



CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

City of Seattle-University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC)

Members

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
 Daniel Kraus (Co Chair)
 Betty Swift
 Brett Frosaker
 Eric Larson
 Dave Eckert
 Pat Cowen
 Chris MacKenzie
 Neal Lessenger
 Matthew Stubbs
 Heather Newman
 Ashley Emery
 Teresa Lord Hugel
 Neil Weshler
 Tom Roth
 Mathew Steele

Alternates

Chris Leman
 Mark Holden
 Larry Sinnott
 Brian Ramey
 Ruedi Risler

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
 Theresa Doherty – UW

MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 97

February 10, 2009

CUCAC Meeting

7:00 – 9:00 University Tower – 22nd Floor
 (Approved)

Members Present

Dan Kraus, UW Staff
 Matt Fox, U District Community Council
 Betty Swift, Portage Bay/Roanoke Parke
 Pat Cowan, University Park Community Council
 Ashley Emery, UW Faculty Senate
 Chris Leman, Eastlake Community Council
 Eric Larson, Roosevelt Neighborhood Alliance
 Dave Eckert, Roosevelt Neighborhood Association
 Mark Holden, Laurelhurst
 Jan Arnst, UW Staff
 Elaine King, Montlake

Staff Present

Thao Tran, Department of Neighborhoods
 Theresa Doherty, UW, Assistant Vice-President of Regional Affairs
 Sharon Star, Department of Neighborhoods

Others Present

Kristine Kenny, UW Landscape Architect
 Steve Tatge, UW Capital Project Manager
 Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture and Planning
 Jon Lebo, Assoc Dir for Student Housing Project
 Jan Arntz, UW Environmental Planner

I. Welcome and Introductions

Matthew Fox, co-chair, called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM . Brief introductions followed. Mr. Fox noted that a quorum was not yet present and therefore asked that the agenda be amended to shift the Tree Report forward in order to allow time for additional members to arrive and a quorum to be present. Members present agreed and the agenda was so amended.

II. University of Washington Tree Preservation and Planting Procedures

Ms. Kristine Kenny was introduced to give a presentation on the University's Tree Preservation and Planting Procedures. Ms. Kenny distributed a handout out of the University's Tree Preservation & Planting Procedures. She noted that many of the provisions of these policies grow directly out of various provisions of the Seattle Campus Master Plan. That plan defines the policies that the

University must follow, including policies related to open space and landscaping. Ms. Kenny noted that the policies essentially look at the campus trees for their educational value, species diversity of the canopy itself, areas to be preserved for ecology benefits for habitat or wild life value and management practices. In addition, there are policies related to horticultural practices and conservation of unique and significant open spaces, which also reference the trees within those open spaces as well as at the development criteria for the sites themselves.

Ms. Kenny then went over their current practices. She noted that they are intended to promote the preservation or replacement of trees as well as deal with primary maintenance issues. The policies are:

1. **Campus Hazard Tree Program** – the identification of hazardous trees that should be removed as they are being maintained.
2. **Campus Tree Inventory** – documentation of the 11,000 trees on campus and species identification.
3. **Invasive Species Removal** – removal of non-native invasive species and replacement with native trees and shrubs. Ms. Kenny noted that this is applied in selected areas and noted areas along 15th as examples.
4. **Tree Assessment & Valuation** – a third party arborist assessment of the condition of trees and determination of appraised values to help define which are significant and which might be replaceable elsewhere if other needs dictated their removal.
5. **Tree Salvage Program** – determination of a trees' value for lumber. The University works with the carpentry shops on campus to evaluate the possibility of use of the lumber from removed trees.
6. **Tree Management Plan** – use of the campus tree inventory to develop and implement a plan for the maintenance existing trees and the replacement for those trees deemed hazardous or invasive. This includes the Identification of what trees should be on campus, where and this helps with individual projects that come along. Ms. Kenny noted that this is dependent upon funding being available.
7. **Tree Replacement Endowment Fund** – the establishment of a tree replacement fund. For those projects that result in the removal of trees on campus, the University appraises tree and that amount would be charged against project. The funds would be retained for the replacement of trees on campus. This primarily focuses on trees that are deemed exemplary, extraordinary or significant that those funds would be contributed. The value varies depending on the tree. Ms. Kenny noted that this is dependent upon funding being available.
8. **Tree Retention & Replacement** – a one-to-one replacement or City's requirements which is a two inch per 1000 square feet of development. She noted that the University's requirements are more stringent than the City's.
9. **Tree Protection During Construction** – strict measure to protect trees that the University wants retained during construction, which include erecting six foot chain link fences around them, putting tree protection signage on them, mulch, irrigate and an arborist does a monthly inspection.

Pat Cowan asked how long a delay there might be for the replacement of a tree that is removed during a construction project, especially if that replacement is elsewhere on campus. Ms. Kenny responded that the hope is that trees can be replaced on-site. However if that is not possible, once the retention and replacement plan is in place, then the replacement could occur at any time and even prior to the tree that is slated for removal being lost.

Dave Eckert asked for clarification concerning the replacement of trees that were initially planted under donation programs. He specifically referenced the cherry trees in the Central Quadrangle. Ms. Kenny noted that these were not donated but were relocated to the Central Quadrangle from the Washington Arboretum as part of the initial SR 520 construction. Preservation of these trees is considered a major issue

for the University and community. As they age and decline they need to be removed and replaced in kind. The University currently has a nursery that is growing replacements for these trees. As each is removed, the University replaces it with one of those trees. No decision if they will all be taken out yet and we need someone to come and assess them as a group and give a recommendation. Betty Swift asked about a survey to the public regarding their preference for replacement for the cherry trees, and wondered what the result was. Ms. Swift stated the two options were total replacement or periodic placement of new ones. Ms. Kenny stated that she hasn't seen the results of the survey and can't answer.

Chris Leman stated that the reason he had asked for a more detailed presentation on this issues was that here have been a couple of situations over the last twenty years where there were some unexpected tree removals. There were some that were in the "green grove" in the late 1980's, and then in the late 90's there was a loss of a couple of memorial trees along Memorial Way. The memorial trees were planted to honor University of Washington graduates who died in WWI. When the University expanded traffic circles in front of Parrington Hall they removed them without notice. He stated that many CUCAC members at that time had concluded that the alternatives to removal were not discussed with either the community or CUCAC.

As a result of the controversy related to the loss of the memorial trees, the University committed to bring decisions about future tree removal before CUCAC unless it was an emergency situation and there wouldn't be time. Mr. Leman noted that the Master Plan states that tree removals will be reviewed by the campus landscape architect and if necessary by the campus landscape advisory committee. However, it makes no mention of CUCAC. He offered the opinion that this was a mistake, that there was no real down side to including CUCAC in this process as was previously committed to and that the commitment should be honored.

Theresa Doherty responded that the University has routinely dealt with tree removal and retention whenever a project is brought before CUCAC and asked if there was a specific situation that Mr. Leman was concerned about. Mr. Leman stated trees are mentioned when project presentations are made but that he hoped for a more systematic approach rather than simply project by project. He noted that in many cases trees are removed or significantly pruned independent of a specific development project and that in other cases the eventual tree removals associated with individual projects have evolved differently from what was presented to CUCAC. Mr. Leman mentioned "Denny Grove". Jan Arntz noted that in that case the EIS identified the possibility of removal of all of the trees.

Mr. Leman noted a previous member of the landscape advisory committee had expressed concerns over recent changes to that committee. Mr. Leman noted that the committee used to be fairly diverse people but that it appears to have been restructured with its membership cut by half and membership restricted to landscape architect program. Previously it had included graduates from fields not related landscape architects and provided valuable insight. He offered the opinion that the previous diversity of the landscape advisory committee should be restored.

Ms. Kenny responded that the University had re-chartered the membership of the committee and renamed it University Landscape Advisory Committee rather than the Campus Landscape Committee. This was done in part because the committee now looks at projects on all of the University's campuses not just the Seattle Campus. The previous committee was adhoc and increased annually up to 22-25 people which became to cumbersome. When the committee was restructured, membership was set at 16. This includes a minimum of 5 faculty members from various departments. In response to a question, Ms. Kenny stated that the current faculty members are: 1) Dale Cole (chair) – Professor Emeritus from the College of Forest Resources; 2) Bob Edmonds – Processor in College of Forestry; 3) Darleen Sibousky – Professor in the College of Forestry; 4) Norm Johnston – Professor Emeritus from the College of Architecture and Urban Planning; And 5) Dick Walker – Professor Emeritus in Botany; 6) Nancy Ridel – Professor in the Landscape Architecture Program and 7) Daniel Winterbottom Professor in the Landscape Architecture

Program. Ms. Kenny noted that this exceeds the minimum. The Committee also includes two outside landscape architect professionals- one is local and the other is from Boston and one student from the landscape architect program and two staff from Facility Services which is a manager from the outside zone and grounds shop manager. The student position is open and someone is volunteering for it. They contact GPPS or ASUW for outreach. Jan stated this committee is a lot of work for the students. Kristine and Jan spoke on how the process involved with having a student appointed to the committee.

III. Review and Approval of the Minutes for January 10, 2009.

Matt Fox requested a change to page 5, 2nd paragraph, - regarding quote, it was asked but not by him. Change to "a member" asked about Terry Lander Hall. Dan Kraus said the same thing. Matt requested to have them both changed to "a committee member". Dave Eckert needs to be added to attendees list, he was quoted.

Matt asked for a motion to adopt minutes, Betty Swift moved and Pat Cowan seconded. All favored, no opposed and no abstentions.

The meeting minutes were approved and adopted.

IV. Update on the Molecular Engineering Building

Steve Tatge introduced himself to give a brief background on the Molecular Engineering Building. He noted that this is a interdisciplinary research building containing space for Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology. He noted that much of the research anticipated for this space requires vibration free environments. Therefore, one of the key components of this building is a large basement, which houses an instrumentation lab, the instruments extraordinarily vibration and EMF sensitive. This site has extremely low native vibration and was therefore chosen for this project. He site is 25C which is located across from Architecture Hall/Stevens Way or where Cunningham Hall and Johnson Hall Annex are currently located. This is a two phase project: 1) first phase is funded. And 2) a second phase's whose future is uncertain. The project is state funded and is in the current stimulus package. As a result construction which was planned to start in mid-December 2009, is now anticipated to start as soon as late May or June.

The last time the University brought this to CUCAC the project was three stories above grade in Phase I and 5 stories in phase II. The college of engineering has asked to look at 4th fl for the Phase I as an additive alternate. The University does not have additional money at this time but has asked us to carry forth a design that includes a 4th floor in the event the University is either able to raise additional funds and/or the current economic climate results in lower bids that allow existing identified funding to stretch farther. If that is the case, then the five story Phase II will drop a floor. There would not be a net increase area in the two buildings on site if the 2nd phase happens. The precursor to making this project happen is making the site available, the Johnson Hall Annex will be demolished and UW is proposing to relocate Cunningham Hall. We have applied for minor plan amendment to the City to create a building site near Parrington Hall, it contingent on the approval.

Mr. Tatge then introduced Susan Boyle with BOLA Architects to coordinate the presentation the Cunningham Hall relocation. He noted that Tim Williams and Randall Bennett from ZGF will update CUCAC on the design of the molecular engineering Project. Ms. Boyle gave a short history on Cunningham Hall with variety of dated pictures and their efforts making to bring the history as well as the building to a new site with it's own historic background. It currently houses the Woman's Center program. The building is one of the few remaining from the Alaska/Yukon exhibition. This building was to be one of seven that is permanent on the UW campus.

Ms. Boyle stated that the University of Washington hired BOLA to look at technical and design issues concerned with moving the building. The University asked that five different sites on campus be evaluated.

That was narrowed to three : 1) Island Grove, 2) Denny Yard and 3) Parrington Yard. A portion of the Perrington Yard site was chosen. Part of the work for BOLA is to look at the history of both Cunningham and Perrington so they can assess site impacts and the appropriateness of the proposed move of Cunningham to this site.

The building would be moved to a location along George Washington Lane via Stevens Way and over the Central Garage pending the structural engineer's analysis of the latter's capacity to carry the weight of the building. A general excavation of the foundation will be prepared in advance and built up to the meet the dimensions of the building. The building will not be cut up and will be moved in tact. It is only 30 x 80 ft. so it can be moved along the streets to its new site. However the front porch, back porch, and side exits stairs will be removed and reconstructed. Ms. Boyle noted that there is a maple on the site that is in poor condition according to the tree condition survey from the arborist so we know conditions of the trees and several are aesthetic value. There are also two large Fir trees and a Madrona on site. Ms. Boyle then showed a variety of illustrations from different angles showing where the building would be placed. She also noted that great care will be taken to preserve the landscaping in the area and that the University has a landscape architect who understands the need for preservation of both the building and landscapes.

Betty Swift stated that this building will help to anchor the site. Ashley Emery asked if students were heard from at all regarding to this space that Cunningham Hall will take up. Jan Arntz stated that they have not heard from students and that these considerations will be included in the EIS. There was outreach on a website and no comments were received. They are trying to minimize disruption.

Editors Note: Much of this discussion related to discussion of the models and was not easily converted to a written format. And is therefore somewhat truncated here.

Tim Williams was introduced to discuss the construction phase. He noted that the project is 80,000 gross square feet in Phase I. The University is looking at whether Phase I of the project will be three or four stories and both options are still being worked on. The project will afford the opportunity to create a formal quad behind Johnson Hall with the molecular engineering building facade forming its western side. In addition the designers are trying to maintain the access for atmospheric sciences in Johnson Hall with expanded additional bays for loading activities. Efforts are also being made to create a grass strip with the sidewalk connected to the interior hallway to allow pedestrian circulation through the site.

Chris Leman noted that there is a pedestrian route that is open 24 hours a day. He noted that this route uses the parking lot but would not be dependent upon the building being open and that CUCAC has traditionally favored retention of these routes. He noted that this appears to actually eliminate an existing 24 hour pedestrian route. Mr. Williams explained that after construction of phase II a stairway will connect to Grant Lane to the front of Architecture Hall which will thus afford 24 hours a day through access. Pat Cowan asked about the circle and Steve said a study separate from this project that the UW of improving the Stevens way intersection. The phase II will be a logical time to do this. The model was placed on table and further general discussion continued.

V. Husky Stadium Renovation Project

Jan Arntz asked if anyone had any comments on the scoping notice for the Husky Stadium project, and stated that if members have comments that they should be sent to her. She was asked about the time frame and she said the scoping time frame is over and still take comments if you have them. A committee member asked about the timing on the stadium mentioned that sound transit will be able to do their work at the same time. Jan Arntz responded that Sound Transit has their funding and so does the University.

VI. Student Housing Project

John Lebo was introduced to give a presentation on the student housing project. He noted that there had been a previous presentation at the last CUCAC meeting and that part of the purpose of this presentation was to address the setback issues that were raised at the last meeting. He noted that he would also speak briefly on issues related to the alley vacations on sites 31, 32 and 35.

Mr. Lebo noted that the Master Plan includes a condition requiring a setback when the property across the street from the University boundary is not owned by the University and that the University was proposing to forgo most of these setbacks. The focus is on the setbacks on the west side of site 31 and north sides of sites 32 and 33 where this situation exists. At the previous meeting members asked why the University was proposing to eliminate portions of the set backs adjacent to these sites and what kind of improvements the UW will do to compensate for the elimination of the setbacks. Mr. Lebo stated that the University is proposing improvements on the other side of the streets away from property we otherwise wouldn't need to do it.

The objective is to allow greater interaction between the street and the facades of the buildings and create a more urban versus suburban environment. By bringing the buildings out to the street dead spaces would be eliminated and a more engaging situation created. Mr. Lebo also noted that along NE 41st the improvements would narrow the street while still maintaining parking on both sides. He noted that the designs would be done to include various elements to create an engaging urban environment. For instance the building can be pushed out and awnings and street trees provided. This enhances and engages pedestrians and masks the height of the building. This will be happening on buildings on sites 32 and 33 and 31. He also noted that parking will be retained at the street level.

Pat Cowan asked if there is a mandatory minimum setback proposed or if the University may build right up to the property line. Mr. Lebo responded that the sidewalks and planting strips would be accommodated within the street right-of-way. He noted that the amount of the right-of way that is dedicated to sidewalks and planting strips for street trees varies with the type of street. The right of way is typically about 60 feet and the amount of sidewalk, landscaping, street is dependent on how the street is classified. Arterials have wider area for more lanes, residential is narrower. He noted that the University is proposing to reduce the street width and provide wider sidewalks and landscape within the right-of-way. He stated that the University wants to avoid very large areas of paving and to limit the traffic or cars on the street. Discussion briefly turned to opportunities for additional sidewalk seating and other street furniture especially related to the proposed cafeteria. Staff agreed that special attention will be given to these areas.

David Eckert asked if street use permits would be required for the canopies that appear to encroach into the right-of-way. Mr. Lebo said they would have to look into that because he didn't know the answer. Staff responded that as long as it's presented as a part the building permit there will be no air rights issue, SDOT will look at it as a street improvement plan. SDOT actually prefers canopies, street trees and pedestrian lighting in these types of situations.

David Eckert asked about the issue of equal treatment of property owners. If the University is allowed to eliminate setbacks and essentially incorporate the setback into their developable areas, would the adjacent non-institutional owners or those across the street be permitted to also do so? Matt Fox noted that it might depend on whether the property was within the MIO or not.

Betty Swift stated that she thought that the reduced setbacks bring the plantings out to the street and is an improvement. Theresa Doherty noted that the bushes beside the building are a safety issue. David Eckert stated that the presentation answered most of his previous.

Mr. Lebo restated that the intention is to bring the buildings up to the street and provide awnings and landscaping on the other side along NE 41st as well. Matt Fox asked how much usable space by eliminating setbacks. Jon for all sites it would appear to be at least 20 to 24 additional units. He also

noted that the University believes that this provides a better urban setting regardless of any gain in housing units. Theresa said a minor plan will have to be submitted and you will be writing the letter and you would like to have CUCAC's support if they want to give or weight in on it. Pat Cowan asked if it was for only these three sites. Mr. Lebo stated that the University would design an appropriate width of sidewalk and landscaping because it's an important consideration for the design as there will be a great deal of pedestrian traffic associated with the project. The university needs to clarify this now since it impacts the design significantly.

Theresa Doherty noted that a minor plan amendment to the Campus Master Plan would be required to reduce these setbacks and that the University would be proposing this to the City. Once this occurs, it will come before CUCAC for the committees comments. Ms. Doherty expressed the hope that CUCAC would endorse such an amendment.

Matt Fox asked if this might be ready for the next meeting. Mr. Doherty responded that this might be possible if letters can be completed and forwarded to the City soon. Mr. Fox requested that efforts be made to do this and return to CUCAC next month for a possible vote on the amendment issue.

There was a brief discussion on descriptions of buildings on sites 32 and 33. A committee member asked how many units added, Jon stated 1500 – 1700 beds. In response to a question John Lebo noted that parking for site 31 and would be accessible at grade off of 41st Street because it slopes downward. Apartments would be provided on top of this parking. Chris Leman noted that this was not an ideal situation and suggested that greater effort be made to avoid this and have more active use along the street rather than parking. Jon Lebo responded that they would look into how best to provide access but that it presented some real challenges..

VIII. Adjournment

No further business being before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:13 PM.