



MEMBERS

Tim Albertson
Michael Cuadra
Marilyn Firlotte
Martin Grassley
Colleen Horn
Liz Kearns
Zachary Myles Pena
Conrado Moran
Lee Bruch (Alternate)
Melanie Davies (Alternate)

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods

Andrea Johnson,
North Seattle College, Administrative
Services

**North Seattle College
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

**Meeting Minutes
Meeting #4
November 20, 2017
Adopted October 25, 2018**

College Center – Room CC1161
North Seattle College
9600 College Way N
Seattle, WA 98103

Members and Alternates Present

Tim Albertson	Liz Kearns	Lee Bruch (alternate)
Michael Cuadra	Zachary Miles Pena	Melanie Davies (alternate)
Marilyn Firlotte	Conrado Moran	Martin Grassley

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	DON
Andrea Johnson	North Seattle College
Jeff Caulk	North Seattle College

I. Opening and Introductions

Mr. Martin Grassley opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

There was a motion to approve and adopt the November 15, 2016 minutes, and it was seconded. The committee voted and the motion was adopted.

III. Review Annual Report

She noted that they met all the Master Plan conditions except for the two buildings that were identified for future build out due to lack of funding.

They continue to work on the TMP goals and have gone back and collected information from students and faculty. The campus continues to collect data and keep records and monitor transit passes, carpool permits, etc. The bi-annual CTR survey was just completed and it will be incorporated at the next annual report.

The TMP goals were modified, as the intermediate goal of 58% was set in 1997. The campus met the 1999 TMP goal of 55.2%. They reviewed the 2015 CTR survey and the SOV rate for faculty and staff was 68%, however, the campus failed to include the student population. The student's SOV rate was at 42%, that placed the campus below the 1999 TMP goal. Ms. Johnson added they will continue to improve the goal.

She mentioned that there are no plans for the International Education Center and the Computer Center due to a lack of funding. She added that Library Project is on hold due to lack of the capital budget and are waiting for the supplemental budget to pass at the Legislature to begin the pre-design process.

There were no development activities outside the MIO boundary. The college continues to promote employees, students and staff alternative modes of transportation and the benefits and promotional events including Bike to Work Day, New student and employee orientation and partnering with King County Metro and bus routes and

schedules and the RideMatch ride sharing program. In summary, the campus continues to improve and achieve the conditions of the TMP with different programs.

A comment was made about the status of the campus enrollment and Ms. Johnson commented that the current trend is downward, and it is a concern. The downward trend is due to the campus programs. Ms. Johnson commented that South Seattle College has more apprenticeship programs because of their population. She added even with these types of programs, South Seattle College's enrollment is like North Seattle College.

Mr. Grassley commented about how the overall SOV average was calculated, and Ms. Johnson commented that she took the information from the report that was provided, but she will investigate further on how the average were determined.

He also commented about the campus' greatest challenge in accomplishing the TMP goal based on the components that were presented. Ms. Johnson responded that they do not know the answer, but they will continue to promote the programs to the students and staff.

A comment was made if the questions in the survey asked where the people are driving to and from. Ms. Johnson responded that they do not know how this information is collected or how transparent they are. It was challenging to take the CTR survey because some does not want to share their email address. She noted that when she took the survey, they ask her about her zip code. A comment was made that the information regarding where people are travelling to and from would be helpful to Metro and Sound Transit about ridership and added service.

IV. Library Remodel Update

Ms. Johnson shared that the college in on queue for the funding, and as soon as it becomes available, the project will begin.

Mr. Jeff Caulk added that they expect to get the funding by July 2019 since it is in a two-year cycle, and the design process will take approximately another two years to develop. He estimated that funding for construction will be in fiscal year 2021 unless there are any further delays on the budget.

A question was asked if the funding request will be adjusted due to the construction environment. Ms. Johnson responded that she asked that question and she was told that it would be, and Mr. Caulk added that part of the design process was providing construction cost estimates. This will be revisited and revised once the project kicks-off.

V. Student Housing Update

Ms. Johnson commented that submitted an RFP to solicit proposals for a feasibility study for a 300 to 400 student housing beds on campus. They are working with Spectrum Development and they were doing their feasibility study that include an analysis of the overall housing demand, development cost models, site location as well as identify various financial models. They are looking at the current housing market around the area, market demand/competition, and the types of projects the campus would like to build. She will provide an overview scope document to the Committee to review.

She noted that they are moving through the process of the study. They recently completed a student survey to test the demand for housing and are currently wrapping up the feasibility findings and they will come back in the next two weeks to present the final draft to the Executive team. The findings will be posted on the school's website.

Mr. Grassley asked if this proposal is accommodated for within the existing Master Plan. Ms. Sheehan added that the college will bring the proposal to this Committee to determine whether it is a major or minor amendment to the Master Plan based on several conditions in the code. The Committee will then make a recommendation to SDCI, and SDCI will make the final determination. A question was asked about what prompted the need for campus housing. Ms. Johnson noted that the campus would like to provide student housing to stay competitive with other campuses that provide housing. She also added that the campus housing will not only provide housing to the general population but also for international students on campus and generate revenue from students that are low income.

They have talked to for-profit and non-profit organizations to help with scholarships for students that are homeless. The end-goal of this project is to provide a welcoming and community space for students and promote living in a diverse environment.

Pedestrian Bridge Update:

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the College is continuing its negotiations with the City towards working through an easement agreement. This agreement outlines the management and maintenance of the pedestrian bridge. SDOT presented a design to the College in May that was different from the model that was previously presented. SDOT also mentioned their preference on the placement of the bridge.

The College responded that the bridge should be a community bridge and voiced its concern about the alignment of the bridge, and not the design. The College proposed utilizing 100th Street because it creates a superior sight lines and safety for individuals. Due to budget and schedule, it will take time for SDOT to align the bridge at 100th Street.

Ms. Johnson noted that the College could not make a recommendation to the Board without public input from the community. She mentioned that there will be a community meeting on November 28 where SDOT will provide a presentation on where their alignment would like to be. The College encourages the community to review the plan and have their voices be heard.

The Committee has no role in the process, but as an advisory committee, the Committee can decide to submit a letter.

VI. Public Comment

Ms. Grassley opened the discussion for public comments.

Comments from an anonymous person: An anonymous person commented that he was encourage about the idea of housing on campus and the college should continue to pursue it. He noted that it will be a complicated process and there will be things to consider.

Comments from Kathleen Braden: Ms. Braden commented that she is interested as the plan develops. She is particularly interested regarding who will end up being the liaison once it is developed because this will impact the student population.

VII. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Grassley opened the discussion for Committee deliberation, and there were no further items to deliberate.

VIII. Adjournment

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