



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



**NORTH SEATTLE
COLLEGE**

One of the Seattle Colleges

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 #3

November 15, 2016

Adopted November 20, 2017

Student Club Room
North Seattle College
9600 College Way N
Seattle, WA 98103

Members and Alternates Present

Tim Albertson

Michael Cuadra

Marilyn Firlotte

Martin Grassley

Colleen Horn

Liz Kearns

Conrado Moran

Lee Bruch (alternate)

Melanie Davies (alternate)

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan

Andrea Johnson

Jeff Caulk

Darryl Johnson

DON

North Seattle College

North Seattle College

North Seattle College

I. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Maureen Sheehan opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping (00:22:11)

Ms. Sheehan opened the floor for the nomination and election of chairperson and vice-chairperson. The role of the chairperson is to facilitate the meeting, ensure that all Committee members are being heard, and help make decisions. The role of the vice-chairperson is to assist the chairperson in facilitating the meeting.

Mr. Martin Grassley was nominated and voted as the Committee's chairperson by a show of hands and Mr. Michael Cuadra as vice-chairperson.

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion to approve the meeting minutes from March 25, 2009. There was a motion to approve and adopt the minutes, and it was seconded. The meeting minutes from March 25, 2009 were adopted.

III. New member Orientation (00:4:00)

Ms. Sheehan began an overview of the structure of the Committee and its roles and responsibilities.

She discussed about the Master Plan process including the formation of the Standing Advisory Committee (SAC). The SAC reviews the annual reports on the institution's development, comments on the progress of the Transportation Management Plan (TMP), reviews amendment requests to the plan, and provides comments on any project developed under the provisions of the adopted plan that requires a Master Use Permit (MUP).

The Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), on the other hand, is formed to develop the Major Institution's Master Plan (MIMP). Once the MIMP is complete, the SAC is put in place to monitor the MIMP.

The MIMP identifies the boundaries around a Major Institution called the Major Institution Overlay (MIO). The MIO identifies specific rules with regards to development standards that include height, bulk, scale, setbacks, parking, lot coverage and site coverage.

She added that her role as a city staff of the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) is to facilitate these meetings, answer questions or refer these questions to other City departments. Some of the City departments that will be heavily involved in the process is the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspection (SDCI) where they review the projects and assist in interpreting technical references and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) that answers any traffic and transportation related issues and impacts.

A question was asked about SDOT doing studies on a bridge across the north end of the campus and if this impacts the MIMP. Ms. Johnson commented that there is a section in the MIMP that anticipate the long-range plan of the bridge. Ms. Sheehan added that if the MIMP did not address the issue, the College will come back to this Committee and request for a major and minor amendment to the MIMP.

Ms. Johnson added that the bridge is being imposed and was not requested by the College. Ms. Sheehan commented that since the bridge is in the campus property, it will depend on the decision of the College on how to move forward. Ms. Johnson noted that their concern is not about the design, but where it lands in the College, and the issue of maintenance responsibilities, and that will be a working conversation between the City and the College.

IV. Review Annual Report (00:30:56)

Ms. Andrea Johnson began her presentation on North Seattle College annual report.

She noted that the College met all the elements required under the MIMP. Two major accomplishments include the Physical Education Building, now called the Roy Flores Wellness Center, that was constructed and occupied in 1995 and the Multi-Purpose Building, now called the Peter Ku Education Building constructed and occupied in 1999.

All other elements such as parking, landscaping, etc. have all been completed. The athletic field was not constructed due to its wetland designation, budget constraints, and low enrollment, a P-Patch was constructed instead.

The College continues to implement a transportation program that encourages reduction in SOV and alternate modes of travel. The College also provides bus passes to their students and offers electric car chargers available on campus.

She summarized the City Council's recommendations outlined in the MIMP as well as updates on the conditions. These includes a Transportation Management Plan (TMP), an annual transportation report, CTR employer report, and progress towards the SOV goals. The College has had challenges achieving the drive-alone goal of 58%, they are currently at 68%. She added that the College charges a daily parking permit to SOV drivers to satisfactorily progress towards the SOV goals.

The Major Institution North Seattle College Master Plan, approved for 10 years and approved for an undetermined extension, listed two unfunded projects that were identified for future growth. One of this projects is the renovation of the existing library. The College is waiting and expecting for the funds to complete the design process.

She noted that the College has partnered with DSHS, ESD, and other state agencies for the Opportunity Center for Employment Opportunity Center to provide integrated service delivery for job seekers, social service customers and college students. This is the College's only leasing activity to a non-major institution during the reporting period.

She added that the College is not engaged in development activity outside its MIO.

She summarized the progress in meeting the TMP goals. The standard requirements include: having a transportation coordinator, periodic promotion of events designed to educate staff and students about the different modes of transportation, a bike to work program, partnership with King County and Metro about bus schedules, and a communication research center where all this information is located. She mentioned that the RideMatch service has not been implemented due to lack of funding. She also mentioned that the current bicycle spaces are 158, that is below the goal of 267 due to some of the area being designated wetlands or having environmental impacts. She added that it appears that the current space is adequate for the biking community and they will continue to monitor and address the issue to report in the annual survey.

The discretionary program elements include a target parking supply of 1,689. Currently, the parking supply is 100 short due to the same issues with the bicycle space. The College provide discounts for carpool and vanpool parking, transit subsidies to students and staff, as well as daily SOV parking rates. She noted that a request was made under the MIMP about shuttle access to the Northgate Transit Center that has not been implemented because there was no clear plan for the project. The College provides a guaranteed ride home program, as well as showers and lockers at the wellness center for those who ride their bikes to campus. The College also participates in the residential parking zone (RPZ) program and provides periodic free parking to non-SOV drivers.

A question was asked if there have been reports from the previous years. Ms. Sheehan noted that since 2009, the North Seattle College SAC has been defunct and the MIMP process has been relatively quiet. Ms. Johnson added that an advisory committee is now in place to move forward with future projects such as the construction of the library building.

A question was asked regarding some of the reasons for the enrollment decline and future expectations. Ms. Johnson noted most of the community colleges are experiencing a decline in enrollment due in part to some expectations regarding the presidential election and the funding for community colleges. She also added that when the economy picks up as it is now, students tend to go to work instead of back to school for training. The College has a heavy international student population and the countries that send their students here for education are experiencing economic challenges. The College is waiting to see what will happen and they will look for ways to promote the College.

Mr. Lee Bruch commented about the Light Rail accessibility to the College would help. Ms. Johnson commented that she is hoping it will. It will depend on the direction Seattle Colleges decide to take and how the new chancellor of North Seattle College will work together or be independent. She added that the Light Rail system will depend on the programs that are offered here versus those offered at the south campus. They are still waiting to see the Light Rail System impact among Seattle colleges.

A question was raised regarding high school students enrolling in campus. Ms. Johnson commented that the College does not have a big high school population. Most of the students enrolled in the College are older students and do not necessarily want to get a degree, but get work skills. She added that international students make up most of the student population.

Ms. Johnson commented that all of the reports discussed will be available at the [DON](#) website.

V. Review Building Development Report (00:52:27)

She mentioned that there were not a lot of guidelines in the report so she went through the MIMP and the building development plan that was laid out in phases. The long-range Master Plan was not adopted by the City Council. Ms. Sheehan noted that every MP is intended to last 10 years, and most of the Major Institution do not have the available funding to get through the anticipated square footage allowance within that time frame.

North Seattle College went back to the City Council and requested a formal extension to comply. The City Council granted an extension and part of the agreement was the building development plan. The building development plan acts as a mini-MIMP that looks at the development sites and the allowable square footage the College is planning to build in the next five years. She mentioned that the 2007 plan is separate from the MIMP since it was not created through the public MIMP process.

Ms. Johnson provided a brief walkthrough of the development plan report. The plan comes in three phases. Phase 1 includes the construction of the P.E. building and parking lot and it was completed in 1995 and renovated in 2007. Area A (campus access to N. 92nd St and bus loading, and storm water flows control) was completed and includes a water runoff detention pond. Area B (construction of new parking area and 137 parking spaces), the parking area is complete and portions of the area remain a green space and permeable. Area C (new parking area to Area A and 126 parking spaces) was also complete.

Phase II include the construction of the Multi-Purpose building, which is now called the Education Building, completed in 1999 and now occupied. Area D (expanding parking area in the SW corner and 206 parking spaces) was not

developed due to environmental and budgetary reason. It was designated a wetland, and a small parking lot was constructed west of the wetland and most of the area remains unchanged. Area E (campus parking for 96 spaces) was complete and a child care facility was added in 1999. Area F/G (regrading and resurfacing of the east parking lot) was completed.

Phase III include the construction of the athletic field which was not developed due to wetland designation, budget constraints and low enrollment. A community P-Patch is currently located on the site.

Ms. Johnson explained the updates to the 25-year development plan outlined in the 2007 long range campus plan. The plan was divided into a 4, 10, and 25-year plan.

The 4-year plan includes development of the Integrated Resource Center and the renovation and expansion of the south end of the Technology Building. This has been completed and the building is now called the OCE&E. The 10-year plan includes the Tech Building renewal and expansion that provides teaching labs and a college tutoring center. This development was combined with the Student Center project, now called Health Sciences and Student Resource Center (HSSC) and was completed in 2015. The plan also includes the plaza roof repair currently underway in phases. The Library Building renewal is the number one priority for major capital projects as ranked by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and will begin construction phase in the 2021-23 capital budget. The Storm Water Conveyance, College Center Surge space and the Instruction Building Renewal Phase I projects are currently on hold due to lack of funding.

The 25-year development plan includes Phase II of the Instruction Building Renewal. This will be the next big project after completion of the Library. There are currently no plans for the College Center Renewal Phase I and II due to lack of funding.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the College would like to move forward with student housing on campus. The College would like to build a 300-400 bed facility for students. A location has not been identified. Currently, the College is researching different funding opportunities as well as applying for grants to begin pre-construction, design, civil investigations, and create funding models. A large population of the College are homeless or low income students as well as international students that do not have the tools and requirements to get affordable housing in the area. The goal of the student housing is to provide affordable housing service for low income, homeless, and international students. A question was asked if other area community colleges are also pursuing this project, and Ms. Johnson noted that Bellevue Community College began constructing affordable housing for their student population.

A question was raised about if the list of projects followed the current prioritization for state capital funding. Ms. Johnson mentioned that they were the #1 capital project funded by the state for all state community colleges that applied due to the current condition of the library building. Mr. Caulk added that the facilities conditions survey is done every two years. The last building identified in 2013 was the Arts & Science Building, and the College received funds for interior renovations. In 2015, when the state came back to review the renovation project, the score for the Arts & Science Building went down, and it ranked lower for renovation and brought the library building to a higher rank because of its condition.

A question was raised if the design and bid for the library building has already been completed. Mr. Caulk noted that an architect did a preliminary design and it was part of the bid process for the state. The state has selected North Seattle and they will award funds for the actual design process. Ms. Johnson added they started to put the process together, and the goal was how to convince the state why the college needs the project fund.

Mr. Caulk noted that the state is looking for a return on investment. Ms. Johnson noted that once the college receives its design fund, they will go out and submit a Request for Proposal (RFP) and select an architect and contractor to begin the formal design process. The design process will include assembling a design committee, identifying stakeholders, and involve this Committee.

A question was raised if the 2007 plan will be made available online. Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Johnson noted that they will make the document available online, but they commented not to rely on the document for guidance.

A follow up question was raised regarding an ADA Campus Access Plan. Mr. Caulk commented that the College just finished a review from the state inspection last year and they are currently working to incorporate any updates that were identified in the plan.

Mr. Lee Bruch noted that the City has requirements for developers to build affordable housing and if the College inquired about their availability. Ms. Johnson commented that she is in talks with developers and the College is exploring all their options. She noted that if the College decides to build a facility, they would want to own and operate the building as part of the College rather than with the developer.

A question was raised if there are specific criteria within the MIMP that allowed the College to maintain a certain number of spaces for parking. Ms. Johnson mentioned that under the MIMP, the new development includes parking spaces, but she noted that she did not find any criteria identified in the MIMP.

VI. Public Comment

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for public comments. There was no public comment.

VII. Committee Deliberation (01:19:46)

Mr. Grassley opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Mr. Grassley thanked the College for the presentation and review and is looking forward for any additional documents that will be available online.

A question was raised about the amount of square footage for new construction. Mr. Caulk showed an area of the map where the remaining developable area exists on campus.

A follow up question was raised regarding the status of the tennis court. Ms. Johnson commented that they have had discussions about the tennis court and they suggested to have it removed for safety reasons since it was not being utilized.

There was a back and forth discussion regarding property limitation and water runoff within the College boundaries. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she can reach out to SPU and ask one of their staff to come to the meeting to talk more about it.

A suggestion was made about an opportunity for the community to make a strong argument to Seattle Parks to help fund and build a recreational area on campus for the surrounding schools and community to use. Ms. Johnson commented about pushing this idea further. She added that once the College decides to build the student housing, they will look at making available spaces open to the community.

Mr. Bruch commented about a shuttle that goes to the Northgate station, and noted that since there are several Metro bus routes that already go to the campus, will the College able to undertake this expense. Ms. Johnson commented that since the funds are tight, they expect not to undertake this type of expense.

Mr. Conrado Moran commented about parking spaces at the College. Ms. Johnson responded that the College could not get the parking area developed which is why they were down to 100 less parking spaces than their target. Mr. Caulk added that the College encourages to use public transportation to access the campus.

A comment was made about a transportation plan that was developed two years ago, and a priority list was created to address the issue of transportation in the region. She noted that this maybe a good topic for the group to address due to the changes happening in the area and transportation will play a big part in it.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that the MIMP was put in place with parameters that discuss issues that affects the neighborhood. She noted that the goal for this Committee is to focus on issues about the development sites and development standards of the College within the MIO.

Mr. Grassley asked about where to draw a line between discussing legitimate community issues and other relevant discussion within the context of the MIMP. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that when the College presents a development project, there will be a back and forth discussion among the Committee members about the project through a series of meetings. The Committee will be submitting and drafting comments that applies to the MIMP. If a Committee member feels that their issue was not addressed during the Committee discussion, that individual can submit their own comment letter addressing their issue.

Ms. Johnson noted that once we get to the design process, this Committee will be more involved in the collaborative process, and she ensures that this Committee will have a voice and influence. She added that this Committee will be very influential in determining physical infrastructures as it has more impact to the surrounding neighborhood.

A question was raised if the project is being designed has a budget. Ms. Johnson confirmed that they are designing with a budget, but that will not be enough. She noted that the library is about \$26 million in construction cost.

Mr. Caulk added that there will not be a lot of demolition going on since the façade and the main building shell will remain, and the overall internal structure will be modified.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the next steps will include scheduling a meeting sometime next year to reconvene and discuss the library project when the College receives the funding, otherwise, the next scheduled meeting will be November 2017. Ms. Johnson noted that the library project is the only major construction project for the College followed by the student housing.

Mr. Caulk added that he expects the next innovation project will be the Instruction building once the library has been renovated.

Mr. Grassley commented about the 1999 MIMP and it was rewritten in 2007 without City approval, and he expressed his concern about coming to the 10-year cycle on the MIMP. Ms. Johnson commented that since the College had an amendment to the MIMP, that eliminated the expiration date.

Mr. Bruch asked when an amendment to the MIMP comes up, for example, dormitories, will the purview be the impact the building will create or does it include other issues such as traffic, etc. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the College must submit a SEPA document to address the issue. Ms. Johnson added that any construction project the College must undertake, they are required to submit a transportation study.

VIII. Adjournment

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