

# Minutes #13

(Adopted TBD)

## Seattle Pacific University Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Thursday, June 26, 2019

6:30 – 8:00 PM

Seattle Pacific University – Gwinn Commons – Third Floor

3310 Sixth Avenue West

Seattle WA 98119

### Members Present:

Emily Evans	Douglas McNutt
Darlene Hickman	Kim Orr
Douglas Jennings	Nancy Ousley
Jay LaVassar	

### Staff and Others Present:

Dave Church	AVP Facility Management, Seattle Pacific University
Cheryl Michaels	Seattle Pacific University PMP Report
Melanie Whitehead	Coordinator of Campus Planning & Development, SPU
Daniel Martin	President, SPU
Craig Kispert	Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Colin Vasquez	Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections (SDCI)

---

## 1. Welcome & Introduction

Mr. Church introduced President Dan Martin and Vice President Craig Kispert who thanked the Committee for their time and effort invested over the years on the Seattle Pacific University Standing Advisory Committee. Ms. Hickman added her thanks and then welcomed the group followed by brief Committee introductions.

## 2. Housekeeping

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the June 26, 2019 Notice and Agenda. The Committee unanimously approved the June 26, 2019 Notice and Agenda. A proposal was moved and seconded to accept the Committee minutes from November 29, 2018. The Committee unanimously approved the November 29, 2018 meeting minutes.

## 3. Project Update

Mr. Church stated a Letter of Intent will be signed to begin the Master Plan in late July 2019. The University, along with DON, will then begin the recruitment process for the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC). Mr. Church was asked why the University was going through this process. He responded that the existing Master Plan was done in 2000 and will grow obsolete as the University goes in to the next 20 years. The

University has sold some apartments to Bellwether Housing. The University also sold its tennis courts. This income, which the University has reported on, was used to invest in acquiring property in and outside the University's zone. The most eminent project to come out in a new Master Plan would be the Student Center Project.

Mr. Church stated that a comprehensive plan amendment has been proposed to allow a Major Institution to add industrial land to a Master Plan. This is not a certainty. A similar amendment was done with a plan for the zoning code. They could receive an application to move the MIO to this area through a Master Plan process. The degree which they could move in there would depend on which projects are proposed to the new CAC. He was asked how much of this was in the University's property. Mr. Church said that the University owns most of the property north of West Nickerson Street, east of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue West, west of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West, and south of the Ship Canal/bike trail (with a couple of exceptions). The University would not develop north of the bike trail.

Mr. Church said people will find the comprehensive plan amendment has been fully adopted. He believes the zoning amendment made its way through City Council, and the Mayor has signed it. It is now in an appeals window. Mr. Church mentioned that information may also be found on the City and/or City Council webpages.

A discussion ensued regarding the expense of cleaning up property near the Ship Canal. The University has cleaned up the site of the Gascoigne Lumber arson. Two million dollars was spent clearing up the air pollution on the King property, and a 2,000+ gallon oil tank was removed from the mill works property. He mentioned that developing any land near the shoreline is incredibly difficult.

Mr. Church said the University will be replacing the electrical feed to Hill Hall in late August or early September. Conduit will be moved by City Light from a pole near 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and West Cremona Street to a location a block up the hill. A new feed will be established for the Hall. The existing power feed is direct-bearing and has a ground fault in it. This will not affect any building projects.

#### **4. Annual Report Update**

Ms. Whitehead provided a spreadsheet that summarized the status of the conditions for the University. The University had 32 conditions by the City Council. One condition was deleted; the remaining 31 conditions were adopted. There are currently 26 fulfilled conditions, 23 of which included the request to add wording to the MIMP.

One update is on Condition 32 concerning a study of the single occupancy vehicle rate for students. The narrative was updated as required. However, the goal was never set by the University. The last time the Committee met (November 29, 2018), Ms. Sheehan brought a copy of the City letter the University received that month. The City went in and looked at the TMP section from the University's recent Annual Report. The City raised four issues and asked the University to respond.

Ms. Whitehead talked on the single occupancy vehicle rate for students. Copies of three letters were distributed. One was the University's first letter to the City; then a response letter back from the City; and finally, the University's current response back to the City. In the initial letter, the University proposed that despite what the Master Plan said, that SDOT allow the University to count all students in order to take advantage of a mitigation measure involving housing students. SDOT has recognized, after working with

Seattle University and the University of Washington, that when more people are housed on campus the number of students who drive is reduced.

The City sent back a response suggesting an occupancy range of 20-30 percent. The University replied with the latest letter saying before any talk about a percent, the University would like to talk about the definition of who is counted in the study before conducting a survey.

The State Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) survey has definitions for employees. Mr. Church felt there should be a definition of who would be counted. He has not received Ann Sutphin's response from SDOT. If there is going to be a survey that the University administers, there needs to be a definition of who gets counted. It seemed to Mr. Church that the City would want a standard definition, so everyone is counting the same way and continues with a uniform program. The University doesn't oppose the survey. The conversation will continue after SDOT's response is received.

Even though the University is going to initiate a new Master Plan, Ms. Whitehead said the University is bound by the current MIMP until the new Plan is approved. The conversation will continue over the next couple of years as the University works to reach a consensus with the City.

Ms. Whitehead provided preliminary information on the University's Transportation Management Plan (TMP.) In November, the City pointed out that the University was not addressing all 15 of the supplemental implementational requirements listed in the University's Master Plan. The University was unaware of the obligation. One thing Ms. Whitehead brought to the Committee's attention was, while looking at the CTR surveys from the last two survey cycles, it was discovered that the "mode split" information the University had provided in its TMP report was incorrect. There is a certain population that is removed, such as people who teach a night class, attend once a week, etc. The University had inadvertently reported the "mode split" data for "All Employees" instead of "Affected Employees."

Mr. Church assured the Committee that the error was not intentional; the University and even SDOT gets confused by the definitions of the CTR survey. Ms. Whitehead said when the correct numbers were plugged in, instead of the University's single occupancy vehicle rate being 54.1 percent, it was 51.8 percent (which is closer to the goal of 50 percent). The University is now looking at how it can use rideshare, carpool, etc., to try and pull in some more people.

Mr. Church said one thing that he discovered is that the City has different goals for different areas. The City had goals in areas that are similar to the University's. The area's goal is 48.9 percent. Ms. Whitehead believes that the City doesn't understand that the area around the University is not well served by transit. The City came back and said the University should have a goal of 28 percent for students. The University pushed back that the goal of 28 percent for students is nearly half the area's target of 48.9.

Ms. Michaels highlighted some of the things that have enthusiasm around them. The University has added more bike racks around campus.

Mr. Church asked Ms. Michaels when the next CTR survey was going to begin. She responded the survey would occur sometime this fall.

Ms. Michaels was asked about her experience with the Bike Share Program. She said that for a new program, it is getting a lot of use. Mr. Church mentioned when the weather is good, more people are interested in the program. A Committee member said a lot of neighborhoods are struggling with how the

bikes are left. Mr. Church has not figured out how to work with them to overcome this issue so that the bikes are evenly dispersed, and the property owner can adjust the bikes, so they are not blocking paths and sidewalks.

Ms. Whitehead talked about the two properties acquired since the November 2018 meeting. In December, the University purchased the Swanson property with the Quonset hut. The building is currently occupied, and they plan to move out in June. The University has no immediate plans on the property.

Discussion then focused on the house at 41 West Dravus. The City finally came in and had the previous owner board it up due to squatters and drug activity. It took several years for the University to track down the owner with an offer to buy. Afterwards, the University hired a bio firm to dispose of drug paraphernalia, etc. The University thought the building would have to be torn down, but it appears to be sound and might be fixed up. Mr. Church's goal is to see if it can be rented out through the Capstone Real Estate Group. The question is what the cost would be to flip the property as there are no windows, the heaters are gutted, there are no electric meters, etc.

Darlene Hickman stated that she is stepping down as the SAC Committee Chair at the end of this meeting. Ms. Hickman encouraged others to apply for the new upcoming SPU Citizens Advisory Committee.

## **5. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

## **6. Committee Deliberation**

Ms. Hickman opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Nelson Pesigan said Ms. Sheehan had already started the process asking for community volunteers to be on the new SPU CAC.

## **7. Adjournment**

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