



**CITY OF SEATTLE - UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
 COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 98

April 14, 2009

CUCAC Meeting

7:00 – 9:00 University Tower – 22nd Floor

(Approved)

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

Members Present

Daniel Kraus, UW Staff
 Betty Swift, Portage Bay/Roanoke Parke
 Chris Leman, Eastlake Community
 Elaine King, Montlake
 Mathew Steele

Matt Fox, U District Community Council
 Chris McKenzie, Wallingford
 Mark Holden, Laurelhurst Community Club
 Anita Bowers, Montlake

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard, City of Seattle , DON
 Kristine Kenny, UW Landscape Architect
 Paul Brown
 Dr. Sheila Edwards Lange
 Steve Tatge, UW Capital Project Manager
 Jan Arntz, UW Environmental Planner

Theresa Doherty, UW
 Rob Lubin
 Laura Lownan
 John Wetzel
 Jon Lebo, Assoc Dir. for Student Housing Project

I. Opening of Meeting/Approval of Agenda/Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Daniel Krause. Introductions followed. Steve Sheppard noted that he was assuming responsibility for the staffing of the Committee and noted that he had done so for many years in the past.

The minutes for meeting 97 were adopted as written. Members reviewed and approved the agenda.

II. EIS for the Molecular Bio-Engineering Building and Related Issues

(Editors Note: The issue of the relocation of Cunningham Hall from the site was incorporated into this Agenda Item. Because of concerns over quorum the discussion was split into two sections split by the discussion of student housing. For the purposes of these meeting notes they two section are combined and presented together.)

Mr. Krause noted that the first item on the agenda is the review of the EIS for the Molecular Biology Building and that if anyone on the Committee intends to put forward a formal motion also have to be delayed in order to achieve quorum.

Mathew Fox stated that while he has some minor issues with the design of the building, his real major issue continued to relate to the relocation of Cunningham Hall and that he would offer a motion to send a letter along the lines of the one we sent to DPD about the inconsistency of the minor amendment for

the relocation of Cunningham Hall as a part of the comments to the overall project and the EIS. He noted that since this would require a vote of the Committee it too might have to be delayed until a quorum was present.

Mr. Fox also noted that in addition to the problems with the consistency with the master plan open space requirements, that in his opinion there is really no mitigation identified for the loss of open space if they do relocate Cunningham Hall. They don't propose to replace it anywhere else.

After Brief further discussion, Mathew Fox moved that:

The City University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) opposes the proposal to move Cunningham Hall onto Parrington Lawn on the basis that: 1) is inconsistent with open space criteria in the master plan; 2) is inconsistent with general building site criteria in the master plan; 3) is inconsistent with the specific criteria for site 25c that says that whatever they build there will respect the adjacency to Cunningham Hall, and 4) that there is no proper mitigation proposed for the loss of this open space..

The motion was seconded by Chris Leman. Discussion followed.

Betty Swift asked what Mr. Fox proposed be done with Cunningham Hall? Mr. Fox responded that the UW should find another spot or retain the building in its current location. . He noted that it is an important master plan principal that open spaces be conserved and that CUCAC needs to reiterate the position it took previously.

Mr. Fox noted that the master plan assumes the Cunningham Hall will stay where it is, in its historic location, and in the EIS they allude to the fact . There is an impact to moving historic buildings from their historic locations. He offered the opinion that this move itself should require a minor plan amendment related to the creation of anew site and changes to the criteria related to respecting the adjacencies to Cunningham.

Mr. Leman stated that one of his concerns is that open space is scarce and we've lost a lot of it over the years. Hopefully adoption of this motion will cause the University to come back with a proposal to compensate for the loss of the open space by adding some somewhere else.

Is there any more discussion before we actually take the vote? I know we have one person that's going.

Betty Swift stated that she can respect the need to prioritize education over open space this being a university there are a lot of students and they're there to be educated.

The question was called and a vote taken by show of hand. The vote was 4 in favor 3 opposed and 1 abstaining. The motion therefore passed.

III. Student Housing Project Set-backs, Alley Vacations

UW Staff noted that they presented to CUCAC in February, and had asked for some relief from setback requirements. They stated that hopefully members had a chance to talk to their constitute groups and provide additional comments to the University as they prepare the minor amendment requests/

There are four sites proposed for the student housing, site 31, 32, 33 and 35. As part of the Minor Plan Amendment request reduced setbacks are being sought on sites 31, 32, and 33. Also the UW is requesting clarification with regard to the total amount of bed counts that's in the campus master plan, and regarding the inclusion of the Cavalier Apartments as part of the development site for 35W. The Cavalier is currently located at this site and the University is proposing its demolition. The University is asking for clarification that the demolition of the Cavalier is part of the overall development for the student housing.

Staff noted that the bed count under the master plan was proposed to increase between 800 and 1000 beds, but that the UW is now proposing an increase 1,600 to 1,700 beds. This is probably not a major issue but it is still different that is shown under the current master plan.

Mathew Fox stated if he had been asked in 2002 what his worst case scenario would be for the outcome of the master plan, it would be knocking down a market-rate apartment building filled with reasonably affordable apartments. He noted that there are about 60 people living in that building, many of whom have lived in there. The UW is proposing to displace this market-rate housing to make room for a dorm. He noted that he had no problems with the other nearby dorm projects, but does with the demolition of the Cavalier. He noted that it might not be possible to change direction here now, but that it bears noting that the UW buying market-rate apartment buildings and tearing them down is a problem and that it makes him less inclined to support an alley vacation on the 35 west. He asked what the project might look like if the Cavalier was retained.

Staff responded that the project would clearly look different. There are about 48 units in the building. Between 40 – 60 % of the units have been rented students over the past 10 years. So the actual proposal is to replace student housing with student housing. In addition, the UW has looked at the building structurally and found sufficient deficiencies. While the Cavalier looks similar to the Commodore Duchess, it is in far worse shape and cost of upgrading it would be quite high. Staff also noted that having students closer to campus frees up other market-rate apartments in other areas of the city. The demolition of this building will result in an increase from 48 to 150 units within the same foot print and is a much more efficient use of the site. The UW looked closely at whether the Cavalier could be retained and concluded that the inefficient use of the site and lack of ability provide for related student services was just too much of a hurdle to overcome.

Mathew Fox noted that in talking to people they're more interested in preserving the upper level setbacks, than the street level setbacks.

Just as a recap, we are proposing limitations on sites 32 and 35. What we are trying to show here are the improvements that we would make for relief of the setbacks on sites 31, 32, and 33 so the yellow represents the area that would be the setback relief that we are requesting and then the dark green represents the improvements that we would make across the street from each of the sites to give back for that setback relief.

Theresa Doherty noted that CUCAC will have 45 days to get your comments to DPD, and then DPD has 120 days to get come up with their opinion from the time that we initiate it until the 120 days runs out. You are within that 120 days. I think the way that we usually try to do it is we issue it so that you have a least 2 CUCAC meetings where you can discuss it. Usually within that 45 day window there's usually 2 CUCAC meetings. After further discussion the Committee decided to forgo formal comments until the next meeting

Chris Leman noted that the last time he observed that wasn't much ground level retail and other pedestrian related activities in the buildings and noted that this did not appear to be a good bargain for the community. UW Staff responded that there is retail, including a café at one of the sites, a large fitness-wellness center, a resource room, which is an after-hours student-wide facility that brings in resources for students after-hours, another espresso stand, and an auditorium.

Matthew Steele asked that the staff look at the affordability of various services and consider cooperatives if possible.

Chris Leman noted that neighborhood commercial requirements that apply to all development Citywide were developed to encourage street level interest and that while the University might not be under these

requirements; he would think that the UW would want to comply with this the extent possible. Mr. Leman also noted that he had received some comments from neighbors expressing concern with student behavior.

Mr. Leman also noted that the drama studio (Old Arnolds) is not a very successful and interesting building and suggested that this be used as a model for other street level uses.

IV. Ethnic Cultural Center (ECC) Expansion

John Whetzel, with the Capital Projects Office was introduced to give a presentation on the proposed Expansion of the Ethnic Cultural Center

Mr. Whetzel noted that this is the first presentation to CAC and that the project is in the early schematic design phase. The existing ECC sits on this site called site 38W the proposal is to demolishing the existing building and building a new one. The program has outgrown the building. There are at least 60 student groups wanting space in the building but only room for about 20 of them now. Some of the student groups actually have space at the ECC and some actually have space at the HUB. We're trying to consolidate into the ECC.

The project goals that have been set forth for the project include:

- 1) Preservation of the ECC as a "safe zone" for minority students, where ethnically diverse students will feel "at home.
- 2) Student leadership and involvement are cornerstones of the ECC program and therefore to this project. The building must be "of the students, for the students and by the students" to be truly successful.
- 3) This facility should enhance and further the image of the UW as a national leader in diversity programs.
- 4) Eliminate chronic shortages of meeting and office space for student organizations and provide for a reasonable amount of future capacity for long term growth of the program.

The project itself is \$15.5 million in project costs with just a little bit under \$10 million for construction. The project is funded directly by the students. No State money is involved. The students will be deciding whether they want to levy a tax upon themselves to fund these projects. The decision will be made in May. The project will stay within the existing site and have a similar footprint to what exists now. The new building will be around 25,000 gross sq. ft. which is double the existing facility and include offices, for the student groups, conference and meeting room spaces, and enhanced student learning support areas, enhanced library and new computer lab and crafts area. The design team includes Ruluda Architects which is a local firm and Larry McFarland Architects out of Vancouver, Canada that has a lot of First Nations (Native American) experience

The project timeline started with a feasibility study that was completed in spring of 2008; architect selection in was completed in September. If the Services and Activities Fee Committee approval in May, and the Board of Regents approve, then the goal is for constructing to start in 2010, with occupancy for August 2010. The key dates will include the May student vote and Board of Regents approval.

The original building was built in '71, originally designed by Benjamin McAdoo Jr. who was the first African-American in the state to really have a sustainable practice. However, the building is not one of his signature works as it has been modified significantly over time and is therefore not a candidate for preservation.

Dr. Sheila Edwards Lange, director of the program, was introduced to give brief comments. Dr. Lange noted that when the program was first established it focused mainly on race and ethnicity. Over time the focus has broadened to include students with disabilities and GLBT students and others involved in social

and economic justice issues. She noted that the focus has evolved ever more towards building connections between various groups.

Mr. Whetzel noted that one of the objectives is to develop a better entrance off of the corner to invite people into the ECC. In addition Because this is student funded and not state funded it's not mandated to be a LEED building, however, the University will design to either a LEED silver to a LEED gold standard. In addition efforts will be made to preserve some important murals that exist in the current building. There are five large murals located in the four main meeting rooms that were created by former ECC students. Three of the five are painted directly onto the wall board. However, these works are high quality and are referred to in some academic journals as. The University is taking an inventory of these and other smaller pieces throughout the building, and developing a strategy to preserve them. He noted that this is made more difficult in that the existing wall board may contain asbestos/. Many strategies for preservation are being considered, including digitally copying and re-use.

Mr. Whetzel briefly went over the murals. They include a piece by Emilio Agawago which is considered the first piece of major Chicano art in the Pacific Northwest. Emilio presently lives in Lynnwood area and if the existing mural cannot be conserved it may be possible to recommission it by the original artist. Other mural were done by Eddy Ray Walker Jesse Ray and Michael Lee Beasley. He noted that the University will return to CAC in July for further review of the building.

A member of the Committee asked if the students have already approved the project. Mr. Whetzel responded that the vote will occur on May 22. The ASUW Senate has voted for it, which was a condition for it to go to a full vote of the students.

V. Other General Issues

- A. **Husky Neighborhood Group** - Chris Leman noted that he had see an article in the Daily concerning the Husky Neighborhood Group. He noted that it sounde4d interesting and asked for more information on it. Theresa Doherty responded that this grew out of an effort that started about 4 or 5 years ago with the City. The students and the faculty and the staff met for about a year and came up with a list of goals concerning improvements in student activities and conduct north of 45th Street. It outlined 10 goals that led in large part to the extension student conduct code. The Neighborhood Group committee is charged with working toward assuring implementation of these goals.
- B. **Coordination of the Various Student Projects and Allocation of Spaces within Them** – Mathew Steele noted that there is a general lack of student office space and meeting rooms on Campus and asked if this will be dealt with as part of the proposed new projects. Staff responded that these will be efforts to do so, especially as the HUMB and ECC are both being renovated under this program. Staff also noted that there will be a major issue with the need to temporarily relocate student organizations temporarily during the renovation of the HUB.
- C. **Possible Hosting of Tent City III** - Chris Leman noted that he had heard that there is a class in the School of Public Health the purpose of which is to plan or locate a tent city or homeless encampment on campus. Mr. Leman asked that there be a presentation to CUCAC and consultations with the surrounding community prior to any decisions on an issue of this magnitude. He stated that he would hope that one of the first things the professors would have told the class was that there was an overriding need to contact with the communities nearby that could be effected by that.

Mathew Steele noted that the original project was looking toward the need for a tent city location in July. The class determined that there was insufficient time to put together a proposal to accommodate that timeframe so they are now looking at possible future date. However, some type of effort is still in the works and a committee of faculty, staff and students is being organized to work on this.

After brief further discussion members agreed that this issue be put on the CUCAC Agenda if and when the committee is formed and any actual alternative proposals are being considered.

VI. Adjournment

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