

City of Issaquah
Urban Village Development Commission
NOTICE OF DECISION

Applicants: Bellevue College
3000 Landerholm Circle SE
Bellevue, WA 98007
Contact: Dan Dawson

Subject: Site Development Permit for Bellevue College

Number: SDP13-00004

Decision Date: February 4, 2014

Request: Application for approval of a site development permit on Parcel 4 of the WSDOT Expansion Area for an institutional campus consisting of 427,000 sq.ft. of primarily institutional and accessory-to-institutional uses. The project encompasses 19.36 acres and the development will comprise six buildings and associated parking (under building, garage, and surface parking) as well as landscape, trails, pavilion, and plazas.

Decision: The Urban Village Development Commission (UVDC) reviewed the proposed Site Development Permit application during Public Meeting conducted on January 22, 2014, and a Public Hearing February 4, 2014. After reviewing the application, reviewing the staff report and supporting documents, and listening to presentations by the applicant and staff, the Commission approved the application with Conditions. Approval of this application is based on the attached Findings of Fact, Conclusions and is subject to the Conditions contained herein.



Geoff Walker, Chair
Urban Village Development Commission

2/13/14

Date

NOTES

1. If any of the Conditions or portion thereof is declared invalid or unenforceable, the application must be remanded to the Responsible Official for reconsideration and evaluation for consistency and appropriateness of the remaining Conditions.
2. Appeals may be filed within 14 days of the issuance of this Notice of Decision by the applicant, the City Responsible Official, property owners within three hundred feet of the proposed action, or other persons claiming to be directly harmed by the proposed action as permitted by Appendix L of the Grand Ridge (Issaquah Highlands) Annexation and Development Agreement, June 16, 1996. Appeals shall meet the Criteria identified in Section 8 of Appendix L and follow the process identified in that Section.
3. Any major change (as determined by the Responsible Official) to the approved site plan or accompanying drawings must be reviewed and approved by the Urban Village Development Commission. Less substantial changes may be approved administratively by the Responsible Official.
4. Building, utility, and sign permits will not be approved unless all applicable Conditions of this Notice of Decision are satisfied to the satisfaction of the Responsible Official.
5. This action does not indicate nor imply that any development activities may occur without the required permits being issued.
6. This SDP approval shall be in effect for the duration of the Term of the Development Agreement per Appendix G, Section 5.3.3 and Section 12 of the Main Body of the Development Agreement.

This Notice of Decision has been executed this 5th day of February, 2014 by the Chairman of the UVDC on the behalf of and per the direction of the UVDC.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Appendix G (Processing) of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement, the UVDC held a Public Meeting on January 22, 2014, and a Public Hearing February 4, 2014, to consider a Site Development Permit for an institutional use called "Bellevue College." The proposal is for the development of six buildings and associated parking (under building, garage, and surface parking) as well as landscape, trails, pavilion, and plazas; and,

WHEREAS, all persons desiring to comment on the proposal were given a full and complete opportunity to be heard at a public hearing; and,

WHEREAS, the UVDC originally received the application on January 22, 2014, and has had adequate time to review and reflect upon the application; and,

WHEREAS, the UVDC is now satisfied that this application has been sufficiently considered, and hereby makes and enters the following:

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Bellevue College submitted a Site Development Permit application on August 6, 2013 for the development of an institutional campus consisting of 427,000 sq.ft. of primarily institutional and accessory-to-institutional uses. The project encompasses 19.36 acres and the development will comprise six buildings and associated parking (under building, garage, and surface parking) as well as landscape, trails, pavilion, and plazas. Revised drawing sets were submitted on December 4, 2013.
2. The site, called Parcel 4 of the WSDOT TDR Urban Village, is located south of College Drive NE and west of the BPA utility corridor.
3. The property is located in WSDOT TDR area, which is governed by a Development Agreement.
4. The site is undeveloped and forested. No occupied structures currently exist on site.
5. Vehicular, bike, and pedestrian access to the site is from existing roads and a trail: College Drive and/or Park Drive, and the King Country trail to the south which provides additional pedestrian and bike access.
6. Per Appendix G (Processing), Section 2.0.3 of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement, the Commission makes decisions on Site Development Permit applications within the WSDOT TDR area for conformance with the policies, goals, and objective contained in the City of Issaquah Comprehensive Plan and the goals, guidelines and commitments of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement.
7. As called for by Appendix G, Section 2.1.2 of the Development Agreement (Complete Application Decision), the application was determined by staff to be sufficient for review on September 7, 2013. Staff has determined the application contains adequate information and detail to review as a Site Development Permit.
8. Staff has thoroughly reviewed the application and presented their findings verbally and in a Staff Report. The Staff Report thoroughly reviews the application in relation to the applicable

approval requirements. The report contains a recommendation of approval, subject to a total of 29 conditions. In addition, the Staff Report contains numerous exhibits which relate to the review of the project. Staff has issued a Briefing Response Memo on January 29, 2014 in response to issues raised at the January 22, 2014 Public Meeting. The Briefing Response Memo added two new conditions and revised three other conditions. The UVDC finds these documents, including its attachments, to be a thorough and complete review of the application and hereby incorporates it by reference as a finding in its entirety.

9. The UVDC has had the opportunity to thoroughly review the application. An initial briefing was provided on January 22, 2014 at a Public Meeting. The Public Hearing was continued on the evening of February 4, 2014. Together they form the public process for the permit.
10. Beyond the information provided in the application, the Staff Report and its attachments, information was provided by staff and the applicant to the UVDC during the course of the public process to enable it to have a complete and thorough understanding of the project. This includes: a slide presentation by staff of the site; a discussion between the staff and UVDC of each non-standard condition proposed in the Staff Report; and a presentation by the applicant explaining the project and its compliance with the Development Agreement.
11. One individual provided a comment letter via email and there were two individuals that provided comments at the public hearing. This correspondence and comments made at both the Public Meeting and Public Hearing contained concerns and/or questions related to: traffic; the end of a sewer line to serve this project that lies within a Critical Area boundary; the use of green roofs that are perhaps not worth the risk; access to I-90; the steepness of the hill for bicycle riders interested in coming through the south or west to the site via the trail; issue of relocating the mountain bike skills course that might jeopardize the health of the adjacent forest or the likelihood the skills course would be built; more than just the BPA or Parks Department should have a say regarding whether the Mountain Bike Skills Course can be moved; and having a pedestrian trail in the forested area would create an opportunity for users to not have to dodge bicycles and, use of informational signs to learn more about the forest.
12. The Commission discussed the proposal at the January 22 Public Meeting. Many of their concerns and questions are summarized in the Briefing Response Memo. The Commission also discussed the proposal at the February 4th Public Hearing and the following considerations and/concerns include: consideration for shared facilities, both parking and recreational, with Bellevue College; reservations regarding traffic and vehicular circulation and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods, especially while the campus is under construction; steps should be taken to communicate construction work times to neighbors; the effects of too little parking at the College on adjacent neighborhoods and Central Park; concerns regarding changes to the submittal that may occur with construction permits, the extent to which changes will be considered minor (thus without further review by the Commission), and whether clearing of the forested areas shown to be left intact might occur. Further detail regarding the UVDC's discussion at both the Public Meeting and Public Hearing can be found in the meeting minutes.
13. Notice of the Public Hearing and Public Meeting was provided consistent with the requirements of Appendix G of the Development Agreement. This is further detailed in the Staff Report.

14. Included in the Staff Report is a review of how the proposal conforms to the City of Issaquah Comprehensive Plan. The UVDC finds that the proposal conforms to the Comprehensive Plan...This proposal will help advance the vision for the City as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan.
15. Section 1.1 of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement, establishes an "Entitlement" in the WSDOT TDR area of 410 Equivalent Residential Units (ERU's) or 150 ERU's with the balance (up to 310 ERU's converted to Institutional Use at a rate of 1,200 square feet per unit) being 372,000 square feet of Institutional Use. The SDP proposes a total of 372,000 sq. ft. of institutional use and 55,000 square feet of uses accessory to the institutional use. The institutional use, also referred to as the principle use, falls within the range of Allowable Development contained within the Development Agreement. In addition, square footage allocated to accessory uses in excess of the entitlement requires additional evaluation of infrastructure to support the accessory uses. Appendix E (Land Uses, Clearing and Grading) also establishes the land uses and densities for the development of this site. The accessory uses proposed in this SDP shall be consistent with the allowed uses as required by the Development Agreement (DA). The City is a party to the sale of the property and acts as the Master Developer. The Purchase and Sale Agreement for the subject property indicates that accessory uses can be in excess of the 372,000 sq.ft. if certain analysis is performed. The CC&Rs (Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions) clearly state that accessory uses are in addition to the 372,000 sq.ft., not included within it and, there are elements which will constrain accessory uses, including trips, utilities, and uses. Thus the Applicant may not build unlimited accessory uses.
16. Section 7.0, "SEPA," of the Main Body in the Development Agreement governs SEPA compliance for implementing approvals such as the SDP. The proposal, as an Implementing Approval of the Development Agreement, is within the "Project Envelope" that was previously evaluated. As specified in the DA, the existing Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance shall be utilized and no further State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist or threshold determination is required when an application for an Implementing Approval is within the Project Envelope.
17. No critical areas are located on-site but wetlands, NF23 and NF20, are adjacent to the subject property. The buffers for these wetlands are located outside the subject property, but this will be evaluated in the future with permits for construction. Should clearing or grading activities uncover an unmapped critical area, the applicant is to cease all construction activity and reconcile any issued permits with the Critical Area through the provisions listed in Appendix H (Critical Area Regulations) of the Development Agreement.
18. Appendix A of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement provides a guiding principle plus planning goals and objectives that influence new development as well as design guidelines that reflect the vision of the WSDOT TDR area. The goals and objectives in Appendix A establishes community expectations for this area, while the urban design guidelines (UDG) serve the overall purpose of creating a framework to ensure the buildings, landscape, circulation system, social gather places, and open spaces relate to one another in a way that implements the vision.

In general the application meets the seven project goals and their multiple objectives in Appendix A, or can be condition to do so. Likewise, the proposal complies with the design

guidelines, or can be conditioned to do so. The Guiding Principle, goals, and guidelines will be further implemented through permits for construction.

19. The original maximum building height for institutional uses was 50 feet or 4 stories, but an Administrative Modification (AMM12-00008, dated September 6, 2012) was approved increasing building heights up to 75 feet, as specifically allowed in the DA.
20. The proposed buildings conceptually meet the building height (per the abovementioned AMM), parking, landscaping, and setback requirements listed in the Development Agreement. Compliance with this requirement will be confirmed with permits for construction.
21. The development standards for private and public streets as set forth in Appendix B of the Development Agreement were used to evaluate the proposal.
22. Transportation mitigation for the entire WSDOT TDR area was thoroughly addressed by the Development Agreement. The traffic generated by this proposal falls within the scope of traffic anticipated by the Development Agreement and evaluated by the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) SEP10-001WS.
23. The existing street network provides for an interconnected system of sidewalks along all streets and the SDP proposes to complete the street, bicycle, and sidewalk network through additional construction. The SDP also provides for multi-purpose trail connections to the King County Trails on the eastern and western boundaries of the campus, and conditioned on the southern edge. They complete the pedestrian and bicycle connectivity on all sides of the campus.
24. The application was routed to various departments within the City as well as various support agencies such as Eastside Fire and Rescue. All comments were incorporated into the proposal or the below-listed conditions.
25. Traffic safety and operation impacts have been considered through review of the application and the incorporated conditions will adequately ensure these issues are addressed.
26. Any conclusion listed below which could be considered a finding is hereby incorporated as a finding.
27. The Commission evaluated all comments related to this application prior to rendering its decision.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Having rendered the above-cited Findings, the UVDC draws the following Conclusions:

1. This proposal was reviewed in accordance with Appendix G of the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement. The UVDC is responsible for reviewing and making the decision for Site Development Permit applications for parcels over three acres in size.
2. The proposal complies with the WSDOT TDR Development Agreement, or can be conditioned to do so.
3. The application contains adequate information for the UVDC to render this decision.
4. The information provided during the public review process by the staff and the applicant has further assisted the UVDC to fully comprehend the proposal.
5. The public has been given ample opportunity for comment on the proposal.

6. The proposed action complies with the City of Issaquah Comprehensive Plan.
7. The conceptual storm water plan is consistent with the Development Agreement.
8. This proposal has undergone SEPA review through past environmental review processes and was within the "Project Envelope" established by the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS)(SEP10-001WS).
9. Through application of conditions of approval, traffic and non-vehicular safety issues related to the proposal will be adequately mitigated.
10. Any finding above which could be considered a conclusion is hereby incorporated as a conclusion.

III. MOTION

I move that the Urban Village Development Commission approves the Bellevue College Site Development Permit, File# SDP13-00004 as described and evaluated in the Staff Report dated January 15, 2014, its Attachments A-F, the drawings dated August 6 and December 4, 2013, Staff's Briefing Response Memo dated January 29, 2014, and subject to the terms, conditions, and rationale contained in the Staff Report, and from the Staff Memo, Revised Conditions #6, 7, 15, New Conditions #29, and New Condition #28 as amended by the Commission this evening:

REVISION TO NEW CONDITION #28: The proposed trail between the amphitheater/Lower Loop Road and the King County trail shall be designed as a multipurpose trail, with a minimum 12 ft width. The design of the trail shall incorporate elements to improve the safety for all types of users, especially where grades are steep (above 8%) and switchbacks are used, including separate bicycle and pedestrian sections, signage, pavement striping, or other means. This trail should be provided with Phase 1 but not later than the last Certificate of Occupancy in Phase 2. This timing can be adjusted if phasing is modified from what is shown in the application, recognizing that the trail is essential for non-motorized connections to the campus.

And, I move that the Urban Village Development Commission direct the Development Services Department to prepare a Notice of Decision for review and approval by the UVDC Chairman, affirming the UVDC's decision to approve the Site Development Permit application for Bellevue College, File No. SDP13-00004, subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report as well as those modified and added in the Staff's Briefing Response Memo, and as added this evening.

IV. CONDITIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions outlined above, the Urban Village Development Commission approves the Site Development Permit application for Bellevue College, file number SDP13-00004, as described in the Staff Report dated January 15, 2014, its Attachments A through F, the Briefing Response Memo dated January 29, 2014, and subject to the following Conditions:

1. In the event the project is phased, the Designated Official has the right to apply additional conditions with Building or Utility Permits to ensure each phase complies with the Development Agreement and other applicable codes, such as but not limited to access, fire circulation, parking, waste collection, and landscaping requirements including site

- stabilization. A later phase may rely on facilities included in earlier phases which have capacity, as long as the development resulting from the combination of phases still complies with the Development Agreement and other applicable codes. Interim landscape shall discourage invasive plants from sprouting and establishing. Routine maintenance of these areas will look for and remove invasive plants.
2. Prior to the submittal of any permit for construction (e.g. with the project feasibility/pre-application meeting required by Condition #5), the Applicant shall provide the City with a plan that includes all dry and wet utility vaults, cabinets, switchgear, pull boxes, meters, equipment, and appurtenances. The purpose of the plan will be to confirm that the location of this equipment and appurtenances is consistent with the approved SDP, pedestrian orientation, and the sociable public realm. Anything not shown on the preliminary submittal (location, relative height, presence at the surface or above ground) is assumed to be located within the structure. Any revisions or additions to what the preliminary submittal has shown and approved outside of the structure requires a modification, except fire hydrants.
 3. Unless expressly identified, approval of this SDP application does not modify any City or WSDOT TDR Development Agreement standards which are in conflict with elements of the SDP plan or application. Modification of the standards or guidelines requires an explicit approval in the Notice of Decision for this application or a separate Modification as allowed under Appendix G of the Development Agreement.
 4. Any inconsistencies, conflicts, or incomplete information, other than those addressed directly by this Decision shall be resolved by the Designated Official, utilizing the Staff Report, and in consultation with the Applicant, at the time of the future application (e.g. Building, Utility, Sign permits).
 5. Additional review and discussion of each phase is required prior to official Site Work, Landscape, or Building permit submittals, e.g. using the project feasibility/pre-application meetings. The purpose is to review submittals at a more detailed level prior to permit submittal. The application and the Staff Report provide a conceptual level of design, unless modified by the Notice of Decision for this application or as identified in this Staff Report and its Attachments. The Applicant must schedule these preliminary meetings with sufficient time to allow necessary review or the construction permits submittal may be deemed incomplete, until such time as the preliminary review has occurred, and issues, conflicts, code or SDP conditions are resolved.
 6. The Applicant may build up to 372,000 sq.ft. of institutional uses. In addition, the campus may choose to include additional square footage for accessory uses, consistent with the provisions and uses listed in the Development Agreement, with additional evaluation of infrastructure (including roads) to support the accessory uses per the Purchase and Sale Agreement and CC&Rs.
 7. Design the campus side of College Drive as a pedestrian oriented, welcoming face to the street and Issaquah Highlands. This includes minimizing the setback of the buildings, reducing the grade separation between the sidewalk and the first occupied floor, structure any setback provided to make it less of a buffer, design the buildings to be open towards the street through modulation, the provision of openings, and selection of materials, etc....

8. All development within the Property is required to pursue sustainable development strategies (such as those included in the LEED certification program) and energy efficient design. If LEED certification is not pursued, the applicant shall provide the City with a report documenting how the development of each phase enhanced the sustainability of the community. This report shall be submitted prior to each phase's first (Temporary) Certificate of Occupancy.
9. Provide a southern pedestrian connection to the King Country trail. Preferably this will be from the north/south spine but as a secondary option, a connection on the east side of Building 3B will be considered if it is pedestrian oriented and provides grade separation from vehicular routes such as the under-building garage entry.
10. The modified cross section of College Drive, specifically the center median that is shown on the plans, is not approved with this application. Prior to approval of any Site Work Permits that would modify the cross section of College Drive, the Applicant must provide an engineering analysis (that is stamped by a Professional Engineer) that demonstrates the traffic and level of service assumptions included in the project EIS are still valid and can be accommodated with the modified section. This includes the impacts of a right-turn-only exit from the Lower Loop Road, and the level of service assumptions and queuing analysis for both on-site and off-site roadways.
11. The intersection of the Lower Loop Road and College Drive may be configured as a driveway entrance with a curb ramp that provides the vertical grade transition from College Drive to the Lower Loop Road. As an alternative (and as shown on the plans) the intersection may be configured as a roadway intersection. In this case the vertical transition must meet ASHTO and City Road Standards which might necessitate the reconstruction of a significant portion of College Drive in order to meet transition requirements.
12. The Applicant must obtain the written approval of the BPA and the City for use of the BPA easement area and relocation of the mountain bike skills course in the configuration shown or other acceptable arrangement. Off-site parking and a vehicular connection to Central Park are not required to allow this proposal to proceed.
13. The Applicant must provide the bus loop on Bellevue College property or obtain the permission of adjacent property owners. The bus loop shall be designed to facilitate bus service and minimize impacts on the pedestrian and building environment, such as locating it completely to the area north of Building 2A.
14. The applicant shall include on the face of each building permit, the number of PM peak hour trips from that application. If the total number of PM peak hour trips from all approved uses and buildings exceeds 907 the applicant shall prepare and obtain approval of a Transportation Management Plan that limits the traffic from all previous uses to 907 PM peak hour trips.
15. The amount of required parking that is provided will be determined with each new Building Permit (based upon building square footage) in order to ensure that the amount of parking is consistent with the demand. However, parking beyond the maximum allowed by code with a Phase may be constructed if the excess parking in excess of the code allowed maximum for that phase is provided in a parking structure (garage or under buildings), except that at no time may the total constructed parking exceed the maximum allowed at total Buildout.

Potential parking within the BPA, though off-site, will be included in any calculation of maximum allowed parking for any phase or total buildout, if and when it is allowed.

16. Prior to the submittal of the construction permits for each phase, the Applicant will prepare a parking/traffic study to confirm that the placement of garage entrances/exits will not result in impacts to public rights-of-way or general functionality of the facilities.
17. All required parking for the project must be provided on the Property unless an agreement is obtained from BPA and/or the owner of said property to construct surface parking stalls off-site.
18. Adopted standard stall dimensions shall be the maximum; adopted compact stall dimensions shall be the minimum. Stalls smaller than standard stall dimensions, in one or both directions, shall be considered compact stalls. Compact stalls are not required, but if proposed are not allowed on a fire lane unless they are standard stall length.
19. In the surface parking lots: Drives and drive aisles, where cars will not be backing out, will be only 20 ft wide; where all standard/ADA or a combination of standard/ADA and compact stalls are located, drive aisles will be 24 ft wide and no wider; where only compact stalls are located on a drive aisle, it may be reduced to 22 ft, though for design simplicity the drive aisle may be 24 ft wide, but no wider. In structured parking (under buildings or garages), to facilitate construction, drive aisles may be slightly wider, up to 26 ft.
20. Consider providing parking spaces for motorcycles, super sub-compacts, electrical vehicles, etc.... If provided, these spaces shall be specifically designated.
21. The number, type, and location of ADA compliant parking spaces is not approved by this permit and shall be reviewed by the Building Official during the Building Permit review. The applicant should meet with the Building Official prior to the submittal of any construction permits (as part of the pre-submittal review) to confirm the number and distribution of ADA parking stalls.
22. The number of required bike parking spaces will be modified based on the final parking count, for each phase. A portion of the bike racks shall be distributed near the various activities generating the bike parking demand and some should be in covered locations. The bike racks should be positioned to not block sidewalk, walkways, entrances, etc... as well as to function when full of bicycles; the racks should likewise be accessible when adjacent activities, such as parking are occurring.
23. With each phase of development and prior to submitting permits for construction (e.g. with the project feasibility/pre-application meeting required by Condition #5), the Applicant shall provide a study acceptable to the Designated Official and based on objective campus needs, to demonstrate that loading will function as necessary to serve the uses to be proposed in that Phase. This would include the loading locations, quantity (i.e. loading stalls adequately meet the demand), and size of vehicle (e.g. Type A, eighteen wheeler). The loading docks shall be sited to minimize their impact on pedestrian areas and to ensure functionality.
24. Edge parking lot landscaping shall be provided in order to screen parking lots from adjacent pedestrian facilities, buildings, roads, etc. The screening shall be continuous and at least 40" in height. Alternatively, screening may be either living (planted) or a wall, but must achieve a minimum of 75% opacity at initial construction/planting. This standard shall also apply to rooftop parking decks if they are used.

25. Fill may not exceed 12 feet from the normalized pre-development grade. The applicant may apply for an Administrative Modification of Standards (AMM) with construction permits, to address exceeding this standard in limited locations, if necessary once the designed is refined.
26. Prior to the approval of the first Utility Permit that would enable the construction of impervious surfaces, the applicant must submit and receive approval for a Master Drainage Plan that details the stormwater conveyance, treatment and outfall facilities, and describes how they are in compliance with the Development Agreement, the SEPA analysis, and City codes and standards.
27. A lighting plan shall be proposed which maintains lighting at the minimum necessary for safety and function, and balances the goal of minimizing night glow and off-site lamp visibility with pedestrian scale lighting and the urban design potential of lighting and light fixtures. Cut off fixtures shall be used and lighting shall be located in areas where drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians are likely to be. The lighting plan shall comprehensively address building, street, drives, open space, parking lot, trails, and landscape lighting so that lighting impacts are not compounded in portions of the site by overlapping illumination patterns. To facilitate review of the lighting, a photometric calculation, stamped by a professional engineer, showing illumination levels on the pavement shall be submitted with each permit for construction of lighting. A point-by-point calculation is required. The illumination calculation shall include all fixtures that contribute light to the site (poles, bollards, building mounted lighting). Low wattage decorative fixtures such as sconces can be excluded from the calculation. No up-lighting is allowed. All exterior lighting is subject to the specific approval of the Designated Official. Other than building mounted lighting, no lights shall be taller than 15 ft., unless otherwise approved by the Designated Official.

The structured parking garage shall be designed to:

- ensure no light direct spill from fixtures or vehicles
- minimize reflective light and exterior glare spilling from the parking deck
- eliminate or significantly reduce visibility of pin point light sources. This may include limiting openings, screening openings with architectural and/or landscape elements, fixture selection (e.g. cut off, lenses), fixture location, turning off fixtures late at night/early in the morning, etc....

The parking garage rooftop's surface parking shall have no direct light spill and will minimize reflective light to adjacent roadways and off-site views. The design of the parking deck will prevent headlights from shining out of the structure. Rooftop lights will be full cut off fixtures and limited to 15 ft in height.

28. The proposed trail between the amphitheater/lower loop road and the King County trail shall be designed as a multipurpose trail, with a minimum 12 ft width. The design of the trail shall incorporate elements to improve the safety for all types of users, especially where grades are steep (above 8%) and switchbacks are used, including separate bicycle and pedestrian sections, signage, pavement striping, or other means. This trail should be provided with Phase 1 but not later than the last Certificate of Occupancy in Phase 2. This timing can be adjusted if phasing is modified from what is shown in the application, recognizing that the trail is essential for non-motorized connections to the campus.

29. The trail connecting the eastern side of the campus to the King County Trail shall be provided as multi-purpose trail, whether or not the Central Park Spur Road is built. This trail should be provided with Phase 1 but not later than the last Certificate of Occupancy in Phase 2. This timing can be adjusted if phasing is modified from what is shown in the application, recognizing that the trail is important for non-motorized connections to the campus.

Attachments: none

cc. Parties of Record

Dave Favour, Lucy Sloman, Dan Ervin