

September 18, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning, Land Use and Zoning (PLUZ) Committee
From: Lish Whitson, Council Central Staff
Subject: Resolution 31839, Preliminary Decision on the University of Washington Master Plan (Clerk File 314346)

On Wednesday, September 19, the PLUZ Committee will consider and may vote on Resolution [31839](#), which would adopt the Council's "preliminary decision" on the University of Washington 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan (CMP) (Clerk File [314346](#)). The resolution is the first step in the Council's two-phase review of the Master Plan. Once the Resolution is adopted, it will be sent to the University of Washington's Board of Regents, the City-University Community Advisory Committee and other parties that filed a petition with the Council. Once those groups have had the opportunity to comment on the preliminary decision, the Council will consider a final recommendation on the Master Plan.

Under the [City-University Agreement](#), which guides the Council's review of the CMP, the Council must "...consider the record before the Hearing Examiner and the comments received at its public hearing and will prepare a preliminary decision which will be sent to the University of Washington Board of Regents, CUCAC, and all persons who petitioned for further consideration." Resolution 31839 is built on the Hearing Examiner's recommendation with a series of technical changes that are outlined in Attachment 1 to this memo.

Attachment 1 also includes a list of amendments being proposed by members of the Committee. Attachment 2 to this memo contains discussion of each amendment and amendatory language. At the September 19 PLUZ meeting, the Committee will consider, and may vote on these amendments, as well as the Resolution itself. A vote on the Clerk File will be held until the final Council decision on the Campus Master Plan.

Background

The CMP is a ten-year plan to guide the growth of the University of Washington. It would allow up to six million additional square feet of space on campus, in order to accommodate an additional 35,000 students, 1,900 staff and 840 faculty. The proposed growth cap provides for between 500,000 and 1,000,000 gross square feet of academic and research partnership space. Growth would be concentrated in the West Campus, west of 15th Avenue Northeast, and in the South Campus, south of NE Pacific Street.

On April 4, 2016 the University filed a [notice of intent](#) to prepare the Master Plan. On October 5, 2016, the University released a [Draft CMP](#), a [Draft Environmental Impact Statement](#) (EIS) and a [Draft Transportation Discipline Report](#) (TDR). On July 5, 2017, the University released a final

[CMP](#), [Final EIS](#), and [Final TDR](#). The City-University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) published a [report and recommendations](#) on the CMP recommending adoption with changes and modifications on August 30, 2017. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections published their [recommendation](#) to approve the CMP with conditions on November 16, 2017. In December 2017, the Seattle Hearing Examiner held an [open record public hearing](#), and [recommended approval](#) of the CMP and proposed modifications to Major Institution Overlay height limits subject to conditions on January 17, 2018.

The Council received [petitions for further consideration](#) of the Hearing Examiner's recommendation from 29 parties, including the University of Washington, the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections and the University District Alliance for Equity and Livability. Four [responses](#) to those petitions were filed with the City Clerk. Three [replies](#) were filed to those responses. On July 18, 2018, the PLUZ Committee was briefed on the plan. The PLUZ Committee held a [hearing](#) on July 31 to receive testimony from the University, the petitioners and other parties of record to the plan. On August 1, the Committee was briefed on the petitions received in response to the plan. On September 5, the Committee began discussion of Resolution 31839 and potential amendments to the plan. On September 19, the Committee will consider and may vote on amendments to Resolution 31839 and may vote on Resolution 31839 itself.

After a full Council vote, Resolution 31839 will be sent to the University of Washington Board of Regents, CUCAC, and all persons who petitioned for further consideration. Those parties will have 30 days to respond to the Council's preliminary decision. Parties will have 14 days to reply to those responses to the preliminary decision. Following that period, the Council will consider and act on the final Master Plan. After the Council's final action, the University's Board of Regents will consider the Council's conditions and will consider whether to adopt the plan.

Councilmembers have proposed 15 amendments to the Hearing Examiner's Recommendation. These amendments respond to comments received at the July 31 public hearing and petitions for further consideration filed by parties of record to the plan. The amendments are summarized in Attachment 1 and detailed discussion of each amendment is provided in attachment 2 to this memorandum.

cc: Kirstan Arestad, Central Staff Director
Ketil Freeman, Supervising Analyst

Attachments:

1. Table of Amendments to Resolution 31839: The Preliminary Decision on the University of Washington 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan
 - A. Technical changes incorporated in the draft resolution
 - B. Proposed amendments to Resolution 31839

2. Proposed Amendments to Resolution 31839
 - A. Housing
 - A1. Affordable staff housing
 - B. Transportation
 - B1. Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle
 - B2. Parking associated with residence halls
 - B3. Lower the parking cap
 - B4. Bike parking facilities
 - B5. Burke-Gilman trail improvements
 - C. Childcare space
 - C1. Childcare space
 - D. Zoning proposals
 - D1. Site W22
 - D2. Site W37
 - E. Construction hiring
 - E1. Priority hire
 - F. Small businesses
 - F1. Space for small businesses
 - F2. Small business leasing programs
 - G. Utilities
 - G1. Stormwater best practices
 - H. City-University Agreement
 - H1. Update the City-University Agreement

Attachment 1: Table of Amendments to Resolution 31839

A. Technical changes incorporated in Resolution 31839¹

Attachment ² /Item # ³	Changes to the Hearing Examiner’s Findings and Recommendation incorporated into the Resolution
1/1 (Hearing Examiner)	Remove introductory discussion
1/1 (new)	Include complete definition of “Major Institution” from the land use code
1/11, 1/12 and 1/13	Include description of the Council’s process from the City-University Agreement
1/24	Clarify the timespan covered by the Campus Master plan
2/1	Replace “Hearing Examiner” with “City Council”
2/11	Update verb tense
2/14	Remove Hearing Examiner’s statement regarding conditions
2/23	Replace “Director” with “Hearing Examiner”
2/24 and 2/32	Replace “Hearing Examiner” with City Council
3/1	Add timing and location of affordable housing from condition 2
3/4, 3/5, 3/6, 3/7 and 3/8	Clarify timing (replace “align with” and “occur” with “be completed by”)
3/10	Clarify street-level use and transparency language
3/14	Clarify applicability
3/15	Maintain parallel structure
3/21	Clarify height limits on sites W19 and W20
3/25	Simplify: “view is... to the southwest as taken from the west pedestrian walkway...”
3/34	Change “guide proposed development” to “regulate development”
3/38	Change “a maximum building height” to “the maximum building height”
3/44	Change “will be evaluated against provisions of the City-University Agreement related to amendments to the CMP.” to “will be processed pursuant to the City-University Agreement’s provisions for amendments to the CMP.”
3/46	Remove “and consider” from “evaluate and consider”; plan will provide <u>for</u> additional signage

¹ Boxes shaded gray indicate changes made after the September 5 PLUZ Committee meeting, prior to Introduction and Referral of Resolution XXXX

² Attachment 1 = Findings of Fact, Attachment 2 = Conclusions, Attachment 3 = Approval with Conditions and Attachment 4 = Rezones

³ Unless noted, item numbers refer to the final numbering of items in the Resolution, rather than the Hearing Examiner’s numbering

Attachment ² /Item # ³	Changes to the Hearing Examiner's Findings and Recommendation incorporated into the Resolution
3/51	Incorporate language proposed by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections and University of Washington providing clear triggers for University support for transit coaches
3/56	Change "complete" to "construct"
3/59 a-n	Add list of typographical errors from Appendix B to the University's Post Hearing Brief
3/59 o	Add correction to Table 21, page 264 to the list of technical amendments

B. Proposed amendments to Resolution 31839

#	Topic	Sponsor	Discussion
<i>A. Housing</i>			
A1.	Affordable housing for staff	O'Brien and Herbold	Require that the University build 300 units of housing affordable to University of Washington staff earning up to 80% of Area Median Income
<i>B. Transportation</i>			
B1.	Single-occupancy vehicles	O'Brien and Herbold	Reduce the goal for the share of trips to campus made by single-occupancy vehicle from 15% in 2028 to 12% and set interim thresholds tied to the opening of light rail stations
B2.	Parking associated with residence halls	O'Brien and Johnson	Include parking associated with residence halls in the cap on parking spaces; remove parking requirements for parking associated with residence halls; adjust the parking cap
B3.	Lower the parking cap	O'Brien	Lower the parking cap from 12,300 spaces to 9,000 spaces to better reflect parking use
B4.	Bike parking facilities	O'Brien	Include showers and other facilities as part of bicycle parking facilities
B5.	Burke-Gilman Trail	O'Brien and Herbold	Adopt the University's proposed language regarding separation of pedestrians and bicyclists. Require trail widening when development adjacent to the trail occurs.
<i>C. Childcare space</i>			
C1.	Childcare space	Herbold and Johnson	Recognize the University's expected growth in childcare slots, exempt childcare space from the gross floor area cap, and encourage partnerships with the City.
<i>D. Zoning Proposals</i>			
D1.	Site W22	Herbold	Maintain the current zoned height limit of 105' on site W22, the area north of NE Campus Parkway and west of 11 th Avenue NE
D2.	Site W37	Herbold	Maintain the current zoned height limit of 65' on site W37 and the adjacent blocks to the west.

#	Topic	Sponsor	Discussion
E. Construction Hiring			
E1.	Priority Hire	O'Brien	Add a recital supporting the use of priority hire in contracting
F. Small Businesses			
F1.	Small business space and contracting	Herbold	Exempt space for small businesses from the gross floor area cap
F2.	Small business leasing programs	Herbold, O'Brien and Johnson	Encourage the University to explore ways to incorporate diversity in retail ownership on campus, including minority and women-owned businesses.
G. Utilities			
G1.	Stormwater best practices	Herbold	Amend the plan to encourage the University to explore Best Management Practices for reducing stormwater runoff and in particular combined sewer overflows into waterways if capacity issues are identified.
H. City-University Agreement			
H1.	Update the City-University Agreement	O'Brien	Add a recital asking the University to negotiate an updated City-University Agreement

Amendment A1: Affordable housing for staff

Councilmembers O'Brien and Herbold

Background:

The University of Washington plans to increase its staff and faculty by 11% between 2018 and 2028. This will add 1,934 staff members and 842 faculty members over this time period.¹ The University District Alliance for Equity and Livability, in their comments to the Seattle Hearing Examiner, estimated “that about half (13,387) of the 26,318 UW classified and professional (non-academic) employees workers earned less than 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI), and about one-sixth (4,574) earn less than 50 percent of the AMI.”² The University’s Environmental Impact Statement and the Campus Master Plan (CMP) do not estimate the income levels of current or future faculty and staff. Applying the U District Alliance’s ratios to the planned growth in staff, the University would add 322 staff members in positions where they would earn less than 50% of Area Median Income and 622 staff members earning between 50 and 80% of area median income.

The City-University Agreement expresses in recitals an intent to “promote the health and vitality of the residential...communities” and “minimize any adverse impact” on the physical and human environment. The Agreement recognizes “the need to maintain the livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods”, and housing availability and affordability are fundamental attributes of neighborhood livability and vitality.

The Agreement requires a report describing “efforts that the UW has made to facilitate, influence, promote and encourage the creation of housing”, including “the number, types and affordability of units lost through demolition, conversion or change of use....”

Additionally, the Agreement includes a specific section that describes Housing Goals. That section includes a recognition of the goals contained in the University Urban Center Plan, which is used to review the CMP, to the effect that there should be “housing for a mix of demographic and income groups, and that “a stable residential population” is encouraged.

That section also states:

3. The University has multiple interests in having housing options available for faculty and staff in close proximity to the University. Such housing would serve to minimize transportation impacts and assist in the recruitment and retention of key personnel. The University's presence and influence in the economy of the [University District Northwest Urban Center Village] affords it a unique ability to encourage the development of housing to serve UW faculty and staff and other potential long-term residential stakeholders. The University will continue its efforts, to the extent allowed by law, to provide housing financing opportunities for its faculty and staff including but not limited to, programs such as the Hometown Homeloan Program....³

¹ Exhibit D2, page 30, note the Hearing Examiner’s Findings, particularly finding 64, conflate the growth between 2014 and 2018 shown in Table 1 and the growth between 2018 and 2028. Resolution 31839 corrects that error.

² Exhibit P1, “U District Alliance Comments on UW Campus Master Plan”, undated, page 10

³ Exhibit D5, section II.H.3.

Amendment A1: Affordable housing for staff

The University has included a section on Housing in its proposed Master Plan. In that section, the CMP states:

Faculty and staff rely on the private market for housing. However, the University of Washington recently completed a housing project with Seattle Childrens' called "Bridges@11th" for faculty and staff and has a program in place to help with housing financing, called "HomeTown Home Loan".⁴

The Environmental Impact Statement analyzed the housing choice of faculty and staff. It determined that

...approximately 641 new faculty and staff would also be anticipated to search for housing in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones. This means that assuming all anticipated new staff and faculty reside in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones were to reside in the U District, approximately 321 private rental units could be leased to employees. Again, this provides a conservative estimate of potential housing impacts since the U District study area is smaller than the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.⁵

* * *

It is anticipated that increased demand for housing, as is evident throughout Seattle, has potential to displace low-income households as, by definition, they have a more difficult time competing in what has become an increasingly competitive housing market.⁶

* * *

The Seattle Hearing Examiner found that:

62. ...The University also has announced a partnership with the Seattle Housing Authority to develop at least 150 units of income-restricted housing on property owned by the University outside the MIO District, but within the City's University District. The housing would be available to University faculty and staff earning less than 60% of the area median income.⁷

64. ...The EIS acknowledges that the increase in campus population would lead to an increase in the demand for housing and various public services.⁸

65. Generally, increased housing demand has the potential to displace low-income households, which find it difficult to compete in an increasingly competitive housing market. The EIS concludes that student, faculty, and staff housing demand impacts on off-campus housing can be accommodated by zoned capacity within the University District, as well as overall housing supply in the Primary and Secondary Impacts Zones, and that additional housing supply is available beyond those zones. The EIS also analyzed housing impacts based on the impacts of recent and anticipated investments in transit that are expected to provide increased commuting choices from areas with currently lower cost housing options. Finally, the EIS concluded that City initiatives,

⁴ Exhibit D2, page 276

⁵ Exhibit A19, page 3.8-27

⁶ *Id.*, page 3.8-34

⁷ Findings and Recommendation, page 15, Finding 62

⁸ *Id.*, Finding 64

Amendment A1: Affordable housing for staff

such as the Mandatory Housing Affordability program, have accounted for the impact of increased housing demand on housing affordability. However, City planning documents conclude that current and anticipated City regulations will not fully mitigate the affordable housing impacts of anticipated growth.⁹

67. The Director concluded that the Master Plan was not consistent with [Comprehensive Plan] Policy H5.19, in that the Master Plan anticipates an increase of approximately 4,649, faculty and staff over its 10-year life, but does not provide for housing, including rent- or income-restricted housing, to accommodate that employment growth. The Director therefore recommends that the Master Plan be amended to require that the University construct 150 affordable housing units within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone, for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI. (Recommended Conditions 1 and 2) Although the University has publicly committed to such a project in partnership with the Seattle Housing Authority, it opposes this requirement.¹⁰

The Hearing Examiner concluded that:

13. Housing. As noted above, the Director concluded that the Master Plan was not consistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy H5.19 because it would lead to an increase of approximately 4,649 faculty and staff over its 10-year life without providing for housing, including rent- or income-restricted housing, to accommodate that employment growth. The University argues that the Master Plan is a specific development proposal and thus, need not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but the City asserts that because the Master Plan is a nonproject action for purposes of SEPA, it is regulatory in nature and must comply with the Comprehensive Plan. As noted above, in *Laurelhurst I*, the City and University argued, and the GMA Board agreed, that a University master plan is properly characterized as a land use decision that establishes development requirements for specific pieces of property. It is not a land use regulation that must be consistent with, and implement the Comprehensive Plan except to the extent required by Chapter 23.69 SMC and the Agreement.

14. The Agreement requires both the Director and the Examiner to assess the Master Plan based, in part, on “SEPA [and] other applicable land use policies and regulations of the City,” and the Director’s report is to include findings and recommendations on the Master Plan’s “[c]onsistency with “other adopted land use policies and regulations of the City”. Contrary to the University’s position, nothing in the Agreement indicates that “land use policies” are limited to the policies found in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan. If the drafters of the Agreement had intended to so limit the Director’s and the Examiner’s consideration of “land use policies,” the limitation would be spelled out in the Agreement.¹¹

The Hearing Examiner recommends requiring the University to commit to developing 150 units of housing affordable to households earning less than 60% of Area Median Income.¹²

⁹ *Id.*, Finding 66

¹⁰ *Id.*, page 16, Finding 67

¹¹ *Id.*, page 21, Conclusions 13 and 14

¹² *Id.*, page 24, Recommendations 1 and 2

Amendment A1: Affordable housing for staff

Proposal: Require the University to build at least 300 housing units affordable to households earning up to 80% of Area Median Income to address growth in low-income employees as a result of the University's growth under the plan. Exempt affordable housing from the University's cap on development.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

66. In the Fall of 2014, the University's campus population was approximately 67,155 students, faculty and staff.¹³ Based on historic trends, the Master Plan anticipates an increase in the University's population of 20% between 2014 and 2028. ~~By~~ Between 2014 and 2028, the University forecasts a student population of approximately 52,399 (an increase of 8,675 FTE students), a faculty population of approximately 8,517, (an increase of 1,410 FTE faculty), and a staff population of approximately 19,563 (an increase of 3,239 FTE staff). Between 2018 and 2028, the University forecasts an increase of 5,180 students, 842 faculty, and 1,934 staff. "In total, the on-campus population under the 2018 ... Master Plan would increase to approximately 80,479 people (an increase of 13,324 over 2015 conditions.)" The EIS acknowledges that the increase in campus population would lead to an increase in the demand for housing and various public services.

Amend Attachment 2 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conclusions:

XX. In an unchallenged statement to the Seattle Hearing Examiner, the University District Alliance stated that "about half (13,387) of the 26,318 UW classified and professional (non-academic) employees workers earned less than 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI), and about one-sixth (4,574) earn less than 50 percent of the AML."¹⁴ Applying those ratios to the forecast growth, the University can be expected to add 944 employees earning less than 80 percent of AMI, including 322 employees earning less than 50 percent of AMI. The FEIS for the Seattle Campus Master Plan assumes that there will be an average of two adult residents per staff and faculty household.¹⁵

XX. Requiring development of housing for low-income and very-low income staff on or near the campus will mitigate transportation and housing impacts caused by the University's growth permitted by this Plan. This required mitigation is imposed under the City's land use authority to approve a Master Plan pursuant to SMC 23.69.006 B, the City-University Agreement, and SMC 23.69; it is not imposed pursuant to SEPA.

Amend Attachment 3 to the Resolution 31389 to amend Conditions 1 and 2 as follows:

¹³ Exhibit A19 at 3.7-1

¹⁴ Exhibit P1, "U District Alliance Comments on UW Campus Master Plan", undated, page 10

¹⁵ See, for example, Exhibit A19, Volume 1, page 3.8-27

Amendment A1: Affordable housing for staff

1. Amend page 276 of the Housing section to include the statement, “The University shall construct no fewer than 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI and no fewer than 300 additional affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 80% AMI within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone prior to the ~~development completion~~ of 6 million net new gross square feet authorized by the CMP ~~or the life of the Master Plan, whichever occurs first.~~”

2. A condition of the Master Plan shall state: “The University shall construct no fewer than 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI and no fewer than 300 additional affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 80% AMI shall be constructed within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone. All the required housing shall be constructed prior to the ~~development completion~~ of 6 million net new gross square feet authorized by the CMP ~~or the life of the Master Plan, whichever occurs first.~~

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following condition:

XX. Page 255: Amend the paragraph under “Growth Allowance” as follows:

GROWTH ALLOWANCE

The phrase “growth allowance” refers to the 6.0 million gross square footage of net new development approved within the University’s MIO boundary authorized by ~~under~~ this CMP. Above ground parking and housing that is permanently affordable to households earning less than 80% of Area Median Income are ~~is~~ not counted against the net new 6.0 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

Councilmembers O'Brien and Herbold

Background:

The University of Washington has a goal of not increasing automobile trips to campus by people driving alone ("single-occupancy vehicles" or SOV). The City-University Agreement and the Campus Master Plan (CMP) include measures to maintain or reduce SOV use and resulting traffic impacts. Among those measures are (1) keeping the total number of AM and PM trips to campus below 1990 levels, (2) maintaining a cap on the number of parking spaces on campus, and (3) maintaining a cap on the share of trips made to campus by people driving alone. Numerous petitioners have suggested reducing the SOV rate.

The CMP assumes a rate of 20% of trips made by students, faculty and staff driving alone for 2018. However, according to the Plan, the Final Environmental Impact Statement, and the University's annual surveys of trips, a more accurate rate is 17%¹ or 18%.² According to the Transportation Discipline Report (TDR) prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement:

Drive alone mode split went from 20 percent in 2015 to 17 percent in 2016 due in part to increased transit use. While the recent survey suggests the drive-alone mode is going down as a proportion of overall trips, this transportation analysis supporting the CMP and EIS has been conducted using the more conservative 20 percent drive-along mode.³

It's appropriate to consider a conservative SOV mode share when considering reasonable worst-case impacts for a transportation analysis. On the other hand, when setting a base for transportation demand management programs, the best available current data is more appropriate.

Because the drop in SOV use appears tied to the opening of the University of Washington light-rail station, in considering future SOV use it is appropriate to look at the data regarding future light rail expansion. The TDR notes that the share of employees who live within a quarter mile of a light rail station will more than double between the current day and 2024 when a second light rail station serving the University has opened, and light rail has been extended north to Northgate and Lynnwood, south to Federal Way, and east to Overlake and Redmond. The share of employees who are anticipated to live in zip codes adjacent to a light rail station is anticipated to increase from 24% to 59% over this time.⁴

Other planned improvements and changes that the plan identifies, including changing travel behavior, new bikeshare programs, and the availability of transportation network companies can also reduce auto trips.⁵ If the SOV mode share is not reduced, the TDR indicates that the cap on the AM trips made to campus by people driving alone could be exceeded by 2025.⁶

¹ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, Transportation Discipline Report, page 1-6.

² Exhibit D2, page 51

³ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, Transportation Discipline Report, page 1-6

⁴ *Id.*, page 2-9

⁵ *Id.*, page 2-13

⁶ *Id.*, page 2-21

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

The Hearing Examiner has recommended setting the TMP rate at 20% as of the date of the plan, with drops to 17% one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension (2021) and 15% one year after the opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension (2023). The Hearing Examiner identifies a number of strategies to reduce the SOV rate goal if these rates are not met.⁷ She concluded that:

The suggestion that the Master Plan be amended to reduce the University's SOV rate to 12 percent by 2024 has some merit, particularly in light of the facts that the SOV rate is presently 17%, the University proposes to replace parking lost in demolition under the Master Plan rather than reducing the parking cap, and the University commits only to consider revising its payment system for parking to reduce demand. However, under current circumstances, the SOV reduction rates recommended by the Director are reasonable and capable of being accomplished and are recommended by the Examiner.⁸

Several petitioners have argued that the SOV share cap should be reduced to 12%. For example, the Transportation Choices Coalition argues that "a 15% SOV fails to mitigate all additional vehicle trips, in turn creating additional congestion and a degradation in travel time in several important intersections and corridors near the University. While the mitigation proposed will likely help address some of the negative impacts of this congestion, it doesn't resolve the underlying cause: too many additional car trips."⁹

The University of Washington, in its response to petitions stated:

The record does not support a further reduction to 12 percent.

The record also shows that the SOV rate goal is only one of the three pillars in the TMP, all of which collectively mitigate traffic impacts. The other two pillars are the University's cap on parking spaces on campus (12,300 spaces) and its AM and PM peak hour trip caps. Both caps were set before 1990, and they have remained unchanged despite a 35 percent University population increase over the last quarter century. The record also shows that the University is currently operating under these caps. (Ex. A19, App. D at 1-2 to 1-3, 3-82). It is misleading for petitioners to ignore the efficacy of these existing caps and focus solely on the SOV rate goal.

In addition, the record does not support the petitioners' request to establish separate SOV 13 rate goals for students and employees. The University's traffic consultant testified that a blended approach is best because the University's student population is substantially larger than its faculty and staff population. (Testimony of J. Acutanza). She explained that separate goals would not materially change the overall numbers. The data in the University's Transportation Discipline Report regarding mode split for the overall University population supports this point, and the record contains no evidence to the contrary. A blended SOV rate goal is also consistent with the City's approach to regulating SOV trips associated with private development in the University District. See SMC 23.48.610 (requiring private development that generates 50 or more employee or student SOV trips in a pm peak hour to prepare a TMP with a blended SOV goal). There is no reason to treat the University differently.

⁷ Seattle Hearing Examiner Findings and Recommendation, page 28, #20

⁸ *Id.*, page 24, #31

⁹ Transportation Choices Coalition, Petition for Further Consideration, January 29, 2018.

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

Overall, the record shows that the University's 15 percent blended SOV rate goal goes far above and beyond what is required by the City's land use code and is reasonable and capable of being accomplished. The City Council should reject the push for a 12 percent SOV rate that deals with students and employees separately.¹⁰

The Sierra Club, in their response to the University of Washington's petition for further consideration notes:

Presently, 6 out of 13 key U District intersections are at LOS E or F with 420 cumulative seconds of delay. With a reduction to 15% campus wide SOV trips by 2028 (it's now 17%), 11 out of 13 key U District intersections are at LOS E or F with 2,394 seconds of delay.¹¹

In the seven transit corridors serving the U District, delay will range from 6% to 63% percent with an average delay of 21% in six of the seven corridors of service. Table 5.13 from the TDR shows that projected transit speeds would be degraded with the recommended Alternative 1.¹²

Proposal: Reduce the SOV rate for 2018 to 17% to reflect current conditions, to 15% one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension, to 13% one year after the opening of the Lynnwood and Overlake light rail stations and 12% by 2028 or the end of the plan, whichever is sooner.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikeouts~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

42. Single Occupancy Vehicle ("SOV") Rate. The TMP states that its primary goal is to reach an overall 15 percent SOV rate by 2028. In 2015, the overall University SOV rate was 20 percent. However, the mode split was surveyed again in 2016, and the SOV rate was shown to have dropped to 17 percent. The Campus Master Plan indicates that the drop is timed to the opening of the Husky Stadium light rail station.¹³ Testimony at the hearing ascribed the change to a very low student SOV rate (approximately 8 percent) that is generally attributable to the University's "U-Pass" program,

¹⁰ University of Washington, Applicant's Response to Petitions for Further Consideration, February 23, 2018, page 13

¹¹ In addition, see Table 5.15 of the TDR, which compares No Action level-of-service (LOS) and intersection-level delay to Alternative 1 LOS and delay. According to that table, in 2018 without additional growth on campus, 11 out of 15 intersections would be at LOS E or F. Alternative 1, the preferred alternative that reflects the proposal in the Campus Master Plan, would result in all 15 intersections at LOS E or F and would add 920 seconds of delay to the No Action alternative's 1,739 seconds of delay at these intersections. See Exhibit A19, Appendix D, Table 5.15, page 5-28.

¹² Sierra Club, Washington State Chapter, Response to the University of Washington's Petition for Further Consideration, February 23, 2018

¹³ Exhibit D2, page 51

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

which is heavily subsidized for students. The program adds a transit pass to a University member's Husky card.

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 to add the following finding:

XX. The TDR notes that the share of employees who live within a quarter mile of a light rail station will more than double between the current day and 2024 when a second light rail station serving the University has opened, and light rail has been extended north to Northgate and Lynnwood, south to Federal Way, and east to Overlake and Redmond. The share of employees who are anticipated to live in zip codes adjacent to a light rail station is anticipated to increase from 24% to 59% over this time.¹⁴ The Housing analysis in the FEIS indicates that when "transit access to campus is improved in the near future (and the very recent past) it is anticipated that shares of students choosing to live in neighborhoods with improved transit access will increase."¹⁵

Amend Attachment 2 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

31. The suggestion that the Master Plan be amended to reduce the University's SOV rate to 12 percent ~~by 2024~~ has ~~some~~ merit, particularly in light of the facts that the SOV rate is presently 17% and dropped after the opening of a new light rail station, access to light rail is planned to improve significantly through both new University-serving light rail stations and system improvements, the University proposes to replace parking lost in demolition under the Master Plan rather than reducing the parking cap, and the University commits only to consider revising its payment system for parking to reduce demand. ~~However, under current circumstances, the SOV reduction rates recommended by the Director are reasonable and capable of being accomplished and are recommended by the Examiner.~~¹⁶

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

20. Page 261: Under "Monitoring and Reporting," amend the text following the bulleted items:

The University's TMP SOV rate goal is ~~20%~~ 17% as of the date of this Plan. The goal shall decrease to ~~17%~~ 15% one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension. The goal shall decrease further to ~~15%~~ 13% one year after the opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension, and 12% by 2028 or the development of six million net new gross square feet, whichever is earlier.

If the University fails to ~~timely~~ achieve the applicable SOV rate goal, the University shall take steps to enhance the TMP to increase the likelihood that the goal shall be achieved. Additional measures will be set by the University and may include, but are not limited to:

¹⁴ *Id.*, page 2-9

¹⁵ Exhibit A19, page 3.8-32

~~¹⁶ History shows that the U-Pass system and its subsidies have been the primary incentives for changes in student travel modes, and increased subsidies for the employee and faculty U-Pass would significantly increase their access to affordable transportation options and reduce the University's SOV rate. The University has committed to going to the state legislature to seek inclusion of the state's higher education employees in the existing program that grants all other state employees living in King County a fully subsidized transit pass. A successful outcome in that forum would do more to reduce the University's SOV rate than mandating in the Master Plan that it achieve a 12% SOV rate by 2024.~~

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

- Providing a transit pass that covers all transit trips with a minimum University subsidy of 50% for faculty, staff, and students, pursuant to SDCI Director’s Rule 27-2015 and SMC 23.54.016
- Replicating the student U-Pass “opt-out” program with faculty and staff to encourage participation among campus populations less likely to use transit
- Expanding the U-Pass to integrate payment for other transportation options, such as car-share or bike-share
- Implementing performance-based parking strategies, including charging more for high-demand parking lots
- Replacing monthly parking permits with a pay-by-use parking payment model

~~In 2028, if the University has not failed to timely reached its SOV rate goal of 20%, 17%, or 15% 17%, 15%, 13%, or 12% for a period of 24 months, the Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) or its successor agency shall not issue master use permits or building permits shall not be issued for development (other than maintenance, emergency repair, or other minor projects) within the MIO. if the University exceeds the 15% SOV goal over two consecutive years beginning in 2029. The Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)(Or its successor agency) The SDCI Director shall withhold permits until the University has it has been reasonably demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that it the University will implement additional mitigation measures shall be implemented that shall meet or restore the University student, faculty, and staff to the required SOV rate to 15%. This measure shall not be applied to maintenance, emergency repair, or other minor projects proposed by the University.~~

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Pages 50-51: Under “Movement to and from Campus” amend this section as follows:

MOVEMENT TO AND FROM CAMPUS

The University of Washington has an extremely desirable mode split—a term used to describe the various ways students, faculty and staff travel to and from campus. Its single occupancy vehicle (drive-alone) rate is low at ~~20~~ 17 percent of campus commutes, while walking, biking and transit collectively account for ~~72~~ 76 percent of campus commutes. The introduction of light rail is anticipated to further modify the mode split. The mode split is discussed in greater detail in the Transportation Management Plan Chapter, the University of Washington Master Plan Seattle Campus Annual Reports, and the Transportation Discipline Report in the CMP EIS.

The mode split aligns with the findings from the campus wide MyPlaces survey as part of the Campus Landscape Framework, in which individuals were asked to identify key campus gateways, or locations at which individuals enter the campus. Details of the mode split analysis methods and history are provided in the Transportation Discipline Report of the CMP EIS. In the mode split analysis, the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and Campus Parkway emerged as the primary gateway to campus, which aligns with Campus Parkway’s identity as one of two significant transit hubs near campus (the second hub is located at the Montlake Triangle). Additional gateways are also located along 15th Avenue NE and at the intersection of 45th Street and Memorial Way, which further reinforces the need to better integrate the entrances to campus with the surrounding urban context. Fewer gateways were identified along the edges of East Campus, which signals the need to improve connections between the Central and East Campus sectors generally.

Amendment B1: Share of trips to campus by single-occupant vehicle

The campus wide mode split for faculty, staff and students is taken from a U-Pass survey of travel modes to the campus in the morning. The 2015 survey's results ~~are~~ were consistent with survey results from the last decade, and showed the drive alone to campus rate ~~is~~ was approximately 20%~~;~~ ~~however,~~ However, the 2016 survey's results, which represent the conditions after the opening of the Husky Stadium light rail station, indicate a drive alone rate of only ~~18%~~ 17%. The Transportation Discipline Report describes the analysis and ~~is~~ was based on the more conservative 20% drive alone mode split from 2015. The Campus Master Plan is based on the current mode split of 17%.

XX. Pages 51: Figure 32. 2015 Mode Split (Morning Arrivals to Campus):

Update Figure 32 to reflect the 2016 Mode Split from the 2016 U-Pass annual survey results.

XX. Page 260: Under "Introduction," amend the second paragraph:

Beginning in 1983, the University's commitment to managing its transportation impacts was formalized in its Transportation Management Plan, which embodies the intent to expand commuting options for University students, staff, and faculty, and to shift travel habits away from single occupancy vehicles. The primary goal of the University's TMP is to reach ~~15%~~ 12% single occupancy vehicle rate by 2028. Through its active and innovative efforts, the University has successfully kept single occupant vehicle trips under 1990 level despite a 35% increase in campus population.

XX. Page 260: Under "Transportation Management Plan Goal"

Limit the proportion of drive-alone trips of student, staff and faculty to 15% ~~by 2028.~~ one year after opening of the Northgate Link Extension, to 13% one year after opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension and 12% by 2028 or the development of six million net new gross square feet, whichever is earlier.

Amendment B2: Parking associated with residence halls

Councilmembers Johnson and O'Brien

Background:

The Campus Master Plan (CMP) includes a cap of 12,300 parking spaces for motor vehicles within the Major Institution Overlay. That cap does not include "service and load zones, parking for student housing, and accessory off-campus leased or owned spaces." The CMP also includes a minimum requirement of 1 space per unit of new student family housing and 4% of total residents for new single student housing.

The plan indicates that there are currently 10,667 spaces that are subject to the cap. There are an additional 1,878 spaces that are not subject to the cap¹. Together, there are 12,545 off-street parking spaces on campus. Of the spaces subject to the cap 6,720 are used during the peak period.²

Parking supply is lowest in the west and south campus sectors (1,524 and 1,161 spaces) and highest in the east campus (4,853 spaces). Parking utilization is high in the Central, West and South campus sectors (86%, 94%, and 98% respectively), but low in the East sector (30%).³

Under the City's zoning regulations, parking is not required for development in urban centers and is reduced in areas outside of urban centers with access to frequent transit service. The University of Washington's Seattle Campus is entirely within the University District Urban Center or within a frequent transit service area.⁴

The City-University Agreement states that restriping or moving parking spaces around the campus does not require an amendment to the Master Plan. However, if "the ceiling of parking spaces set forth in the Master Plan is reached, for [restriping or moving parking spaces around the campus] to be exempt, any new parking space(s) must be accompanied by a decrease in parking space(s) elsewhere on campus so that the total number of approved parking spaces on campus is not increased."⁵

Proposal: Include student parking under the cap and remove the parking requirement. The University would be allowed to continue to use existing parking spaces above the cap, but would be limited when removing parking spaces to only replacing parking spaces up to the 12,300 space cap. Parking for student housing would apply toward the cap.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

¹ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, "Transportation Discipline Report", page 3-82

² *Id.*, page 3-84

³ *Id.*, page 3-85

⁴ Seattle Municipal Code, section 23.54.016

⁵ Exhibit D5, Section C.2.c.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 to add the following findings:

XX. Under SMC Chapter 23.54, off-street parking is not required in urban centers. Most of the University of Washington Campus is within the University Urban Center, except for portions of the East Campus. Portions of the East Campus that are not within the Urban Center are classified as being within a Frequent Transit Service area where frequent transit is readily accessible.⁶

XX. On-campus parking is underutilized, with only 63% peak hour occupancy of those spaces that are subject to the cap. However, parking at the south, west and central campus is heavily used.⁷ The Master Plan notes that demand for parking is strong when small parking facilities are located next to buildings.⁸ The Master Plan proposes to close East Campus surface parking lots and build more parking with the development of the west and south campuses.

XX. The Master Plan notes that “parking resources are managed holistically on a campus-wide basis.”⁹

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Amend the first two paragraphs under “Parking” on pages 240 and 241 to remove the student parking requirements, as follows:

PARKING

Parking is planned on a campus-wide basis, and needs for parking near new development are assessed concurrently with development planning. Parking spaces may be located in any sector to accommodate need. There is no minimum parking requirement. Overall, motor vehicle parking is limited to a maximum of 12,300 spaces within the MIO (the “parking cap”). Service and load zones, ~~parking for student housing,~~ and accessory off-campus leased or owned spaces are not counted toward the parking cap. Above-ground parking is not counted against the net new 6 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.

~~Minimum parking standards for new student housing will be one space per unit for family housing and spaces for up to 4 percent of total residents for single student housing.~~

XX. Amend the last paragraph on page 68 as follows:

The following types of spaces are excluded from the parking space cap and the parking count in the table: bicycle, loading spaces, the UW vehicle, physical plant vehicle, shuttle, UCAR, and miscellaneous restricted ~~parking spaces, and parking associated with residence halls.~~

XX. Amend Table 5 on page 68 of the Master Plan to include parking associated with residence halls.

⁶ Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections Director’s Rule 15-2018, “Frequent Transit Service Area Map”

⁷ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, “Transportation Discipline Report”, pages 3-82 and 3-84

⁸ Exhibit D2, page 68

⁹ Exhibit D2, page 265

Amendment B3: Lower the parking cap

Councilmember O'Brien

Background:

The Campus Master Plan (CMP) includes a cap of 12,300 parking spaces for motor vehicles within the Major Institution Overlay. The plan indicates that there are currently 10,667 spaces that are subject to the cap. There are an additional 1,878 spaces that are not subject to the cap.¹ Together, there are 12,545 off-street parking spaces on campus. Of the spaces subject to the cap 6,720 are used during the peak period.²

Parking supply is lowest in the west and south campus sectors (1,524 and 1,161 spaces) and highest in the east campus (4,853 spaces). Parking utilization is high in the Central, West and South campus sectors (86%, 94%, and 98% respectively), but low in the East sector (30%).³

Assuming the parking spaces not subject to the cap are occupied during the peak period, peak occupancy is 8,598 spaces.

The City-University Agreement states that restriping or moving parking spaces around the campus does not require an amendment to the Master Plan. However, if "the ceiling of parking spaces set forth in the Master Plan is reached, for [restriping or moving parking spaces around the campus] to be exempt, any new parking space(s) must be accompanied by a decrease in parking space(s) elsewhere on campus so that the total number of approved parking spaces on campus is not increased."⁴

Proposal: Lower the parking cap to 9,000 spaces to better reflect parking use.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 to amend the following finding:

41. Parking Cap. The TMP ~~retains~~ proposes to retain the cap on on-campus parking at 12,300 spaces, as established in 1990.

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 to add the following findings:

XX. On-campus parking is underutilized, with only 63% peak hour occupancy of those spaces that are subject to the cap. However, parking at the south, west and central campus is heavily used.⁵

¹ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, "Transportation Discipline Report", page 3-82

² *Id.*, page 3-84

³ *Id.*, page 3-85

⁴ Exhibit D5, Section C.2.c.

⁵ Exhibit A19, Appendix D, "Transportation Discipline Report", pages 3-82 and 3-84

Amendment B3: Lower the parking cap

The Master Plan notes that demand for parking is strong when small parking facilities are located next to buildings.⁶ The Master Plan proposes to close East Campus surface parking lots and build more parking with the development of the west and south campuses.

XX. The Master Plan notes that “parking resources are managed holistically on a campus-wide basis.”⁷

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to amend the following conditions:

58. ~~Both the~~The existing trip caps ~~and parking cap~~ shall be maintained.

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Page 68: Under “Parking Lot Typologies,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING LOT TYPOLOGIES

Parking on campus is provided through surface, structured, and underground parking lots of varying sizes. As the campus has grown, surface parking lots have increasingly been replaced by buildings, sometimes without replacing lost parking capacity on that site. In 1991, the University agreed to a parking space cap of 12,300 in the MIO, ~~and that same cap is in place today, 25 years later. Twenty-five years later, that cap is reduced to 9,000 spaces to better reflect actual parking use.~~

XX. Page 68: Table 5. “Existing Parking Lots within Parking Spaces Cap, 2016” amend the notes at the bottom of the table as follows:

Total – 10,667 Parking Cap – ~~12,300~~9,000 ~~Under~~ ~~Over~~ ~~Cap~~ – ~~1,633~~1,667

XX. Page 120: Under “Parking,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING

The existing parking cap of 12,300 parking spaces ~~remains unchanged~~ is reduced to 9,000 parking spaces to better reflect actual parking use. All new parking shall remain within the ~~12,300~~ 9,000 parking spaces cap.

XX. Page 240: Under “Parking,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING

Parking is planned on a campus-wide basis, and needs for parking near new development are assessed concurrently with development planning. Parking spaces may be located in any sector to accommodate need. Overall, motor vehicle parking is limited to a maximum of ~~12,300~~ 9,000 spaces within the MIO (the “parking cap”). Service and load zones, parking for student housing, and accessory off-campus leased or owned spaces are not counted toward the parking cap. Above-ground parking is not counted against the net new 6 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.

XX. Page 260: Under “Introduction,” amend the last paragraph on the page as follows:

To reinforce the University’s commitment to limiting auto travel, the University shall ~~continue to~~ cap the number of parking stalls available to commuters within the Major Institution Overlay boundary to ~~12,300~~9,000. ~~This parking cap has remained unchanged since 1984.~~

⁶ Exhibit D2, page 68

⁷ Exhibit D2, page 265

Amendment B4: Bike parking facilities

Councilmember O'Brien

Background:

The Campus Master Plan proposes to improve the quality and security of bike parking on campus. Facilities that support the use of bicycles for commuting, such as shower facilities and lockers, are quickly becoming standard components of bicycle parking facilities at workplaces. The University recognizes the importance of these facilities as part of bicycling infrastructure, as the plan mentions secure parking, lockers and showers in their discussion of bicycle facilities.¹ However, the plan does not mention adding these facilities with additional bike parking.

Proposal: Amend the plan to include showers and other facilities as part of bicycle parking facilities.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikeouts~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Page 267: "Bicycle," amend as follows:

Bicycle

Bicycling is a reliable, active, space-efficient, and carbon-free commute option for UW students, faculty, and staff. For neighborhoods close to campus, bicycling commuting times can rival those of transit or driving. Reliable door-to-door travel times likely contribute to the popularity (according to U-PASS survey data) of bicycling among faculty, who are otherwise more likely to drive alone. The University of Washington has long supported bicycle commuting through infrastructure and programming. Continued investment in the capacity and security of campus bicycle parking, quality of campus bicycle routes, and innovative educational and encouragement programming shall accommodate growth in the number of bicyclists reaching the growing campus.

The University of Washington currently supplies bicyclists with multiple locations for securing and storing their bicycles on campus. High security parking and showers are available at some campus locations for students, faculty and staff. Bike lockers and space in cages can be rented for a fee on a quarterly or annual basis. Bicycle routes on the Burke-Gilman Trail and University Bridge and elsewhere provide bike access to campus. The Burke-Gilman Trail provides excellent access to West, South and East Campus locations. Bike routes are outlined in the CMP. The University completed a corridor study and design concept plan for expansion of the Burke-Gilman Trail in 2012 and is working toward implementing these improvements as funding allows.

¹ Exhibit D2, page 267

POTENTIAL BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

1. Plan a comprehensive on-campus bicycle network that provides desirable bicycle facilities while reducing conflicts with other modes, enhancing the pedestrian experience throughout campus.
2. Work with partners to develop connections to and from key neighborhoods, regional bicycle facilities, and transit hubs.
3. Work with the City and transit agencies to improve sidewalks, transit stops, and other bicycle amenities near transit services and hubs including consideration of space for secure bicycle parking.
4. Coordinate with the City to create bicycle connectivity through the street network, particularly along the University Bridge, Montlake Bridge, Brooklyn north to Ravenna Park, and west over I-5.
5. Improve the connectivity and interfaces of the off-campus bike network, the Burke- Gilman Trail, and Central Campus.
6. Improve the capacity of the Burke-Gilman Trail as defined in the Burke-Gilman Design Concept plan as funding allows.
7. Provide adequate bike parking supply to serve demand.
8. Improve quality and security of bike parking through investments to expand covered and high-security parking, lighting, lockers, and shower facilities.
9. Develop a Bicycle Parking Plan that identifies a toolbox of parking solutions and design standards.
10. Investigate ways to reduce bicycle thefts.
11. Encourage transit agencies to identify strategies for accommodating increased bicycle travel demand on transit.
12. Consider integrating programs (like future bike share and secure bike parking) into the U-PASS and work with partner agencies to expand these mobility options with connections to transit hubs and other campus destinations.

Amendment B5: Burke Gilman trail improvements

Councilmembers O'Brien and Herbold

Background:

The University owns the section of the Burke Gilman Trail that runs through the campus. The trail carries a large number of pedestrians and bicyclists and conflicts occur between users. In order to address these conflicts, increase the usability of the trail and better connect uses on the north and south sides of the trail, the University prepared a Burke Gilman Trail Design Concept Plan. The Trail Concept Plan has been partially completed.¹ The Campus Master Plan indicates that "improvements to the Burke-Gilman Trail, especially where these improvements help reduce conflicts between bicyclists and other modes, are important, and shall be implemented as funding becomes available."

The Hearing Examiner recommended the following amendments related to the Burke-Gilman trail:

56. The University shall complete separate pathways for bicyclists and pedestrians on the Burke-Gilman Trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE, and install lighting following the University's Facilities Design Guidelines and Campus Illumination Study, or successor documents. This should be accomplished by the earlier of the first day of 2028 or when site W27 develops.

57. The University shall widen the Burke-Gilman Trail and separate users along the trail east of Rainier Vista as opportunities permit.

W27 is a potential development site located on the north side of the Burke-Gilman trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and University Way NE.

In their response to petitions for further consideration, the University agreed to separate pedestrians and bicyclists along the trail by 2024. They stated:

6. Bicycle-Pedestrian Separation on Burke-Gillman Trail

Several petitioners request a commitment to separate bicycles and pedestrians on the Burke Gillman Trail by 2024. The record shows that separation will maintain adequate levels of bicycle and pedestrian service under the Master Plan. (Ex. A19, App. D at 5-11). In light of this conclusion, the University will commit to separating users by 2024. The University will also separately commit to widening the trail as funding becomes available.²

In its reply to the University's response, the Cascade Bicycle Club noted that "there are specific adverse impacts on the Burke-Gilman Trail identified in the UW's own analysis, including that under all development scenarios the segment of the Burke-Gilman trail that is currently unseparated will drop to LOS level F..."³

Proposal:

¹ Exhibit D2, page 107

² University of Washington Response to Petitions, February 23, 2018, page 18

³ Cascade Bicycle Club's Reply to the University of Washington's Response, March 1, 2018, see also Exhibit A19, Appendix D, page 5-11

Amendment B5: Burke Gilman Trail Improvements

Adopt the University's language regarding separation of pedestrians and bicyclists. Require trail widening when development adjacent to the trail occurs.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

56. The University shall construct separate pathways for bicyclists and pedestrians on the Burke-Gilman Trail ~~between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE through the campus~~ and install lighting following the University's Facilities Design Guidelines and Campus Illumination Study, or successor documents by 2024. ~~This should be accomplished by the earlier of the first day of 2028 or when site W27 develops.~~

57. The University shall widen the Burke-Gilman Trail ~~and separate users along the trail east of Rainier Vista as opportunities permit~~ between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE (the Garden Reach) by 2028 or when site W27 develops. The University shall widen the Burke-Gilman Trail north of Rainier Vista (the Forest Reach) when sites C8 or C10 develop, or as opportunities permit.

Amendment C1: Childcare space

Councilmembers Herbold and Johnson

Background:

The City-University Agreement requires an analysis of impacts on “City facilities and services.” Among the facilities and services that the City supports is childcare space and preschools. The EIS did not originally study impacts on childcare, but it was a topic of comments on the EIS, and the University included a section on childcare in its Final Environmental Impact Statement. In this section, the FEIS notes that the University “offers 334 subsidized child care slots on-campus and within the Laurel Village family housing complex... the University is planning to add 266 to 366 slots in the next eight years, which would reduce the current ratio [of students to child care slots] to somewhere between 74:1 and 87:1... In addition, the University also offers staff and faculty priority access and a 10% discounts [sic] at several off-campus child care centers, including Bright Horizons. Within the Primary Impact Zone and Secondary Impact Zone, there are 548 slots at 9 centers, including a Bright Horizons center with 170 slots. Priority access is also provided at locations outside the immediate vicinity of the Seattle campus.”¹

Proposal: Recognize the University’s expected growth in childcare slots, exempt childcare space from the gross floor area cap, and encourage partnerships with the City.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Add two recitals to Resolution 31389 as follows:

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes the University’s intent to increase access to child care facilities by adding up to 366 child care slots on campus in the next eight years; and

WHEREAS, the City Council encourages the University and the City of Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning to explore opportunities to support access to high quality preschool and child care for University students, staff and faculty workers; and

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Page 255: Under “Growth Allowance” amend the paragraph:

GROWTH ALLOWANCE

The phrase “growth allowance” refers to the 6.0 million gross square footage of net new development approved within the University’s MIO boundary under this CMP. Above ground

¹ Exhibit A19, Volume 2, page 4-42

parking and space dedicated to child care uses is not counted against the net new 6.0 million square foot allowance in the CMP.

Amendment D1: Zoning of site W22

Councilmember Herbold

Background:

The plan proposes to rezone a number of sites in the West Campus area from a Major Institution Overlay with a 105' height limit to a Major Institution Overlay with a 240' height limit. One of those sites is site W22, bounded by Campus Parkway on the south, Eastlake Avenue NE on the west and 11th Avenue NE on the east. The site is prominently situated at the north end of the University Bridge. This site is currently in use as a surface parking lot, which is screened from the surrounding area by landscaping.

Across Eastlake Avenue E to the west is a triangular block owned by the University that is landscaped and undeveloped. To the north of W22 are two parcels that form the southeast corner of the block bounded by Eastlake Avenue NE and 11th Avenue NE, NE 41st Street, Roosevelt Way NE and NE 42nd Street. Those parcels are in use as a vacant lot and a four-plex apartment building, the four-plex is not owned by the University. Those parcels are proposed to remain undeveloped under the plan. To the south, east and northeast of site W22 are University-owned buildings, including Startup Hall, the Cedar Apartments and Terry Hall.

The plan proposes to rezone site W22 from MIO-105-C1-65 and MIO-105-MR to MIO-240-C1-65 to MIO-240-MR. This would allow the development of a 240-foot tall, 17-story building with academic, mixed-use, transportation, or industry partnership/manufacturing space. Areas to the northwest are zoned SM-U 75-240 (M1), a mixed-use zone that allows buildings up to 240 feet. Areas to the northeast are zoned SM-U/R 75-240 (M1) a similar zone that limits non-residential uses. Areas further to the west are zoned Midrise, a multifamily zone that allows buildings up to 80 feet.

In their response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see [CUCAC report](#)), CUCAC recommended that the existing zoning should be retained on site W22 and stated:

The height allowable in neighborhoods adjacent to the MIO is dependent upon the type of development together with height bonuses for public benefit resulting in a range of possible heights. In order to provide a fair comparison between zoned heights in the MIO and adjacent neighborhoods, the EIS and CMP should show both the upper and lower height limits of the adjacent neighborhoods.

Variation in height, adequate building spacing, and modulation along the edges of campus, where the public generally interacts with the campus, such as 15th Ave. NE, NE Pacific St., and Montlake Blvd. NE should be required, and not just a goal, so that amenities beyond the buildings are visible and accessible to the public. The primary concern is the "wall of buildings" along NE Pacific St. is not replicated when this area is redeveloped.

The CMP recognizes there are tradeoffs to preserve the Central Campus character, one being density in West and South Campus. CUCAC supports preserving Central Campus, in conjunction with better development of waterfront edges in South and West Campus.¹

¹ Exhibit D3, page 18

In their final recommendation on the plan, CUCAC stated:

11. Height, Bulk, & Scale

CUCAC's original comment asked that the Final CMP/EIS discuss how the proposed heights of the types of buildings the University is likely to construct in the MIO, primarily office buildings rather than the more slender residential towers that would be permitted under the new University District zoning, would compare to the zoning outside of the MIO. In other words, the University is asserting that since there are 240' heights allowed in the areas adjacent to the MIO, the 240' buildings they propose to construct are consistent with that. However, this would only be true to the extent that the University built the slender residential towers that are allowed to achieve those heights. The heights in the University District upzone that apply to commercial/office type buildings similar to those that the University is proposing to develop are much lower.

* * *

Recommendation #27: CUCAC strongly recommends that the existing zoning along University Way NE be retained at W-19 and W-20. Conditioning sites down to 90' still leaves open the possibility to build up to 240' in the future. If the University has no need to build beyond 90', the permanent underlying zoning should reflect that. Therefore, Site W-20 should remain at 105', site W-28 should be reduced to 90', and site W-22 should be reduced to 160' per CUCAC's original recommendation.²

The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections evaluated the proposed rezone in their report on the plan. In particular, they reviewed Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) section 23.34.008.E. related to zoning principals. Regarding this site, the Department found:

* * *

SDCI has reviewed OPCD and CUCAC's recommendations (#27) to the height limits for sites W19, W20, W22, W28, W31, and W32. SDCI concluded that the proposed heights for W19 and W20 should not be increased to 240' because of their adjacency, at the MIO boundary, with NC3-65 zoned properties. The 240' height designation would not be a gradual transition.

Sites W22 and W28 are either not abutting a substantially lower zone at the MIO boundary (W22), or in the case of W28, is not at the MIO boundary and is proposed to be conditioned to a building height of 90'. Site 28 is on Campus Parkway, which provides a buffer between the zoning to the north, where Site W19 is recommended to remain at the existing 105-foot height designation, and the 240-foot designation to the south.³

* * *

SDCI also analyzed SMC 23.34.124 related to Designation of Major Institution Overlay Districts. Section 23.34.124 C3, states: "Transitional height limits shall be provided wherever feasible when the maximum permitted height within the overlay district is significantly higher than permitted in areas adjoining the major institution campus." SDCI found:

² *Id.*, page 8

³ Exhibit D1, page 43

Height limits at the MIO district boundary will increase, primarily in the West Campus. As noted previously, the location of existing rights-of-way and natural features create a buffer and transition between the proposed MIO heights and the adjacent zoning heights. SDCI has provided recommendations to mitigate impacts of incompatible heights at the MIO boundary where transitions or similar buffering conditions aren't present.⁴

No changes have been proposed to the heights at Site W22.

In his presentation before the Seattle Hearing Examiner, Matt Fox argued that site W22 is on the boundary between the campus and the surrounding neighborhood. According to Mr. Fox's testimony: "This building will be seen as the entrance to the West Campus by the thousands of drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians who come north across the University Bridge every day."⁵ Regarding planning for the site, his presentation states:

* * *

1) There is a long history with regard to the need to ensure that this site – which sits a critical juncture between the UW and surrounding neighborhood - is designed to serve a gateway to the neighborhood. The 2003 Campus Master Plan acknowledged this on page 108, where this site was then called 30W, and which promised that the UW would "Develop site as a gateway to the neighborhood and the University. Gateway locations shall include visual enhancements, such as improved landscaping, signage, artwork, or other features that signify entries into the communities. The triangle shaped lot west of Eastlake Ave NE shall be incorporated into the design of the gateway feature and enhanced with the development of Site 30W. While the site may include other permitted uses, the University will consider retaining the entire site as a gateway."

2) The University Community Urban Center Plan of 1998 also identified this location as a gateway to the community on page III-10, which describes "suggestions for upgrading the 11th Ave NE entry into the Community and the University" There is a long planning history that identifies this site as a critical gateway into the neighborhood

CUCAC's comments on the Draft CMP also echoed the concern that these building sites at this boundary between the West Campus and the neighborhood needed to reflect the role they will play at this critical juncture, and made the following recommendations:

- A recognizable gateway into campus is needed at the west end of Campus Parkway.⁶

* * *

SDCI rejection of CUCAC recommendations for reduced height at 22W is based on a misreading of newly adopted zoning

1) With regard to SM75/240 zoning, when SDCI was discussing this height increase with the community, they promised that the buildings built to the maximum height would be slender residential towers, and that new construction that was commercial-only and/or office related and

⁴ *Id.*, page 57

⁵ Exhibit P2, slide 4

⁶ *Id.*, slides 8-10

that would not be allowed the zoned height bonus would adhere to the lower height, which in this case is 75'.

- The sort of office and research facilities the UW is proposing for the so-called “Innovation District” will be far more like the commercial buildings allowed under the neighboring 75’ height limit than the 240’ limits that will apply to mixed residential buildings

2) There is a brand new privately owned apartment building across the street that was recently completed and was built to the 65’ limit that was in place until the SM75/240 height limit was adopted. This building is unlikely to be replaced under the newly adopted zoning in the life of the proposed Campus Master Plan and/or its successor.⁷

The Seattle Hearing Examiner adopted SDCI’s analysis and recommended rezoning site W22 to MIO-240-C1-65.

In their petition for further consideration of the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation, the University District Community Council (UDCC) recommended maintaining the current height limit of 105 feet, stating: “105’ would be more consistent with the longstanding goal of providing a ‘gateway’ at this location rather than a wall. SDCI and the Hearing Examiner both erred in asserting that this location does not serve as the boundary for the campus.”⁸ In their petition, the UDCC included a previous letter that stated: “The heights for building sites W21 and W22 (as well as the unnamed site to the north of the latter) should remain at 105’ to be more consistent with the height limits on University Way. This point is of particular concern to the community, which has repeatedly expressed its support for retaining the pedestrian feel of the Ave.”⁹

The University, in their response to the UDUC petition, stated:

H. Height, Bulk, and Scale

Finally, the University District Community Council (“UDCC”) proposes reducing the allowed height of development along Montlake Boulevard and on two sites in West Campus. The sites and heights proposed in the Master Plan were developed over many years with significant feedback from stakeholders within the University and outside it. The University modified many development sites and height limits to ensure future development fits its context and balances the University’s needs with significant open spaces. Partly in recognition of the extensive and inclusive work that has already gone into the delineation and tailoring of development sites, neither SDCI nor the Hearing Examiner supported the UDCC’s requests.

1. There is no authority under the CUA to require protection of views.

The CUA does not require the Master Plan to include view-protection measures, and there is no applicable neighborhood plan or policy adopted by ordinance nor any land use policy or regulation that requires the University to constrain development envelopes to protect views. CUA § 11.B.8.d. Absent such requirements, there is no basis in the CUA for this condition.

7

⁸ University District Community Council Petition for Further Consideration of the Seattle Hearing Examiner’s Recommendation on the 2018 UW Campus Master Plan (CF-313346), January 30, 2018, page 2

⁹ University District Community Council Comments on Draft UW Campus Master Plan & EIS, November 21, 2016, page 9

2. There is no authority under SEPA for requiring protection of views as SEPA mitigation.

There is also no basis in SEPA to impose the view protection measures requested by the UDCC. The City's SEPA policy on views applies only to specific public places including viewpoints, parks, and scenic routes. See SMC 25.05.675.P.2. The section of Montlake Boulevard adjacent to East Campus and the areas around sites W22 and W37 are not enumerated scenic routes or public places where SEPA view protection applies.

3. The record does not support the petitioners' concerns about views.

The record also establishes no basis for additional view protection along Montlake Boulevard or around sites W22 and W37. With respect to Montlake Boulevard, the Master Plan proposes three mid-block corridors in East Campus that mandate 25-foot separation between new developments. (Ex. D2 at 257). These corridors will provide views from Montlake Boulevard to Lake Washington and beyond. Both elements, streetscape features, landscaping, and/or signage." (Ex. A34 at 16). The height proposed in the Master Plan does not preclude incorporation of those elements in a development on Site W22, and nothing in the Framework suggests the area's gateway status requires a lower height.

* * *

The City Council should decline the UDCC's request to adjust bulk, scale, and height in these three areas.¹⁰

Proposal: Maintain the current zoned height limit of 105 feet on site W22, the area north of NE Campus Parkway and west of 11th Avenue NE.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 2 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

29. The CUCAC's requested height reduction for Site W22 is ~~not~~ recommended. ~~Although some may consider it Site W22, with the vacant sites across the street to the north and west, sit on the edge of the campus boundary and provide~~ a gateway to the neighborhood, ~~the site is not on the campus boundary and is proximate to the Seattle Mixed-University 75-240 zone that would allow structures up to 240 feet in height. The relationship between site W22 and the University Bridge and the midrise area to the west make the current height limit of 105 more appropriate than the proposed 240 feet.~~

Amend Attachment 4 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

¹⁰ University of Washington, Applicant's Response to Petitions for Further Consideration, February 23, 2018, pages 26-28

Draw a zoning boundary down the middle of Campus Parkway between 11th Avenue NE and Eastlake Avenue NE, and down the middle of 11th Avenue NE between NE Campus Parkway and NE 41st Street. Maintain the current zoning of site W22 and the areas within the MIO to the north of Campus Parkway NE and west of 11th Avenue NE.

Amendment D2: Zoning of site W37

Councilmember Herbold

Background:

The Campus Master Plan proposes to rezone an area on the west side of the University Bridge from a Major Institution Overlay with a 65' height limit to a Major Institution Overlay with a 160' height limit. The plan further proposes to condition the height of development on that site down to 130'. The area covers three blocks and is bounded by NE 40th Street/the Burke Gilman Trail and Peace Park on the north, 6th Avenue Northeast/Interstate 5 on the west, NE Northlake Place on the south and the University Bridge/Eastlake Avenue NE on the east.

The north end of the University Bridge, NE 40th Street and the Burke Gilman Trail are designated "scenic routes" for the purposes of the City's SEPA policies. According to the City's SEPA Policies: "It is the City's policy to protect public views of significant natural and human-made features: Mount Rainer, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, the downtown skyline, and major bodies of water including Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union and the Ship Canal, from public places consisting of the specified viewpoints, parks, scenic routes, and view corridors..."¹ The plan identifies the view across site W37 as "View Corridor 8."

Across Northlake Avenue to the south is an industrial /shoreline area containing single-story commercial structures. Across NE 40th Street to the north is a multifamily area zoned midrise. To the east, across the University Bridge is the bulk of the University's west campus. Across NE 6th Street, to the west of Interstate 5 is an area zoned industrial-commercial with a 45 foot height limit. To the northwest is a Single Family 5000 zone.

The area contains the Benjamin Hall and the UW Creative Communications buildings. There are two blocks, which together make up site W37, that are currently vacant. NE Northlake Place dead ends between these blocks. The Campus Master Plan indicates that the University may seek to vacate this segment of NE Northlake Place.

The plan proposes to rezone site W37 and the two adjacent blocks from MIO-65-IC-45 to MIO-160-IC-45, with conditions on the block limiting heights to 130 feet. This would allow the development of a 130-foot tall, 14-story building with academic, mixed-use, transportation, or industry partnership/manufacturing space.

In their report on the Final Campus Master Plan and the Final Environmental Impact Statement, CUCAC stated:

14. Development Standards - Site Design Standards

CUCAC appreciates the expansion of the public realm allowance along Brooklyn Ave NE.

We do not believe that the new view corridor at the north end of the University Bridge proposed in the proposed CMP is adequate to protect the existing views to the west that would be blocked by the building proposed for Site W-37.

¹ Seattle Municipal Code 25.05.675 P2ai

Recommendation #30: The reduction in height at this location from 200 to 130 feet is not sufficient to protect the existing panoramic views to the west that would be blocked by the building proposed for Site W-37 and should be further reduced.²

The University District Community Council (UDCC), in their response to the Final Plan made the following statements:

The UDCC continues to strongly support the preservation of the existing west facing panoramic view from the sidewalk and roadway at the north end of the University Bridge over the building that now stands at site W-37. The UW's final proposal to allow an increase in height here to 130' is simply unacceptable, is inconstant with the shoreline zone across NE Northlake Way, and must be rejected.³

The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections evaluated the proposed rezone in their report. In reviewing recommendations from the City-University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC), SDCI determined "that the existing views across W37 should be protected; this can be accomplished by view corridor review of future permits (see Master Plan p. 251-253, View Corridor #8)."⁴ With these view corridors, the Department determined that the proposed zoning would be appropriate.

SDCI also analyzed SMC 23.34.124 related to Designation of Major Institution Overlay Districts. Section 23.34.124 C5, states: "Obstruction of public scenic or landmark views to, from or across a major institution campus should be avoided where possible." SDCI recommended three changes to the plan related to this site:

24) Page 251: After the last paragraph under "View Corridors," add: When proposing to develop sites adjacent to or within the 12 view corridors documented on Table 19 (pages 252 and 253), the University shall provide more detailed analysis of the existing or proposed views and demonstrate how the proposed development will maintain existing or proposed view corridors.

25) Page 252: Amend the View Corridor 8 description as follows: The view is of Lake Union generally to the southwest, as taken from the west pedestrian walkway along the University Bridge, at the edge of the existing UW Northlake building.

26) Page 253: Replace the View Corridor 8 graphic with the new one the University submitted to SDCI that is consistent with other view corridor graphics in terms of formatting.

In his presentation to the Seattle Hearing Examiner, Matt Fox from the UDCC and CUCAC made the following statements regarding W37:

CUCAC stands firmly behind its recommendation to reduce the height of Site W37 to protect existing panoramic public views

- Per CUCAC - The reduction in height at this location (Site W37) from 200 to 130 feet is not sufficient to protect the existing panoramic views to the west that would be blocked by the building proposed for Site W-37 and should be further reduced.

² Exhibit D3, pages 9-10

³ University District Community Council (UDCC), Written petition for further consideration of the Seattle Hearing Examiner's Recommendations on the 2018 UW Campus Master Plan (CF-313346), page 13

⁴ Exhibit D1, page 17

- SDCI asserts that the existing views across W37 should be protected; this can be accomplished by view corridor review of future permits (see p. 251-253, View Corridor #8). CUCAC believes this statement is not accurate.⁵

* * *

160' or even 130' height at Site 37W is also not consistent with adjacent zoning

Site 37W is across the street from the Shoreline Overlay Zone to the south, which is limited to 30'/37' (CMP, P. 123)

- Site 37W is directly abutted to the north by Midrise Zoning with a 65' or lower height limit (CMP, p.123)
- A small sliver of Site 37W is bordered by a SM 75/240' zone (CMP, p.123), which is not consistent with this height for the reasons outlined in the discussion of Site 22W above.⁶

The Seattle Hearing Examiner accepted the Department's findings and recommended changes to the plan, including the height increase for W37.

In its petition for consideration of the Hearing Examiner's recommendation, the University District Community Council stated:

- 5) Per CUCAC's recommendation, Site W-37 must be reduced in height to preserve the existing panoramic views to the west that the public now enjoys from both sides of the street at the north end of the University Bridge. SDCI erred in asserting that the view blockage of a building that is nearly as tall as the I-5 Ship Canal Bridge itself can somehow be designed away – it cannot. The current height limit of 65' must be retained.⁷

The University, in their response to the UDCC's petition stated:

1. There is no authority under the CUA to require protection of views.

The CUA does not require the Master Plan to include view-protection measures, and there is no applicable neighborhood plan or policy adopted by ordinance nor any land use policy or regulation that requires the University to constrain development envelopes to protect views. CUA § 11.B.8.d. Absent such requirements, there is no basis in the CUA for this condition.

2. There is no authority under SEPA for requiring protection of views as SEPA mitigation.

There is also no basis in SEPA to impose the view protection measures requested by the UDCC. The City's SEPA policy on views applies only to specific public places including viewpoints, parks, and scenic routes. See SMC 25.05.675.P.2. The section of Montlake Boulevard adjacent to East Campus and the areas around sites W22 and W37 are not enumerated scenic routes or public places where SEPA view protection applies.

3. The record does not support the petitioners' concerns about views.

⁵ Exhibit P2, slide 17

⁶ *Id.*, slide 21

⁷ UDCC, Written petition, page 2

The record also establishes no basis for additional view protection along Montlake Boulevard or around sites W22 and W37.

* * *

Last, the record shows the proposed height of site W37 is consistent with adjacent zoning when grade changes are taken into account. (See Ex. A33). The Master Plan also proposes a view corridor near this site to protect views of Portage Bay. (See Ex. D2 at 251-252). SDCI recommended modifying that view corridor to better protect views of Portage Bay from the University Bridge. (Ex. DI at 58-59). The University supports that modification, which the Hearing Examiner incorporated as a recommended condition. (HE Rec. at 30). SDCI and the Hearing Examiner considered all of this evidence when making their recommendations and did not recommend reducing the proposed height.

The City Council should decline the UDCC's request to adjust bulk, scale, and height in these three areas.⁸

Proposal: Maintain the current zoned height limit of 65 feet on site W37 and the adjacent blocks to the west.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 1 to Resolution 31389 to add a finding as follows:

XX. Seattle Municipal Code, Section 25.05.675.P.2.a.i. requires consideration of impacts to public views from designated scenic routes, including NE 40th Street and the Burke Gilman Trail west of the University Bridge as shown on Exhibit 1 to SMC 25.05.675.

Amend Attachment 2 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

30. The CUCAC's requested height reduction for Site W37 is ~~not~~ recommended. The University has identified a view corridor at this location, ~~and because the topography rises to the north of the site, most~~ some of the square footage allocated to the site will be ~~outside~~ inside the view corridor.

Amend Attachment 4 to Resolution 31389 as follows:

Maintain the current zoning on site W37 and the area to the west of the University Bridge/Eastlake Avenue NE and south of NE 40th Street.

⁸ University of Washington, Applicant's Response to Petitions for Further Consideration, February 23, 2018, pages 26-28

Amendment E1: Priority Hire

Councilmember O'Brien

Background:

Under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the University will construct six million net new gross square feet and up to 11 million square feet of development including demolition and rebuilding of existing space. The University has an opportunity to use tools that the City of Seattle, King County, Sound Transit, and the Port of Seattle are using to provide jobs to qualified construction workers from economically distressed areas. Priority hire sets goals for use of residents of economically-distressed zip codes in construction projects. The intention of priority hire is to support economic growth and job creation in areas of the region that are experiencing economic distress. Further the programs are intended to support the hiring of people of color and women on construction programs to provide access to these high-paying jobs to all members of the community.

Proposal: Add a recital supporting the use of priority hire in contracting

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Add a recital to Resolution 31389 as follows:

WHEREAS, the Seattle City Council encourages the University of Washington to use a priority hire program to support the hiring of residents of underserved communities to work on construction projects; and

Amendment F1: Space for small businesses

Councilmember Herbold

Background:

The University plans to add six million net new square feet of space on campus over the next ten years. CUCAC has requested that some space within the Campus be provided to small locally-owned businesses to support business diversity and equitable economic development. The Hearing Examiner recommended requiring that buildings in the West Campus include active street-level uses, including but not limited to commercial uses.

Proposal: Exempt space for small businesses from the gross floor area cap.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikethroughs~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 3 of Resolution 31389 to add the following conditions:

XX. Page 255: Under “Growth Allowance” amend the paragraph:

GROWTH ALLOWANCE

The phrase “growth allowance” refers to the 6.0 million gross square footage of net new development approved within the University’s MIO boundary under this CMP. Above ground parking and commercial spaces on the ground floor of buildings designed for and dedicated to small businesses is not counted against the net new 6.0 million square foot allowance in the CMP.

Amendment F2: Small business leasing programs

Councilmembers Herbold, Johnson and O'Brien

Background:

The University plans to add six million net new square feet of space on campus over the next ten years. CUCAC has requested that some space within the Campus be provided to small locally-owned businesses to support business diversity and equitable economic development.

Proposal: Encourage the University to explore ways to incorporate diversity in retail ownership on campus, including minority and women-owned businesses.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikeouts~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Add a recital to Resolution 31389 as follows:

WHEREAS, the City Council encourages the University of Washington to explore innovative ways to support local economic development and integration of woman and minority-owned local businesses into the Campus, such as the Port of Seattle's retail leasing program at Sea-Tac airport; and

Amendment G1: Stormwater best practices

Councilmember Herbold

Background:

A majority of the stormwater on campus either drains to University or City-owned storm drain lines, which discharge into waterbodies surrounding the campus. On-site stormwater management practices control the flow rate and address water quality standards. Some of the campus' stormwater flows into the University's sanitary sewer system before discharging into King County's trunk line. During large storm events, combined sewer and stormwater from the trunk line overflow into Portage Bay.

The University is guided in its actions by its Federal Phase I Permit requirements and City of Seattle stormwater regulations. It uses a series of initiatives to control stormwater discharges, including:

- * Public education and outreach on the impacts of stormwater pollution.
- * Public involvement and participation.
- * Detection and elimination of illicit discharges.
- * Stormwater treatment infrastructure techniques including catch basin filtration as new development occurs (particularly in West Campus).
- * Construction site stormwater runoff control.
- * Post-construction stormwater management for new development and redevelopment.
- * Pollution prevention and good housekeeping for facilities operations.¹

To prevent overflows, the Campus Master Plan (CMP) proposes to separate storm drainage from the sanitary system, where possible. The University also proposes to use stormwater for irrigation and other greywater purposes, when possible.

The CMP states: "There are currently no known capacity issues with the University's storm drainage systems, but storm drainage shall be evaluated as new development occurs."²

Proposal: Amend the plan to encourage the University to explore Best Management Practices for reducing stormwater runoff and in particular combined sewer overflows into waterways if capacity issues are identified.

Notes:

Double underlines indicate new language to be added to a finding, conclusion or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner

~~Double strikeouts~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from a finding, conclusion, or condition recommended by the Hearing Examiner.

Amendments

Amend Attachment 3 to Resolution 31389 to add the following condition:

¹ Exhibit D2, page 143

² *Id.*

XX. Page 143: Amend the last paragraph under “Storm Drainage”

There are currently no known capacity issues with the University’s storm drainage systems, but storm drainage shall be evaluated as new development occurs. If capacity issues are identified, the University will use best management practices to reduce stormwater overflows and discharges into waterways, to the extent practicable.

Amendment H1: City-University Agreement

Councilmember O'Brien

Background:

Many petitioners have asked for a renegotiation of the City-University Agreement, which governs relationships between the City and the University regarding the development and review of the Campus Master Plan. Under the City-University Agreement, the agreement may only be amended "in whole in part by agreement of the parties."¹

Proposal: Add a recital asking the University to negotiate an updated City-University Agreement

Note: Double underlines indicate new language to be added

~~Double strikeouts~~ indicate language proposed to be removed from the Resolution XXXXXX

Add a recital to Resolution 31389 as follows:

WHEREAS, the City Council encourages the University of Washington to engage in negotiations to amend the City-University in order to bring the agreement up-to-date and respond to changes to the regulatory environment, including changes to the Growth Management Act, the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, and the City Council's quasi-judicial rules, and

¹ Exhibit D5, section VIII.A.