



City of Seattle - University of Washington
 Community Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

June 10, 2008

CUCAC Meeting #92

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

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

Members

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
 Daniel Kraus (Co Chair)
 Caroline Colon
 Betty Swift
 Brett Frosaker
 Eric Larson
 Dave Eckert
 Pat Cowan
 Chris MacKenzie
 Neal Lessenger
 Matthew Stubbs
 Heather Newman
 Ashley Emery
 Matthew Steele

Alternates

Chris Leman
 Mark Holden
 Neal Wechsler
 Tom Roth
 Larry Sinnott
 Brian Ramey
 Ruedi Risler

Ex-Officio Members

Cliff Louie – DON
 Theresa Doherty – UW

Members Present

Dan Kraus, UW Staff
 Neal Lessenger, UW at Large
 Matt Fox, U District Community Council
 Ruedi Risler, University Place Community Council
 Betty Swift, Portage Bay/Roanoke Parke
 Stan Sorscher, Laurelhurst Community Club
 Pat Cowan, University Park Community Council
 Chris MacKenzie, Wallingford Community Council

Staff Present

Cliff Louie, Department of Neighborhoods
 Theresa Doherty, UW, Assistant Vice-President of Regional Affairs

Others Present

Jan Armtz, UW Capital Project Office (CPO)
 Everett Spring, UW CPO
 Kristina Kenney, UW CPO
 Celeste Gilman, UW
 Ashley Kangas, UW
 Ken Kubota, UW

I. Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Kraus called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introductions were made.

II. Review and approve meeting notes – March 11, 2008 and May 13, 2008

Daniel Kraus asked members to review minutes for March 11 and May 13 meetings for approval if there is a quorum.

Matt Fox noted for the record that CUCAC membership is 15 because Kit O’Neill, representing Ravenna Springs Community Group, has moved from the neighborhood and there are no other members of this group. He asked to suspend their membership until they appoint a new community representative, thereby lowering the quorum number to seven. There were no objections to lowering the quorum by one.

Matt Fox motioned to accept the March 11, 2008 minutes with a minor change; Neal Lessenger seconded the motion. Shington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) is a joint committee appointed by the University of Washington and City of Seattle to advise both on the development of the University of Washington and the City of Seattle. Meetings are held on the second and fourth Thursdays of each month. For more information, please contact Cliff Louie at (206) 377-1103. The minutes were approved unanimously with the minor change. Neal Lessenger motioned to accept the May 13 minutes; Matt Fox seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Cunningham Hall Relocation Siting Plan – Kristine Kenney, UW

Kristine Kenney, UW, distributed copies of the handouts. One was the site selection committee's preferred four locations, and the second one was a matrix with selection criteria rating each site – Denny Yard, Winkenwerder, Island Grove and Parrington Lawn. Cunningham Hall, a wooden structure, is being relocated because of the development of the Molecular Engineering Building on the site. Since the Molecular Engineering Building would be taller and tower over Cunningham Hall, the thinking is that it would be better to relocate it to a more suitable location.

Currently, the main tenant of Cunningham Hall is the Women's Center. Johnson Annex will be demolished for the new building.

The selection criteria – CMP site, site suitability, costs, best use of site, program proximity, architectural context and accessibility - was briefly reviewed by Kristine Kenney using the selection matrix handout. Two of these sites are identified as development sites (Denny Yard/#5C & Winkenwerder/#20C) in the Campus Master Plan and the other two are not. The building is 5,000 SF with a 2,500 SF footprint, so it is a small structure. Because of the buildings history, its current use, and the fact that most development sites have a capacity up to 200,000 SF, the University does not want to occupy these CMP development sites, with a building that is only 2,500 square feet and not being used as an academic building. In addition, the University is looking for sites more within the context of Cunningham Hall.

- Deleted: its nature
- Deleted: most
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: we do
- Deleted: normally used as academic buildings.
- Deleted: We are
- Deleted: and help frame Memorial Way with Parrington Hall.

She reviewed Denny Yard site (southwest end) The building is relatively small for that site. However, they don't think the architectural character is in keeping with Parrington Hall and Denny Hall.

UW has hired a moving consultant, and the intent is to move Cunningham Hall in one piece, taking off both porches before the move begins and putting them back on once the building is relocated.

- Deleted: without the

The second site is Winkenwerder that is close to the Burke-Gilman Trail and the College of Forestry; and this site is a parking lot. It was not viewed favorably, especially by the Women's Center, because it was too remote and secluded and they have night classes, and therefore security became an issue.

Island Grove is the third site. The building would not disturb the medicinal herb garden. Cunningham Hall would be located behind it. The architecture context is more in keeping with the building. The site is identified as an open space along with Rainier Vista.

- Deleted: .
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: and t

The last site is Parrington Lawn. The building would be relocated along the edge of George Washington Lane. The advantage of this site is that is located near 15th Avenue which has bus routes and many woman use them. It is a more secure site with more visibility.

- Deleted: And t

The site selection committee's preference is the Parrington Lawn site, the second is Denny Yard, and the third choice is Island Grove. The committee eliminated the Winkenwerder site from consideration. It will make a recommendation to the Provost at the end of June.

Matt Fox stated that he did not like any of the sites because two are open space sites, and the only favorable aspect of the Denny Yard is that it is a development site. Neal Lessenger asked if the University looked at off-campus sites. Kristine Kenney said the committee did look at off-campus site, but the Women's Center like being in the heart of the campus. Currently, they have a lot of students using Cunningham Hall between classes and were afraid they would lose that connectivity.

Stan Sorscher asked why the University wants to save the building. Kristine Kenney answered that it is one of the two buildings from the Alaska-Yukon Pacific Exhibit (1909) remaining. It was a temporary building. Kristine Kenney said that the building has a history behind it. Betty Swift asked about its uses. The Women's Studies Program holds meetings and events, besides holding conferences and there are offices in Cunningham Hall. Kristine Kenney added that classes are held in an adjacent building that is another reason for relocating it nearby. Theresa Doherty clarified that the Women's Center is not an academic program.

Deleted: part of the

Theresa Doherty asked Matt Fox about this concern for particular sites. Matt Fox responded that he was concerned about losing open space at the Denny and Parrington sites. He was inclined to favor the Island Grove site because the building would be relocated behind the medicinal herb garden and its siting will not likely affect Rainier Vista. The building was named after a well known woman photographer, Imogen Cunningham.

Ruedi Risler asked why the Winkenwerder site was eliminated. Kristine Kenney iterated that Cunningham Hall would be facing the Burke-Gilman Trail and additionally it would not be in the campus core, and students maybe less apt to use the facility. Theresa Doherty added that there may be a perception of safety because the site is a wooded area, and perhaps installing lights could address this issue. The College of Forestry plants a lot of specimen trees in that location, and there would be an issue of removal of some trees that it uses for its program.

Matt Fox stated that he would like to see other sites examined by the site selection committee. He has a difficult time supporting sites that eliminates open space. He suggested that CUCAC write a letter to the Provost encouraging the site selection committee to examine other sites without impinging on open space. Kristine Kenney stated that the committee looked at development sites, and these were the ones selected based on the criteria. Neal Lessenger noted that he would like a site where Cunningham Hall fits in architecturally. There was more discussion about the Island Grove site. The Women's Center stated it was their least favorite site. Daniel Kraus expressed that the building should not be sited on Parrington Lawn.

Matt Fox restated his motion: "Of the current sites under consideration, CUCAC considers the Island Grove site the least objectionable and urge the site selection committee continue their search and open space not be impinged upon." He withdrew his motion, and re-stated the motion again, "CUCAC should write a letter strongly opposed to the Denny Yard and Parrington Lawn sites, and the Island Grove site is the least objectionable and would encourage the site selection committee to continue their study for the relocation of Cunningham Hall." Neal Lessenger seconded the motion. Daniel Kraus called for the vote. The motion was approved unanimously. Matt Fox will write the letter. Kristine Kenney encouraged Matt Fox to list the criteria that the

committee could use for its review of potential sites. One of the guiding principles would be open space.

Theresa Doherty said there are many processes on campus that building projects go through an internal process as well as an external process and sometimes those processes are really complicated. Cunningham Hall is a good example. There is an affection for that building not only because of its historical significance but also because of the fact that the Women's Center is in it and it started as a suffergent building during the AYPE..Because this is only the second building the UW has moved, new processes (i.e. committees) had to be put in place just for that building. Timelines, criteria, and a schedule had to be put in place to be sure that it gets done in a timely manner. The project managers managed this new process for Cunningham Hall.. There was a one-pager put together by Capital Projects Office when they did the Master Plan, this "General site selection process",

A random discussion continued about Cunningham Hall. With Cunningham Hall there is a small constituency driving this and aren't enough, what can this group say/do to give support to the people who want more balance. Matt Fox said we are urging them to look at other sites. We did pick a site we thought that was least objectionable. She had a feeling maybe this is a building that people think should be done away with? We could have them either go talk with them or have them come talk with us, this might be a better way to see if we could move the comfort zone a little. The fact here is that we are funding the move of this building. Theresa Doherty said the University would not build a 5000 sf building today. Cunningham Hall has a constituency and if the UW thought about demolishing it then a different group would be concerned and that group would be the historical constituency. I am wondering can we separate the occupancy of the building now and the building, just for terms of discussion. If we have the building, would be moved for itself. I think it would because of it's historical, I think it would be moved regardless of who is in the building but the fact the women's program in the building elevates the status. They have a very strong sense of where they want it today. If the program wasn't in the building, we would have a larger number sites to look at. What happened when the Allen Library was built, there was a building there called the high energy physics laboratory was also one of those. Theresa said to make sure if your concerned about open space being encroached upon to then you need to make sure that is well stated.

IV. U-Pass Annual (2007) Report – Celeste Gilman, UW

Celeste Gilman briefed CUCAC on the 2007 UPass Annual Report. She distributed copies of the report. She started out by stating that 2007 was a successful year for the University's Transportation Management Plan (TMP). A new transportation services director was hired, and has been re-organized. Commuter Services, a new office, integrates the functions of Parking Services and the Transportation Office.

According to the 2007 report, "Driving Alone" is utilized by 23% of the employee/student population to travel to the University District. Whereas, slightly over 75% use alternative modes of transportation (see page 3). These measurements occurred during the peak AM and PM commuter traffic hours. Even with a 24% in employee/student population since 1990, the

University has managed to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation. Since 1991 there has been an increase of 23% of users of the U-PASS program of approximately 45,000 people. The largest U-PASS budget line item is for Transit Service Contracts (\$11,855,000) that totaled 91% of the 2007 overall budget of \$13 million (page 5). Celeste Gilman talked about their promotional events to encourage other modes of transportation rather than driving alone, i.e., walking and bicycling; and continued their partnerships with Zipcar and merchants on the AVE.

Stan Sorscher asked why the number of carpools decreased from 1990 to 2007. Was it intentional? In 2004 Celeste Gilman explained that a fee was introduced at the gate and resulted in a significant reduction. In some respects it (fee) was an intended consequence. There was concern that some carpooler participants were picking up riders at the parking lot leaving as a carpool. To avoid this situation, participants now must "have value on a Husky card." And each must pay using their card.

Neal Lessenger asked if the University still talks to other colleges, since the U-PASS Program is considered a good model. It is still a model and Celeste Gilman cited a conference recently held in Reno by the American Public Transportation Association that she attended focusing on college communities. She was one of the presenters. Jan Arntz noted that accepted freshman students are contacted before they arrive on campus to educate them about alternative modes of transportation in the U-PASS program.

Stan Sorscher asked about the number of riders who use the shuttle (Health Sciences Express) going to Children's Hospital and South Lake Union (Fred Hutchinson/Seattle Cancer Care Alliance). Celeste Gilman said the shuttle is not part of their program and they have not historically counted those participants in their annual report. This shuttle service is administered by the Property and Transport Services. She thought the number of trips generated is about a million per year. Daniel Kraus said he uses it to go between this campus and Harborview Hospital. It is heavily used, he added.

Theresa Doherty responding to a 520 question said that the University continues to work with Metro to have continued service hours to and from the eastside. Although less than 10% of their student population comes from the eastside, the University would like to have Metro increase their service hours. High capacity transit is being planned.

Matt Fox asked why walking and bicycling has remained flat from 1990 to 2007. Theresa Doherty suggested that people are using other alternative modes. He thought the U-PASS program is great, since more people are using it. Celeste Gilman cited that there are 600 bicycle lockers and there is a waiting list. The University is introducing an inter-mediate security program that has a lower cost, where a limited number of bikers will have access to it. This option is being installed in the University Tower in the garage.

Ruedi Risler asked about possible impacts from the University Village expanding its retail and building another parking garage, in light of the efforts of the U-PASS program to reduce traffic in the University District neighborhood. He acknowledged that this is not the University's problem, but something that they need to watch. With improvements in 372 in the past few

years, it's definitely increased transit access past University Village. A number of projects that are part of the UW area Action Strategy that would improve pedestrian access to the University Village and working in partnership with the City with that.

Matt Fox asked what the committee thought about relocating the loop ramp off northbound University Bridge. They are trying to eliminate the bike/car conflict, bikes cross an aggressive turning lane of traffic. They are talking of taking all the traffic down and have the loop ramp extended. Celeste Gilman cited that Peter Dewey is taking the lead and I haven't been involved and she is supportive of it. Matt Fox stated that was the biggest impediment to access to the UW. This was talked about in the Master Plan before and it wasn't like then.

V. Brooklyn Building Demolition – Everett Spring, UW

Everett Spring, Project Manager said the scope of this project is to demolish the Brooklyn Building. UW will also take out the five houses that are on the same block. We will be capping the existing underground site, building utilities and regrading the site and securing with a fence for future use. Just starting a work plan and moving into the permitting process with current schedule demolition to begin in March 2009 and finish in June. The reason is the building is structurally unsound and sagging and differential settling in foundation. Possible being knocked off the foundation during the Nisqually earthquake; we did shoring to hold it up. It was built before we had codes and all systems are compromised, leaks, mold and same issues in the houses. An Elm tree in Master Plan that will stay and lot W3 will remain. A question was asked if this was one of the housing and food services development sites. Everett Spring said it was. Discussion on the alley and Everett said in the Master Plan it was cited as a single site. Legally there are seven different properties. The Master Plan said that it's both sides of the alley. Also exploring to sell the houses for relocation to another site. Preliminary discussion with transportation services who are in charge of selling these items. There are processes in place for giving non-profit organizations preference. If can't sell, they will salvage as much as possible re-use materials. The plan is to identify this is as lead credit options for whatever development would come on the site afterwards would be able to rollover lead credits for that project to help reach whatever standards they want.

VI. Clark Road Culvert Replacement – Ashley Kangas, UW

Ashley Kangas gave out handouts, the project is occurring of the Montlake landfill and we are replacing culvert through the University slew? under Clark Row. Project scheduled to start in the summer 2009. We are finishing drawing and specifications now because it will be entering permitting phase which will take nine months to one year. SPU did an analyses on existing culvert which is 48 inches x 4 feet wide and said it's undersized and maybe this is why there is overspilling into the street during rain. We will replace with a 14 foot culvert and 8 feet tall. We will install a copper dam and dewatering the area for the culvert. Estimated project cost is \$750,000 total cost, most are soft cost and construction is \$300,000 to \$350,000. The traffic will be closing Clark Road for two months during July and August; this is during the fish window so there is no impact to salmon. No alternate route, biggest concern the heli stop on the west of the

canal, we will work with Airlift Northwest and coordinating an alternative route for ambulances to access the stop. Currently four gates that span the width of the road on the north entrance to the E1 lot will be fencing that gate and if they want access they can use the north side. Matt asked if affects the Ravenna Creek outflow. Ashley said no it doesn't. King County can delineation of the wetlands because they are going through emergency permitting to be able clean up the slew.

VII. Lewis Hall Addition – Ken Kubota, UW

Ken Kubota, Project Manager with Capitol Projects Office for Lewis Hall. This is to restore the core project and funded by the State for \$25.3 million, the renovation portion is 24, 500 sf and we planning an addition of 9,250 sf. The building will be the new home for the information school that has history with the Library Science and off shoot with computer science with how to access information. The present tenants will move to Condin Hall. Currently in design phase, we are in schematics and construction will begin November 2009 and the move in date is January 2010. The Lewis Hall is one of the oldest historic buildings on campus. Ken gave a brief history on the building. Our project is looking at renovation of the exterior as much as possible. The windows will be look at for energy concerns with meeting WEEDS? requirement. We will study if we can keep those windows, they are in fairly good condition. The roof used to be cedar shingles and been changed to asphalt and we will continue the same.

Mithun is our architect and with the new program with the information school on the addition and the pre-design study looked at alternative location for the addition except we focused on maintaining the historic frontage and hiding the addition on the north side of the building. The pathway on the right side of Lewis Hall is on access with the quad and that is a major thoroughfare for students going to the dormitories. We are looking at a second entrance at the new addition and reinforcing the main entrance with both keeping the center stairway as well as adding accessible entrance on that side of the building. We want to take advantage of the tree outside the building. Most programs are office space with couple classrooms and computer labs. A question was asked if the new addition has a rooftop. Ken Kubota said yes, we are thinking of a roof garden accessible with possible mechanical equipment as well.

Another CUCAC member asked about the addition is it going to be outside the hatched area. Ken Kubota spoke about a drawing on the dashed line is a build able area. We will maintain developable site to the north. He asked where is all the crude going with Cunningham Hall, where is the KTCS dishes? There are owners for those and we find them and have them removed. The two annexed type building they are staying, campus engineering report indicated they are at the end of their life. In the Master Plan we prefer not to have temporary building. Matt Fox's initial take was they handled the addition by not messing with the architectural integrity of the original building. This will be back to you soon because a SEPA checklist. A discussion on the buildings surrounding this one.

Deleted: ?

VIII. More Hall Annex Update – Jan Arntz, UW

A couple of years ago the UW applied for our Master Use Permit and there were concerns raised during the 14 day comment period on the MUP. UW asked the City to put the MUP on hold so they can assess what these comments letters are saying like do historic research addendum and

where we are going from here. Contracted with historic architect to do an HRA for the project, it was signed today. The UW will keep everyone appraised as they move ahead.

IX. UW Medical Center: DSEIS - Jan Arntz, UW

Matt Fox thought this was better than usual. We don't have a lot of comments on this project and if we have comments we need them by June 30, 2008.

Several CUCAC members commented as follows:

- was not happy with the site, just a building. No matter what you change it's not going to change the view.
- thought they made an honest effort for fitting it in.
- said that CUCAC doesn't have to make comments about if there isn't any. Matt Fox just opened to see what they think about.
- Matt Fox said if there is a second phase (and the height limit is increased) happens and need to do a major plan amendment to the Master Plan, we will an opportunity to weigh in at that point.

- Deleted: ?
- Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 0 pt + Indent at: 36 pt
- Deleted: ?
- Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 0 pt + Indent at: 36 pt
- Deleted: ?
- Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 0 pt + Indent at: 36 pt
- Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 18 pt + Tab after: 0 pt + Indent at: 36 pt
- Deleted: ?
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: received

X. CUCAC's Role – Matt Fox

Matt Fox was put on the agenda because he wanted to discuss what he perceives as a declining influence of CUCAC's role. Eric Larson could not be there so he wrote an e-mail to point of having and not having influence and Matt Fox read the e-mail. Matt Fox wanted this discussion for the newer members because they walk in on steep learning curve and they are gone in a year.

A short discussion took place.

There was a question about ASUW or GPSS representation. JanArntz said ASUW or GPSS contact Theresa Doherty or her, we ask the ASUW to be the alternate and they move up to the delegate. Sometimes we get ASUW and GPSS people that really want to help. We can't force them to appoint someone and it is a huge learning curve. Matt Fox thought everyone should go back and read the By-Laws.

- Deleted: AHEW
- Deleted: ever
- Deleted: we say if they could be a freshman or sophomore, we want to encourage them to have as long tenure as they can. We
- Deleted: 's
- Deleted: to walk in here.

Dan Kraus suggest that if our object to get the people who haven't spent as much time with CUCAC and let them understand and do a presentation for them. This is to give them what our understanding of this history is and would be interesting for you see as CUCAC's role. Therese could talk about what the University sees and someone from the City and what they see.

Jan Arntz said what would help is that each project has a different type of time table and still surprised at discovering when it is along the process somewhere we are expected to be effective. I would like some mention as project comes to us, what the likely timetable would be or steps and points where we plan on being responsive. Matt Fox said we get that and sometimes we don't and things come to us at different times. Maybe we need to manufacture that ourselves or make sure it happens. Matt Fox thought that this a very good point. Maybe its time to walk around the campus.

This paragraph is moved to the Cunningham Hall discussion part of the agenda since it relates there.

Matt Fox what ever happened to the long house we talked about? Therese said they are still talking about it and Jan no funding and it's on the Capitol Budget list to ask the legislative funding.

The paragraph above is moved to the Cunningham Hall discussion part of the agenda since it relates there better.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Deleted: Theresa Doherty said so many processes on campus and the different building and internally to the university it really hard to figure that out. Cunningham Hall is a good example that there is an affection for that building and so processes that have been put in place just for that building. Could we come up with some type of timeline or expectation or something like that so Jan and her so they could make sure that it gets to the project managers. We did put together the one-pager when they did the Master Plan, this general site selection process, its not very good. A discussion on the Cunningham Building as an example and how quickly that went. Jan Artnz and Theresa Doherty are open to helping as much as they can. ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ? said with Cunningham that there is a small constituency driving this and aren't enough, what can this group say/do to give support to the people who want more balance. Matt Fox said we are urging them to look at other sites. We did pick a site we thought that was least objectionable. A question she had a feeling maybe this is a building that people think should be done away with? We could have them either go talk with them or have them come talk with us, this might be a better way to see if we could move the comfort zone a little. The tact here is that we are funding the move of this building. Theresa Doherty said the University couldn't build 5000 sf building, I think that Cunningham Hall has a constituency if we demolish it then a different would come out of the woodwork which would be the historical constituency. I am wondering can we separate the occupancy of the building now and the building, just for terms of discussion. If we have the building, would be moved for itself. I think it would be moved regardless of who is in the building but the fact the women's program in the building elevates the status. They have a very strong sense of where they want it today. If the program wasn't in the building, we would have a larger number sites to look at. What happened when the Allen Library was built, there was a building there called the high energy physics laboratory was also one of those. Therese said to make sure if your concerned about open space being encroached upon to then you need to make sure that is well stated. ¶

¶ Theresa Doherty said we could invite them except it passed that. A question on who is them? The women's study director, Sue Tapa and board members. ¶

Deleted: ¶