



Minutes #2

(Adopted March 7, 2019)

Seattle Central College Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Thursday, November 1, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Seattle Central College

1716 Harvard Ave Entrance

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Ivy Fox

Akinlana Sterling

Daniel James

Janice Wong

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan – DON

David Ernevad – Seattle Central College

1. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Ivy Fox opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the August 8, 2017 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Review Annual Report

Ms. Fox opened the discussion to review the annual report.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that all 13 Major Institutions that has a Master Plan is required by the Land Use Code to complete an annual report that is reviewed by the City of Seattle and this Committee in an annual basis. The annual report is a retrospective document that the institution has taken or accomplished in the last 12 months. The annual report comprises of four sections including: a) the conditions set by the Seattle City Council on the Master Plan, b) Transportation Management strategies, c) current developments under the Master Plan, d) any activities outside the MIO (Major Institutions Overlay) within 2,500 ft. including any leasing and construction activities.

Mr. David Ernevad, Director of Capital Projects and Environmental Safety for Seattle Central College mentioned that the College continues to work on a project that does energy reduction. The college has a 72-kilowatt solar array panel that has a 7,000 sq. ft. footprint panel in the roof. The college has done new heat pumps and upgraded equipment that is going to save the college 600,000 lbs of coal a year. There are also new LED lighting lamps around campus that provides a higher quality levels of light.

He mentioned that there was a big flood last October and did some damage to the building campus. The college is reorienting interior renovations based on the City of Seattle and its ability to get permitting in time

from SDCI and the cost of construction. The college struggles to keep up on the funding and was unable to complete a huge library renovation that was planned instead the college decided to move on improving the restrooms in the buildings.

Minor Amendment Request

The college filed for a minor amendment to the Master Plan. The amendment is to reduce the parking requirement for the college in the Master Plan. The MIMP was approved in 2002, and the parking requirements for the college was very high. The City has done several studies and the college has done a parking demand analysis, and it is the opinion that because of location and hub the college is located including light rail, surface rail, and bus lines in the area that there were several parking vacancies within the parking garage.

The college filed for a minor amendment and was not sure to move forward with it since the college is also facing a potential need to create a new Master Plan. The life span of a Master Plan is 10 years, and the college is coming at 16-20 years and it maybe best to move forward and have a new Master Plan.

Ms. Sheehan commented that this Committee has a role in the recommending a minor amendment. If the college does move forward with a minor amendment, this Committee would review the minor amendment in a meeting and will come back to decide whether to recommend, not recommend or recommend with conditions to the minor amendment. The Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to SDCI who will make the final decision.

If the College decides to go through a new Master Plan, this Committee would dissolve, and it would become a different committee with a different time commitment as far as meetings. She noted that she will keep the Committee up to date on what the College decided to choose.

Mr. Ernevad commented that it would cost the College about \$2-3 million dollars to proceed with a new Master Plan. The cost includes lawyer fees, an extensive staff including architectural consultants, design and transportation professionals to study the feasibility of having a new Master Plan. He mentioned that he spoke with Ms. Carly Guillory of SDCI who is responsible for approving or rejecting the minor amendment request.

Mr. Ernevad consulted with SDCI about moving forward with a minor amendment or having a new Master Plan, and SDCI suggested this Committee review the document and make a recommendation. Mr. Ernevad noted that they entered a contract to begin the MIMP submission, and the college is in the process of gathering information and he hopes for board approval January 2019. He will submit a notice of intent to the City in the first quarter of 2019 to proceed with the MIMP rewrite.

Ms. Sheehan will send a document package over email to the Committee to review and schedule the next meeting to discuss and make a recommendation. She added to forward her any questions or clarifications they may have after reviewing the package.

Mr. Ernevad mentioned that he is including the parking demand study that was completed on behalf of the college in response to the correction letter from SDCI who prior to approving the minor amendment requests want to have a parking demand studies completed.

Mr. Ernevad discussed considerations for modifying the MIMP boundary to eliminate buildings at the corner of Pine and Broadway that would likely go to Capitol Hill Housing. There was some thought about building affordable student housing and it is currently exploring if student housing can be built on top of a parking garage. Preliminary studies indicate that the housing could accommodate 450 beds.

The College's SOV rate is at 34% and the goal is 50%, well below the target. He added that Mr. Jeff Keever, transportation management coordinator, plays an important role in making sure that the college is meeting the SOV goals through different transportation programs. Ms. Sheehan mentioned about the CTR (Commute Trip Reduction) program survey that every Major Institution does and goes out every other year to gather feedback from all employees and staff on how they get to and from their work and shares it with the state. Each institution has a goal that they should be meeting.

Mr. Ernevad noted that the Colleges are using incentives to gather more participation to complete the survey and Mr. Keever is responsible in developing the different programs that were summarized in the transportation management plan section of the annual report.

He highlighted the energy projects completed around the campus including internal system infrastructure upgrades as well as the canopy at the Fine Arts are going to be completed.

A comment was made if there was an arts district overlay designation around the campus area, and Ms. Sheehan noted that she will get back on the definition of an arts district and any implications.

Mr. Ernevad noted that there will be landmark designations for some of the campus buildings. He added that the college approved a \$26 million renovation of the Broadway Performance Hall which includes a library expansion and a two-story skybridge coming from the hall to the Broadway Edison Building. Mr. Ernevad mentioned that the skybridge is going on a private property and not in a public right of way.

Mr. Ernevad concluded that there were no changes within the 2,500 ft. of the MIO.

4. Public Comments

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

5. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Fox opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

She commented that the next steps will include reviewing the proposed minor amendment plan and inviting Mr. Keever at the next meeting to present his perspective on the transportation management.

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will schedule the next meeting after the holidays and she will reach out in January to schedule the next meeting. She added that she will send the documents electronically and she will provide any updates about the minor amendment and a new Master Plan. She reminded the committee that any discussion or decision should be happening at this meeting because it is an open public meeting.

Mr. Ernevad asked if there is a criterion on what a minor versus a major amendment is and the process on how to make any recommendations, and Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will provide the information the Committee.

Mr. Ernevad added he does not see any challenges regarding the proposed minor amendment of reducing the parking requirements. He added that it makes sense since there have been significant studies about the reduction in demand due the availability of other modes of transportation. He also mentioned that the goal of the College is to reduce the car flow that is coming to and from the college as well as congestion and the carbon footprint.

6. Adjournment and scheduling next meeting

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