Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened at 7:12 by Matt Fox. Brief introductions followed.

Student Housing Project – Phase II

John Lebo was introduced to update the Committee on phase II of the Student housing project on West Campus. He noted that Phase I included four sites on West Campus that was about $162,000,000. Two of the sites (Cedar Hall Apartments and Poplar Hall) are now under construction, and two more (Elm and Alder Halls) will start construction in January 2011. The University is now getting ready to start the second phase of design of the student housing projects and is presently involved in the pre-design phase. He noted that information presented at this meeting is based upon these early pre-design phase discussions and is therefore subject to considerable future modification.

Rob Lubin was introduced to lead the presentation on this issue. Mr. Lubin stated that this is a part of a housing master plan that spans over a decade. He noted that prior comments to phase I have been incorporated as much as possible into phase II and briefly went over the status of projects in phase I.

The original intention was to renovate both Terry and Lander Halls as part of Phase II. Instead, after looking at a variety of issues, the idea is now to renovate the existing
Terry Hall with some new additions on it’s periphery and replace Lander. The new development would be five stories with the upper stories wood.

Chris Leman asked why the new buildings are being constructed of wood. He observed that wood buildings are less durable and permanent. Mr. Lubin responded that the buildings will be very attractive but that cost considerations were involved. Since the buildings must support themselves, there is a premium to constructing them under a certain cost. Wood construction is the only type that is cost effective at the allowed height. Mr. Lubin also noted that most systems (electrical, mechanical etc.) have a life of only about 40 years and that building must be significantly renovated thereafter. He also noted that concrete construction requires greater allowed height to be cost effective and that only parts of the area are designated for 105 foot heights with other parts at 85 feet. He also noted that all of the proposed new buildings will be lower than 85 feet.

Chris Leman asked that there be additional information presented about the possible loss of mature trees. He noted that there has been some criticism of CUCAC for its inattention to this issue. Mr. Lubin responded that the University is following all City guidelines to the letter. Mr. Leman noted that there is a major concern over the weakness of the City tree ordinance and that the University might be complying with all provisions of the ordinance and still not doing the right thing as far as the broader community is concerned.

Mr. Lubin noted that the new Lander Hall will contain the food service elements that will be open to the public and re-create that 1101 café that exists presently. The Center building between Terry and Lander will focus on student recreation and study spaces with HFS offices. Site 29 is currently Mercer Hall. This building will be demolished and will be replaced with additional student focused apartments.

Mr. Lubin then briefly went over preliminary massing studies for the possible buildings. He noted that the intention is to retain openness and views to the Burke Gilman Trail. Buildings included in phase I will be completed by 2013. The new Lander and Terry will be completed before about 2016. Ounce completed there will be a net increase of 2200 in available beds with about 3000 total beds on the west campus area. This will increase the share of area housing provided by the University from about 18% to about 23% or its student housing.

Chris Leman noted that there have been concerns raised about the recently developed laboratory spaces and the printing and mailing building just to the west of the University Bridge have adversely affected the Burke Gilman Train. This development appears to have the potential of continuing these same conditions. He stated that he is concerned that while the University shows view corridors to the trail it them blocks them. Mr. Lubin responded that there are two story openings in the buildings that allow light through to the Burke Gillman and that there are two story glass enclosed spaces against the trail. This is intended to allow pleasant views of and from the trail. Matt Fox encouraged the designers to work towards this as much as possible. Other members strongly agreed.

Mr. Lubin noted that the project will be presented to the board of regents to approve moving forward. The intent of this presentation is to get approval of funding and to assure the regents that this will be constructed from funds that will not take away from other academic projects. After receiving this approval they will commence with design. CUCAC will receive additional briefings in December.

**III. Building Mitigation for SR 520**
Theresa Doherty noted that Federal legislation – Section 6f – provides grants to help pay for the acquisition and development costs of outdoor recreational sites and facilities. Many years ago the University and City of Seattle received two grants from this program that were used to improve the Ship Canal and Arboretum waterfront trails. These acquisitions are protected by this program. When these grants were accepted both the City and University agreed to keep these trails in public use in perpetuity and that whenever anything that uses the property or more than 180 days that project (in this case 520) would have to compensate the City and County for that use.

The 520 project will convert 4.77 acres and this is considered by the land and water conservation fund as a “conversion” requiring compensation. Washdot will provide dollars for this conversion. The University and City are required to find comparable land to compensate for this conversion that is close to the impacted area and similarly situated.

After evaluation various sites the University and City have agreed to use the funds to purchase the old Bryant Building. This is currently owned by the University and would be converted into a park in perpetuity. The idea is to remove the buildings. However, the current buildings are considered historic and there will be a process to look at this. This would be a passive park similar to what exists in the arboretum. It would not be intended for intensive use. She noted that the park has not yet been designed. Members agreed that this appeared to be a positive direction to proceed.

Jorgan Bader, from Ravenna Bryant stated that when he looked at the areas it appears that there is University-owned land that is outside of the 6f conversion area but is still being taken by the SR520 project. He presented a map of those areas. Theresa Doherty stated that the property that she had discussed was only the 6f conversions and that there was some additional property. Mr. Bader responded that the University owns property that is part of the old Canal Reserve that was deeded to the University by statute for arboretum and botanical garden purposes and that too must be replaced. In addition there is property that was deeded which is called a University of Washington reversions that was provided to the city for museum purposes. Once that use ceased the University was supposed to get that property back. That too must be replaced. He noted that some of the conversion area that the University shows is actually claimed by the arboretum association.

Mr. Bader suggested that CUCAC support the proposed conversion but urge the City to participate and that in so far as the land that was deeded for arboretum and botanical garden purposes is not included in this proposal, that it be replaced too.

Matt Fox noted that Ravenna Bryant has requested that there be a resolution before CUCAC to endorse that any land taken be replaced. He asked that members discuss this issue internally and be prepared to consider a formal CUCAC motion at the next CUCAC meeting. He noted that he knew of no other properties. Theresa Doherty stated that she needed to have the University’s lawyers look at these issues.

IV – New Business – Housekeeping

Chris Leman requested that future agendas and meeting notices include illustrations and power point presentation materials as attachments. It was agree that staff will attempt to do so.

Chris Leman also noted that he agreed with University Park that CUCAC meetings should not generally be cancelled.

V. – Presidential Search
Theresa Doherty noted that there was a meeting on October 27 and November 1st concerning this issue and that there was still time to weigh in on this. She noted that she provided CUCAC with more information on this and will continue to do so. Barbara Quinn provided a copy of a letter from University Park on this issue. Mr. Leman suggested that a letter be sent from CUCAC concerning the importance of community relations and stated that he might be willing to draft such a letter. Matt Fox agreed that this should be done.

VI.  Adjournment

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