



**City of Seattle**  
Edward B. Murray, Mayor  
**Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**  
Kathy Nyland, Director



Engaging the culture, changing the world

**Seattle Pacific**  
UNIVERSITY

**MEMBERS**

Darlene Hickman, Chair  
Nancy Ousley, Vice Chair  
Doug McNutt  
Doug Jennings  
Emily Evans  
Jay LaVassar  
Kim Orr  
Bob Drov Dahl

**Ex-Officio Members**

Maureen Sheehan,  
Department of Neighborhoods  
David Church,  
Seattle Pacific University

**Seattle Pacific University  
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting #11**

**April 19, 2017**

**Adopted TBD**

Seattle Pacific University  
Ames Library – Second Floor  
3226 Sixth Avenue West  
Seattle, WA 98119

**Members and Alternates Present**

Bob Drov Dahl	Douglas Jennings	Kimberly Orr
Emily Evans	Jay LaVassar	
Darlene Hickman	Doug McNutt	

**Staff and Others Present**

Maureen Sheehan	DON	Colin Vasquez	SDCI
Dave Church	SPU	Melanie Whitehead	SPU
Sara Zora	SDOT		

**I. Welcome & Introductions**

Ms. Darlene Hickman opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

**II. Housekeeping**

A motion was made to approve the agenda as written, and it was seconded. With no objections from the Committee, the motion passed.

A motion was made to approve the June 22, 2016 minutes, and it was seconded. With no objections from the Committee, the motion passed.

**III. Nickerson Paving Project Update (00:18:48)**

Mr. Brian Glas of SDOT is the project manager for the Nickerson Paving project. The scope of the project is to take out the old asphalt and replace it with new from Atria St. to the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue interchange.

This project is funded by a grant that is currently held up at the Washington State Legislature. He mentioned that they decided to split up the work at the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue interchange as a separate project.

The work will include full depth pavement replacement, as well as constructing curb ramps along the corridor to meet the ADA guidelines. They are also upgrading the pedestrian crossing islands with a full-type curb to provide safety and comfort for the pedestrians, and these will be at Dravus and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Construction should begin by second half in June. Most of the work to 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> interchange should be done by end of October. The first phase is to work on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and it should be done by the time the students come back to school, and the second phase of the work further west will continue in October. The goal is to shift the

traffic at one side of the street and provide a left turn pocket at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to clear the traffic flow.

Mr. Jay LaVassar commented about the striping and bicycle lanes, and Mr. Glas noted that they are not changing anything regarding the striping and bicycle lanes.

Mr. Glas added that they will maintain access to the University's main parking lot when students and staff enter 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to make a left turn.

Mr. Church noted that SDOT have done a very good job in providing communication and outreach to the neighbors. Mr. Glas mentioned that there will be public fairs to inform the public about the project and construction.

Mr. LaVassar commented about the signal in the left turn pockets along the north and south of Nickerson and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street where there are high accident rates in the intersection.

Mr. Michael Swenson of the Transpo Group commented that he has been in contact with SDOT regarding the physical modification to the signals including signal changes with interaction changes between the cars and pedestrians as well as signal infrastructure and widening of the streets on 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Church added that communication between SDOT and the consultants from the Transpo Group has been receptive and all sides are having these conversations.

Mr. Swenson commented that the priority is to address pedestrian safety along Westlake.

#### **IV. Annual Report (00:02:15)**

Mr. Church mentioned that the Ashton Parking Expansion and University Center project permits have expired and both projects are no longer active.

Property ownership outside the MIO (Major Institution Overlay) remains unchanged; as well as the Foundation and University partner owned buildings at 246 Nickerson.

Ms. Cheryl Michaels introduced Ms. Heather Eide to provide a brief update on the annual TMP report. Ms. Eide mentioned that the TMP results are conducted every two years and the current data that was distributed by Ms. Michaels was from 2015. A new survey will be conducted this fall to gather new information and the results will be published next year.

Ms. Eide noted that they started promoting the Bike Tour Month for the month of May and there will be two to three SPU teams that will join and participate with faculty and staff. They saw an increase in van usage and ferry ridership. They continually promote different alternatives and method of transportation and the best enhancement she had seen this year was the zip car usage. They received excellent feedback from staff on the zip car usage for the CTR (Commute Trip Reduction) program.

Mr. Church mentioned that student enrollment last fall was 4,060 and he would like to improve it and not go below 4,000 students.

Ms. Melanie Whitehead that there were 32 MIMP conditions that were recommended by the Hearing Examiner to the City Council. One condition was deleted so there are 31 of the 32 conditions that were incorporated to the MIMP annual report. There were 9 conditions that were fulfilled, 14 conditions are not yet applicable due to the specific projects are not completed or specific areas in campus are not doing any development.

There were 6 applicable conditions that were done in the past but not this year an one of the example is the Irondale block since there were no development happened in the past year, and only 1 was applied last year and this was the Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The FAR is the amount of development square footage owned and occupied within the MIO and cannot exceed 90% of the sq. ft. of the land that SPU owned. She noted that SPU is at 62%.

Ms. Whitehead noted that there was a past due condition regarding amending a language in the MIMP regarding reducing the SOV rate, and there was no action taken in setting a goal. She noted that the University does track the rate such as tracking the student commuter survey every year and they are comparable to the SOV rate to what the SPU employees are.

There were two conditions that their status was changed, and both relate to 6<sup>th</sup> and Nickerson; and on a 2005 condition regarding the Science Building and working with SDOT to determine a separate left and right turn lane

installed and a signal. Phase 2 of the Science Building was never built and 2005 came and SPU wrote a letter to C-Tran (formerly SDOT) about the condition that never happened. Last month, Ms. Sheehan provided a SDOT contact and determined to lay Phase 2 of the Science Building instead of the 2005 condition so it will no longer be past due. Ms. Sara Zora added that SDOT is now more involved on this issue.

Ms. Church mentioned that the University is having a discussion to host Tent City 3 again at the same location it was before. He noted that if there are any progress on the discussion that he will share the information to this Committee via email. Ms. Whitehead added that there were no problems or issues in the past and the student were engaged with hosting Tent City.

#### **V. Crew Dock – Project Update (00:35:12)**

Mr. Church mentioned that when the University submitted its Master Plan in 1999-2000, they did not identify the two crew docks they owned, but City Council staff did. The two crew docks that are within the MIMP are not connected to the main boundary. These docks were built by King County Metro when the water quality lab was built. The University paid for the docks and the engineering, while King County did all the permitting and construction. The Army Corps of Engineers owns the water and shoreline. He noted that the dock can be accessed by contacting the University's safety and security department since the docks are locked.

Mr. Church introduced Mr. Steve Gillespie, a land use attorney from Foster Pepper to briefly explain the different types of permitting process for this dock.

Mr. Gillespie noted that this is not a complicated permitting process, but it does include several jurisdictions. The Army Corps of Engineers are the property owner, and a regulator as a representative of the federal government. The University also deals with the state along with the federal government through the Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA), and the city through its Shoreline Master Plan.

He noted that the Shoreline Master Plan as well as SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) each has exemptions for repair and maintenance, and repair includes replacement. He mentioned that he had conversations with Bellingham Marine who constructed the float and confirm that the best way to repair this type of structure in this type of condition is to have it float away and have float a new one in. He had spoken with the Shoreline planner at SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspection) and have an agreement that this project fits within the exemption of both the Shoreline Master Plan and SEPA.

He is currently drafting a letter while the University is working with a permit expeditor to complete the process. Mr. Church mentioned that this process is permit dependent and if all the entities agree and follow the rules it should begin in October through April of next year.

Mr. Gillespie added that the onsite work will be brief and the Bellingham Marine will construct the replacement float.

#### **VI. Student Center – Project Update (00:45:20)**

Mr. Church mentioned that they went through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process with six different architectural firms and selected McGranahan Architects to begin a preprogramming schematic of the project. He noted that the current project is on hold, and the University will begin a fundraising campaign and once enough funds are raised, the project will move forward.

He wanted to update the Committee and inform them that there is some conversation that are taking place about this project. The University will be coming back to this Committee to discuss more information about the project.

#### **VII. 6 Nickerson (36 Cremona St.) – Request for Minor Amendment (00:51:00)**

Mr. Church mentioned the partnership with the Foundation regarding 2, 4, and 6 Nickerson buildings. Once the University becomes a tenant of 6 Nickerson, this will be the first process of the project to vacating the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the Marson building.

Mr. Gillespie began to discuss about the permitting process and the role of the Committee because there is a minor amendment involved. He noted that 6 Nickerson is commercially zoned and lies outside the MIO. The commercial zone permits Major Institutions uses outright, however, if any other entity would come in and build a school in the building, permitting is a matter of right. Because Seattle Pacific University is a Major Institution with a MIO and a

MIMP, and because the building is outside but within 2,500 ft. of the MIO, Major Institution's uses are not permitted in that building at street level unless it fits and similar to a list of uses that includes retail, dining or street activated uses.

The University is proposing to locate the School of Health and Sciences in the building including: classrooms, faculty offices, meeting, training and clinic spaces. This will take all the square footage of the building. To achieve that in a permitting perspective, a MUP (Master Use Permit) is required to change the use. This is a Type 1 permit because it is a change within one of the four categories. It is categorically exempt from SEPA.

He noted that it requires a minor amendment to the MIMP. He is requesting the Committee to review the proposal and decide whether it is a minor or major amendment. A major amendment requires a new MIMP and a minor amendment is an administrative process.

There are four criteria that specifically addresses the availability of a minor amendment to allow to locate a Major Institution's use at street level in a commercial zone that is outside and within 2,500 ft. of the MIO. These four criteria are appropriate for this Committee to consider, and these are: 1) There will be an adequate supply of commercially zoned land for businesses serving neighborhood that will continue to exist after the amendment; 2) The use will maintain or enhanced the viability or long-term potential of a neighborhood character of the area; 3) The use will displace existing neighborhood serving commercial uses or disrupt a commercial street front; and 4) The use supports the neighborhood planning goal and objectives as provided by a Council approved neighborhood plan.

Mr. Gillespie requested the support of this Committee for the University's proposal of a minor amendment to allow this use.

Mr. Church briefly summarized the project as an interior improvements and there are no plans for any exterior work. He believes that the best chance for the University to maintain its current student population is to expand one of these programs by adding a Doctor of Nursing and expanding the skills of the faculty, and class space, and this project will have training and classrooms that would allow students practice and perform real-world scenarios.

He added that the goal is to have all of the design in Spring, submit permits in June and begin the interior tenant improvement in March 2018 and be ready for fall 2018.

Mr. LaVassar commented his concerns on the number of people that will be crossing Nickerson and suggested that an improvement is needed on the two crosswalks in 3<sup>rd</sup> and Queen Anne as well as lowering the speed limit along Nickerson.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the code allows a Committee to recommend conditions, and this Committee can have the City consider and look at the intersection.

Ms. Sheehan asked if the University would pursue including the building in the MIO, and Mr. Church commented that the University would consider it in the future.

Mr. LaVassar suggested pathway lighting be installed similar to Ross Field. Mr. Church mentioned not adding a lighting as a condition to improve the interior of the building.

A comment was made that the University presented a very good case about their request of having a minor amendment. He added that he supports Mr. LaVassar's suggestion to look at pedestrian safety as a condition.

A motion was made to grant the University's request for a minor amendment to the Master Plan, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

Mr. LaVassar made a motion as a condition to have the City and the University look at pedestrian safety crossing at Nickerson and Queen Ann, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

Mr. Gillespie noted that if the Committee is asking for a condition, to make sure it is tailored to mitigate a significant impact of the condition. He added that a condition for pedestrian safety crossing is appropriate while the need for adequate lighting for safety is not.

A motion was made that the University should pursue adequate lighting along the pathway and the exterior of the building for public safety, and it was seconded. The Committee voted with 1 opposed, the motion passed.

### **VIII. Remediation Projects – Project Updates (01:23:50)**

Mr. Church mentioned that they had a very vocal session regarding the Ross Parking lot project. They have removed about 500 pounds of dry-cleaning chemical solvents out of the ground and expect to have the system run through 2021 or longer.

A comment was made about noise complaints that was coming from the clean-up, and Mr. Church commented that if you moved further away from the clean-up location, the noise is very minimal and not noticeable.

The other clean-up project involves the former King Fiberglass property on 6<sup>th</sup> and Nickerson. Mr. Church mentioned that they have demolished one building and excavated beyond the clean-up requirements. They are in the process of working with other businesses to continue the clean-up of the contaminants under the buildings. The University will enter the Ecology Voluntary Clean-up Program once the work is done. There are no plans to demolish the other buildings.

### **IX. Public comments**

Ms. Hickman opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

### **X. Committee Deliberation (01:27:30)**

Ms. Hickman opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

She noted drafting a letter on behalf of this Committee regarding the minor amendment and the three motions. The Committee will have the opportunity to review the letter and provide comments before it is submitted.

### **XI. Adjournment**

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