I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Matthew Fox opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping (00:12:51)

There was a motion to adopt the July 25 minutes, and it was seconded. The majority of the Committee members present voted with one abstention, the motion passed.

III. Public Comment (00:01:30)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for public comments.

Mr. Bill Roach is a representative of Sierra Club and a nearby neighbor. He commented about his concerns for the University’s proposed growth plan and its 15% SOV goal and its impacts. He suggested of adjusting the SOV goal to 12% and provided a letter that summarized how the University can achieve this goal.

Mr. David West of the University District Alliance commented that there had questions that came up in the past meetings about whether CUCAC can make recommendations that deals with University employees, U-pass programs, childcare and housing subsidies. He noted that a typical answer they would get is any issues relating to employees is subject for labor negotiations, employment management and cannot be included in the plan.

He noted that is not accurate and cited one of the State Supreme Court decision about the City’s preservation ordinance and the nuclear reactor made clear that the City has complete authority to issue regulations that are based on the State’s Growth Management Act (GMA). The City has sections in their comprehensive plan that deals with issues including transit, transit viability,
equity, reducing the SOV rate, as well as child care and working with institutions such as Universities to provide more affordable housing to faculty and staff.

Secondly, he noted that when the City of Seattle adopted its higher minimum wage ordinance, the University complied with that and decided not to deal with a potential legal battle with the City and this was based on another court case that dealt with the City of SeaTac on whether they could regulate a minimum wage and other employment standards within another municipality (Port of Seattle).

IV. Final CMP/EIS Group Discussion (00:14:00)

Ms. Kjristine Lund opened the discussion to review the final CMP/EIS comments.

Ms. Lund noted that the goal for tonight’s meeting is to go through and review all 60 comments and have the Committee to agree or disagree with the comments and have further discussion.

Group #2:

Ms. Lund opened the discussion on Group #2 report on Transportation.

The Committee voted that they would like Comment #9 to be included in the letter.

The group would like to encourage the University to build below grade parking instead of above grade parking garages. If they build a below grade parking, it is not included in the square footage development. The Committee voted with a majority in support of the comment.

Mr. Ruedy Risler noted on Comment #22 that there should be incremental progress to the SOV goal of 15% before any proposed development project. The Committee voted with a majority. Mr. Timmy Bendis and Mr. Doug Campbell commented about reducing the SOV goal below 15% as a possible option. Ms. Sheehan suggested to have further discussion to determine the goal percentage later.

A comment was made about the lack of funding with regards to the commitment the University made on transportation projects on Comment #24. Ms. Lund noted that this was stating a factual observation. The Committee voted to include this to the letter.

Mr. Doug Campbell suggested on adding conditions where the City and the University could agree on making sure these transportation projects are funded before Master Plan approval. Mr. Bendis commented that it will be challenging for his group to put conditions on issues that the University has no control over. He noted that the main theme of their comments is for the University to take a lead role in communicating with other transit agencies about the ongoing transportation issues.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee agrees that there are ongoing issues and suggested members of the Committee identify these significant issues and present them at the next meeting.

Ms. Arntz clarified that the reason she voted down on this comment is not about the conditions, but rather the scope of the statement. Ms. Lund suggested to revisit Comment #25 for further discussion.

Mr. Risler commented that performance measures should be included for transit riders, bike and pedestrian experiences for Comment #27. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Ms. Lund noted that Comment #28 is about a condition that there should be a threshold in place before any future development takes place. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Ms. Jan Arntz commented about asking the University to do tasks that are beyond their control. She worked with the City and Sound Transit to have a bus staging for the station and they lost. She suggested having the City and County, and other agencies look at what the community and neighborhood would like instead of having the University do their task.

Ms. Lund suggested we revisit any transportation coordination issues and formulate an overarching comment that captures these issues. Ms. Sheehan asked a few Committee members to work and further develop the overarching comment.

Mr. Bendis commented about having the University pursue other transportation management programs, and expanding U-pass availability to University faculty and staff for Comment #29. The Committee voted and agree on the statement.
Mr. Bendis noted that Comment #30 was related to what Ms. Arntz was discussing and suggested to revisit along with the overarching comment.

Ms. Lund commented about Comment #34 regarding RPZ permits and subsidies and the Committee decided to revisit that topic.

The group mentioned that Comments #34, #37, #40, #42, #59 are resolved.

Mr. Bendis noted that Comments #38, #39, and #41 will be included in the overarching comment.

**Group #4:**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion on Group #4 report on Land Use.

Ms. Lund commented that the first part of Comment #43 shows CUCAC is concerned that the new zone heights in West Campus are not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox noted that the University captured what the group was asking for regarding building height modulations along Pacific. Mr. Gaines commented that the University clarify connectivity and viewpoints along Pacific. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Ms. Lund commented that Comment #45 states that CUCAC strongly recommends that the existing zoning along University Way NE should be retained and the University should assess the impacts to local businesses. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox suggested a language change from design to development standard and have gross sq. ft. and lot coverage as minor plan amendments based on the City and University Agreement for Comment #47. The Committee voted and supported the comment.

Mr. Fox commented that Comment #52 regarding open space commitment and phasing at the West Campus green is resolved.

Mr. Fox and Mr. Gaines commented that Comment #53 regarding site design standards is resolved.

Mr. Fox mentioned that Comment #54 about the designated view corridor was not adequately addressed by the University. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Mr. Fox commented that the view studies at street level in Comment #55 should be addressed by the University by providing a long-term vision and plan. The Committee voted and did not support the comment.

Mr. Fox noted that he agreed the University addressed the expansion of the public realm allowance, but noted that they should have done more along Pacific. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

Mr. Fox commented to revisit Comment #57 regarding tower separation and add definite language.

Mr. Fox commented that the underlying zoning sites and how their comments are tied to Comment #45. Ms. Lund suggested to revisit Comment #45 and add additional clarification and information about the building height reduction. A suggestion was made to add the paragraphs back to the letter that was omitted in Comment #45.

**Group #3:**

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will rephrase the language on Comment #5 about convenient pick up and drop off along Portage Bay park for marine businesses, kayakers, etc. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

A comment was made about keeping the trail signage along the waterfront trail. The Committee voted and agreed with the comment.

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment regarding light and glare and the University’s response to minimize these conditions.
The Committee voted and agreed on the comment about how the University conforms with the campus storm water code and its impact where it is appropriate.

**Group #1:**

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment at Comment #1 as summarized by Mr. Kerry Kahl.

The Committee voted and agreed on the comment regarding the University’s approach to affordable childcare.

Mr. Campbell proposed developing affordable housing units within the primary and secondary zones. The Committee voted and agreed with the recommendation.

Ms. Lund summarized the following key mentions that describe multi-modal growth within the campus. These include that the University should begin a planning process, any growth within the MIO should be made conditional and further development should report to CUCAC. The Committee voted and agreed with the recommendation.

**Next Steps:**

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will provide an updated document for the Committee to review next week. She also reminded the members who decided to work on the transportation issues to provide her with a document to review at the next meeting.

Mr. Campbell suggested to the Transportation group if they could include a statement about achieving a level of coordination and agreement among the transit agencies as a condition to approve the Master Plan. Mr. Bendis noted that he will draft a statement and will work with other members of the Transportation group to address this issue.

**VII. New Business**

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for new business. There was no new business before the Committee.

**VI. Adjournment**

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