



# Minutes #5

(Adopted March 11, 2021)

## North Seattle College Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Thursday, October 25, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

North Seattle College

9600 College Way N – College Center, Room CC1161

Seattle WA 98103

### Members and Alternate Present:

Michael Cuadra

Martin Grassley

Liz Kearns

Patrick Pendergast

Marilyn Firlotte

Colleen Horn

Zachary Myles Pena

Lee Bruch (Alternate)

### Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan – DON

Andrea Johnson – North Seattle College

---

### 1. Opening and Introductions

Mr. Martin Grassley opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

### 2. Housekeeping

There was a motion to adopt the November 20, 2017 minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

### 3. Review Annual Report (4:37)

Ms. Andrea Johnson announced that Mr. Jeff Caulk will be leaving the college and introduced Ms. Mayra Werner as the new capital projects manager. The campus will be posting for a new facilities director position. Ms. Werner will be assisting in the administrative and facilities functions.

Ms. Johnson noted that there were no changes to the Master Plan. The campus is meeting all the Master Plan conditions except for the two buildings due to lack of funding. The Roy Flores Physical Education and the Peter Ku Education Buildings have been constructed and occupied. All site elements for the parking train systems and landscaping has been completed. The athletic field was not completed due to budget constraints and a decline enrollment, and the field is where the community p-patch resides.

She added that all the major elements of the Master Plan have been satisfied including reducing the SOV % goal, monitoring the effectiveness of the Transportation Management Plan (TMP), continue having the standing committee meetings and reaching out to the Licton Springs neighborhood. Other recommendations have been presented including a supplemental traffic studies and charging staff, faculty, visitors and students parking on campus.

She noted that the goal of the TMP was to have a SOV of 58% or below. This past year, the campus SOV % is over 52%, and the limit goal was 55.2%. The student SOV rate was 35%, and faculty and staff were at 67%.

She added that both the International Education and Instructional Computer Centers are still on the radar and the campus once funding is available.

#### **4. Northgate Pedestrian Bridge (22:39)**

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the Northgate Pedestrian bridge will be coming across I-5 from the new transit station and it will drop off at the north end of the campus where the north parking lot is located.

The college has been working with SDOT with the storm water drainage easements and a temporary construction action to the land and there will be a permanent easement to maintain the bridge. SDOT is wrapping up the permits. SDOT passed by SEPA and are not currently working with Fisheries and Wildlife and other permitting agencies.

The project is currently moving forward, and they submitted solicitations for contractors to do the work. They anticipate beginning the work in 2019. Ms. Werner will be the campus contact person on the project to ensure that the college is keeping an eye on the project and SDOT is respecting the college property.

She added that Mr. Jeff Young, the security director of the college is working with SDOT and the North Precinct police and are developing plans to ensure the safety and security of the bridge.

Ms. Johnson briefly discussed about the TMP. The college was able to decrease the SOV rate and will continue to strive to go lower by providing information regarding alternative modes of transportation. The college is currently recruiting a full-time TMP coordinator. The college also continues to do periodic promotional events such as bike to work and orientation to new students and staff. The new TMP coordinator will work with SDOT regarding their promotional events.

The college's commuter information center is up and running to inform students, faculty, and staff about bus schedules, and different modes of transportation. The college continues to partner with Zimride, a ridesharing program, and the college will continue to conduct surveys to gauge the TMP.

She noted that bicycle parking has not been adequate due to the budget constraints and currently it is down by 40 spaces, but the college will continue to monitor bicycle parking. She commented that the campus parking supply is at 1,689. Some of the parking spaces were lost due the day care center building and may lose an additional 32 spaces because of the bridge.

A comment was made if the parking lot remains full and she noted that it depends on the time of day and year. The fall season is very busy as well as Tuesday and Thursday nights, and the lot is not full during the summer months. The campus still has parking capacity.

She continued to mention that the campus is monitoring the discounted parking for carpools and vanpools as well as the guaranteed ride home program that is available to staff and students. The college has increased the subsidy for student ORCA cards. The shuttle to Northgate has not happen, but there is currently a bus route. The college provides showers and lockers at the Wellness Center for bikers, runners and walkers. The campus also continues to have residential parking zones and pays for the RPZ parking permits. She added that the college also gives free parking to staff who commutes 50% or more.

## **5. Library Removal Update**

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the library building update has begun its process. The college is currently reviewing the different programming spaces that will occupy the building including classroom, office and conference rooms. The governance structure is composed of different user groups that will use the space from different departments of the library including faculty and instruction. The project update will not only renovate the library, but also the building and its auxiliary spaces. Other user groups include student affairs, continuing education, disability services, facilities, IT and security. The goal and vision is to make the library a learning common and provide digital and e-learning, and interactive services to the users.

Once the programming is done, the project will move into the design and development phase where the college will be gathering input and feedback. The architects will have community meetings for the community to see what is being done to the library and gather feedback. The project is currently funded for design. The schedule is out until 2020 and the programming phase will wrap up after the beginning of next year. She hopes to get funding from the state to begin construction.

A question was asked about how big the change will be to the library building, and Ms. Johnson mentioned that the plan is to upgrade the infrastructure with an updated system and structural integrity that can last for several years. Most of the budget that will be allocated will be for infrastructure upgrades.

Ms. Sheehan asked if there is a MUP (Master Use Permit) need based on the work that is being done, and Ms. Johnson noted that she does not think so since the exterior of the building is not being altered.

A question was asked if there will be feasibility estimates to determine the budget for the project. Ms. Johnson mentioned that once the programming phase is complete, it must be approved by the State to estimate the cost to move forward. About \$3.8 million has been allocated for planning and programming. After each of the phases are complete, the information will be submitted back to the State.

A comment was made about the status of the theater, and Ms. Johnson mentioned that there are plans for a multi-use performance space that will encompass theater-like elements, presentations, etc.

She added that the architects and a capital projects manager are on board to monitor the project. The campus has a COP (Certificate of Participation) leasing agreement with DSHS (Department of Social & Health Services) and ESD (Employment Services Department) for the opportunity center. This service assists students on housing, and social services in collaboration with college to get them back on their feet.

There is currently no development outside the campus' MIO (Major Institutions Overlay) except that the college is working with SDOT regarding the pedestrian bridge.

## **6. Student Housing Update (33:58)**

Ms. Johnson mentioned that there is a current RFP (Request for Proposal) underway to solicit developers for a private or public partnership with the College. The potential challenges for the project to move forward will depend on the proposals that the College can act on and budget constraints. The project is 185 housing units without any international students occupying the units and 260 potential units including the international students with certain age requirements. Obstacles to this project to continue to be environmental studies, food services, security, student life services within the housing units, etc.

A question was asked if there will be in-house food service that will be available, and Ms. Johnson mentioned that the proposed model units that she has seen will have a kitchenette, and the College will continue to pursue other potential avenues.

Mr. Grassley commented that it will be helpful if there is a square footage summary of the campus that was identified back in 1995 Master Plan and any changes to the 2010 Master Plan and how much square footage has been used so far and will the addition of the student housing affect the amount of square footage that was identified.

Mr. Grassley commented that it will also be helpful if any potential projects be communicated early to the Committee members, so they can weigh in and identify any potential impacts in the early planning of a project. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee only meets once a year because there are not much going on regarding the Master Plan and if the Committee is interested to have an additional meeting, she could invite Ms. Melissa Mixon about the College communication plans.

A comment was made that conveying and communicating the RFP to the different neighborhood groups will be beneficial.

Mr. Grassley asked the Committee if they would prefer an additional meeting next year to discuss any project updates. A motion was made to conduct a summer meeting for the Committee, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was passed.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that their responsibility and focus should be on the Master Plan of the campus, design standards, building sites, etc. Any issues and concerns surrounding the pedestrian bridge, light rail, etc. and its effect on the campus is a different conversation that may be discussed in local community council meetings.

A question was asked if there were any changes to the Master Plan with the addition of the pedestrian bridge, and Ms. Johnson noted that there were no changes to the Master Plan.

**7. Public Comment (1:22:57)**

Mr. Grassley opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

**8. Committee Deliberation (1:23:36)**

Mr. Grassley opened the discussion for committee deliberation and questions about the annual report.

A question was asked about studies and location of people who come to campus to help in the transportation education planning, and Ms. Johnson commented that she was not sure if the report goes into detail about the location, but they may try and incorporate zip code clusters to get more information about the commuters to and from campus.

A question was asked if there surveys are done on how many would use the light rail system, and Ms. Johnson mentioned that the campus has not done any surveys, but SDOT may have done outreach regarding the use of the light rail system.

A question was asked if there is coordination among Seattle Colleges regarding transportation, etc. and Ms. Johnson commented that the Seattle Colleges are currently undergoing system integration to identify efficiencies and are beginning to make recommendations and share resources.

Mr. Grassley suggested in future iteration of the annual report that he would like to see more data and actual numbers and trends regarding the TMP, SOV rate, and the surveys. Ms. Sheehan commented that the City is reviewing the annual reports of all the Major Institutions in coordination with SDOT, SDCI, and DON and going through all the questions that needs to be answered.

A question was asked about who decides the SOV goal for the campus, and Ms. Sheehan noted that it is a conversation between SDCI and the college, and City Council makes the determination and it is effective throughout the life of the Master Plan.

A question was asked about the big picture of the college regarding trends and changes in enrollment, assimilation to the community and neighbors, etc. Ms. Johnson commented that it has been a challenge regarding enrollment and the college is putting the effort to increase student enrollment and making sure that the student experience needs on campus are met. Current enrollment is 90%.

A question was asked if other Seattle Colleges are looking at adding additional trainings and trade, and Ms. Johnson mentioned that Seattle Central College has a strong apprenticeship program and North Seattle is focusing on bringing more of these type of programs to campus.

Ms. Sheehan commented that the focus of the Committee is on the Master Plan, MUP and design, and any conversation about campus enrollment, etc. is a different conversation that the College and the neighbors may pursue.

A comment was made that it would be beneficial to have a document that summarizes the roles and responsibilities of the Committee and its purpose for the new members. Ms. Sheehan noted that she would share the information electronically.

Mr. Grassley reminded the Committee members to take advantage the knowledge and expertise of Ms. Sheehan regarding the Master Plan process and to reach out to her for additional questions and information. He also added that having an additional meeting next year will be beneficial for the Committee to have a clear understanding about the upcoming projects, and updates about North Seattle College.

Ms. Sheehan commented about potential topics for the next meeting including neighborhood communication and inviting Ms. Mixon of the Office of Marketing and Public Relations for North Seattle College to present about community outreach and communication. Mr. Grassley added that it is essential for this Committee to be an advocate for the communities surrounding North Seattle College. Even though they do not represent the local community, it does not prevent this Committee to reach out and listen to the needs of the community to understand the potential impacts of any potential development inside and around the campus.

Ms. Sheehan noted that the role of the City and the Department of Neighborhoods is to help facilitate the Committee meetings and bring everyone together. These meeting are open to the public, and it is up to the surrounding communities if they decide to attend these meetings. She added that the College could play an important role in informing and reaching out to these community groups and provide them direction about the meeting.

Mr. Grassley noted that other potential topics at the next meeting is outreach to the community, so they can be interested on what is happening in the campus and any updates about the RFP on student housing. Ms. Johnson mentioned that she is cautious on what type of information to share from the RFP if the prospect of moving forward about the project is not feasible, but also, she would like to inform the Committee about the progress.

A comment was made about a community event on campus where the President of the College spoke about what is happening on campus and she thought that event was informative. She hopes that this will continue to build more connections and support around the community about the success and opportunities for the College. Ms. Johnson noted that she will share the information to the College.

A comment was made about other potential happenings at the east of I-5 that the College and the community should be informed about and make it visible.

**9. Adjournment and scheduling next meeting**

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