Mercer Hall is an existing building but not identified as an existing building site. UW wants to make it clear that it is okay to tear down existing building and build a new building on the same site; in this case Mercer Hall will be torn down and UW will build a new building on the site. It is just to clarify existing buildings are also building sites.

3. **Clarifying the open space on building space 42W is recreated in the open space as plazas as part of the new development**. Square footage for 42W is between 60,000 and 64,000 square feet the new development will be about 64,000 square feet but different kind of open space, a more urban plaza/community open space not just a pastoral open space.

Matt Fox asked that the committee look at this item at the next meeting. Ms. Doherty noted that the Committee would receive more information on this issue prior to its next meeting and could consider it at that meeting. She further noted that as there will be a 45 day comment period, CUCAC could consider this issue both at its January and February meetings.

**Terry/Lander Hall – West campus sector**

New Lander Hall will be a seven story building (2 stories of concrete with 5 stories of wood frame); new Terry Hall and renovation of existing Terry Hall. There will be a food court area. Twelfth Avenue will be opened as a pedestrian walkway area.

Mr. Lebo also noted that they are doing a tree survey. Chris Leman noted that there is a presumption that the trees should only be two stories high. He suggested taller trees. Mr. Lebo responded that this is part of the general concept that identified the types of trees for each street front. In this case the effort is to create a canopy rather than height. Still these should be substantial trees.

**VI. Authorization of CUCAC Letter Concerning the Presidential Search**

Chris Leman provided copies of a suggested letter to the University Board or Regents outlining CUCAC’s role and encouraging the Board of Regents to emphasize the importance of positive relations with the neighborhoods and business districts that immediately surround the University when discussing issues with perspective candidates. He briefly discussed the points of the letter.

Member of the Committee expressed their support for the letter and thanked Mr. Leman for his work on this issue. The letter was approved unanimously.

**VII 6F Site Problem**

Matt Fox noted that the Committee still needs to address the property exchange issues and called upon Jorgan Bader to briefly discuss this issue. Mr. Bader noted that back in about 1968 to 1970 the ‘city and
University made a deal with the federal government to establish the waterfront trail. That agreement required that this be held in perpetuity and if it were ever lost it would have to be replaced by the signators to the agreement. Earlier this year Washington Recreation Conservation Office drew up the area that they said was impacted by 520 and that within the scope of the 6f agreement. They stated that the City and University would have to replace this land. The University put forward the Bryant site as this replacement. He stated that this is the best sit available. He suggested that CUQAC endorse this portion or the replacement.

However he noted that the Conservation Office had identified 4.77 acres being taken that needs to be replaced and Bryant Building site which is only 3.92 acres. In addition, 520 also takes the old canal reserve strip and other areas. When you total this up it is another 4 to 5 acres also needs to be replaced. Mr. Bader suggested that CUCAC call for the return of the WSDOT peninsula which is the wedge shaped area that is sticking into the Arboretum next to 28th Avenue. This area is envision3ede as being returned to wetland use and it would appear appropriate that it be incorporated into the Arboretum.

He noted that there is a complicating issue. The Arboretum Mitigation Plan was approved by the technical committee made up of UW, City, WSDOT and Arboretum and looked at this issue. For some reason they did not call for the return of land. This was related to negotiating strategies. CUCAC should approve the plan that is the substitution approved by the UW and call for the return of use either by the UW or City of the WSDOT peninsula.

Chris Leman also noted that there had apparently been some consideration of other critical links in the Lake Union Loop Trail had been considered and rejected. He expressed disappointment that this had not been raised to CUCAC at the time. The Trust for Public Lands is actively trying to save this land. And if lost it would be a shame. He gave the opinion that this purchase would have been much better than transfer of the Bryant site form one public ownership to another. He noted that if the Bryant site was endorsed, he hoped that this would not be the entire exchange.

Matt Fox noted that this is a very complex issue that needs to be addressed carefully. He suggested that this item be further considered at upcoming meetings.

VIII. Adjournment

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