

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS

University Response to CUCAC Recommendations:

CUCAC Recommendation	University Response
<p>Recommendation #1: construction of the West Campus Green shall occur, at the latest, when either: a) the adjacent development sites are completed (W29, W33 and W34), b) 2.5 million square feet of development is completed in the West Campus sector, or c) by December 2028, whichever is earlier.</p>	<p>SDCI Condition #6 proposes slightly different language for the timing of the completion of the West Campus Green. The University accepts the language proposed in SDCI Condition #6 as modified in the proposed amended condition language below and does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #1. The University believes the timing for completion of the West Campus Green in SDCI Condition #6 as modified in the proposed amended condition language is reasonable.</p>
<p>Recommendation #2: The University must report annually the progress made in meeting the conditions of master plan approval, describing actions taken in the year and status of completion of three open space commitments: 1) West Campus Green, 2) South Campus Green, and 3) continuous waterfront trail. This includes but is not limited to major planning and development milestones completed to date, and milestone target dates for the next two years.</p>	<p>Although this is not a condition of Section II.D of the City-University Agreement, the University will agree to voluntarily report on its progress in implementing the open space commitments in the Plan.</p>
<p>Recommendation #3: When planning the West Campus Green, the University and City need to be sensitive to long-standing marine businesses and kayakers using their own kayaks who need parking near the water at Portage Bay Park. At the very least, convenient pickup and drop off facilities should be provided.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #3.</p> <p>The University agrees that convenient parking for kayakers and marine businesses should be provided near the water and the City’s new Portage Bay Park. The right-of-ways in this area and Portage Bay Park itself are City-owned. The University is happy to work with the City to plan and advocate for parking and loading zones in these areas, but does not have authority to install on-street parking or loading in City-owned rights-of-way. On campus, all parking is managed on a campus-wide basis. (See Plan at 241.)</p> <p>The University is also sensitive to the needs of marine businesses in this area. The University has longstanding agreements with Jensen Motor Boat Company that are recognized in the FEIS and will be followed. (See FEIS at 5-77 to 5-78.)</p>
<p>Recommendation #4: The University and City need to make a commitment to the Native American History that is especially rich around Portage Bay. Signage along the waterfront trail should echo the existing historical Chesihahud trail signs around Lake Union.</p>	<p>The University agrees recognizing Native American History is important. SDCI Condition #6 proposes language to be added to the Plan related to culturally appropriate signage. The University accepts the language related to signage in proposed in SDCI Condition #6.</p>
<p>Recommendation #5: The University must begin a planning process to study growing its physical presence and mission critical programs outside the boundaries of its current MIO and Primary and Secondary Impact Zones. Part of such planning must identify the benefits remote communities will gain where such programs are located. Such new locations will benefit from University employees who must live long distances from the Seattle campus due to housing costs.</p> <p>and</p> <p>Recommendation #6: Growth within the MIO must be made conditional upon the exploration of other growth options. The University must report annual progress made in meeting these conditions of master plan</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendations #5 and #6.</p> <p>As noted in the City’s Recommendation, University development outside its Major Institution Overlay Boundary is regulated by Section II.E of the City-University Agreement. (SDCI Recommendation at 11.) The growth allowance in the Plan reflects only the growth anticipated on the University’s Seattle Campus over the 10-year planning horizon. The University takes seriously the need to plan for growth in many areas (local, regional, state-wide and beyond), and it does this on a continual basis as part of its day-to-day operations. The University maintains separate master plans for its Tacoma and Bothell campuses, and works to maximize use of its existing and new facilities across all of its campuses and in other areas.</p>

<p>approval, describing actions taken in the year ended. Further, no work on developing the CMP subsequent to this 2018 plan may begin without the University providing CUCAC and the City with a long-range plan for including multi-nodal development as well as internal growth options for a significant share of all future growth.</p>	
<p>Recommendation #7: The University must provide reports to CUCAC as it updates the six-year One Capital Plan, and in each biennial cycle of approving its Capital Budget.</p>	<p>Although this is not a condition of Section II.D of the City-University Agreement, the University agrees to voluntarily annually report to CUCAC on its One Capital Plan.</p> <p>It is the University's practice to provide information on the Capital Budget in the University's annual report on the Campus Master Plan. The University will continue that practice.</p>
<p>Recommendation #8: Incorporation of the University's stated goal in the FEIS (vol. 2 p 4-46) as a commitment to provide an increase in on campus childcare capacity by at least 350 slots when 5 million square feet of development is completed, or by July 2026, whichever is earlier.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #8. Providing a commitment for childcare in the Plan is not a requirement of the City-University Agreement. The University also agrees with SDCI's response to this recommendation. (See SDCI Recommendation at 11.)</p> <p>Although the University does not accept the Condition, the University recognizes that access to childcare is an important issue. The University is addressing this issue through its childcare access initiative. As noted in the FEIS, through that initiative, the University will continue to work on securing additional childcare services both inside and outside the MIO. (See FEIS at 4-42 to 4-47.)</p>
<p>Recommendation #9: A commitment to partner with the City on any new University District Child Care voucher fund or create a new subsidy program that includes off-campus child care costs (via voucher or a similar system) beyond the boundaries of the University District for faculty, staff, and students, similar to peers like the University of Chicago. This program should be approved by the Seattle City Council prior to initiating developments covered under the proposed CMP.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #9. Providing a commitment to participate in a voucher fund in the Plan is not a requirement of the City-University Agreement. The University also agrees with the City's response to this recommendation. (See SDCI Recommendation at 11.)</p> <p>Although the University does not accept CUCAC's Recommendation, University agrees access to childcare is important. The University has committed to participate in the City's exploration of the efforts outlined in Resolution 31732 to support access to affordable childcare. To the University's knowledge, the City has not yet taken the steps outlined in that Resolution.</p>
<p>Recommendation #10: Annually report the progress made in meeting these conditions of master plan approval, describing actions taken in the year ended and status of increasing childcare slots; and reporting on outcomes, plans and future University actions resulting from City of Seattle Childcare Assessment (FEIS vol.2 p 4-47).</p>	<p>Although this is not a condition of Section II.D of the City-University Agreement, the University will agree to voluntarily report its progress on its childcare access initiative in its annual report.</p>
<p>Recommendation #11: The University must create a thoughtfully developed plan to address housing affordability prior to initiating development under the proposed CMP, using some combination of the suggested mitigation strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pay MHA fees on all new development covered by the CMP to be used in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones. b) Develop additional Bridges@11th-type projects with deeper affordability targeting faculty and staff earning less than 60% of AMI. c) Create a need-based housing assistance program for faculty and staff, with eligibility for rented units. d) Partner with nonprofit housing developers in transit-accessible locations. e) Ensure pay scales keep pace with increased cost of living expenses in the Seattle region. 	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #11. The FEIS concluded the Plan will not have significant adverse impacts on housing. (FEIS pg. 4-7; Sec. 3.8 Housing, Sec. 4.1 Key Topic Areas: Housing.) For additional explanation of the University's position, please refer to pages 4 to 5 and 11 to 14 of the Applicant's Pre-Hearing Brief.</p>

<p>Recommendation #12: City of Seattle must partner with the University and others to address the needs for affordable housing. This includes the City fulfilling its obligations in the City-University Agreement: “The City will report on the progress of housing development in the University District Northwest Urban Center Village (UDNUCV), including the number and types of units built, the number, types and affordability of units lost through demolition, conversion, or change of use and whether such units are replaced with comparable units in the UDNUCV; the jobs/housing ratio in the area; progress in meeting City housing and job targets in the UDNUCV and send that information to the University for inclusion in the report. (Sec II.D.1.i)”</p>	<p>The University agrees that the City should fulfill its obligations set out in Section II.D.1.i of the City-University Agreement. The University agrees with the City that a partnership to provide affordable housing is beyond the scope of what is required to be in the Plan pursuant to the City-University Agreement. (See SDCI Recommendation at 12.) The University also opposes Plan conditions that require housing as the City does not have authority to impose such conditions. Please refer to pages 11 to 14 of Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Recommendation #13: Due to the complexities of multiple agencies at the city, county, regional and state levels we believe it is critically important that the University take the leadership role in ensuring that effective transportation coordination be realized.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The University plans to be a transportation leader through implementation of its Transportation Management Plan, and through organizing a quarterly transportation stakeholder group. The University plans to lead this the stakeholder group by chairing it, setting the agenda, and staffing the committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation #14: Below grade parking should be strongly encouraged to realize the admirable goals of the plan. Excluding above grade parking as developable square footage does not do so.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #14 to include above ground parking as part of the square footage in the growth allowance. The University agrees it is important to locate parking underground whenever possible. However, as acknowledged by the City, above-ground parking has historically been excluded from square footage calculations in the University’s various master plans. (See SDCI Recommendation at 13.) Please also see the response to CUCAC Recommendation #28, below, for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Recommendation #15: The proposed CMP plan should be modified to fill in the specifics of the University’s plans, rather than simply provide an explanation of how nice the concept of an Innovation District is. Only with these elements can this plan be judged or endorsed.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #15 seeking additional information in the Plan regarding the innovation district. The Plan includes an overview of the innovation district concept in Chapter 5, which provides substantial information on the University’s vision. Additional explanation of the vision set out in Chapter 5 will be provided by witness testimony at the hearing.</p>
<p>Recommendation #16: Approval of the proposed CMP, should be contingent upon the University explaining its place-making strategies for the neighborhood of which it is a part, but which exists outside the MIO boundary. This work is also an essential element of the Innovation District model as described by Brookings where placemaking to make a livable 24-hour neighborhood for all people is an essential element of the innovation district model.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #16.</p> <p>The Plan provides information about place-making strategies for the planned West Campus innovation district in the Design Guidance Chapter. In particular, pages 176 to 195 articulate a specific vision for West Campus that includes place-making elements like active edges, streetscape improvements, and significant open spaces. Additional explanation of the Design Guidance in the Plan will be provided by witness testimony at the hearing.</p>
<p>Recommendation #17: Approval of the proposed CMP should be made contingent upon creation of a plan to integrate small business into the footprint of the University campus physical expansion.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #17.</p> <p>The City-University Agreement does not require the University to create a plan to accommodate small businesses. (See SDCI Recommendation at 13.) Separate from the Plan, the University supports small business success in the University District and specifically along the Ave. The Plan allows for the location of businesses inside the campus boundary when they are necessary to fulfill the University’s mission. University Housing and Food Services maintains some cafés and food stores in residence halls and in the HUB that are necessary to serve immediate campus needs. The University does not wish to overpopulate campus with such businesses because they could compete with existing small businesses already located in the University District.</p>

<p>Recommendation #18: The development in the proposed CMP should be contingent upon the required transportation and mobility infrastructure, both on and adjacent to campus, being in place or fully funded with a clear timeline for implementation. The University must lead in this effort by committing the necessary resources and leveraging its political influence to ensure that this occurs in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #18. The University also opposes the transportation conditions proposed by the City. For additional explanation of the University’s position, please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief.</p> <p>As explained in the FEIS, the Plan is not reliant upon any transportation improvements that are not fully planned and funded. The transportation analysis provided in section 3.16 of the FEIS evaluates the Plan’s impact based on background conditions that reflect existing conditions and planned and funded improvements. (<i>See, e.g.,</i> FEIS 3.16-7.)</p>
<p>Recommendation #19: CUCAC encourages the University to include an employee transit pass as a Universal employee benefit.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #19. The University also opposes the transportation conditions proposed by the City. For additional explanation of the University’s position, please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief.</p> <p>The University maintains the U-PASS program, available to employees, as a strategy in its Transportation Management Program. The University is committed to the success of the U-PASS (and to its other TMP elements), and is committed to working with employees, students and transit providers on ways to make the U-PASS financially viable in the long-term.</p>
<p>Recommendation #20: The University must add a section in its annual reports on the CMP that outlines the ongoing procedure for monitoring the progress of mobility and transportation infrastructure improvements both on and adjacent to campus. The proposed CMP must stipulate that proposed development is contingent upon concurrent implementation of mobility and transportation infrastructure improvements and that failure to maintain this concurrency will cause a delay or termination of proposed campus development.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #20.</p> <p>The University also opposes the transportation conditions proposed by the City. For additional explanation of the University’s position, please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief. The University will agree to alternative condition language for SDCI Condition #20, as stated below, which includes withholding of permits if the University does not meet its SOV rate goals.</p> <p>The University reports on its progress toward achieving its Transportation Management Program as a required part of its annual reporting. As stated above, the University will also commit to voluntarily reporting to CUCAC on the work of the new transportation agency stakeholder group. Through that group, the University may receive information on mobility and transportation infrastructure improvements “owned” by City, State or Regional transportation agencies. These “owners” would be the appropriate party to hold this reporting responsibility to CUCAC for off-campus projects.</p>
<p>Recommendation #21: The SOV rate should be reduced to 12%. This will demonstrate that the University is striving to eliminate all unnecessary SOV trips to campus in the long-term, and we believe that this is a goal that the University should strive to achieve. We believe that this is achievable over the course of 10 years, since SoundTransit is expected to open the Lynnwood Station in 2024, well before the 2028 expiration of the CMP.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #21.</p> <p>The University has identified a 15% SOV rate goal in the Plan, which the University believes is aggressive but achievable on the timeline in the alternative condition language for SDCI Condition #20, below. This goal is far below the goal set for comparable major institutions. Seattle’s code requires a 50% SOV goal for Major Institutions, see SMC 23.54.016.C.1, and comparable institution SOV rate goals are closer to that number. For example, Seattle University’s MIMP (completed in 2013), sets a SOV goal of 35%. Similarly, Swedish Cherry Hill’s MIMP (completed in 2016), sets a SOV goal of 32% to be achieved by 2034. By setting a SOV rate goal of 15%, the University is already demonstrating significant leadership in this area and a further reduction in the SOV rate to 12% is not reasonable.</p>
<p>Recommendation #22: We believe that the University should reduce the number of SOV trips gradually over the course of 10 years, with a reduction from 20% to 12% happening biannually. If the University does</p>	<p>The University accepts metering of its SOV rate goal; however, the metering benchmarks in CUCAC Recommendation #22 are not workable for the University. Therefore, the University does not accept CUCAC</p>

<p>not achieve 18% SOV campus trips by 2022, 16% by 2024, 14% by 2026, and 12% by 2028, master use permits and building permits shall not be issued within the MIO until this is achieved.</p>	<p>Recommendation #22, but will accept the alternative condition language proposed for SDCI Condition #20, below.</p>
<p>Recommendation #23: Improve the pedestrian and bicyclist experience within the MIO and Primary and Secondary Impact Zones and have metrics to show progress.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #23. The City-University Agreement does not require the University to undertake planning, such as installation of bike improvements, outside of campus boundaries. Nonetheless, the University will accept SDCI Condition #56 with the alternative condition language proposed below and SDCI Condition #57, both of which will improve the bicyclist experience.</p> <p>Further, the Plan shows that the University is dedicated to continuous improvement of pedestrian and bicycle circulation on campus. The Plan identifies a "Circulation and Parking Framework" and a "Public Realm Framework" that demonstrate the University's plans. (See Plan at 94-107 and 112-121.) The University also envisions that off-campus pedestrian and bicycle circulation will be a topic of discussion for the transportation agency stakeholder group the University will form.</p>
<p>Recommendation #24: CUCAC remains concerned that the new zoned heights in west campus are not consistent with those in the surrounding neighborhood.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The University believes the proposed heights meet the rezone criteria. In addition, the University will agree to lower heights in certain areas, and accepts SDCI Conditions #21 and #22, as discussed further below. Witness testimony regarding consistency with the rezone criteria will be provided at the hearing.</p>
<p>Recommendation #25: It is still unclear how view points and pedestrian connectivity will be maintained between S45 & S46, S40 & S41 and S47 & S48. It should also be noted that the heights called out Fig 168 do not match the reduction in height shown on Fig 164.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Viewpoints and pedestrian connectivity will be maintained in South Campus through the mid-block and view corridors identified in the Development Standards Chapter of the Plan. (See Plan at 232, 239-240, 251-252.) Those Development Standards are mandatory and will maintain appropriate building porosity in South Campus.</p> <p>The University accepts CUCAC Recommendation #25 as it relates to the incorrect heights shown on Figure 168. The University will correct this typographical error.</p>
<p>Recommendation #26: The impacts on local businesses of vacating N. Northlake Place should be studied.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The University agrees the impact on local businesses should be studied. This study will occur at the time a street vacation for a portion of North Northlake Place is proposed, consistent with state law (RCW 35.79) and the City's code related to street vacations (SMC 16.62 and CF 310078). (See also SDCI Recommendation at 15.)</p> <p>The City-University Agreement requires the University to identify any potential street vacations in the Plan. (See CUA § II.A.1.j.) The University has done so with respect to North Northlake Place but the University has no immediate plans to seek this potential street vacation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The University agrees that the existing heights for sites W19 and W20 (105 feet) should be retained.¹ The University accepts the relevant portions of CUCAC Recommendation #27 and SDCI Condition #21, discussed below.</p> <p>The University also agrees that site W28 should have a 90 foot height limit. That height limit is already reflected in the Plan. (See Plan at 235.)</p>

¹ The height of site W20 is currently 240' conditioned down to 90', see Plan at 235, the University will update the Plan to reflect the current 105' height limit for this site consistent with SDCI Condition #21.

	<p>Consistent with the City’s analysis, the University does not agree that the height limit for site W22 should be reduced from 240 feet to 160 feet; and therefore, does not accept the relevant portion of CUCAC Recommendation #27. As noted in SDCI’s Recommendation, site W22 is not on a campus boundary and is consistent with heights allowed in adjacent University District areas. (See SDCI Recommendation at 16.) The University agrees with the City’s reasoning on this topic.</p>
<p>Recommendation #28: CUCAC urges the City to address the need for Primary and Secondary Impact Zones mitigation, and condition approval of the proposed CMP to identify and address all impacts in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones resulting from University development, including:</p> <p>a) The proposed 6 million GSF of net new development includes any and all University facility growth, whether through new construction, acquisition, or leasing, in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones as well as within the MIO boundaries.</p> <p>b) The proposed 6 million GSF includes any new above ground parking structures; a building is the same impact whether used for offices, research, student housing or parking.</p> <p>c) CMP Development Standards (p 233) are revised so that “Exceeding GSF in one sector: The net new square footage of growth allowance may exceed the allocation for each campus sector [add: except west campus] by up to 20% on a cumulative basis over the life of this Plan without a Plan amendment.”</p> <p>d) The University annually report its progress towards developing and engaging its industry partnerships, and adds an assessment of industry FTEs as part of its proposals for any new development project whether in MIO or in the Primary and Secondary Impact Zones.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #28 and related SDCI Conditions #17 and #18, discussed below.</p> <p>The University cannot support these conditions for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) As noted in the City’s Recommendation, University development outside its Major Institution Overlay boundary is regulated by Section I.E of the City-University Agreement. (SDCI Recommendation at 16.) Further, the 6 million net new square foot growth allowance in the Plan is the development capacity needed on the Seattle campus to support the University’s educational mission over the 10-year planning horizon. The growth allowance does not reflect the development capacity needed outside the MIO to support the University’s educational mission. Limiting all University development to 6 million net new square feet would impact the University’s ability to meet its mission. To the extent the University may develop facilities outside its MIO in the primary and secondary impact zones, such development must be and will be consistent with the development standards of the applicable zoning, as required by the City-University Agreement. (See CUA § II.C; see also SDCI Recommendation at 16.)</p> <p>b) The Plan’s Design Guidelines encourage below grade parking. (See Plan at 156.) In some circumstances, below grade parking will not be feasible due to site conditions or cost. Where below grade parking is not feasible, above grade parking should not count against the growth allowance, all of which is needed for academic uses to meet the University’s mission.</p> <p>c) The University objects to the deletion of language on 233 of the Plan relating to the movement of approved GSF between campus sectors. The allowance for movement of square footage between sectors is language in the Plan that is primarily retained from the approved 2003 Campus Master Plan and was proposed to be inserted by the City during the approval process for that Plan. See Ord. 121041. The language does not conflict with the City-University Agreement and should remain.</p> <p>d) The University agrees to voluntarily report annually to CUCAC on its progress towards developing innovation district partnerships within the MIO. The University will not add an assessment of industry FTEs as part of its proposals, as all uses and development on campus is dictated by the University’s mission.</p>
<p>Recommendation #29: We ask the City to require something akin to privacy glass so that, particularly the Portage Bay neighborhood residences and boaters traversing Portage Bay at night, are not blinded by new south campus buildings.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #29. The Plan states that all exterior lighting will be shielded from residential neighborhoods. (Plan at 239.) Although some interior lighting may be visible during nighttime hours, the University expects most interior lights will be turned off at night to preserve energy, so the mitigation measure proposed is not necessary.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #30 to change the height limit for site W37. Instead, views will be protected through the view corridor designated for this area. (Plan at 252-53.) The University accepts SDCI Conditions #25 and #26, discussed below, which are related to this view corridor.</p>

<p>Recommendation #31: CUCAC recommends that SDCI consider increasing this distance in key locations in the east, west and south campus that will help ensure variations in height, adequate building spacing, and modulation along the edges of the campus.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendation #31.</p> <p>The Plan’s proposed separation of 75 feet in most instances is consistent with the tower separation requirements under new University District “Seattle Mixed” zoning requirements for high-rise structures. <i>See</i> SMC 23.48.645.E. SDCI agrees this separation is adequate to preserve light, air, and views between towers. (SDCI Recommendation at 17.)</p>
<p>Recommendation #32: The City should require not only that the University expansion NOT increase storm water runoff and sewer capacity, but rather that the University show leadership in design and building of forward looking green practices for storm water and sewer management, where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation #33: The City should require that the University do better, i.e., instead of using the CSOs, the University should take a leadership role in showing best practices for rain garden design, pervious surfaces and designing for climate change (likely increased storm rainfall), etc. The University prides itself on being green – see http://green.uw.edu/news/uw-named-green-honor-roll-7th-straight-year?utm_source=UW+News+Subscribers.</p>	<p>The University does not accept CUCAC Recommendations #32 and #33. The University agrees with the City that there is no legal mechanism to require it to exceed applicable stormwater requirements. (<i>See</i> SDCI Recommendation at 17.)</p> <p>Further, additional requirements are not reasonable. The FEIS concludes that there is adequate system capacity to accommodate increased stormwater runoff resulting from development under the Plan. (<i>See</i> FEIS Ch. 3.15.) The Plan commits to following applicable stormwater regulations and proposes a number of initiatives to manage stormwater in an environmentally friendly manner. (<i>See, e.g.</i>, Plan at 143; FEIS at 3.15-31-32.) In addition, where it is possible in connection with University development, the University has committed to updating the few remaining combined storm-and-sewer outflow systems on campus to separated systems. (<i>See, e.g.</i>, Plan at 143.) Thus, the University will be treating stormwater in a responsible way consistent with applicable regulations.</p>

University Response to SDCI Proposed Conditions:

SDCI Proposed Condition	University Response
<p>Condition #1: Amend page 276 of the Housing section to include the statement, “The University shall construct 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI.”</p> <p>Condition #2: A condition of the Master Plan shall state: Construction of 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI shall be constructed within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone prior to the development of 6 million net gross square feet or the life of the Master Plan, whichever occurs first.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Conditions #1 and #2. For explanation of the University’s position, please refer to pages 11 to 14 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief.</p>
<p>Condition #3: Page 98: Amend the first paragraph under “Open Space Commitment”:</p> <p>...A design and implementation plan for the West Campus Green and the West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall be completed by the <u>earlier of:</u> the time 1.5 million square feet of net new development in the West Campus sector is completed; <u>or the time the University submits its first permit application for development of Site W27, W29, W33, W34, or W35.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #3.</p>
<p>Condition #4: Page 102: Amend the second paragraph under “Open Space Commitment”:</p> <p>A design and implementation plan for the South Campus Greens, as well as the South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall occur when construction on the first adjacent development site is completed <u>(by the time the University submits the first permit application for development of Sites S50, S51, S52, S41, S42, S45, or S46.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #4.</p>

<p>Condition #5: Page 104: Amend the second bullet under “Open Space Commitment”:</p> <p>Construction Completion of the East Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall align with the <u>earlier of: completion of construction of the 750,000 gross square feet of net new development allowed in East campus under the CMP; or exhaustion of the 6 million square foot growth allowance.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #5.</p>
<p>Condition #6: Page 240: Amend the last three sentences of the first paragraph under “West Campus Green and Plaza”:</p> <p>. . . . A design and implementation plan for West Campus Green and West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall be completed by the <u>earlier of: the time 1.5 million square feet of net new development in West Campus sector is completed; or the time the University submits its first permit application for development of Site W27, W29, W33, W34, or W35.</u> A concept plan for all three sections of the continuous waterfront trail-West, South, and East -shall also be completed at this by that time. <u>The concept plan for the continuous waterfront trail shall be reviewed by SDCI for compliance with the City’s Shoreline Master Management Program and the University’s shoreline public access plan. The West Campus Green and the continuous waterfront trail design and implementation plan shall include convenient pickup and drop off facilities and signage that reflect local Native American history.</u> At the latest, e <u>Construction of the West Campus Green and the West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall occur when by the earlier of: completion of 3.0 million gross square feet of net new development is completed in the West Campus Sector; at the completion of adjacent development sites W29, W33, and W34; or the exhaustion of the 6 million gross square foot growth allowance. In addition, as the University completes development of Sites W29 it shall complete the “Plaza”, and as the University completes development of W27, It shall complete the “Belvedere”, both identified on page 98.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts most of the modifications contained in SDCI Condition #6. However, it cannot agree to include pickup and drop-off facilities in the continuous waterfront trail and the West Campus Green design and implementation plan. These are open space projects and do not involve right-of-way improvements. In addition, the majority of the streets in West Campus are City-owned and the University does not have authority to install parking and loading areas on City-owned property.</p> <p>For consistency with the required trigger for the design and implementation plan, the University would also prefer that completion of the West Campus Green be tied to completion of all of the adjacent development sites, so sites W27 and W35 should also be referenced in the second to last sentence of the paragraph.</p> <p>The University therefore proposes the following alternative condition language that it will accept:</p> <p>Page 240: Amend the last three sentences of the first paragraph under “West Campus Green and Plaza”:</p> <p>. . . . A design and implementation plan for West Campus Green and West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall be completed by the earlier of: the time 1.5 million square feet of net new development in West Campus sector is completed; or the time the University submits its first permit application for development of Site W27, W29, W33, W34, or W35. A concept plan for all three sections of the continuous waterfront trail-West, South, and East -shall also be completed that time. The concept plan for the continuous waterfront trail shall be reviewed by SDCI for compliance with the City’s Shoreline Master Management Program and the University’s shoreline public access plan. The West Campus Green and the continuous waterfront trail design and implementation plan shall include convenient pickup and drop off facilities and a plan for signage that reflects local Native American history. Construction of the West Campus Green and the West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall occur when by the earlier of: completion of 3.0 million gross square feet of net new development is completed in the West Campus Sector; at the completion of adjacent development sites <u>W27, W29, W33, W34 and W35</u>; or the exhaustion of the 6 million gross square foot growth allowance. In addition, as the University completes development of Sites W29 it shall complete the “Plaza”, and as the University completes development of W27, It shall complete the “Belvedere”, both identified on page 98.</p>
<p>Condition #7: Amend the second paragraph under “South Campus Green”:</p> <p>A design and implementation plan for the Greens, as well as the South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall occur when construction on the first adjacent development site is completed (by the time <u>the University submits the first permit application for development of Sites S50, S51, S52, S41, S42, S45, or S46.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #7.</p>

<p>Condition #8: Amend the third paragraph under “Continuous Waterfront Trail”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction <u>Completion</u> of the East Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall align with <u>the earlier of: completion of construction of the 750,000 gross square feet of net new development allowed in East campus under the CMP; or exhaustion of the 6 million square foot growth allowance.</u> 	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #8.</p>
<p>Condition #9: UW shall include updates about the progress of the planning and completion of the West Campus Green, the South Campus Green, and the continuous waterfront trail in the annual reports to the City.</p>	<p>Although this is not a condition of Section II.D of the City-University Agreement, the University will agree to voluntarily report on its progress in implementing the open space commitments in the Plan.</p>
<p>Condition #10: Page 239: Add a new section to the beginning of the page:</p> <p><u>ACTIVE STREET-LEVEL USE AND TRANSPARENCY</u> <u>Active street-level uses shall be located within buildings adjacent to City of Seattle right-of-way in the West Campus sector, mid-block corridors in all sectors, West Campus Green Plaza and Belvedere, South Campus Green, and the continuous waterfront trail. Active street-level uses include commercial uses, child-care facilities, multi-use lobbies, lounges, study spaces, and active academic uses like classrooms, labs, libraries and hands-on collaboration spaces. All buildings with required active street-level use and transparency shall provide active uses and transparency within 2-8 feet above sidewalk level along 60% of the building façade. Where active street level uses are required, street-level parking within structures, excluding driveway access and garage doors or openings, shall not be allowed unless separated from street-level street-facing facades by active street level uses complying with the use and transparency requirements in this paragraph.”</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #10.</p>
<p>Condition #11: Page 241: Under “Parking,” amend the paragraph in the middle of the page:</p> <p>Parking access is preferred from streets owned by the University. Where necessary, parking access from streets that are not owned by the University shall be allowed based on the following hierarchy of preference (from most preferred to least preferred). A determination on the final access location <u>shall be made by SDCI, in consultation with SDOT, based on this hierarchy. The final access location shall balance the need to minimize safety hazards and the feasibility of the access location based on topography, transit operations, bike infrastructure, vehicle movement, and other considerations ...</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #11.</p>
<p>Condition #12: Page 242: Under “Public Realm Allowance,” amend the second paragraph:</p> <p>The public realm allowance refers to a minimum zone between the street curb and the edge of building facade, and is intended to provide space for a comfortable and desirable pedestrian experience. The public realm allowance proposed are based upon and maintain the current street widths which the University understands to be sufficient. <u>City of Seattle right-of-way widths are determined by SMC 23.53 and the Street Improvement Manual, or functional successor. Where required, improvements to the public realm allowance shall be completed in accordance with adopted Green Street Concept Plan. The existing curb-to-curb width, plus the linear square feet associated with the public realm allowance defines the extent of impact on development sites.</u></p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #12.</p> <p>The University objects to the insertion of the reference to the City’s code and the Street Improvement Manual. The Plan bases the public realm allowance on existing street widths. Requiring wider streets will impact the University’s ability to develop the 6 million gross square foot growth allowance and thereby fulfill its mission. The Plan retains the existing street widths, which the University understands to be sufficient. (See Plan at 242.) SDCI has provided no information to the contrary.</p> <p>Further, the Plan already indicates that the University will strive to implement improvements to Brooklyn Avenue NE, 43rd Street, and NE 42nd Street that are included in the U District Green Street Concept Plan, which is included as an appendix. (See Plan at 182).</p>
<p>Condition #13: Page 251: Under “Upper Level Setbacks,” amend the first paragraph under “First Upper</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #13.</p>

<p>Level Setback”:</p> <p>Sites with building footprints that exceed 30,000 square feet shall maintain a minimum upper-level setback of 20’ along sides of the building where the height exceeds the 45’ podium. Sites with building footprints smaller than 30,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds the 45’ podium height shall maintain a minimum upper level setback of 20’ along at least two edges of the podium. <u>The required upper-level setback shall be provided along the street or major public open space façade if one exists.</u> If necessary to allow flexibility and modulation of the building form, a maximum of 50 percent of the building perimeter may extend up to 90’ without a setback.</p>	
<p>Condition #14: Page 251: Under “Second Upper Level Setback,” amend the first paragraph as follows:</p> <p>To create a more gradual transition between University and non-University property, an additional upper level setback shall be required on building edges identified within the Development Standards and Design Guidance maps, pages 174, 189, 298, and 226. <u>as follows:</u> sSites with building footprints that exceed 20,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds 160’ that are located along University Way and Campus Parkway, shall be required to step back an additional 20’ at 90’ in height along a minimum of one façade, generally the facade facing the more prominent street edge. Sites with building footprints that exceed 20,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds 160’ that are located along Pacific Street, shall be required to step back an additional 20’ at 120’ in height along a minimum of one façade, generally the façade facing the more prominent street edge. <u>The required second upper-level setback shall be provided along the street or major public open space façade if one exists.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #14.</p>
<p>Condition #15: Page 239: Under “Ground Level Setbacks,” amend the third paragraph:</p> <p>Setbacks may be averaged horizontally or vertically. University structures across a City street or alley from commercial, mixed use, manufacturing, or industrial zones outside the MIO boundary shall have no required setbacks. Pedestrian bridges, retaining walls, raised plazas, sculpture and other site elements shall have no setback requirements.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #15.</p>
<p>Condition #16: Page 156: Amend the paragraph under “Gateways”:</p> <p>The UW-Seattle campus is embedded within the larger urban fabric of the city and has multiple points of access. Gateways, <u>including NE 45th Street at 15th Avenue NE, the “landing” of the University Bridge at NE 40th Street, and NE 45th Street at 25th Avenue NE,</u> serve as important access points for pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles, and may provide a welcoming and clear sense of arrival on campus. Gateways also form key points of connectivity between campus sectors. <u>Gateways should include visual enhancements that signify entries into the community, such as landscaping, signage, artwork, or architectural features that will be installed at the discretion of the University.</u> Gateways also form key points of connectivity between campus sectors.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #16.</p>
<p>Condition #17: Page 232: Amend the second bulleted paragraph:</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Conditions #17 and #18.</p>

<p>A new development site: A proposal for a development site not previously approved <u>under the Master Plan is considered a proposed change to the Master Plan and will comply with the City-University Agreement Section II.C.1 – 5, Changes to University Master Plan.</u> shall constitute an exempt Campus Master Plan change, unless the proposal requires a Plan amendment according to the provisions of the City University Agreement because the Director of SDCI (or its successor department) determines that the specific use proposed for a site, within the broad use categories permitted in tables 14 through 17, is inconsistent with the guiding principles or policies of this Campus Master Plan, or because of the use relationship to, or cumulative use impacts upon, area surrounding the University boundary.</p> <p>Condition #18: Page 233, remove the two bulleted paragraphs.</p>	<p>The University objects to the deletion of language on page 232 of the Plan explaining that a proposal for a new development site constitutes an exempt plan change, except under certain circumstances, and to the deletion of language on page 233 of the Plan relating to the movement of approved GSF from underdeveloped development sites within the sector and unused square footage between campus sectors. The language related to the movement of square footage between sectors is primarily retained from the approved 2003 Campus Master Plan and was proposed to be inserted by the City during the approval process for that Plan. <i>See</i> Ord. 121041. The language does not conflict with the City-University Agreement and should remain.</p> <p>In order to recognize that movement of square feet from one development site to another within a sector requires a plan amendment, consistent with the City-University Agreement, the University will agree to add the following sentence to the end of the first bullet point on Page 233:</p> <p><u>“A proposal to move GSF from one development site to another is considered a proposed change to the master plan and will comply with the procedures required in the City-University Agreement.”</u></p>
<p>Condition #19: Page 261: Replace the first bulleted item with the following text:</p> <p>“Convene a transportation agency stakeholder meeting, at least quarterly, to review progress, monitor TMP performance goals, prioritize additional strategies if the TMP performance goals are not met, and address unforeseen challenges and opportunities.”</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #19.</p> <p>The University is responsible for implementing its TMP as a required part of its master plan. (<i>See</i> CUA § II.A.1.f.) Outside groups do not have substantive oversight of the TMP. The University therefore proposes the following alternative condition language that it will accept:</p> <p>Page 261: Amend the first bulleted item:</p> <p><u>“Convene a transportation agency stakeholder meeting, at least quarterly, to review progress, monitor TMP performance goals, prioritize additional strategies if the TMP performance goals are not met, and address and discuss unforeseen challenges and opportunities. The University may report on the TMP performance, but the group will not have oversight to set TMP priorities.”</u></p>
<p>Condition #20: Page 261: Under “Monitoring and Reporting,” amend the text following the bulleted items:</p> <p><u>The University’s TMP SOV goal is 20% as of the date of this Plan. The goal shall decrease to 17% by the earlier of the first day of 2022 or one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension. The goal shall decrease further to 15% by the earlier of the first day of 2025 or one year after the opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension.</u></p> <p><u>At any point, if the UW fails to timely achieve the applicable SOV goal, the UW shall enhance the TMP to increase the likelihood that the goal shall be achieved. Additional measures to be considered include, but are not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>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</u> 	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #20. However, the University will agree to appropriate metering of its SOV rate that is achievable and balances the needs of the University in carrying out its academic mission.</p> <p>The University therefore proposes the following alternative condition language that it will accept:</p> <p>The University’s TMP SOV <u>rate</u> goal is 20% as of the date of this Plan. The goal shall decrease to 17% by the earlier of the first day of 2022 or one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension. The goal shall decrease further to 15% by the earlier of the first day of 2025 or one year after the opening of the Lynnwood, East, Redmond, and Federal Way Link Extensions.</p> <p><u>At any point, if the UW University fails to timely achieve the applicable SOV <u>rate</u> goal for a period of 24 months, the UW 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:</u></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Replicating the student U-Pass “opt-out” program with faculty and staff to encourage participation among campus populations less likely to use transit</u> • <u>Expanding the U-Pass to integrate payment for other transportation options, such as car-share or bike-share</u> • <u>Implementing performance-based parking strategies, including charging more for high-demand parking lots</u> • <u>Replacing monthly parking permits with a pay-by-use parking payment model</u> <p>In 2028, if the University has not failed to timely reached its SOV goal of 17% or 15% 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 and 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) SDCI shall withhold permits until the University has it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>If the University has failed to timely reached its SOV <u>rate</u> goal of <u>20%</u>, 17%, or 15% 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 and building permits for development (other than maintenance, emergency repair, or other minor projects) within the MIO. SDCI shall withhold permits until the University has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that the University will implement additional mitigation measures that shall meet or restore the University student, faculty, and staff to the required SOV rate <u>within a reasonable time</u>.</p>
<p>Condition #21: Maintain the existing MIO height limitation (105’) for properties along University Way north of Campus Parkway (Sites W19 and W20). Amend Table 10: Maximum Building Ht. Limit and Figures 125, 150, 153 and 191 to show the MIO height limitation of 105 ft. for Sites W19 and W20.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #21.</p>
<p>Condition #22: Limit structure height on development sites W31 and W32 to 30 ft. and amend Table 10 “Conditioned Down Building Heights” accordingly.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #22.</p>
<p>Condition #23: Page 240: Under “Mid-Block Corridors” amend the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 240:</p> <p>Mid-block corridors are required where identified in Figures 192-195 169 and 185. Relabel the “Priority Pedestrian Connectors on these figures as “Mid-block Corridors”.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #23.</p> <p>The University has the authority to set development standards for campus, and has deliberately defined Mid-Block Corridors separately from Priority Pedestrian Connections. For additional explanation of the University’s position on its authority to set development standards, please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief.</p> <p>The Plan currently identifies eight Mid-Block Corridors in the South and East Campus Sectors, and it requires a minimum 25-foot separation between buildings in those corridors. (<i>See</i> Plan at 257, 239-40.) Those Mid-Block Corridors are designated intentionally to break up future development along NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard and to ensure significant porosity between buildings. The Plan separately identifies seven Priority Pedestrian Connections in the South and East Campus Sectors. (<i>Id.</i> at 208, 226.) These are identified in the University’s design guidelines and are intended to be pedestrian connections through new development. Priority Pedestrian Connections do not have mandatory development standard requirements in the Plan because they are to be realized in a flexible manner reflecting incremental development. They may vary in width (but generally have a minimum width of 8’), go through buildings, be covered by upper-level building connections, or be open to the sky. (<i>See</i> Plan at 156-157.) Unlike Mid-Block Corridors, they are not intended to be a wide open corridor between buildings in all circumstances.</p>

	<p>Flexibility in Priority Pedestrian Corridors is needed to meet the University’s development goals for South and East Campus, where development will occur incrementally and may not reflect the long-term vision for campus for decades. This flexibility is consistent with the Plan’s guiding principles and balances adequate pedestrian facilities with the University’s ability to develop to meet its mission.</p> <p>Testimony at the hearing will provide additional information on the distinction between Mid-Block Corridors and Priority Pedestrian Corridors and the need to keep these features of the Plan distinct.</p>
<p>Condition #24: Page 251: After the last paragraph under “View Corridors,” add:</p> <p><u>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.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #24.</p>
<p>Condition #25: Page 252: Amend the View Corridor 8 description as follows:</p> <p><u>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.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #25.</p>
<p>Condition #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.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #26.</p>
<p>Condition #27: Page 6: Amend the third paragraph under “Purpose and Context”:</p> <p>Work on this CMP began in 2015 so that by 2018, the 2018 CMP would be in place to accommodate the Seattle campus’ growth demands. Between 2015 and 2018, the University of Washington developed this long-term vision for the Seattle campus as well as a 10-year conceptual plan for campus growth that balances the preservation of historic campus assets with intensive investment.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #27. Please refer to page 10 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #28: Page 8: Amend the paragraph under “Guiding Principles”:</p> <p>The CMP balances preservation of historic campus assets with increased density, and relies on the University’s strategic goals, academic, research, and service missions, and capital plan objectives, to inform the physical development of the campus. Five overarching principles guide the 2018 CMP:</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #28. Please refer to page 10 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #29: Page 24: Amend paragraphs Nos. 1, 3, and 5 under “Regulatory Authority and Planning Process”:</p> <p>1. Pursuant to RCW 28B.20.130, The University of Washington Board of Regents exercises full control of the University and its property “full control of the university and its property of various kinds, except as</p>	<p>The University accepts the portion of SDCI Condition #29 modifying page 24 paragraph 1. The University does not accept the portion of SDCI Condition #29 modifying page 24 paragraphs 3 and 5.</p> <p>Please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>

<p>otherwise provided by State law.” Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.103 and .200, “[s]tate agencies shall comply with the local . . . development regulations and amendments thereto adopted pursuant to this chapter,” but “[n]o local . . . development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities,” including “state education facilities.” The Washington Supreme Court has ruled that the University is a state agency and the Regents’ “full control” under RCW 28B.20.130 is limited by RCW 36.70A.103.</p> <p>3. The City-University Agreement governs preparation of the CMP. <u>Consistent with the City-University Agreement and the City’s Major Institutions Code</u>, the CMP includes design guidance, development standards of the <u>underlying zoning</u>, and other elements <u>unlike those applicable to other major institutions which differ from or are in addition to those included in the City’s Major Institutions Code, consistent with the City-University Agreement</u>. A Major Institution Overlay (MIO) district and boundaries are established through the CMP adoption and eCity ordinance.</p> <p>5. The University shall comply with the provisions of the Seattle Shoreline Master Program and other applicable State or Federal laws. <u>University development remains subject to City development regulations that do not constitute development standards of the underlying zoning and do not preclude the siting of an essential public facility within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.200.</u></p>	
<p>Condition #30: Page 150: Amend the paragraph under “Introduction”:</p> <p>Chapter 6 contains detailed information on the 10-year conceptual plan for campus, including sector-by-sector descriptions of the design goals for each area. This Chapter further provides information on the University’s Project Review Processes, and includes non-binding design guidance. Although non-binding, design guidance will be implemented through capital project design and environmental review carried out by the Architectural Commission, the University Landscape Advisory Committee, the Design Review Board (all as applicable), and project design teams. In a few places, Several figures reference development standards are referenced; these standards <u>of the underlying zoning</u> are set out and explained further as mandatory requirements in Chapter 7.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #30. Please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #31: Page 151: Amend the paragraph under “Demolition”:</p> <p>Demolition is permitted prior to future development as long as sites are left in a safe condition and free of debris. Demolition permits are may be submitted in advance of a building site being selected for development and any grading work is reviewed under the Grading Code (SMC Chapter 22.170). Demolition of any structure, including any structure that is more than 25 years old or historic, is allowed if authorized by the UW Board of Regents.</p>	<p>The University does not accept deletion of the first sentence as of the paragraph under “Demolition” on page 151 that is proposed by SDCI Condition #31. Please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p> <p>The University accepts deletion of the last sentence as proposed by SDCI Condition #31.</p>
<p>Condition #32: Page 153: Amend the first four sentences of the first paragraph under “History of Stewardship by the Board of Regents”:</p> <p>Over the last century, the University of Washington Board of Regents has been the steward of the University of Washington campus. The Regents recognize the value of the campus setting to the University, the greater University area community, the City of Seattle, the State of Washington, and future generations. <u>The University is As a state institution of higher education and a state agency. Pursuant to RCW 28B.20.130, the Regents “have full control and authority over the development of the campus of the university and its</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #32.</p>

<p>property of various kinds, except as otherwise provided by law.” The institution is encumbered with a public purpose that is essential to the future of the State, and this purpose requires that the campus continue to be developed to meet the growing and changing education needs of the State. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.103 and .200, “[s]tate agencies shall comply with the local . . . development regulations and amendments thereto adopted pursuant to this chapter,” but “[n]o local . . . development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities,” including “state education facilities.” The Washington Supreme Court has ruled that the University is a state agency and the Regents’ “full control” under RCW 28B.20.130 is limited by RCW 36.70A.103.</p>	
<p>Condition #33: Page 155: Amend the paragraph preceding “The Historic Resource Addendum (HRA)”:</p> <p>The review of historic resources on the campus utilizes the process stated above and does not include a review under the City of Seattle’s Landmark Preservation Ordinance. The University’s position is that it is not subject to the ordinance, as the University of Washington Board of Regents has full control and authority over all development on campus. [†]</p> <p>[†]Arguments related to this topic have been heard by the Washington Supreme Court. A decision is pending.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #33.</p>
<p>Condition #34: Page 230: Amend the first paragraph under “Introduction”:</p> <p>Consistent with SMC 23.69.006.B, ¶this chapter outlines the development standards of the underlying zoning that guide proposed development within the campus boundaries. The City University Agreement requires that all University of Washington development within the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) boundary follow the standards outlined in this chapter. While Chapter 6 includes design guidance to be used to achieve the design intent for the campus, this chapter includes the required development standards of the underlying zoning for campus development.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #34. Please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #35: Page 238: Delete all text in its entirety and replace it with this:</p> <p>Subject to a Major Institution Overlay (MIO), as shown on page 26, a variety of zoning designations make up the underlying zoning of the Campus. As of the date of this Master Plan, the development standards of the underlying zoning are found in the provisions of SMC Chapters 23.43 through 23.51B, SMC 23.54.016.B, and 23.54.030 relevant to those zones.</p> <p>This Chapter contains the development standards that supplant the development standards of the underlying zoning within the MIO boundary as allowed by SMC 23.69.006.B and the City-University Agreement. The development standards in this Chapter are tailored to the University and its local setting, and are intended to allow development flexibility and improve compatibility with surrounding uses.</p> <p>Development standards of the underlying zoning not addressed in the Master Plan may be developed in the future by the University, provided they are consistent with and guided by the goals and policies of the City-University Agreement, the goals and policies of this Master Plan, and the process for any amendments to the Plan required by the City-University Agreement. Lack of specificity in the Master Plan development standards shall not result in application of provisions of underlying zoning.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #35. Please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>

<p>University development remains subject to all other City development regulations that do not constitute development standards of the underlying zoning and do not preclude the siting of an essential public facility within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.200.</p>	
<p>Condition #36: Page 241: Amend the fifth paragraph under “Parking” to accurately reflect the bicycle parking requirement of SMC 23.54.015:</p> <p>All new development shall consider opportunities for bike parking facilities. Bicycle parking shall be provided equal to ten percent of the maximum students present at the peak hour plus five percent of maximum employees present at the peak hour.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #36.</p> <p>The University objects to insertion of a prescriptive bike parking standard in to the Plan. Bike parking is one of the development standards that the University has authority to identify. (CUA § II.A.1.d.)² For additional explanation of the University’s position on its authority to set development standards, please refer to pages 8 to 11 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief.</p> <p>In addition, the City-University Agreement requires the University to describe existing and proposed bike facilities on campus. (CUA §II.A.1.e.) The Plan complies with this requirement: new development “shall consider opportunities for bike parking facilities.” (See Plan at 241.) The Plan also provides information about the existing bike network, bike parking, and circulation improvements. (<i>Id.</i> at 58-59,114-115.) Further, providing adequate bike parking supply is an identified component of the University’s Transportation Management Plan (“<u>TMP</u>”). (See <i>id.</i> at 267.)</p> <p>Finally, the University has a history of providing more than an adequate supply of bike parking on campus, consistent with the Transportation Policies in the City-University Agreement, without ever having identified a prescriptive bike parking standard in the past. (See CUA § II.C.3.) The bike parking facilities available on campus have historically exceeded demand in all campus sectors, and bike parking utilization rates have never exceeded 70 percent of available supply. (See FEIS, Appendix D at 3-49 to 3-42.) The University has been a good steward of bike parking on campus, and will to continue to be one under the Plan. It is inappropriate and unnecessary for the City to recommend a different bike parking standard.</p>
<p>Condition #37: Page 244: Amend the second paragraph under “Shorelines” (including the addition of a footnote) to recognize that any amendment to the Shoreline Master Program must be made by the City Council and approved by the Washington State Department of Ecology:</p> <p>The Shoreline Management Act (SMA) regulates development, uses, and modifications of shorelines of the state in order to protect the ecological functions of shoreline areas, encourage water-dependent uses, provide for maximum public access, and preserve, enhance, and increase views of the water. The City of Seattle has adopted implementing regulations for the Shoreline Management Act for development and use of shorelines within the City limits. The City’s shoreline regulations, called its Shoreline Master Program (SMP), are <u>currently</u> found in SMC Chapter 23.60A. There are <u>currently</u> three shoreline environments within the MIO: the Conservancy Preservation environment, the Conservancy Management environment, and the Urban Commercial environment, as shown on pages 110 to 111. The University follows applicable SMP regulations for University development proposed within the shoreline. The applicable regulations are <u>will be those in effect on the date of adoption of this Master Plan if: (1) the City amends the SMP to so provide; and (2) the Washington State Department of Ecology approves that amendment¹³. If those conditions are not met, the applicable regulations will be those applied pursuant to City and Washington vested rights law. For existing</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #37.</p>

² The 2003 Campus Master Plan foregoes a specific bike parking standard even though SMC 23.54.016 contained a bike parking requirement for major institutions at the time the 2003 Campus Master Plan was approved by the City. See Ord. 118409 (Sec. 200).

<p>buildings within the shoreline environment, regular repair, maintenance and restoration is allowed, provided such activity is consistent with the SMP.</p> <p>¹³ As of the date the University submitted a final draft of this Master Plan to the City Department of Construction and Inspections, SMC 23.60A.016.D stated: “Nothing in this Chapter 23.60A changes the legal effect of existing approved Major Institution Master Plans adopted pursuant to Chapter 23.69 or Ordinance 121041.”</p>	
<p>Condition #38: Page 246: Amend the first sentence of the third paragraph under “Structure Height Limits”:</p> <p>All development within the Shoreline District, which is all development within 200 feet of the shoreline and associated wetlands, is restricted to a maximum building height of 30 feet specified in SMC Chapter 23.60A.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #38.</p>
<p>Condition #39: Page 254: Insert a sentence after “Definitions” and before “Development”:</p> <p><u>Where a conflict exists between the definitions in this Plan and those in SMC Chapter 23.84A or SMC Chapter 23.86, the definitions in this Plan shall apply.</u></p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #39.</p> <p>The University objects to the insertion of a reference to the City’s definitions chapter. The definitions applicable to the Plan are contained in it. (See Plan at 254.) None of the definitions in the City’s code are applicable. To the extent this Condition relates to the University’s authority to set development standards on campus, please refer to pages 8 to 11 of Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for further explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #40: Page 255: Amend the paragraph under “MIO” to accurately reflect legislative history:</p> <p>The Major Institutional Overlay (MIO) boundary defines the extent of the campus that is governed by the City-University Agreement, and the development standards defined within this CMP. The MIO boundary was established by Ordinance 112317 <u>and subsequently amended.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #40.</p>
<p>Condition #41: Page 104: clarify how waterfront trail relates to Shoreline Public Access Plan by revising the text in the last bullet point on the page to say:</p> <p>“The University has proposed a Shoreline Public Access Plan as part of the CMP that incorporates and supports the continuous waterfront trail. <u>The trail’s design will incorporate the Access Plan improvements shown on pages 108-111. Refer to those pages for more information about the Shoreline Public Access Plan.</u>”</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #41 with the minor modification noted below:</p> <p>“The University has proposed a Shoreline Public Access Plan as part of the CMP that incorporates and supports the continuous waterfront trail. The trail’s design will incorporate the Access Plan improvements <u>that relate to the trail</u> shown on pages 108-111. Refer to those pages for more information about the Shoreline Public Access Plan.”</p>
<p>Condition #42: Page 108: Delete the following paragraph, because commercial uses are not public access uses.</p> <p>Commercial water dependent uses, including moorage for private boats and boat rentals, may be included in the Urban Commercial shoreline in West Campus where their requirements do not conflict with the water-dependent uses of the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences or limit public access to the waterfront. Potential uses could include a passenger ferry dock. Uses which would require additional single purpose public parking shall be discouraged.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #42.</p>
<p>Condition #43: Delete the following statement on page 108, at the end of the South Campus discussion:</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #43.</p>

<p>The public dock in South Campus would be removed.</p>	
<p>Condition #44: Page 108: Clarify the approval process for the Shoreline Public Access Plan in the introduction:</p> <p><u>“This section provides the University’s Shoreline Access Plan. It is a combination of both existing and new elements. Please refer to pages 48 and 49 for information on existing shoreline access conditions. It shall be binding upon University development within the shoreline district when the City approves the Access Plan pursuant to SMC 23.60A.164.K. It is a combination of both existing and new elements. Any modifications to the Shoreline Access Plan will be evaluated against provisions of the City-University Agreement related to amendments to the CMP.”</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #44.</p>
<p>Condition #45: Page 109: Add a discussion of the continuous waterfront trail to the end of the existing text:</p> <p><u>Continuous Waterfront Trail Design and Implementation Plan</u></p> <p><u>All development proposed within the shoreline district will meet the permitting, use, and development standards of the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP).</u></p> <p><u>The continuous waterfront trail design and implementation plan will show the existing and proposed shoreline public access plan improvements documented on pages 108-111 that are part of the trail.</u></p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #45, but proposes to add the text to the discussion of the waterfront trail on page 240, which contains a broader discussion of the trail, rather than page 109 as the Condition requires.</p>
<p>Condition #46: Page 109: Add general standards after the recommended text regarding the continuous waterfront trail:</p> <p><u>General Standards</u></p> <p><u>The design and implementation plan will include accommodations for ADA parking at key access points.</u></p> <p><u>The design and implementation plan will incorporate new hand-carry boat launch access points and provide additional signage for all existing and proposed boat launch access points.</u></p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #46.</p> <p>All parking, including ADA parking, is managed and planned for improvements on a campus-wide basis. (See Plan at 241.) Further, the trail is not proposed to incorporate new hand-carry boat launch access points. Hand-carry boat launch facilities are already available in the West and South Campus Sectors, and although such facilities are a recognized means of shoreline access under the City’s Shoreline Master Program, there is no minimum requirement demanding these facilities. SMC 23.60A.164; (see also Plan at 110-11, noting the location of hand-carry boat access points.)</p>
<p>Condition #47: Prior to issuance of any demolition, excavation, shoring, or construction permit in West, South, or East Campus, provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #47.</p>
<p>Condition #48: Pages 234-237: Amend Tables 14 – 17 to list the year of construction for all existing buildings on identified development sites.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #48.</p>

<p>Condition #49: SDCI recommends that, if SDOT determines that new signals are warranted at these intersections while the Master Plan is in effect, the UW pay a proportional share of the cost of the new traffic signals, based on the percentage increase in traffic volumes through the intersections due to UW growth. The UW share of the University Way NE/NE 41st Street intersection will be 28.7%, and the UW share of the 6th Avenue NE/NE Northlake Way intersection will be 18.3%.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #49. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #50: The University contribute 14% of the costs of ITS improvements at the time of ITS implementation within the primary impact zone, and 7% of the costs of ITS improvements at the time of ITS implementation within the secondary impact zone.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #50. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #51: SDCI recommends that UW pay King County-Metro operating costs for three additional bus transit coaches in both the AM and PM peak hours to provide additional capacity on routes serving Campus Pkwy near Brooklyn Ave NE.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #51. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #52: SDCI recommends that UW fund SDOT capital improvements to facilitate transit performance within the primary and secondary impact zones as follows, at the time of implementation of the respective RapidRide project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11th Avenue NE/Roosevelt Avenue NE: 11% of the cost of the RapidRide project within the primary impact zone; 5.5% within the secondary impact zone. • NE 45th Street/15th Avenue NE/Pacific Avenue NE: 30% of the cost of the RapidRide project and other planned transit improvements, including bus only and BAT lanes, within the primary impact zone; 15% within the secondary impact zone. • Montlake Blvd NE: 25% of the cost of the RapidRide project and other planned transit improvements, including bus only lanes, within the primary impact zone; 12.5% within the secondary impact zone. 	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #52. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #53: SDCI recommends that the UW dedicate space at new developments adjacent to existing and future Link light rail stations and RapidRide stops to better accommodate higher volumes of transit riders, provide better connections between modes, accommodate shared mobility services, and provide transportation information related to travel and transfer options.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #53. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #54: SDCI recommends that the UW upgrade the campus gateway at 15th Ave NE/NE 43rd Street as adjacent sites redevelop to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and work with SDOT to identify opportunities to implement the U District Urban Design Framework streetscape concept plan connection between this campus entrance and the new U District light rail station.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #54. The property between the 15th Avenue NE / NE 43 Street intersection and the new U District light rail station is not owned by the University or within its MIO. Therefore, the University will accept SDCI Condition #54 with the following modified condition language:</p> <p>SDCI recommends that the UW upgrade the campus gateway at 15th Ave NE/NE 43rd Street as adjacent sites redevelop to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and work with SDOT to identify opportunities to implement the U District Urban Design Framework streetscape concept plan connection between this campus entrance and the new U District light rail station.</p>
<p>Condition #55: SDCI recommends that UW expand or pay SDOT for transit stop expansion at these locations as part of the NE 45th St/15th Ave NE/NE Pacific St RapidRide implementation.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #55. Please refer to pages 14 to 17 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>

<p>Condition #56: SDCI recommends that the UW complete separate pathways for bicyclists and pedestrians on the Burke-Gilman Trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE, and install adequate lighting following SDOT standards. This should be accomplished by the earlier of the first day of 2022 or when UW sites adjacent to the trail redevelop.</p>	<p>The University does not accept SDCI Condition #56 as the timeframe proposed is not practical. The segment of the Burke-Gillman Trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE runs through the proposed West Campus Belvedere.</p> <p>The University will accept timing of the improvement of this section of the trail along with construction of the Belvedere that is triggered by development of site W27. Therefore, the University will accept SDCI Condition #56 with the following alternative condition language:</p> <p>SDCI recommends that the UW complete separate pathways for bicyclists and pedestrians on the Burke-Gilman Trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE, and install adequate lighting following SDOT standards. This should be accomplished by the earlier of the first day of 2022 or when site W27 develops UW sites adjacent to the trail redevelop.</p>
<p>Condition #57: Additionally, SDCI recommends that the UW widen the trail and separate users along the trail east of Rainier Vista as opportunities permit.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #57.</p>
<p>Condition #58: SDCI recommends that both the previous trip caps and parking cap be maintained.</p>	<p>The University accepts SDCI Condition #58. The trip caps are required by Section II.A.3 of the City-University Agreement unless modified during the master planning process. Please refer to pages 14 of the Applicant’s Pre-Hearing Brief for additional explanation of the University’s position.</p>
<p>Condition #59: Amend page 261, as follows:</p> <p>In 2028, If the University has not failed to timely reached its SOV goal of 17% or 15% 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 and 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) SDCI shall withhold permits until the University has it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that 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.</p> <p>Condition #60: SDCI recommends that the University achieve a 17% SOV rate by January 1, 2022 (approximately one year after the scheduled opening of Link light rail to Northgate), and a 15% SOV rate by January 1, 2024 (approximately one year after the scheduled opening of Link light rail to Lynnwood). If UW fails to timely achieve either rate, UW shall enhance the TMP to increase the likelihood that the goal shall be achieved. Additional measures to be considered include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>SDCI Conditions #59-61 appear to duplicate but conflict with SDCI Condition #20. The University will accept the alternative condition language proposed for Condition #20 discussed above. The University will not accept SDCI Conditions #59-61.</p>

- Expanding the U-Pass to integrate payment for other transportation options, such as carshare 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.

Condition #61: If the UW fails to achieve the applicable SOV goal for two consecutive years, it is recommended that SDCI withhold construction permits for new development under the Campus Master Plan until the SOV goal is met.