



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

MEMBERS

- Yvonne Sanchez  
Eastlake Community Council
- Douglas Campbell  
University District Partnership
- Kay Kelly  
Laurelhurst Community Club
- Tomitha Blake  
Montlake Community Club
- John Gaines (Co-chair)  
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
- Jean Kelday  
Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Brett Frosaker  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- Eric Larson  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- TBD  
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Matthew Fox (Co-chair)  
University District Community Council
- Barbara Quinn  
University Park Community Council
- Brian O'Sullivan  
Wallingford Community Council
- Kerry Kahl  
University of Washington At -Large
- Bry Osmonson  
University of Washington Students
- Ashley Emery  
University of Washington Faculty
- Jan Arntz  
University of Washington Staff
- Alternates
- Timmy Bendis  
Eastlake Community Council
- Louise Little  
University District Partnership
- Leslie Wright  
Laurelhurst Community Club
- Miha Sarani  
Montlake Community Club
- Barbara Krieger  
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
- Pamela Clark  
Ravenna Springs Community Group
- Jorgen Bader  
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.
- Natasha Rodgers  
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
- Amanda Winters  
Roosevelt Neighbors Association
- Jorgen Bader  
University District Community Council
- Ruedi Risler  
University Park Community Club
- Jon Berkedal  
Wallingford Community Council
- TBD  
University of Washington At -Large
- Osman Salahuddin  
University of Washington Students
- Rick Mohler  
University of Washington Faculty
- TBD  
University of Washington Staff
- Ex-Officio
- Maureen Sheehan – DON  
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods
- Sally Clark – UW  
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

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

### Meeting Minutes

### Meeting #160

January 10, 2017

Adopted February 14, 2017

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue

Seattle, WA 98105

22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Matthew Fox	Ashley Emery
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	Rick Mohler
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Barbara Krieger (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Kerry Kahl	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Bry Osmonson		

### Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Sally Clark	Lindsay King
Theresa Doherty		

(See attached attendance sheet)

### I. Welcome and Introductions

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

### II. Housekeeping (00:14:14)

There were motions to adopt the November 29, December 6, and December 13 minutes as amended; all were seconded. The Committee voted and the motions passed.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan noted that she will go back and listen to the December 6 minutes and clarify the changes.

Mr. Mat Fox noted about adding a language about specific “legal agreements” on Mr. A. Dewitt Jensen’s public comment on the December 13 minutes.

### III. Public Comment (00:01:00)

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments.

**(Editor’s Note: The comment shown below is a summary of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in voice recording (.mp3) form)**

**Comments from A. Dewitt Jensen:** Mr. Jensen of Jensen Motor Boat Co. commented about access along NE Boat St. He presented the opinion of a Casseday Consulting. In their opinion, the proposed vacation of NE Boat St. as part of the University’s overall Campus Master Plan will adversely impact the truck access, emergency response and the overall traffic circulation for Jensen Motor Boat Co. and other shoreline businesses near South Campus.

NE Boat St., Brooklyn Ave NE and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE are the only connections for emergency vehicle and response truck access and traffic circulation. His

company connects with the Seattle Freight Network through these local streets, which are vital to the company's daily truck trips. Over 60% of traffic that comes to the boatyard comes on NE Boat St., and the entire length of Boat St. needs to stay open.

He noted that due to the existing trolley lines along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE to the north and NE Pacific St. to the east, any over height truck trips for the company's large boat deliveries can only travel via Brooklyn Ave NE to and from Pacific St.

He emphasized the 1994 binding legal agreement between Jensen Motor Boat Co., UW, and the City of Seattle regarding truck access and NE Boat St. being open. He said that the loading zone, truck turnaround, and parking area are vital and critical elements for the company's access along NE Boat St.

The impacts to the change of the NE Boat St. turnaround for Jensen Motor Boat Co. was not identified or reflected in the University's CMP. This change will eliminate 40% of the company's parking area thus impacting employees and visitors.

Mr. Jensen provided a copy of a letter from [Casseday Consulting](#) as well as a letter from his [attorney](#).

Mr. Gaines asked about the impact to JMC if NE Boat St. is vacated. Mr. Jensen responded that 60% of traffic comes along NE Boat St. and it will impact the way the trucks go in and out.

Mr. Doug Campbell was asked if the University has offered to relocate the company. Mr. Jensen said that he has not heard any proposals. He noted that the company has been in the same location for 90 years and it is the only old style boat yards that is left in the U.S. and only in Seattle. He said it will be difficult to imagine moving the company.

#### **IV. CMP Next Steps (00:25:46)**

Ms. Theresa Doherty provided a draft schedule of the next steps. She thanked the Committee for their efforts in submitting their comments. All the letters and comments from the comment period are being reviewed. She is targeting to publish the Final EIS and Campus Master Plan at the end of May 2017. At that time, there will be a 120-day window for SDCl to write their own report, and within the 120-days, CUCAC will have 56 days to write their own report (June-July).

After the 120-day review period, the reports from this Committee and SDCl go to the Office of the Hearing Examiner (OHE) who will hold a public hearing. The Hearing Examiner will write their report in 30 days after closing the record. She projected that SDCl's report will be done by the end of September, and the OHE public hearings may last about a month. There will be a window of opportunity for the Hearing Examiner to gather more information after the record is closed.

After the Hearing Examiner completes their public hearing, they will send their report to the City Council. The City Council should hold its own public hearing within 14 days after receiving the Hearing Examiner's report. There will be several City Council meetings to consider all information before they reach their preliminary decision. Once a preliminary decision has been reached, the City Council will submit their report to the Board of Regents and other organizations that were in the public hearings. The Board of Regents votes on the plan and submits it to the City Council. The City Council will vote and issue an ordinance.

Mr. Fox asked if the City Council's public hearing will be based on the Hearing Examiner's recommendation. Ms. Doherty mentioned that the City Council's hearing will be a closed record public hearing about the Hearing Examiner's recommendations. It is not a typical City Council's public hearing, but an opportunity for organizations such as CUCAC and UW, who filed written petitions for consideration within 14 days after receiving the Hearing Examiner's report.

Mr. Gaines asked where CUCAC interacts in the hearing process. Ms. Doherty mentioned that CUCAC is expected to be at the Hearing Examiner and City Council's public hearings to answer questions and comment about the report.

Mr. Fox asked at what point CUCAC can mention that the University did not listen to their draft comments and decided it was unsatisfactory, if that is the case. Ms. Doherty mentioned that should be included in their report within the 56 days' period.

She said that CUCAC will look at the Final EIS and Final CMP and decide whether the University incorporated their comments. At that time, CUCAC will write their own report and submits it to the Hearing Examiner where they will make their recommendations.

Ms. Sheehan inquired if there is an opportunity for CUCAC to introduce comments in their final report that were not brought out during the draft comment period. Ms. Doherty mentioned that this would be the opportunity, but she will confirm. She did mention that by the time CUCAC gets to the City Council's public hearing, they will only be commenting on the final record.

A question was asked that during the Hearing Examiner's public hearing, can any parties come and comment about the SDCI's report. Ms. Doherty noted that anyone can come to the Hearing Examiner's hearing and comment on the SDCI's report.

Mr. Reudi Risler inquired about other city agencies such as SDOT and how do they enter in the review process. Ms. Doherty mentioned that Ms. Lindsay King is currently compiling all City department comments for SDCI's comments. Ms. King said that she will send her draft report on the Final EIS and CMP to UW, CUCAC, and other City departments to respond before it gets published as a public record and submitted to the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Fox suggested that the sooner CUCAC knows about the definite schedule for the public hearings, etc., the sooner CUCAC can plan on having sufficient time for any comments about the report.

Mr. Kerry Kahl asked about any action the Board of Regents takes once the final EIS and CMP are complete. Ms. Doherty mentioned that the Board of Regents does not take any action after they have adopted the plan.

He asked about a communication plan throughout the community about the process. Ms. Doherty mentioned that they do not have any broad outreach because there is no comment period for the final report except for CUCAC and the City.

Mr. Fox asked if the University sends out notices to those who commented about the draft when the final document is available. Ms. Doherty said that they must respond to everyone's comments, but will confirm about sending out notices regarding the final report.

Ms. King mentioned that for their comments to be considered by the City and included in the SDCI's report, they should be submitted by January 16<sup>th</sup>.

#### **V. New Business (00:47:37)**

Ms. Sally Clark mentioned that in the next couple of meetings, she will be asking the University about upcoming projects. There will be presentations on schematic designs about the North Campus Housing Phase IV in the upcoming meetings.

She mentioned about past conversations from the Master Plan regarding the Innovation District, and she suggested inviting presenters such as program directors, faculty staff and students to provide more information about the topic. She suggested having the meeting at a different location such as Startup Hall, to which the group was agreeable.

Ms. Sheehan commented about updates from the Population Health project and Ms. Clark noted that she will provide information on when will they be available to provide an update to the Committee.

A comment was made if the Board of Regents will provide the Capital Projects Update to this Committee. Ms. Clark said that currently, there was not a lot of movements around capital projects but will provide an update once she receives more information.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will add to the meeting notice some of the projects that have been reviewed and presented to the Committee. Mr. Gaines commented that he is interested with the critical dates of the upcoming projects.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

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



Peter J. Eglick  
eglick@ewlaw.net

January 3, 2017

*Via Facsimile (206) 233-7901  
and Email (PRC@seattle.gov and Lindsay.King@seattle.gov)*

City of Seattle  
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections  
Attn: Public Resource Center and Lindsay King, Planner  
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

RE: Project 3023261: Preliminary Comments on behalf of Jensen Motorboat Company concerning proposed Council Land Use Action to adopt a new Major Institution Master Plan for the University of Washington Seattle Campus.

Dear Ms. King:

These preliminary comments are submitted on behalf of the Jensen Motorboat Company which is located at 1417 NE Boat St, Seattle and is directly impacted by the University's Master Plan proposals.

The Jensen Motorboat Company is a family owned wooden boat building and repair business. It has been located at the same location on the Portage Bay shoreline for the better part of a century, long before the University expanded by accretion in what is now known as the "Southwest Campus."

These comments are necessarily preliminary because the City, in apparent haste to forward the University's plans, has published a call for public comments based on a fundamentally inaccurate premise that, as the DCI Notice states, an "Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared by the University of Washington." This is not correct; the University has only circulated to date a draft EIS.

The pretense that there is a University application proposal supported by a final EIS and ready for City review is contrary to SEPA's purpose and its basic SEPA requirements. See, e.g., WAC 197-11-070, 197-11-055, 197-11-406; 478-324-030; The University and the City are proceeding as if the University governing body, the Board of Regents, has taken action on

January 3, 2017

Page 2

submission of a proposed Master Plan to the City. But the University, acting as its own SEPA lead agency, could not have lawfully made the decision to pursue the Master Plan Application because it has not yet had the opportunity to make such a decision based on review of an adequate final EIS. Why then is the public being asked by DCI to comment before the lead agency has completed required SEPA predicates?

Exacerbating this, the draft EIS circulated by the University is fundamentally inadequate. The glaring omission of disclosure and analysis of impacts on the Jensen Motorboat Company, a longstanding water dependent and shoreline-serving use, is a fundamental flaw. That omission is compounded by the University's failure to acknowledge at all binding written agreements it entered into with Jensen Motorboat Company (and in which the City concurred) for preservation of street geometry and access to the Jensen site. These have gone unaddressed in the University's submissions while amenities tied to University uses are touted as beneficial regardless of their impacts on streets and access critical to the viability of Jensen Motorboat Company. (Further description of impacts on access will be identified in comments by independent traffic engineer Katherine Casseday, commissioned by the Jensen Motorboat Company).

The University's 2018 Master Plan application materials repeat the same blindered approach taken in past University Master Planning where Jensen Motorboat Company is concerned. Seattle Comprehensive Plan provisions supportive of preservation of access and viability for water dependent and shoreline uses such as Jensen Motorboat Company are not deemed important enough to discuss. In fact, the materials are not based on the City's current Comprehensive Plan at all. The application materials do not provide in relation to the Jensen Motorboat Company the traffic, street, and circulation analysis required as part of a Master Plan application.

The University suggests that consistency with the Shoreline Management Act and the Seattle Shoreline Master Program will not be addressed in any depth now, but will be left for review of individual plan and permit applications, when and if submitted after Master Plan adoption. Of course, under this approach, the Master Plan framework for strangling access and impeding operation of the Jensen Motorboat Company, which the University has attempted over the last four decades, will already have been put in place.

These issues cannot be deferred by the City even if the University chooses to pretend that its Master Plan proposal only need be measured against accomplishment of University goals. Consideration from the perspective of the public trust impressed on the shoreline and the adopted policies for preservation of longstanding shoreline water-dependent uses is also required. Nor can review of diminution of public street access be deferred when the University's over-all plan including such changes is up for adoption now.

EGLICK & WHITED, PLLC

January 3, 2017

Page 3

The City should withdraw its public comment Notice and defer further action. The process can be restarted when and if the University submits an adequate final EIS and evidence of final action by the University Board of Regents adopting that EIS and approving its submission to the City, accompanied by final Master Plan application materials that forthrightly address the issues raised by Jensen Motorboat Company. Further, if the final EIS perpetuates the deficiencies inherent in the draft EIS circulated by the University, then the City should pursuant to, inter alia, WAC 197-11-600 and 620 require preparation of or itself prepare a supplemental EIS before consideration of the University Master Plan proposal proceeds.

Sincerely,

EGLICK & WHITED PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Eglick', written over a faint, illegible stamp or background.

Peter J. Eglick

cc: Julie Blakeslee (jblakesl@uw.edu)