



Minutes #12

(Adopted TBD)

Seattle Pacific University Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Thursday, November 29, 2018

6:30 – 8:00 PM

Seattle Pacific University – Gwinn Commons – Third Floor

3310 6th Ave W

Seattle WA 98119

Members and Alternate Present:

Bob Drov Dahl

Darlene Hickman

Jay LaVassar

Nancy Ousley

Emily Evans

Douglas Jennings

Kim Orr

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan – DON

Heather Eide - SPU

Colin Vasquez – SDCI

Dave Church – Seattle Pacific University (SPU)

Cheryl Michaels – SPU

Mike Swenson – Transpo Group

Melanie Whitehead – SPU

Terry McCann – EA Engineering & Technology Steve

Gillespie – Foster Pepper

1. Welcome & Introduction

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

2. Housekeeping

There was a motion to adopt the April 19, 2017 minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Annual Report Update (03:47)

Ms. Hickman introduced Mr. Dave Church to present the annual report update.

Ms. Melanie Whitehead provided a spreadsheet that summarized the status of the conditions for the University. She noted that there were no significant changes from last year's report.

There are two property ownership changes outside the institution's boundary. The University sold a property on the corner of 8th and Cremona in June. The University purchased a small strip of land from Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway that is adjacent to the parking lot that the University already occupied. Mr. Dave Church mentioned that the University for years has rented a parcel that is equal in length and width that is adjacent to Otto Miller Hall. The University was paying so much and decided that it is worth to buy the parcel. Through the purchase, the University discovered a tiny additional parcel that nobody owns and decided to purchase that piece of parcel.

Ms. Whitehead introduced Ms. Chery Michaels and Ms. Heather Eide to discuss the TMP (Transportation Management Plan).

Ms. Eide mentioned that SPU continues to meet the demand for carpools (3 to 5 riders) which is over 50% . The institution added additional bike racks on campus and is in the process of adding more bike storage next year. The enrollment for ZipCar has gone up by 10% and continues to garner interest for the program. Last year, King County Metro added two more direct bus (3 and 4) routes that comes directly to SPU and the University has seen more usage of these bus routes.

Ms. Whitehead mentioned that there are currently no active projects for the University during the reporting period.

Mr. Church mentioned the four-alarm fire that happened between Nickerson St. and Ship Canal. The cause of the fire was ruled as an arson by the Seattle Fire Department. The fire destroyed most of the business of Gascoigne Lumber. The University owned one building that was destroyed, which was occupied by Gascoigne Lumber. Gascoigne Lumber and the University partnered with an environmental company to do the clean-up. The University obtained a permit from the City of Seattle to demolish an unstable building. The University is in the process of identifying a contractor to complete the demolition. The University has no plans to build anything on the site and want to make sure that the site is safe. Any future plans about the site will be shared and communicated to this Committee.

Mr. Church mentioned that the University has been in dialog with the City of Seattle over the past couple years about the possibility of changing the existing land use code to allow major institution uses in the industrial zoned land north of the University's current MIO. The City encouraged the University to look at the various process that would allow the University to do so. Mr. Church introduced Mr. Steve Gillespie of Foster Pepper to briefly summarize the plan.

Mr. Gillespie mentioned that they are working with the City on behalf of the University to come up with a zoning tool for Major Institution uses that would allow placement of the MIO in industrial zones adjacent to north of Nickerson, south of the Ship Canal, between 3rd and 8th. The zoning code that is currently written allowed Major Institution use at buildings that existed in 1987. They have been in discussion with stakeholders, industrial land advocates, City Council, Queen Anne Community Council and several groups on how to address the needs of the institution while being sensitive to preserving industrial land for industrial uses.

The conversation began 2015/2016, and the target direction was a text amendment to tweak language of the zoning code to allow a Major Institution to use in these blocks of land. In the spring of 2017, the executive staff encouraged the University to seek an amendment to the comprehensive plan as well as a zoning amendment. The effect of the comprehensive plan amendment would mean that the properties would remain designated as industrial. There will be no changes on what is allowed on the properties.

The corresponding text amendment will allow Major Institution uses and an establishment of a MIO at the conclusion of a MIMP process. Mr. Church mentioned that it does not move the boundary, but it allows the University to have a conversation if the path it chooses is to start a new MIMP process. This will provide a good indication which directions the University may propose moving its boundaries. The University has been selling land to the south outside the MIO. Mr. Gillespie added that having this amendment in place allows the University to ask the question to plan for Major Institution uses and development standards in the area. He noted that without the amendment, the University cannot even ask the question.

Mr. LaVassar commented that they have suggested in the original MIMP process about moving the boundary but because they were told that there will be high paying shoreline jobs that will be moving in the area it was not an option for moving the boundary.

Mr. Church said if the Committee would like to make a comment about what the institution has been asking the City to consider, he would welcome the comment. Mr. Gillespie noted that when he talked to the North Industrial Association and several other key players, the message he received is that they are concerned about the industrial land, but they like the University, and agree that the land will be better served as an institutional land.

The Planning and Land Use Zoning Committee will be discussing this on Wednesday and the full City Council could take up the proposal as soon as the second week of December.

4. Public Comments (26:41)

Ms. Hickman opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments 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 Mr. Tom Schmitt: Mr. Schmitt is a neighbor and he commented about the property across from the cemetery and if the institution is purchasing the property.

Mr. Church mentioned that the cemetery put a piece of property for sale where their maintenance shed and surplus soil operations were located. The cemetery sold that property to a party who resold it to a developer, G Projects. The institution considered making an offer since it is within the MIO and decided not to pursue. G Projects discussed with the institution about their future development plans. He added that there is nothing happening between G Projects and the institution.

Mr. LaVassar commented about putting the light along the pathway of the canal since it is very dark and dangerous, and Mr. Church noted that someone vandalized through the electric wire and stole the copper wires. The university is trying to get a permit from SDOT and re-establish the lighting.

5. Committee Deliberation (32:19)

Ms. Hickman opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Ms. Sheehan called the Committees attention to a letter SPU received from SDCI. SDCI reviews the annual report along with SDOT and DON to make sure that the institution is reporting on what they are supposed to. The letter that was sent includes comments from SDCI and SDOT. The goal is to have additional answers on whether they are meeting the SOV rate they were asked to meet. These departments will work collaboratively with SPU to ensure they are meeting its goal.

Mr. Church commented that they received and are reviewing the letter and will have its response by the end of January to address the transportation issues. He added that the institution came close to meeting its goal. He noted that the loss of the Route 17 bus and the establishment of Routes 3 and 4 took awhile for

commuters to adjust to their commute, and it was a challenge having these commuters change their behaviors. He added the SPU is planning to talk to SDOT and DON and collaborate on different ideas to improve its TMP results.

Ms. Sheehan added that Commute Seattle is another group that will be included in the conversation and they will work with the institution on different methods and techniques they could use for improvement.

A comment was made if the institution is able to track rideshare data, and Mr. Church mentioned that the best tracking tool is the CTR (Commute Trip Reduction) survey they do every other year.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned about the survey that the Committee received. One of the major themes from the survey from other major institutions was the frequency of meetings. She wants to ensure that the Committee is being utilized and connected with what is happening with the institution other than having a meeting once a year to review the annual report. She asked the Committee if there is an interest to have a meeting more than once a year. A comment was made that having a meeting once a year works and she trusts that the institution will inform the Committee in a timely manner if there are any developments.

Ms. Sheehan commented that she will send the minutes in the next few weeks and there are no further action items.

There was a question if the Committee will receive a full report on the City Council's response, and Ms. Sheehan noted that the institution will provide that report.

A comment was made about the institution's commitment on the original MIMP and he mentioned that the institution began with a good MIMP to start with and that they are doing a good job on following up on it.

A comment was made if there is an interest from the Committee to have a vote of support for the request that Mr. Gillespie spoke about. Mr. LaVassar volunteered to do a first draft and he will send it out for review. Mr. Church mentioned that it would be helpful if a statement that summarizes encouraging the institution to move its boundaries towards the north instead of west and south.

Mr. Bob Drov Dahl made a motion for Mr. LaVassar to prepare a brief statement of letter in support of the institution's boundary proposal to present in front of the City Council, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

Mr. Church recommended that the letter should be in Council member Rob Johnson's office before December 5th. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will work with Mr. Gillespie and the institution to forward the request.

6. Adjournment and scheduling next meeting

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