



MEMBERS

Douglas Campbell University District Partnership

Kay Kelly Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake Montlake Community Club

Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Ravenna Springs Community Group

Eric Larson

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan Wallingford Community Council

Kerry Kahl University of Washington At -Large

Ashley Emery University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz University of Washington Staff

<u>Alternates</u>

University District Partnership

Leslie Wright Laurelhurst Community Club

Barbara Krieger Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Rayenna Springs Community Group

Natasha Rodgers Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader University District Community Council

Ruedi Risler

University Park Community Club

Jon Berkedal Wallingford Community Council

Osman Salahuddin University of Washington Students

Rick Mohler University of Washington Faculty

University of Washington Staff

University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

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

Meeting Minutes Meeting #161 February 14, 2017

March 14, 2017 **UW Tower** 4333 Brooklyn Avenue Seattle, WA 98105 22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell Ruedi Risler (Alt.) Ashley Emery Brian O'Sullivan John Gaines Jan Arntz Jon Berkedal (Alt. non-voting)

Pamela Clark (Alt.) Kerry Kahl Matthew Fox Bry Osmonson

Staff and Others Present

Sarah Sodt Sally Clark (See attached attendance sheet)

Welcome and Introductions

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

Housekeeping

Ms. Sally Clark mentioned that she and Ms. Theresa Doherty have reached out to several folks that are currently engaged in what an innovation district would look like. She noted that Ms. Lisa Graumlich, the Dean of the College of Environment has will talk to this Committee about the different federal grants they are pursuing and potential partnerships with federal and public agencies.

Mr. Dan Schwartz, director of the Clean Energy Institute, who has partnered with state agencies and private companies on the future of energy storage and generation will discuss with this Committee about what his group does and why they may look at West Campus someday.

Ms. Clark mentioned that other folks that they will be inviting are students housed at start-ups and have them present the projects they are involved in.

She mentioned that she may distribute articles in advance of these meetings that talk about what other Universities have done and the shortcomings and benefits. The location for the March meeting will be at the Start Up Hall.

Mr. Fox mentioned that while public comments about the Master Plan has cooled off, a change in meeting location may cause a concern, should members of the public decide to submit or hear public comments from this Committee. Ms. Clark noted that she will have the meeting location published in their website as soon as possible.

Mr. Reudi Risler commented in addition to presenting their different programs, they should also address the type of space they would require.

Mr. Fox opened the discussion to review and adopt the January 10 minutes. Ms. Jan Arntz made a motion to adopt the January 10 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion passed.

III. Public Comment (00:01:00)

Mr. Fox opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

IV. North Campus Housing Phase IV: Schematic Design (00:03:59)

Mr. Shane Ruegamer, project manager for the University's Major Capital projects presented on the North Campus Housing Phase IV project. The project goals established by KierantTimberlake and OLIN, the design leads for the project, five years ago, include the following: creating a vibrant live/work student community, fuse common space, regional and recreational programs with landscape, integrate student community with campus and off-campus neighborhood, embrace the University's historic campus fabric and the natural landscape, and holistically form the landscape and buildings about the environment.

He described the various community and regional space locations around Phase IV and various circulation points including pedestrian and stair paths, vehicular and shared access points to and from the quad and the main campus.

A comment was made about lack of parking among students, residents, faculty and staff. Mr. Ruegamer mentioned that there was no parking demand among the student residents because of the cost. A comment was made that students can access available parking spaces that allows them to go around campus, and maintaining the U-Pass program is a valuable resource for faculty and students.

Mr. Ruegamer showed a diagram of where the existing canopies are as well as the proposed areas for the removal of the trees due to construction restraints. He showed the different schematic designs of Oak Hall and its floor plans. He pointed out the importance of having a common and student lounge access at the building where students and staff can gather for meeting events.

He showed a visual diagram of Denny Field and described the proposed typology and materiality. He mentioned having a synthetic field to accommodate year-round use of the filed for intramural sports activities.

Mr. Risler commented about the heavy rain and how water runoff will not go into the drain. Mr. Ruegamer mentioned that the new code require filtration facilities in Denny Field that would capture rain water and dispersed it naturally. Mr. Ruegamer stated that he site plan for Haggett Hall is challenging because it sits on the most topographic area and surrounded by emergency access areas.

Mr. Risler inquired if the University Police department was involved in assessing security and operations the buildings. Ms. Arntz commented that they were involved in the EIS process and the University Police have been a primary partner during the phase and SEPA reviews.

Mr. Fox commented about the buildings glass design and how it helps in improving and getting more light coming out of these buildings.

A comment was made about the phasing plan that showed the pathways and will these be open during construction. Mr. Ruegamer confirmed that these pathways will be open during construction.

Mr. John Gaines commented about the disconnect and wasted access and connectivity opportunities between the University and the U-Village. A comment was made about the location and topography that exist along the U-Village that creates a challenge. Mr. Gaines emphasized better connectivity between the University and the U-Village should be included in the discussion in future projects.

A comment was made about the circulation around the Phase IV projects and if this will affect the Intellectual House Phase 2 funding. Mr. Ruegamer noted that since it is in an early pre-design phase, they may have to revisit the circulation to know how it would look and he will have a discussion with the University architect.

V. New Business

There was no new business for the Committee.

VI. Adjournment

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