Approved Meeting Notes
Meeting #110
January 11, 2011
University of Washington Tower
4333 Brooklyn
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Matt Fox  
Dan Kraus
Elaine King  
Ashley Emery
Betty Swift  
Barbara Quinn
Eric Larson  
Chris Leman

Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard  
Theresa Doherty
Jorgan Bader for Brett Forsaker  
John Lebo, Cap. Proj., UW
Jan Amtz, Planner

I. Welcome and Introductions
The meeting was opened at 7:05 PM. Brief Introductions followed.

II. Approval of Agenda and Minutes
Theresa Doherty informed the committee that the introduction of Rebecca Barnes was being delayed until the next meeting. With removal of that item the agenda was approved. The minutes for meeting 109 were approved without substantive change.

III. Amendments to the master plan related to the West Campus Housing.
John Lebo was introduced to discuss the Amendments of the University Master Plan associated with the West Campus Student Housing Project. Mr. Lebo noted that the committee had been provided with copies of the requested amendments both from the City and the University. He noted the requested amendments as: 1) clarification that the sites of existing buildings are available for redevelopment even if they had not been identified as such in the Master Plan; 2) the transfer of gross square feet from the Central to West Campus sectors to accommodate the new student housing; 3) but only with the issuance of the actual building permit. There were challenges to this that
have been settled and no additional mitigation is being required at this time.

Changes to the open space configurations on site 42W adjacent to Mercer Hall; and 4) the tree removal at site 32 W. Concerning the latter he noted that trees had been cut down prior to the permit being issued. The UW believed that this was allowed as part of the demolition permit. This was an error and the removal of the trees was permitted.

**Concerning the clarification concerning redevelopment of existing buildings** - Mr. Lebo noted that many of the existing residence halls are being renovated or replaced but are not listed redevelopment sites. The University had always considered these sites to be available for either renovation or redevelopment and this is only being submitted to get confirmation of this.

**Concerning the transfer of square footage** – Mr. Lebo noted there is three million square feet of overall development identified in the Master Plan with a set proportion allocated to each of three campus sectors. The Master Plan allocates 875,000 square feet to West Campus. The development proposed for the new housing will exceed that amount. The Master Plan provides that up to 20% of the total 3,000,000 square feet can be transferred between campus sectors without the necessity of a Master Plan amendment. That would bring the total to 1,044,000 square feet. The Development will require 1,400,000 square feet so University is proposing the reallocation of approximately 535,000 square feet of development for the Center Campus sector to the West Campus Sector.

Matt Fox asked if the University has any idea which sites it proposed elimination from the Central Campus. Ms. Doherty responded that the plan does not require that specific sites be identified for removal, but only that the total square footage of development be reduced. Mr. Fox noted that he had a suggestion for where most of that square footage might come from. Ms. Doherty noted that the change will reduce the amount of development authorized on Central Campus from an addition of about 1,500,000 square feet to 1,000,000 square feet.

**Concerning the Open Space on Site 42W** - Mr. Lebo stated that this is the Mercer Hall site. In the Master Plan this was envisioned as an underground parking garage with open space over it. The same amount of open space will be provided but in a different configuration focused on the plazas running through the Mercer Hall site. These spaces are both active and passive. About 55,000 square feet of open space will be proposed which is a 1:1 replacement.

**Concerning the Trees on the Existing Sites** – Mr. Lebo presented various views of the existing and proposed trees. The University has surveyed the trees on the Mercer Hall sites and determined that there are 144 trees on the site and 14 street trees. Seven of the trees are considered exceptional. He noted that the footprint of the building will require that many of these trees be removed or transplanted. The design team was charged with re-using or retaining as many of the trees as possible with a focus on the retention of the exceptional trees. New trees will be provided on a 1:1 ration. 86 trees are proposed for removal so that a total of 86 new trees will be provided either on site or elsewhere on campus. Where existing mature trees can be relocated they will be so.

Mr. Lebo noted that transplanting of a tree is considered a removal and must be permitted by the City. The University is proposing that this be done in March. Eighteen trees are being considered for transplanting at a cost of about $160,000 to $200,000.

Mr. Leman expressed his appreciation for the discussion of the trees and noted that the Committee had a long history of concern over tree removal. He noted that the University and CUCAC has forged an
agreement that the committee receive briefings on this issue from Mr. Bill Talley. He noted that this practice has ceased and strongly suggested that this practice be re-established. Ms. Doherty noted that the University attempts to inform CUCAC of tree removals with each project. Mr. Leman responded that this notification should extend to removals not necessarily related to a specific redevelopment project.

Matt Fox stated that he was convinced that the University has known for many months that amendments would be required and expressed strongly that the University should have brought these issues to CUCAC much earlier. Jan Arntz responded that the University had initially believed that most of these changes did not require amendments. After discussing this with the City and legal staff it was determined that minor amendments were required.

Matt Fox stated that many of the amendments appeared justified, but that a condition should be suggested to the shift of square footage on the condition that site 5C (the site northwest of Savory Hall) that CUCAC has already said should not be built on is changed in the Campus Master Plan to a dedicated open space and that this be continued into future plans. He also stated that similar consideration might be given to site 39W as this area is now envisioned to become much more densely developed that was envisioned in the Master Plan. Others noted that there is a need to better define what constitutes open space. Mr. Fox agreed to develop a letter for CUCAC’s consideration at its next meeting.

IV. Discussion of Possible Committee Positions Regarding SR520 Replacement Property Exchanges

Steve Sheppard noted that he had provided members with a letter drafted by Jorgan Bader for consideration at this meeting. Mr. Bader stated that negotiations over this issue have not yet started. The retention of this land was part of the last construction of 520. The land was purchased from the City and University with the proceeds placed into the Arboretum Improvement Fund. Theresa Doherty stated that it is her understanding that WashDOT is looking for a way to convey this land to the Arboretum and that the letter as proposed is probably a positive action. Matt Fox moved approval of the letter. The motion was seconded. Discussion followed.

Chris Leman responded that the letter states that the Bryant Building is the best of the alternatives considered. This is not clear and there were other sites that would have helped complete the Lake Union Trail that were not looked at closely. The City’s Lake Union plan identified that site as a critical link. He suggested that the first paragraph of the letter be amended to remove any implied endorsement of the Bryant Site. Ms. Doherty stated that the Bryant site would be converted into passive open space and would therefore be similar to what is being lost. This was the reason that the Bryant site was chosen.

In response, Matt Fox suggested that the second and third sentence of the proposed letter be removed so as to render the letter neutral on the Bryant issue. The committee voted on the friendly amendment. The amendment passed 6 in favor 1 opposed and 1 abstaining – Eric Larson voting in the negative and Chris Leman abstaining. The amended motion was moved and passed 7 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstaining – Chris Leman Abstaining

V Adjournment

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