



MEMBERS

Timmy Bendis 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

Ravenna Springs Community Group

Natasha Rodgers Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan

Wallingford Community Council

Ashley Emery University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz University of Washington Staff

<u>Alternates</u>

Eastlake Community Council

Miha Sarani Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader

Ravenna Bryant Community Associ

Ruedi Risler

University Park Community Club

Wallingford Community Council

Osman Salahuddin University of Washington Students

University of Washington Staff

Maureen Sheehan – DON

University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

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

Meeting Minutes Meeting #175 March 13, 2018 Adopted April 10, 2018

UW Tower 4333 Brooklyn Avenue Seattle, WA 98105 22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell **Amanda Winters** Barbara Kreiger Matthew Fox Kay Kelly Natasha Rodgers Brian O'Sullivan John Gaines Jon Berkedal Sarah Swanberg Ashley Emery

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark (See attached attendance sheet)

Welcome and Introductions

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

Housekeeping

Mr. Fox suggested postponing the adoption of the January 9 and February 13 minutes for revisions.

Public Comment

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comment.

Mr. Alex Zimmerman commented about the overall cost of the project. He asked the Committee to provide more details about the Master Plan and how much it would cost, as well as where will the financing will be coming from and how will this money be used to.

UW Campus Master Plan: City Council Public Hearing Prep

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion on the Hearing Examiner recap.

Ms. Sally Clark commented that a date has not been set for the UW Campus Master Plan (CMP) to go to City Council. Councilmember Rob Johnson and his staff are working to manage his workload with the Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) public hearings. Councilmember Johnson is tentatively looking at presenting the CMP at committee on June 6 at the earliest. A 21day notice will go out in advance of the date.

If the Council does not pick up the CMP during the summer, she does not know what will happen next after summer because the Council discussion will then focus on the budget.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned she has all petitions from the parties on record, replies and responses and she can provide a compiled copy to the Committee to review. Mr. Fox asked that the Committee get a copy.

Ms. Barbara Krieger asked if there is a connection between the MHA and the Campus Master Plan. Ms. Clark mentioned that they two independent discussion. MHA has more work because it is a big program of Citywide discussions. She added that it could affect the CMP and the U district based on the final disposition on what will happen on the Ave.

Mr. Fox commented that the Committee and the work groups should start thinking about which areas of the CMP they would want to emphasize in preparation for the City Council presentation. He suggested time be set aside at the April and May meetings to discuss this.

Mr. Brian O'Sullivan commented about going through the process all over again since the Committee already went through this with the Hearing Examiner. He asked what the expectations will be this time. Mr. Fox answred that the City Council may have more latitude to make changes than the Hearing Examiner. In the past, the City Council sided with community members about changes in their neighborhood. He cautioned that he does not know how far the City Council will go to grant the recommendations and concerns brought by this Committee.

Ms. Sheehan commented that the Committee is limited to the comments it previously submitted. If there is a way the Committee can make a more compelling argument to the City Council that may persuade them to make changes from the Hearing Examiner decision. Ms. Kay Kelly added that it will be worthwhile presenting to the City Council since it will be a different audience.

Mr. Fox recommended they discuss if the working groups want to reconvene in April or May and discuss the areas the Committee would want to emphasize at the City Council presentation.

Ms. Clark mentioned that she would want to have a brief discussion and walkthrough of the Husky TMP added in the April agenda.

V. New Business

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for Committee's new business.

Ms. Clark mentioned the University presented nominations to the Landmark Preservation Board (LPB) for the original Husky Shell House and the MacKenzie Hall.

Mr. Gaines asked what the merits were for MacKenzie Hall. Ms. Clark responded that the Mackenzie Building is a 1940-50's building and it is a problematic building with office spaces and no classrooms. When the business schools redid their office spaces, Mackenzie was not warmly embraced. Ms. Clark noted that the University hired consultants because the University plans to go to the Landmark Preservation Board with different buildings and they will be working with the City of Seattle to identify what will be a Board level vs. a staff level review.

The Shell House received a nod from the LPB for designation. The IMA controls the building, and they are trying to get clarity on what they can do to the interior of the space. It is currently a storage space for boats, canoes, etc. and they would like to make it a place where the public can come.

A question was asked about how the University benefits having the buildings designated as landmarks. Ms. Clark commented buildings older than 25 years in age on campus will be considered for landmark status.

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will be sending out who belongs to the working subgroups, so they can reconvene at the next meeting.

VII. Adjournment

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