



Minutes #2

(Adopted July 7, 2020)

Seattle Central College Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Monday, March 2, 2020

6:00 – 8:00 PM

1625 Broadway Ave – Broadway Performance Hall Boardroom

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present:

Don Anderson	Michael Gilbride	Erica Loynd
Adam Behrman	Tori Halligan	Brittney Moraski
Jacobi Bourdreaux	Cathy Hillenbrand	Michael Seiwerath
McCaella Daffern	Jacqueline Kim, Alternate	Emily Thurston

Staff and Others Present:

Lincoln Ferris	Seattle Central College
David Ernevad	Seattle Central College
Stephen Starling	Schreiber Starling Whitehead Architects
Maureen Sheehan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)

1. Welcome & Instructions

Ms. Sheehan informed the Committee that she would run the meeting until the nominations/vote on Chair and Co-Chair later in the meeting. Or, at the very latest, the next meeting. A brief round of Committee and Staff introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

Meeting #2 Context and Schedule

- Review and timing of the City of Seattle/Seattle Central College Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) Concept Plan in addition to the Committee’s next steps.
- Comments on the Public Outreach Plan. This plan is not a formal Advisory Committee role but is very important to the process.
- A separate section for Student comment has been provided.
- Hold nominations for Committee Chair and Co-Chair.

Vote on Bylaws

Ms. Sheehan said that changes may be made to an Institution’s Bylaws as they are a stand-alone document. She pointed out however that the City Council will default to the Code Bylaws language when reviewing the Master Plan.

Ms. Hillenbrand suggested revising the Bylaws Article II Membership, Section 2. Committee Member Job Description, Item A to be more positive. She also suggested revising the Bylaws Article III Participation, Section 3. Replacement to include recruitment of people of color, the underrepresented communities and the students. Reference was made to the City of Seattle's Racial and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI).

The proposal to adopt the above language to Bylaws Article II and Article III was made and seconded. The vote to accept both revisions was unanimous.

3. Public Comment

Ms. Sheehan reviewed the guidelines for public comment. She opened the public comment period for those who had checked the box under the Comments column on the public sign-in sheet.

[Editor's Note: The comment(s) shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in voice recording (.mp3) form.]

Comments from Sandra Miller: Ms. Miller is an employee of Kaiser Permanente. She wanted to observe the MIMP process. Ms. Miller mentioned that Kaiser Permanente is a member of the community and is excited about moving forward with the neighborhood.

Comments from Andrew Hans. Mr. Hans is a community member. He stated that Seattle Central has a lot of underutilized and dysfunctional public spaces. Mr. Hons hopes that those can be addressed in this process. He mentioned that the north and northeast of the campus has so much underutilized space. In a dense neighborhood, it should function more like a park. Mr. Hans would also like to see a maintenance plan for the dysfunctional space that includes the mural and (redoing) the stairs. The Building's street frontage along Broadway has a quite stark and brutalist quality. The streetscape can use a lot more greenery to make it an inviting presence in the neighborhood.

4. Student Comment

There were no student comments.

5. Public Outreach Plan Update

Mr. Ferris gave his thoughts on the College's Community Outreach Program for Winter 2020. He requested that members bring to the Committee their input about any outside audiences to be identified

The second item Mr. Ferris would like to get the Committee's reactions about an initial open forum for the public. There is a need for two if not three community meetings to make sure Committee members have heard from the community and to have the Committee's input reflect that input – particularly with mitigation matters. Saturday was suggested as an option along with the Capitol Hill Farmers Market on Sundays. Mr. Ferris said that the public meeting would have a short version of the MIMP Concept Plan with an explanation of what it incorporates (with level of detail determined by the Committee). In addition, a 45-minute time for smaller groups to break out in 10-minute periods.

Ms. Sheehan asked if there were any more thoughts on Public Outreach. Mr. Ferris will revise the Public Outreach Plan with some dates and a little on the Farmers Market. Ms. Sheehan will send this out to the Committee to reflect on this conversation. There were many suggestions concerning other neighborhood groups. Ms. Daffern and Ms. Thurston will provide some additional contacts.

Ms. Hildebrand suggested they advertise through social media like Facebook. Ms. Sheehan will send out an e-mail to the Committee regarding the College's social media sites and how to post on social media. Mr. Ferris will talk with the College's Public Information Officer about any issues.

Ms. Hildebrand asked if the Committee could post on Nextdoor.com. Regarding the College posting, Ms. Sheehan explained that there were different rules of engagement such as the Department of Neighborhoods. It is an issue of public safety and considers the mission of Nextdoor.com. The City is not part of the community; it provides services. The City may help in crafting a post, but it cannot be the one posting on the site.

Ms. Hildebrand had a comment regarding the Plan's last section "Secondary Objectives/Elements to be Discussed." She would like to add the [Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay](#) and asked about the intersection with the College's Plan.

6. Seattle Central College Context/Background

Mr. Ferris stated Seattle Central College was, in 1966, one of the 'foundation' colleges in the State Community College system. He explained that the State combined the Edison Technical School with some older buildings to establish the College. North Seattle College and South Seattle College were built post-1966. In contrast, Seattle Central College inherited buildings from the 1910s and 1920s. When one looks at the outside red brick envelope, inside it houses a lot of aging older buildings.

Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Ernevad have engaged some consultants to look at the amount of the College's deferred maintenance. The campus in the last ten years has really struggled with the concept of how it can, in a vibrant urban but constrained neighborhood, go about with a system of constrained resources. How does the College keep a vital and relatively large campus knowing full well that the more money the College spends on broken parts, the less money there is for instruction?

Mr. Ferris asked If anyone on the Committee has walked through the two buildings recently sold to Capitol Hill Housing. Those buildings have not been conducive towards instruction, i.e., no insulation on the upper floors, some single-pane windows, etc. The context of this new Master Plan is that the College needs to figure out how to renovate and re-invigorate the campus. At the same time, the Committee might think a little less expansively about what 20+ years ago the College thought would be founded on enrollment growth. Much of the existing plan was ambitiously based upon 2-4 percent annual compounding growth of enrollment.

The College needed to acquire property on the south side of Pine Street in order to tear down buildings and replace them over time for a new and more modern campus.

The College took in things like international student tuition, which the College can retain, and then a federal line with the State to buy those properties. The properties were obtained with the knowledge that they were older buildings and would be torn down. For instance, looking at the Atlas Building and the Porte Cochere Building, these were acquired with the idea at some point they would be demolished, and the College would spread out a block and a-half with new campus buildings.

Mr. Ferris presented three primary objectives:

1. The context of submitting the new plan is to make the campus more compact and easier for pedestrian students to get between classes.
2. The Committee should think about the need and opportunity of replacing buildings or to spend money renovating current buildings to meet needs.

3. The Committee should be aware of the traditional Community College composition. Community Colleges are made up of mostly people who have 'paused' their education. Seattle Central has had Running Start students but very few high school graduates going into the College's academic transfer programs.

Yet the strong point of Seattle Central has always been the strength of its academic programs for transfer degrees. The College has a high placement rate with the University of Washington and with Western Washington University. The average age for the enrolled population has traditionally been 28- to 29-years-old. More recently, perhaps because of the strong regional economy, the College has been getting a higher mix of part-time students. So, the actual headcount is starting to go up even though the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student numbers are slowly, gradually rebounding from a six-year drop.

More importantly, as the College looked at the higher cost of education and the strength of the College's International Program, the College needs to think about the opportunity to offer more four-year degree programs for students and more opportunities for what would traditionally be a residential opportunity on campus. There has always been some (not ideal) off-campus housing available for international students. The College is rethinking the concept of what is the core of the campus, and what is the campus experience is going to be. Perhaps adding more of a "24/7" experience for a portion of the students.

Right now, the fastest growing piece of the College's enrollment will be scholarship recipients from the City of Seattle's Education Promise scholarship program. The College is expecting 400-500 new 18-year-olds next year on campus as full-time students. Also, because the cost of housing has become so prohibitive, it is estimated one in five community college students experienced some form of homeless or housing insecurity every year. The College feels a need to offer housing on campus.

In addition to housing, another driver of the plan deals with a more compact and less expensive to maintain campus. Mr. Ferris said Mr. Starling will provide a bigger picture of what is in the plan. From Mr. Ferris' perspective, much of this is driven by the realization the College does not have a lot of help coming from the State. He confirmed with Mr. Ernevad that the College receives approximately \$5M every two years in capital funding for repairs and minor projects. The College's current capital plan for deferred maintenance shows a @\$55-\$70M backlog where buildings are either past their useful life or the College has had to defer required maintenance.

Mr. Ferris said the College is looking at a less ambitious pictures of how fast it will grow but a more comprehensive view of what the physical plant has to be able to perform to meet the College's mission and the population that will be served going forward.

7. MIMP Concept Plan Presentation

Mr. Starling hopes the Committee will understand why the College has made these big gestures and the thinking behind them.

Mr. Starling summarized the College's Mission, Vision and Values: providing a high-quality education and modern, up-to-date technology and pedagogy. This is increasingly difficult to do in older and older, unrenovated and underutilized buildings. He proceeded to review five of the Physical Planning Objectives.

The College made the decision to target enrollment on Main Campus to serve 7,500 FTE students. They worked backwards from there to come up with the space and actual facilities needed.

The cost of maintaining and operating the small, older outdated buildings south of Pine and the efficacy of the programs being taught in them is much lower than the College would like. These smaller buildings, and the Plant

Sciences Building, probably have a better life serving the community than college functions – if the College can replace those functions north of Pine in newer, state-of-the-art instructional facilities.

The College has two sources of funds available for the kind of income that can pay for these projects: First, the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges funding system which is a highly competitive and restrictive program, and very difficult to come by. The second source is If the College started working on other, creative financing scenarios. With student housing, the College can also generate revenue that could be used for other purposes. The College is starting to try to build the institution on alternate funding resources that do not come from the State.

The Concept Plan is predominately looking to redraw the MIO boundaries around parcels the College owns. The College has engaged in a large, complicated swap between multi-agencies to trade these parcels in order to acquire the rights to the parcels around the Capitol Hill Station. It is the College’s expectation that if the plan goes forward and gets further developed, the College will remove these functions from the boundary.

The College also wanted to expand boundaries for potential future use. If anything in the area west of Harvard became available, it would be a logical location where the College may expand and consolidate space. Therefore, that block has been included in the new boundaries.

Mr. Ferris reported that the College has a Memorandum of Understanding with the regional Presbyterian Church. (The church has been closed for the better part of two years.) The church has an interest in partnering with the College either for an expansion of college activities that would have a community interface, or the potential for workforce affordable housing.

In terms of the new MIO zoning, the College is suggesting that all the area north of Pine within the boundary would be MIO-105, and everything south of Pine MIO-65.

The College is in line to receive funding for its next major project, but the funding will not come before 2030. The money the College will get is only for renovation (an internal renovation of an existing facility). The renovation dollars will go towards the Broadway Performance Hall.

The State funds projects in one of three ways:

1. Growth – There is demonstrated FTE growth that can only be met by creating new buildings.
2. Renovation money – An asset that is only be usable by the Institution if it is fully renovated and brought up.
3. Replacement – A building that is rundown and in poor condition so the only way to use the site would be to tear it down.

Or, if the students are willing to tax themselves as the State will not fund student enterprises or other enterprise that are generating revenue from a source that is not a college-related function. If the students want to build the Student Union or add on to the Student Activities Building, they will have to fund it. If the students vote in favor, this can be done through a “Certificate of Participation” which is typically 20-22 years in length. The students would borrow at the State’s rate. They still must fund it through a reliable projection of how much they will bring in each enrollment.

In order to integrate better with the community, the College considered some ideas that the Committee will consider and advise on.

Streetscape improvements: The College believes the Committee will advise it to make Broadway a much more pedestrian-friendly.

8. Chair/Co-Chair Nominations

Chair/Co-Chair nominations will occur at the April meeting.

9. Meeting #3 Agenda

Ms. Sheehan asked if the Committee wanted to put together a comment letter to the College documenting what was talked about tonight. It was decided to set aside the April meeting to work on the letter

Ms. Sheehan will put together a list of bullet points of topics talked about. If a Committee member has other topics to be included, send them to Ms. Sheehan by March 16. This list will go out with the April agenda.

10. Adjournment

Ms. Sheehan adjourned the Committee at 8:05 p.m.