



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake
Montlake Community Club

John Gaines (Co-chair)
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Joan Kelday
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Scott Cooper
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council

Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council

Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large

Bry Osmonson
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Timmy Bendis
Eastlake Community Council

Louise Little
University District Partnership

Leslie Wright
Laurelhurst Community Club

Miha Sarani
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Pamela Clark
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Natasha Rodgers
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Amanda Winters
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader
University District Community Council

Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Club

Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council

TBD
University of Washington At -Large

Osman Salahuddin
University of Washington Students

Rick Mohler
University of Washington Faculty

TBD
University of Washington Staff

Ex-Officio

Maureen Sheehan – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods

Sally Clark – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

**City of Seattle - University of Washington
Community Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Minutes
Meeting #158
December 6, 2016
Adopted January 10, 2017**
UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Barbara Quinn	Barbara Krieger (Alt. – non-voting)
Tomitha Blake	Brian O'Sullivan	Pamela Clark (Alt. – non-voting)
John Gaines	Kerry Kahl	Natasha Rodgers (Alt. – voting)
Joan Kelday	Ashley Emery	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Scott Cooper	Timmy Bendis (Alt. – voting)	Rick Mohler (Alt. – non-voting)
Matt Fox	Leslie Wright (Alt. – voting)	

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark Kjriss Lund Lindsey King
(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. John Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

There were no meeting minutes to review and adopt. The meeting minutes from November 29, 2016 will be reviewed at the next meeting.

III. Public Comment

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments, and there was no public comment.

IV. Population Health Building Update (00:32:40)

Ms. Sally Clark introduced Ms. Jeannie Natta and Ms. Lyndsey Cameron for an update to the Population Health Building.

Ms. Natta did a presentation to the Committee last September, while they were in the process of soliciting and submitting grants for the project. She began her presentation with an update on the site reviews, and mentioned at their September presentation, that they were looking at the 2003 CMP. The project is now looking at two more site options, Site A which is the Purchasing Building between Brooklyn and University avenue and Site C. These sites both have significant changes in the 2018 CMP. The project team considered what is in the draft master plan for these two site locations, making for two more alternatives.

Ms. Natta shared that the vision and goals of the project began as an initiative brought forth by UW President Ana Mari Cauce's desire to bring together faculty, researchers, and experts to collaborate and find synergy to work on

world health concerns. The University wants to become a leader of this initiative regionally, nationally, and globally.

(Note: Ms. Natta shared a brief video presentation of Ms. Cauce describing her vision about the Population Health Building).

Ms. Natta mentioned that the goal for the Population Health building is a place for interaction and classrooms and as a collaborative environment for the public as well as other entities.

She noted that the target scope is a 300,000-sq. ft. facility. The target number came from a combination of affordability and funding availability. The facility will be office space that can accommodate single and multiple use occupancy. It will be a place for collaboration, work-group type environment, conference room space for seminars, workshops as well as computing laboratories. They do not anticipate this facility to house wet labs (a research lab with water, chemicals, gas, etc.). The goal of this facility is to be a community oriented destination that will activate the surrounding neighborhood.

The project is currently drafting the EIS. The goal is to begin construction in the spring of 2020. The budget is \$230 million. This include a gift from the Gates Foundation of \$210 million. The University requested for \$20 million on the state funded capital plan, and is committed to come up with the \$20 million as part of the grants agreement. This may come up from the state funding request or the University reserves to close the gap.

The team has identified three possible sites that can accommodate the size of the building. A site review working group was formed to gather information on each of the identified sites, performed cost analysis that will be presented to the project executive committee. There will be several discussions including meeting minutes from this meeting and a comprehensive review document will be presented to President Cauce who will decided on a preferred site and forward that information to the Board of Regents, who will select the site.

The team is currently doing outreach beginning with this Committee. They will be coming back to this Committee to provide updates regarding the design. The team met with different departments to educate them about what the project will be. They also met with several students from Global Health and the School of Public Health to inform them about what their roles will be. The team will also be meeting with several faculty and senior leadership along with the Gates Foundation to inform them about the expectations for the building. The project team also plans to meet with the School of Public Health chairs and potential occupants of the building. They will also be meeting with the neighboring departments of the proposed sites to determine their projects to make them aware so their ongoing projects are not disrupted and impacted during construction.

She noted about identifying the floor plate size of the building and where it lands along the pedestrian as one of the design and construction analysis. She added that there will be a cost analysis among the different sites and determining the pros and cons. The team will be looking at the 2018 CMP and the vision of the plan and how it will affect the building, impacts to the community, open space, pedestrian and transit system access, etc.

From an institutional perspective, Ms. Cameron noted that they are starting to see the growth in the area and they would not want to waste any space for these potential sites. The team will not propose any new parking sites for Sites A and B.

A question was raised about open volume of space and whether the building connecting various floors are accommodated in the diagrams. Ms. Natta commented that they have not gone through the design details of what the floors and collaboration spaces would look like. Ms. Cameron added that the collaboration spaces are within the 300,000-sq. ft.

Mr. Reudi Risler asked if the project team has reached out to the police department. Ms. Natta mentioned that they have contacted them and they will be included on the list for outreach communication. They considered them as partners in the planning process.

Mr. Gaines asked why they chose to pursue a design/build process compared to other methods. Ms. Natta mentioned that they are moving towards a more integrated process model. Ms. Cameron added that having integrated project teams early creates a better collaborative effort and reduces cost.

V. Review Draft CMP/EIS Comments (00:35:35)

Ms. Kjrjs Lund opened the discussion to review the draft CMP/EIS comments.

Height/Bulk:

Comment #29, The group came to a consensus about variation in height and modulation should be required along Pacific, Montlake, and 15th on these streets. Ms. Sheehan commented that she will add a language around public realm.

Comment #30, The group agreed on having a higher public realm allowance on Montlake.

Comment #31, The group agreed on maximizing the open space for additional light, air and green space in the area.

Comment #32, Ms. Lund suggested to leaving the comment as it was written since it was difficult to determine the precise development footprint. The University can look back and decide on what to do.

Comment #33, The group does not have a consensus regarding the height limit and view corridor along Montlake Boulevard.

Ms. Lund opened the discussion to review the comments on livability and open space.

Comments #42, #51, and #53, Ms. Lund noted that the comments are similar and she went ahead and broke it into two parts: socio-economic impacts that were not addressed in the EIS, and the elements necessary to make the area livable such as affordable housing, child care, cultural activities, etc.

Mr. Doug Campbell commented about the lack of analysis and options by the University about the impact of an innovation district to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Fox added that this was the same issues and concerns that he heard from the public hearing regarding social impacts. Mr. Campbell added that he would like to see an analysis of spreading the growth across the neighboring areas.

Mr. Risler noted that he supports these comments and would like to add having a clear definition of what an innovation district mean. He added that there needs to be reference from other places, for example, the Bay Area, and how an innovation district impacted the area.

Ms. Clark commented that early in the process, Ms. Theresa Doherty presented on the physical developments in an innovation district, and asked if the group would like to have another refresher from her about the innovation district. Mr. Campbell commented that he agreed on having the innovation district next to the U District, but it has a different impact to the U District. He added that the University did not adequately analyze the full sq. footage needs.

(Note: There was a back and forth discussion among the group regarding square footage, socio-economic benefits, innovation district, growth dispersed options, etc.)

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will work with Mr. Campbell, Mr. Timmy Bendis, and Mr. Rick Mohler to fine tune introductory language that captures the issues that were discussed.

Livability/Open Space:

Comments #55-63, The group agreed that there should be a plan for parking and accessibility for public access including boats and cars as a condition for vacating both streets, and to combine Comments #56 and #57.

Comment #58, The group agreed to add support for greenery and a pedestrian plaza as well as an open space at the south end of Roosevelt, and combine Comment #59.

Comment #60, The group agreed to delete the comment about passive vs. active public space.

Comment #61, The group agreed to have a balance of pedestrian access with the preservation of the Union Bay natural area.

Comment #62, The group agreed to have water trail kayak and signage for neighboring communities, and combine Comment #63.

Comment #64, Ms. Sheehan noted that it is a duplicate of Comments #53 and #64.

Transportation/Connectivity:

Comments #84-86, The group agreed on encouraging the University to build a strong transportation access system along the east-west corridor, and bus improvements along Montlake Boulevard and 25th Ave NE.

Comment #87, The group agreed to delete this comment since it was already included in a broader comment.

Comment #88, The group agreed that the traffic analysis in the EIS focusing on peak hours is inadequate due to the current traffic volumes. Ms. Sheehan will work with Mr. Brian O'Sullivan to enhance the language statement.

Comment #89, Ms. Lund suggested to hold this comment and review if it is related to other comments that were already discussed.

Comments #90-91, The group agreed that these comments are self-explanatory.

Comment #68, The group agreed to add development triggers to strengthen the comment.

Comments #70-71, The group agreed that bicycle safety should be addressed.

Comment #72, The group agreed to have a plan required for better data and analysis on bicycles and pedestrians.

Comment #73, The group agreed that a stronger language be included and should be considered in transportation planning.

Comment #74, The group agreed that this comment was sufficiently covered in earlier comments.

Comment #75, The group agreed to delete this comment.

Comment #76, Ms. Lund suggested that this comment may be included in the introductory statement. The group agreed to leave the statement as-is.

Comment #77, The group agreed to add to this comment a reference to w24 and w25.

Comment #78, The group agreed to add develop pedestrian connectivity, and combine with Comment #79.

Comment #80, The group agreed to delete this comment.

Comment #81, Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will work in defining the comment into a question for the University to review and look at.

Comment #82, Mr. Risler suggested to combine with Comment #74 and #83.

Ms. Lund commented on adding data analysis and performance metrics to Comment #72 as suggested by Mr. Risler.

Next Steps:

Ms. Lund noted that at the next meeting, the group will be discussing parking, neighborhood coordination, accessibility, transportation, light and glare and cumulative impacts. Further discussion may be warranted to resolve the height issues on Montlake as well as the view corridors.

Ms. Sheehan added she will combine the draft comments from the previous and tonight's meeting. She intends to share the draft comments with the group before the next meeting. The next task for the group is to focus on the draft letter once the comments are completed.

Mr. Fox suggested to hold another meeting on December 15th if the group are unable to finish the comments, since the deadline for the draft letter is coming soon. The group commented about completing the comments as well as a review of the draft letter at the next meeting, and decide if an additional meeting is necessary.

VI. New Business

There was no new business.

VII. Adjournment

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