



Minutes #4

(Adopted TBD)

Seattle Central College Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, August 7, 2019

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Seattle Central College

1625 Broadway Ave – Broadway Performance Hall Board Room

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Don Anderson

Ivy Fox

Tori Halligan (Alternate)

Dana Behar

Daniel James

Elliott Grace Harvey (Alternate)

Jamie Merriman-Cohen

Catherine Smith

Staff and Other Present:

Nelson Pesigan – DON

Stephen Starling – SSW Architects

Lincoln Ferris – SCC

Ron Fues - McKinstry

1. Welcome & Introductions

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

Mr. Nelson Pesigan introduced himself. He is the staff person for the DON Major Institutions & Schools program. He is filling in for Ms. Maureen Sheehan who is currently on maternity leave until November.

2. Housekeeping (27:06)

Ms. Fox mentioned that there were meeting notes from Mr. Michael Seiwert regarding his concerns about the formal plans for the use of Broadway Performance Hall (BPH) to be amended at the March 7, 2019 minutes. Mr. Seiwert also suggested having a more detailed meeting agenda including discussion of upcoming projects.

Mr. Don Anderson commented having the meeting minutes available to the Committee sooner rather than later.

A motion was made to adopt the March 7, 2019 minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

Mr. Pesigan commented that Mr. Ferris will present a Master Plan update and upcoming projects. Since the College will be undergoing a new Master Plan, the current Committee will be dissolving and form a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). He asked the current members if they want to continue to be involved in the Master Plan process to let him know.

3. MIMP & Upcoming Projects (07:06)

Ms. Ivy Fox introduced Mr. Lincoln Ferris to present the Master Plan and upcoming projects.

Mr. Ferris shared the updated transportation demand study done by Transpo. This demand is taking the current snapshot in terms of the usage of the campus parking, mode splits between part time versus full time students and looks at the effects of adding on-campus student housing, the addition of the Light Rail and the extension of the street car lines. The Transportation plan will be part of the new MIMP. He noted that in the meantime having a short term snapshot of what is currently available on campus will allow them to plan the on-campus student housing.

Mr. Starling commented that the existing parking garage usage is currently being assessed. There is also an analysis being done on the projected usage or changes in parking with the addition of a campus student housing and anticipation of student enrollment growth to better understand the working demand of the campus.

Mr. Ferris mentioned that the campus has a contract with other Major Institutions in the downtown area and First Hill with Enwave where steam is delivered from a steam plant at Pike Place Market. This drives most of the HVAC and heating to the college. Enwave is looking at replacing the capacity because it is an old and aging system. The college will have the capital expense if it continues buying steam from Enwave, the question is if it is a wise decision for the campus.

The college asked McKinstry to investigate where the campus is using the energy now and what for and opportunities for conservation if the campus decides to create an on-campus power plant that could be shared with other property owners and around the campus and achieve economies of scale, and to have it consolidated into one building where the college has more land. The college would still have to identify where to place this power plant.

The goal of these projects is to jumpstart the context of the new MIMP and have this baseline information and options for the college before presenting in front of the City and this Committee.

He noted that three new construction projects that will be executed in the next four years. Mr. Starling added that there is no current funding in place for these projects.

Student Housing Project:

The college looked at the option of keeping the existing structure and building student housing above the structure. In the long-run, it might be cost-effective to demolish and rebuild. The project would be five-stories above ground. The primary focus of the student housing is for SCC students, especially international students. It will have a variety of different units and an apartment style rather than dormitory.

Technology Center:

The college is in the process of exchanging land with Sound Transit and their 10,000 sq. ft. parcel that they have to the west of the entry that would be swapped for a two parcel half-block. The college signed off an agreement with Sound Transit, Capitol Hill Housing and noted that Sound Transit will not allow the exchange of the property until Capitol Hill Housing has secured its financing and vested permit to build.

Capitol Hill Housing is applying to the City and the Office of Housing for an affordable housing of 70-units for elderly LGBTQ people. The building will be five-story above ground, underground parking, and possibly a new power plant for the college on the North Plaza. This building will go up at the west entry way to the light rail station.

The college wants to create a new entry way and focus on the light rail as the main entry to the college. The college will have a new welcome center for students for enrollment services. The college will also be expanding classrooms and other faculty offices and study spaces that focus on Information Technology and Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.

The college anticipates these projects will be happening in the next 10-15 years. The college will be doing a planning process in the next two years with a target of a new institutional building for the technology center in 2022 or 2023 and student housing after that.

Bookstore:

The college identified a lack of student union facility in the campus for student government, activities and gathering spaces. The college is discussing, and it will be launching a feasibility study with the student government to look at a fee-funded use to build a dedicated building to student services and activities where the current bookstore is and linking the building to the Mitchell Activity Center.

Broadway Performance Hall:

Mr. Ferris mentioned that the college belongs to the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges comprised of 34 colleges. All the colleges submit and propose capital improvement projects. Through internal plans, the college determined that it is undersize in their library services and space. It is currently at a conceptual stage and the most logical plan is to remodel the building.

Mr. Starling provided a brief overview on how the college gets the state funding and application process. Based on the scoring and ranking threshold, the college decided to propose renovating the Broadway Performance Hall (BPH) for state funding. Any work to the hall will be probably 18-20 years out due to the number of projects ahead of the college.

Mr. Ferris commented that he may have misspoke at the last meeting about the target list of projects for the campus. He noted that in order to pay for student housing and instructional buildings, the college does not rely on state funding. This is why the college is looking at the older buildings that are not being used and expensive to maintain. The college is looking to right-size the campus.

South Annex/International Programs building:

Mr. Ferris commented that they have signed a purchase and sale agreement with Capitol Hill Housing and they will turn over the Youth Care building after their acquisition in early October and it will be a combination of dormitory style space for formerly homeless youth that are transitioning to stable employment, training, or school enrollment. The timeline for the building is unclear and depends on City and County levy funds being available to them.

Presbyterian Building:

Mr. Ferris noted that the college has been in preliminary talks with Seattle Presbyterian about two parcels of land west of the Science & Math building. The church operates the land as parking and the building is vacant. The college executed a letter of mutual interest to come up with a proposal on what to do with the property. The college is uncertain if it will hold on to the property for future potential expansion or workforce housing on the site. This will be part of the discussion of the new Master Plan when discussing changing the boundaries. There is a portion of that land that the college would want to include in the Master Plan.

(31:48)

Mr. Don Anderson commented about the source of funding and asked if the funds the college use are solely from the sale of campus properties. Mr. Ferris responded that the student housing project is self-funding. This is done when the college would lease the development rights over the property to a 501(c)(3) where the 501(c)(3) hires professional property managers and operates the student housing for a period long enough to pay off the bond, and at the end of the lease, it is turned over to the college to operate. The college does not own the physical improvement until the bond is paid off.

Mr. Anderson asked if it is limited to student housing only, and Mr. Ferris noted that the purpose of the 501(c)(3) is specific to the end use. If students from North Seattle or South Seattle College want to live at this location it would allow the college to take in students. The feasibility study focuses on SCC's enrollment, and there is a demand for about 615 beds. He also added that there will be a official charter that will be written to limit the purpose of the 501(c)(3).

Mr. Ferris mentioned that the proceeds from the other property sales will go towards the North Plaza improvements. The challenge for the campus are the improvement costs and the college is looking at other income streams that the college could commit to.

Mr. Anderson asked about the bookstore and activity center and Mr. Ferris responded that these will be self-supporting, and the students will be charged.

Mr. Starling added that there are areas that the state will not provide funding such as the construction of parking garages, creation of a student union, housing and enterprise services like the Egyptian Theater.

Mr. Anderson asked if the Seattle College system has done an onsite housing scenario and Mr. Ferris noted that the Seattle District has not done on-site housing. He mentioned that Green River, Bellevue, Shoreline, and Everett Colleges have on-site housing. Mr. Anderson asked if it is possible to have a partnership with the University of Washington to follow their model or assist with student housing. Mr. Ferris noted that the UW has a different legal authority than Seattle Central College where the UW can go to the bond market and borrow for student housing while SCC uses 501(c)(3).

Mr. Starling added that his impression is that UW's target audience from the amount of rent they could charge is different from the amount of rent the community colleges might charge.

A comment was made about the need for international students and are they demanding for affordable student housing rental rate or market rate. Mr. Ferris noted that the international students want an apartment and they are currently renting a dormitory which is not enough privacy. The college is looking at

a combination of both shared rooms, studios, and 1-bedroom. Most of the demand from the international students is a safe place to stay that is managed by a college or university affiliated housing.

Energy Sharing (EcoDistrict) Approach: (43:35)

Mr. Ron Fues of McKinstry made a brief presentation of the EcoDistrict approach.

He noted that for the college to sustain being green, having a central energy power plant that uses less energy makes financial sense for the college. He added that the college is looking for possible a building location for the power plant and proposing the Technology Center building as an ideal location. These buildings do not need heating or cooling at the same time, and the most effective use is energy sharing and energy exchange between buildings.

If all buildings are not connected to one another, thermal heating exchange will not be effective. Mr. Ferris commented that the college has reached out to Capitol Hill Housing, Mill Creek Building and other residents in the area to look at the model asking if they would want to pursue a shared energy district. The college is exploring this opportunity and having willing partners to pursue and share this investment. The college is actively involved in analyses that can sustain the college in the next 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Ferris estimated that the potential savings is about a quarter to a half million dollars a year. McKinstry is looking at the studies and other projects in Spokane and Eastern Washington University.

Mr. Ferris commented that the college is currently looking and exploring the design of buildings and how the design can accommodate the power plant.

4. Public Comment (58:37)

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

5. Committee Deliberation and Next Steps (1:39:40)

Ms. Fox opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Mr. Anderson commented about any negotiation update with Sound Transit regarding a window facing their station, and Mr. Ferris responded that Sound Transit is entering a no build easement. Sound Transit would like the college to build their wall to minimize any graffiti. He added that it cannot have windows due to the fire code unless the adjoining property owner agrees 10 ft. into their property. The college will build up to the property so there will be no gap.

Mr. Anderson asked if there will be a new entrance from the Sound Transit station to the new campus building. Mr. Ferris responded that there will not be a new entrance. Mr. Anderson noted that this is a good opportunity for the college to introduce and welcome the public to the campus. Mr. Starling added that this will be a conversation during the new Master Plan process about open and public space and access. This is one of the design elements the new CAC will comment on. There will be three new major buildings that will come together as public space and there will be pedestrian activities from all entry points to the building.

Mr. Anderson commented about an opportunity in rethinking and planning with SDOT on streetcar configurations and how it could be changed. He asked what the new CAC could do to advertise these brand-

new campus buildings. Mr. Ferris commented that the college is thinking about the kind of services it could provide and how it will fit. Mr. Starling noted that the new Master Plan will address how these spaces would interact with the public.

A comment was made if there will be parking at the Technology Center building, and Mr. Ferris responded that there is parking under the Science and Math building, and the plan is to extend the garage. If parking is added at the Technology building, parking spaces that will be taken away from the student housing complex. The plan is not to build more parking but move parking spaces around.

Mr. Pesigan commented that the CAC solicitation will begin in mid-August until the end of September. Mr. Ferris added that the college is committed to this new Master Plan process and it is important to get feedback from the committee as well as the community.

6. Adjournment and scheduling next meeting

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

DRAFT