

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Name of Institution: Seattle Pacific University

B. Reporting Year: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

C. Major Institution Contact Information:

David B. Church
Assistant Vice President for Facility Management
Suite 311
3307 Third Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119
Tel: 206-281-2602
Fax: 206-281-2737
Email: dchurch@spu.edu

Melanie Whitehead
Coordinator of Campus Planning and Development
Suite 311
3307 Third Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119
Tel: 206-281-2537
Fax: 206-281-2737
Email: melaniej@spu.edu

D. Master Plan Adoption Date and Date of any Subsequent Amendments:

MIMP Approval Date: August 25, 2000

Minor Amendment(s): On June 2, 2011 a minor amendment was approved to enable construction of the University Center project. The University had requested three amendments of the MIMP: 1) a change to the primary use designation to remove the parking designation; 2) expansion of the development site to include the ground under the Crawford Music Building; and 3) augmentation of the building demolition list to include the Crawford Music Building.

On June 15, 2011 the MUP and Minor Amendment Determination were appealed to the Hearing Examiner. The hearing was held on August 30-31, 2011. On September 28, 2011 the original DPD decision was affirmed by the Hearing Examiner, therefore, on October 21, 2011 the Minor Amendment decision & MUP Decision for the University Center was issued by DPD.

II. PROGRESS IN MEETING MASTER PLAN CONDITIONS

A. Provide a general overview of progress made in meeting the goals and conditions of the approved Master Plan.

In August 2000 the City Council approved a new Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) for Seattle Pacific University so the University is in the thirteenth reporting year for this MIMP. As reported previously, many of the conditions imposed by the City Council were editorial in nature. Those requested changes were incorporated into the Adopted MIMP that was published in November 2000; therefore, those conditions were fulfilled with the publication of the Adopted MIMP and are so noted below. Several of the remaining conditions are still not applicable because the development that would trigger them has not yet occurred. The status of the majority of the conditions is unchanged from our previous report with only a few exceptions which are so noted below in **red**.

B. Conditions Adopted by the City Council

Conditions - MIMP

Prior to adoption of the MIMP, SPU shall revise the MIMP as follows:

1. Modify the MIMP to replace the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 43 with the following statement: "The following standards shall constitute the development standards for all University development unless otherwise noted. When specific development standards are not modified by the adopted master plan, the underlying zoning development standards apply, as modified in SMC 23.69.006A.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2000.

The following wording was inserted in the first paragraph of the "Development Standards" section on page 38* of the Adopted MIMP: "*The following standards shall constitute the development standards for all University development unless otherwise noted. When specific development standards are not modified by the adopted master plan, the underlying zoning development standards apply, as modified in SMC 23.69.006A.*" (* Page numbers in the Adopted MIMP do not correspond exactly with the page numbers referenced in the final MIMP so the wording was inserted in the intended location rather than on the page noted in the condition.) The same wording was also inserted in the fifth paragraph of the Introduction found on page 1.

2. Modify the MIMP to include the following provision: "To encourage commercial use of ground floor building space on West Nickerson Street in the area rezoned from L-2 to NC2-40, such ground level building space shall have a minimum building depth of 30 feet, a minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 13 feet, and pedestrian entrances from West Nickerson Street that are no more than three feet above or below the sidewalk level. SPU shall be encouraged to use this space for commercial-type uses, which may include institutional uses of a commercial nature, when it is determined by the University that there is a market for this space at prevailing market rates."

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was inserted under "Development Standard A: MIO District Underlying Zoning" in the fourth paragraph on page 38 of the Adopted MIMP: "*To encourage commercial use of ground floor building space on West Nickerson Street in the area rezoned from L-2 to NC2-40, such ground level building space shall have a minimum building depth of 30 feet, a minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 13 feet, and pedestrian entrances from West Nickerson Street that are no more than three feet above or below the sidewalk level. SPU shall be encouraged to use this space for commercial-type uses, which may include institutional uses of a commercial nature, when it is determined by the University that there is a market for this space at prevailing market rates.*"

June 2013 Status: No additional development activity has occurred along W. Nickerson Street for which this condition would apply.

3. Modify the note on page 51 of the MIMP to correctly identify Alexander Hall, rather than Peterson Hall, as a registered historic building.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2000.

The correction was made in "Development Standard O: Preservation of Historic Structures" on page 45* of the Adopted MIMP. (* See note above regarding page number discrepancies.)

4. Modify the MIMP to clearly state that the FAR of the MIO District, excluding street rights-of-way and other property not owned by SPU shall not exceed 0.90.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for this reporting period. The following wording was inserted in the “Development Density” section on page 25 of the Adopted MIMP: *“The FAR of the MIO District, excluding street rights-of-way and other property not owned by SPU shall not exceed 0.90.”*

June 2013 Update: The FAR for the MIO District, which includes the two projects for which MUPS have been issued (Ashton Parking Lot Expansion - Project No. 3009946 and the University Center - Project No. 3011176) and one project under construction (Irondale Residence Hall - Project No. 3004816) is 0.672, which is well below the 0.90 threshold.

5. Modify the MIMP to replace the heading for development standard U1 with the following heading: “Additional Development Standards in the MIO District South of West Dravus Street Between Humes Place West and Queen Anne Avenue North” and add the following sentence in the note: “University development standards in this area would also be subject to Lowrise density standards.”

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The heading for development standard U1 on page 47 of the Adopted MIMP was replaced with the following wording: *“Additional Development Standards in the MIO District South of West Dravus Street Between Humes Place West and Queen Anne Avenue North”*. In accordance with the second half of the condition, the wording of the note under development standard U1 was modified to read as follows: *“University development standards in the MIO District south of West Dravus Street between Humes Place West and Queen Anne Avenue North shall be subject to the height, setback, lot coverage, landscaping, open space, width and depth limits, and Lowrise density standards of the underlying zoning.”*

In addition, a new development standard entitled “V. Residential Unit Density Standards” was included on page 47 of the Adopted MIMP and the following wording was added in development standard V2: *“University development standards in the MIO District south of West Dravus Street between Humes Place West and Queen Anne Avenue North shall be subject to Lowrise density standards.”*

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred in this area of campus for which this condition would apply.

6. Modify the MIMP to add the following development standard: “In expansion Area A, the residential unit density limits of the underlying zoning shall apply. On the “Irondale Block” portion of the MIO District expansion Area A, as an alternative to underlying zoning residential density requirements limiting the number of units, SPU shall be allowed the option to base density on total number of student beds. With this option, the total number of student beds allowed on this site shall not exceed 150.”

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for development activity occurring during this reporting period. The following wording was added in “Development Standard V: Residential Unit Density Standards” as development standard V1 on page 47 of the Adopted MIMP: *“In expansion Area A, the residential unit density limits of the underlying zoning shall apply. On the “Irondale Block” portion of the MIO District expansion Area A, as an alternative to underlying zoning residential density requirements limiting the number of units, SPU shall be allowed the option to base density on total number of student beds. With this option, the total number of student beds allowed on this site shall not exceed 150.”*

June 2013 update: The only development activity to date on the “Irondale Block” is the Irondale Residence Hall (Project No. 30048016) which was designed in accordance with this condition. Construction of the residence hall began on May 2013 and is expected to be completed by August 2014 to enable occupancy to begin Fall Quarter 2014.

7. Modify the MIMP to add the following development standard: "With the exception of restrictions in expansion Area A and expansion areas south of West Dravus Street, there shall be no unit density restrictions on residential development in the MIO."

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2000.

The following wording was added in "Development Standard V: Residential Unit Density Standards" as development standard V3 on page 47 of the Adopted MIMP: "*With the exception of restrictions in expansion Area A and expansion areas south of West Dravus Street, there shall be no unit density restrictions on residential development in the MIO.*"

8. (Modified) Modify the master plan to adopt the plan alternative regarding potential pedestrian bridges or tunnels, on page 35 and 37 of the plan, and state clearly that designs which incorporate grade separations for pedestrians may be allowed in the future as minor master plan amendments, if they are consistent with then-current City policies and regulations.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable.

The following wording was included in the "Planned and Potential Circulation" section on page 33 and 34* of the Adopted MIMP (*See previous note regarding page number discrepancies): "*Grade separated pedestrian crossings of arterial streets bisecting the campus are not currently considered necessary or feasible to improve pedestrian safety. Existing pedestrian safety problems involving multiple crossings of West Bertona Street are proposed to be addressed by traffic and pedestrian calming measures. However, it is possible that during the long time-span of the MIMP, one or more pedestrian bridges or tunnels may be determined to be necessary and feasible. Such facilities could be constructed as minor amendments to the MIMP if they were consistent with then current City policies and regulations. Possible locations for grade-separated facilities for pedestrians include crossings of both West Bertona Street and West Nickerson Street west of Third Avenue West (in the vicinity of the existing Student Union Building and Bookstore), and a crossing of West Bertona Street in the vicinity of the Fifth Avenue Mall (vacated Fifth Avenue West). A grade-separated crossing of Third Avenue West, between West Bertona Street and West Cremona Street, might also be considered if a large auditorium or other facilities that would generate substantial pedestrian traffic should be constructed east of this arterial street.*"

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred for which this condition would apply.

9. In order to provide a better transition in scale with abutting properties, modify the MIMP to clearly state that the above-grade development in the "Irontdale Block" in Area A shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from 7th Avenue West and 15 feet from West Bertona Street.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for development proposed during reporting period.

The wording of development standard F2 of "Development Standard F: Structure Setbacks" on page 42 and 43 of the Adopted MIMP was modified to read as follows: "*The structure setbacks requirements shall be the same as is required in the underlying zone or by setback requirements applicable to structures on abutting lots or structures directly across a street or alley from a structure in the MIO District, whichever is greater, except that above-grade development in the "Irontdale Block" in Area A shall be setback a minimum of 20 feet from 7th Avenue West, and 15 feet from West Bertona Street.*"

June 2013 update: The only development activity to date on the "Irontdale Block" is the Irontdale Residence Hall (Project No. 30048016. As noted above, the residence hall has been designed in accordance with this condition; however, the residence hall lies east of the mid-block alley so the setback from 7th Ave. W. is not applicable for this development. Construction of the residence hall began on May 2013 and is expected to be completed by August 2014 to enable occupancy to begin Fall Quarter 2014.

10. In order to preserve the scale of the adjacent neighborhood, modify the MIMP to state clearly that development of the two lots north of the Irondale Block (601 and 605 West Emerson Street) shall comply with the underlying zoning height limit.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The wording in the last sentence of the second paragraph in “Development Standard B: MIO Height Limits” on page 40 of the Adopted MIMP was modified to read as follows: *“Additional height restrictions would apply in the MIO expansion zones south of West Dravus Street and the two lots north of the Irondale Block (601 and 605 West Emerson Street) that are located in expansion area A.”*

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred in this area of campus for which this condition would apply.

11. Modify the MIMP to clearly state that vehicular access to the Irondale Block off of 7th Avenue West shall be restricted to providing ADA access, and then only if convenient ADA access cannot be reasonably provided to the development off of any other street.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added under the “Planned and Potential Parking Facilities” section in the sixth paragraph on page 26 of the Adopted MIMP: *“Vehicular access to the Irondale Block off of 7th Avenue West shall be restricted to providing ADA access, and then only if convenient ADA access cannot be reasonably provided to the development off of any other street.”*

June 2013 update: The only development activity to date on the “Irondale Block” is the Irondale Residence Hall (Project No. 30004816) which lies east of the midblock alley so this condition does not apply to that project.

12. Modify the MIMP to clearly state that the Land Use Code requirements of the underlying zoning for landscaping of surface parking shall apply, provided that DCLU may waive screening and internal landscaping requirements where the Director finds an overriding safety issue.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for development proposed during reporting period. The following wording was added in the “Planned and Potential Building Development” section in the last paragraph on page 21 of the Adopted MIMP: *“In accordance with City Council condition #12, the proposed design of the parking lot shown in Figure 8 will be revised to meet the underlying zoning requirements for the landscaping of surface parking lots.”* In addition, the following wording was added in “Development Standard J: Landscaping” as development standard J3 on page 44 of the Adopted MIMP: *“The Land Use Code requirements of the underlying zoning for landscaping of surface parking shall apply, provided that DCLU may waive screening and internal landscaping requirements where the Director finds an overriding safety issue.”*

June 2013 update: The only development activity during this reporting period for which this condition applies is the Ashton Parking Lot Expansion project (Project No. 3009946) for which the MUP was issued on May 31, 2012. The parking lot has been designed in accordance with this condition. The project is on hold until funding is available.

13. Modify the MIMP to clearly state that the vacated 5th Avenue “pedestrian mall” shall be maintained publicly accessible throughout the life of the MIMP. A walkway that is accessible to the general public shall continue to be provided adjacent to and south of the Library and connecting to West Dravus Street provided that the existing walkway may be replaced with a new walkway of at least an equivalent width.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added in the “Planned and Potential Circulation” section in the fourth

paragraph on page 34 of the Adopted MIMP: *“The vacated 5th Avenue “pedestrian mall” shall be maintained publicly accessible throughout the life of the MIMP. A walkway that is accessible to the general public shall continue to be provided adjacent to and south of the Library and connecting to West Dravus Street provided that the existing walkway may be replaced with a new walkway of at least an equivalent width.”*

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred in this area of campus for which this condition would apply.

14. Modify the plan to clearly state that future development in the area of the “5th Avenue Mall” extension shall be sited or configured to allow a pedestrian connection to West Nickerson Street.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added in the “Planned and Potential Open Space and Landscaping” section in the last line of the fourth paragraph on page 29 of the Adopted MIMP: *“Future development in the area of the “5th Avenue Mall” extension shall be sited or configured to allow a pedestrian connection to West Nickerson Street.”*

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred in this area of campus for which this condition would apply.

15. Modify the MIMP to include the following development standard: “Within the underlying NC zones, there shall be no maximum size limit for institutional uses. Size limits for non-institutional commercial uses shall be applied on a per business establishment basis, as indicated in Chart B for SMC 23.47.010, and calculated in accordance with the provisions of SMC 23.47.010(C). The cumulative amount of commercial space in the areas within the MIO District that have NC1 and NC2 underlying zoning shall be limited to 30,000 square feet.”

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added in the sixth paragraph of “Development Standard A: MIO District Underlying Zoning” on page 38 of the Adopted MIMP: *“Within the underlying NC zones, there shall be no maximum size limit for institutional uses. Size limits for non-institutional commercial uses shall be applied on a per business establishment basis, as indicated in Chart B for SMC 23.47.010, and calculated in accordance with the provisions of SMC 23.47.010©. The cumulative amount of commercial space in the areas within the MIO District that have NC1 and NC2 underlying zoning shall be limited to 30,000 square feet.”*

June 2013 Update: No development activity has occurred in this area of campus for which this condition would apply.

16. Modify the MIMP to correctly show L-3 RC underlying zoning on the block identified for expansion Area B.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2000. Figure 12 – Adopted Underlying Zoning, found on page 39 of the Adopted MIMP, was corrected to show L-3 RC underlying zoning on the block identified for expansion Area B.

17. Modify the MIMP to provide that the design guidelines of Appendix F are applicable to Phase II of the Science building.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added in the “Planned and Potential Building Development” section in the second paragraph on page 25 of the Adopted MIMP: *“The design guidelines of Appendix F are also applicable to Phase II of the Science Building.”*

June 2013 Update: Phase II of the Science Building has not been constructed so this condition does not apply yet.

18. Deleted

19. Modify the MIMP to clarify that SPU will support the creation of an RPZ along 8th Avenue West if requested by the residents on that street.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2007.

The following wording was added to the "Transportation Management Program (TMP) in the paragraph entitled "Parking Fees and Residential Parking Zones" found on page 51 of the Adopted MIMP: "SPU will support the creation of an RPZ along 8th Avenue West if requested by the residents on that street."

Previous Action Taken to Fulfill Condition: An RPZ was established on 8th Ave. W. in November 2007 for which SPU paid all associated fees for signage, decals, etc. SPU continues to pay for all decal renewals.

By 2005 or prior to occupancy of the second phase of the Science Building, whichever occurs first, SPU shall:

20. Provide funding for the modification of the intersection of 6th Avenue West/West Nickerson Street to allow for separate northbound left and right turning lanes from 6th Avenue West to West Nickerson Street (subject to Seattle Transportation Department [SeaTrans] approval).

MIMP Revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: In process – still awaiting response from SDOT.

When the Adopted MIMP was compiled the following wording related to this condition was added to the "Planned and Potential Circulation" section in the second paragraph on page 33 of the Adopted MIMP: "By 2005 or prior to the occupancy of the second phase of the Science Building, whichever occurs first, SPU shall provide funding for the modification of the intersection of 6th Avenue West/West Nickerson Street to allow for separate northbound left and right turning lanes from 6th Avenue West to West Nickerson Street (subject to Seattle Transportation [SeaTrans] approval).

June 2013 Update: As previously reported, Phase II of the Science Building has been postponed indefinitely but since this condition was also date sensitive in September 2005 a letter was sent to Director of Seattle Department of Transportation, Grace Crunican, requesting the name of an SDOT staff member with whom we should be working on the fulfillment of this condition. (A copy of the letter was attached to our previous report). To date, SDOT has never responded to our letter.

In May 2013 construction began on the Irondale Residence Hall which is scheduled for occupancy fall quarter 2014. This 150-bed residence hall will generate some new traffic in this area campus. SPU is willing to participate in a study of this intersection, as well as the intersection of Third Ave. W. and W. Nickerson Street, to explore options that would enable these two intersections to function more efficiently for both motorists and pedestrians.

In 2005, SPU shall:

21. In consultation with SeaTrans, initiate a traffic study to determine if a traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of 6th Avenue West/West Nickerson Street.

If a signal is determined by SeaTrans to meet their warrants and is determined to be a desirable traffic improvement:

- i. SPU shall assist with the funding for the design and installation of the signal. SPU's share of the funding for the signal shall be equivalent to the proportion of

the University-generated traffic that is anticipated to use the intersection during an average weekday when classes are in session as determined by a traffic study, which is approved by SeaTrans. Following the completion of the potential development project, SPU shall assist with the funding of the signal in accordance with the formula described above.

If a traffic signal is not determined to meet SeaTran's warrants in 2005:

- ii. An additional future traffic study may be required by DCLU in association with the environmental review for a potential development project that is considered likely to significantly increase traffic at the intersection. If warrants for a signal should be determined to be met following the completion of the potential development project, SPU shall assist with the funding of the signal in accordance with the formula described above.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: In process – still awaiting response from SDOT. When the Adopted MIMP was compiled the following wording related to this condition was added to the “Planned and Potential Circulation” section beginning with the third paragraph on page 33 of the Adopted MIMP:

“In 2005, SPU shall, in consultation with SeaTrans, initiate a traffic study to determine if a traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of 6th Avenue West/West Nickerson Street. If a signal is determined by SeaTrans to meet their warrants and is determined to be a desirable traffic improvement:

- i) *SPU shall assist with the funding for the design and installation of the signal. SPU's share of the funding for the signal shall be equivalent to the proportion of the University-generated traffic that is anticipated to use the intersection during an average weekday when classes are in session as determined by a traffic study, which is approved by SeaTrans. Following the completion of the potential development project, SPU shall assist with the funding of the signal in accordance with the formula described above.*

If a traffic signal is not determined to meet SeaTran's warrants in 2005:

- ii) *An additional future traffic study may be required by DCLU in association with the environmental review for a potential development project that is considered likely to significantly increase traffic at the intersection. If warrants for a signal should be determined to be met following the completion of the potential development project, SPU shall assist with the funding of the signal in accordance with the formula described above.”*

June 2013 Update: See update for Condition 20 which pertains to the status of this condition as well.

22. (Modified) In consultation with SeaTrans conduct tube counts during the Winter Term of 2005, on non-holiday weekdays on West Raye Street at its intersection with 3rd Avenue West, in order to determine full day and peak hour traffic volumes. The information shall be shared with SeaTrans and with DCLU. If the City determines: i.) that additional study and analysis of traffic in the vicinity of West Smith Street and West Raye Street and 3rd Avenue West is indicated by a significant increase in traffic shown in the required 2005 counts; and ii.) that a significant proportion of the traffic growth can not be reasonably attributed to background traffic growth, then SPU shall conduct such study and analysis. The study should include further assessment of the proportion of through traffic that is attributable to SPU.

If the City determines, based on the additional traffic study, that further implementation of the SPU Master Plan would result in unacceptable impacts from cut-through traffic in the vicinity, then prior to further implementation of the SPU MIMP, SPU shall contribute to measures determined by the City to be reasonably necessary to reduce projected growth in cut-through

traffic attributable to SPU in the area in question by a share proportionate to SPU's share of projected cut-through traffic growth.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in 2005. When the Adopted MIMP was compiled the following wording related to this condition was added to the "Planned and Potential Circulation" section beginning with the seventh paragraph on page 34 of the Adopted MIMP:

"In consultation with SeaTrans conduct tube counts during the Winter Term of 2005, on non-holiday weekdays on West Raye Street at its intersection with 3rd Avenue West, in order to determine full day and peak hour traffic volumes. The information shall be shared with SeaTrans and with DCLU. If the City determines: i.) that additional study and analysis of traffic in the vicinity of West Smith Street and West Raye Street and 3rd Avenue West is indicated by a significant increase in traffic shown in the required 2005 counts; and ii.) that a significant proportion of the traffic growth can not be reasonably attributed to background traffic growth, then SPU shall conduct such study and analysis. The study should include further assessment of the proportion of through traffic that is attributable to SPU.

If the City determines, based on the additional traffic study, that further implementation of the SPU Master Plan would result in unacceptable impacts from cut-through traffic in the vicinity, then prior to further implementation of the SPU MIMP, SPU shall contribute to measures determined by the City to be reasonably necessary to reduce projected growth in cut-through traffic attributable to SPU in the area in question by a share proportionate to SPU's share of projected cut-through traffic growth."

Previous Action Taken to Fulfill Condition: In June of 2003, SPU agreed to pay \$20,000 towards a traffic study as part of a settlement agreement for an appeal of the MUP for the Cremona/Dravus Student Housing Project (now renamed "The Wesley Apartments") by "Concerned Neighbors of SPU". (Copy of the settlement agreement is attached). The agreement also stated that Concerned Neighbors of SPU would support SPU in seeking approval from the City that this traffic study would fulfill MIMP condition #22 (see point 3 of the settlement statement). On June 13, 2005 attorney Thomas Walsh of Foster Pepper & Shefelman, PLLC wrote a letter to Diane Sugimura, Director of the Department of Planning & Development requesting that DPD determine that MIMP condition #22 had been satisfied based on the traffic study and agreement by the neighbors in the settlement agreement. On August 17, 2005, Mr. Walsh received a letter back from Ms. Sugimura acknowledging that this condition had been met. (Copies of referenced letters were attached to the earlier report).

Conditions – Rezones

23. Modify Appendix B of the master plan to include legal descriptions of properties where height limit changes are proposed.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in November 2000.

On page 2 of Appendix B of the Adopted MIMP, the following information was added:

Rezone MIO-50' to MIO-37'

Victory Addition, Lots 1 - 4, Block 2

Rezone MIO-37' to MIO-50'

Ross Second Addition, Lots 11 - 30, Block 2

Rezone MIO-65 to MIO-37'

The westerly 120 feet of Blocks 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Hill's Queen Anne Park Addition, together with the adjacent portions of vacated streets and alleys.

Conditions – SEPA

For the life of the project:

24. Proposed development not reviewed at the project level in the FEIS shall require additional environmental review at the time of application for Master Use and/or building permits. Additional environmental review may also be required for those proposed developments which were reviewed at the project level in the FEIS pursuant to MSC 25.05.600 (e.g. if there are substantial changes to a proposal).

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for development activity occurring during reporting period.

The following wording related to this condition has been added to the "Planned and Potential Building Development" section in the third paragraph on page 25 of Adopted MIMP: *"Proposed development not reviewed at the project level in the FEIS shall require additional environmental review at the time of application for Master Use and/or building permits. Additional environmental review may also be required for those proposed developments which were reviewed at the project level in the FEIS pursuant to MSC 25.05.600 (e.g. if there are substantial changes to a proposal)."*

June 2012 Update: No new development activity has occurred in this area of campus during this reporting period for which this condition would apply.

25. Fencing and/or landscaping shall be provided along the southern boundary of the Overlay District as necessary to provide a buffer and separation between the University uses and the residential uses to the south.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable.

The following wording related to this condition has been added under "Development Standard J: Landscaping" as development standard J4 on page 44 of the Adopted MIMP: *Fencing and/or landscaping shall be provided along the southern boundary of the Overlay District as necessary to provide a buffer and separation between the University uses and the residential uses to the south.*

June 2013 Update: No University development has occurred on the southern boundary of the MIO since adoption of the MIMP.

Additional Conditions – MIMP

The following additional conditions are adopted:

26. The information contained in the Hearing Examiner's Findings #31 and #32 in the Matter of the Appeal of the adequacy of the EIS for the proposed SPU MIMP shall constitute baseline information for future evaluation of cut-through traffic in the vicinity of West Raye Street, or other streets, between Queen Anne Avenue and West Raye Street.

MIMP Revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled in August 2000.

The following wording was added in the second paragraph on page 35 of the "Planned and Potential Circulation" section of the Adopted MIMP: *The information contained in the Hearing Examiner's Findings #31 and #32 in the Matter of the Appeal of the adequacy of the EIS for the proposed SPU MIMP shall constitute baseline information for future evaluation of cut-through traffic in the vicinity of West Raye Street, or other streets, between Queen Anne Avenue and West Raye Street.*

27. In developing additional information and conducting supplemental environmental review of potential parking facilities, SPU, the Citizen's Advisory Committee and DCLU shall consider the implications of alternative locations upon cut-through neighborhood traffic, as well as spillover University parking, on residential streets.

MIMP Revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for development activity occurring during this reporting period.

The following wording related to this condition has been added to the "Planned and Potential Parking Facilities" section in the sixth paragraph on page 28 of the Adopted MIMP: *"In developing additional information and conducting supplemental environmental review of potential parking facilities, SPU, the Citizen's Advisory Committee and DCLU shall consider the implications of alternative locations upon cut-through neighborhood traffic, as well as spillover University parking, on residential streets."*

The identical wording has also been added in the "Planned and Potential Circulation" section in the third paragraph on page 35 of the Adopted MIMP.

June 2013 Update: No new development activity has occurred in this area of campus during this reporting period for which this condition would apply.

28. The final compiled SPU MIMP shall be modified to state as follows:

University acquisition and use of the property included in MIO District expansion Area D shall not displace the current use of the property as a service station. However, if the service station should close for reasons unrelated to SPU, SPU may use the site for other purposes; provided that any University uses, other than landscaping and signage, must be approved as a MIMP minor amendment by DCLU following review and comment by the Standing Advisory Committee, unless subject to the requirement for a major amendment according to the criteria of the Land Use Code.

MIMP Revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable.

The following wording was inserted in the "Boundaries and Land Uses" section under Area D in the second paragraph on page 16: *"University acquisition and use of the property included in MIO District expansion Area D shall not displace the current use of the property as a service station. However, if the service station should close for reasons unrelated to SPU, SPU may*

use the site for other purposes; provided that any University uses, other than landscaping and signage, must be approved as a MIMP minor amendment by DCLU following review and comment by the Standing Advisory Committee, unless subject to the requirement for a major amendment according to the criteria of the Land Use Code.”

June 2013 Update: The University does not own nor has it made an attempt to purchase the property in Area D. The service station is privately owned and still an active station.

29. The final compiled MIMP shall include the following statement with the description of potential street and alley vacations:

The approval of the vacation of public rights-of way in this plan indicates the intent of the institution to seek vacations described and the consistency of the vacations with the master plan. Adoption of this plan does not constitute City approval of the vacation petitions, which must be submitted for review according to the City’s street vacation procedures. Upon review the City may approve, condition, or deny the vacation petitions consistent with City street vacation policy.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not yet applicable. The following wording was added in the “Planned and Potential Circulation” section in the last paragraph on page 31 of the Adopted MIMP: *The approval of the vacation of public rights-of way in this plan indicates the intent of the institution to seek vacations described and the consistency of the vacations with the master plan. Adoption of this plan does not constitute City approval of the vacation petitions, which must be submitted for review according to the City’s street vacation procedures. Upon review the City may approve, condition, or deny the vacation petitions consistent with City street vacation policy.*

June 2013 Update: The University has not applied for any street or alley vacations since adoption of the MIMP.

30. Add the phrase “Contact identifiable offenders” (of restricted parking zones) in the column describing the proposed Transportation Management Program, Table 4, page 59 of the Final MIMP.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Fulfilled for reporting period. The phrase “Contact identifiable offenders” was added in the column entitled “Adopted TMP Requirements in Table 4: “Summary of Changes to the Transportation Management Program (TMP)” found on page 54* of the Adopted MIMP. (* See previous note regarding page number discrepancies.)

June 2013 Update: When the University is contacted with regards to a vehicle with an SPU parking decal which is parked in violation of an RPZ, the University attempts to identify its owner and notify them of the need to move their car and to park in the future in accordance to the restrictions of the RPZ.

31. Identify the areas known as the beach, the basketball court, the grassy areas surrounding the basketball court, the tree-covered slope to the south of the basketball court, and the steep slope north of West Barrett Street, as shown on Appendix 1 to this Findings, Conclusions, and Decisions, as existing open space, landscaping and screening, but not “designated open space” and require a minor amendment to allow development of the areas in a manner that would significantly reduce the size or location of the areas identified.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Not applicable. Figure 10 – “Adopted Open Space” on page 30 of the Adopted MIMP was modified to show the beach, the basketball court, the grassy areas surrounding the basketball court, the tree-covered slope to the south of the basketball court, and the steep slope north of West Barrett Street as “Existing Open Space, Landscaping, and Screening Subject to Minor Amendment Provisions”.

The first sentence in the first paragraph of the “Planned and Potential Open Space and Landscaping” section on page 28 of the Adopted MIMP was modified to read as follows: The major existing and proposed open spaces and landscape features are depicted in Figure 10, *which has been modified to include three additional existing open spaces that were added by the City Council during their approval of the MIMP.*”

A sentence was also added at the end of the first paragraph on page 29 that reads as follows: *The three additional existing open spaces added by the City Council, as shown on Appendix 1 of their Findings, Conclusions and Decisions and added to Figure 10 as “existing open space, landscaping and screening subject to minor amendment provisions”, are not “designated open spaces”, but would require a minor plan amendment to allow development of the areas in a manner that would significantly reduce their size or location.*”

The following sentence was also added in the first paragraph on page 31: *The existing open space areas near Ashton and Hill Halls, as depicted on Figure 10, (the area known as the “beach”, the basketball court and the surrounding grassy areas, and the steep slope north of West Barrett Street) are not designated as open spaces but would require a minor plan amendment to allow development of these areas in a manner that would significantly reduce their size or location.*

June 2013 Update: No development activity is proposed for any of the “existing open space” areas identified in this condition.

32. Amend the language in the MIMP, page 56, to read as follows:

The proposed program also maintains the goal of reducing student SOV rates. SPU will work with the City’s TMP Coordinator to establish a reasonable and fair percentage goal for commuter student SOV trips within a reasonable period of time, such as one year from adoption of this plan.

MIMP revised in November 2000 to add condition. Status: Ongoing. The following wording was inserted in the Transportation Management Program (TMP) in the section entitled “TMP Goal” on page 50* of the Adopted MIMP: (* See previous note regarding page number discrepancies.): *The adopted program also maintains the goal of reducing student SOV rates. SPU will work with the City’s TMP Coordinator to establish a reasonable and fair percentage goal for commuter student SOV trips within a reasonable period of time, such as one year from adoption of this plan.*

June 2013 Update: A commuter student survey was conducted in June 2013 which showed that there has not been a statistically significant increase in drive-alone commute behavior from previous years’ survey results.

III. Major Institution Development Activity Initiated or Under Construction W/in MIO Boundary

See attached spreadsheets...

IV. Major Institution Development Activity Outside but within 2,500 Feet of MIO District Boundary

See attached spreadsheets...

V. Progress in Meeting Transportation Management Program (TMP) Goals and Objectives

See attached TMP report and accompanying email correspondence between the University and SDOT'S Eric Mamroth about some issues related to the most recent CTR survey results. As in past years, SPU surveyed all employees rather than all CTR-affected employees. The CTR survey inaccurately estimated that SPU has 639 CTR-affected employees, when we believe that we have 440 CTR-affected employees. Thus the results are skewed when compared to previous survey results. Furthermore, the survey analysis also assumes that all non-responding employees between the actual response rate and 70% drive alone 5 days a week, which is clearly not the case. This further impacted and skewed the analysis and makes it appear that our SOV rate increased by almost 10%. In addition, there were increases in the number of employees who used alternative modes of transportation in almost every category (bus, vanpool, carpool, telework, etc.) but because SPU surveyed all 788 employees instead of the 440 CTR-affected employees and because the survey over estimated the number of CTR-affected employees, the percentages in most of the alternative transportation mode categories appear to be less than previous years.

As you will read, Eric recommended that in the next survey cycle we survey only our CTR-affected employees rather than all. He said he will also make a note in their records of why our results appear to be so much worse than in the previous survey cycle.