

# Minutes #1

(Adopted July 6, 2020)

## Seattle Central College Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Monday February 3, 2020

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Seattle Central College

Broadway Performance Hall Boardroom

1625 Broadway Ave, Seattle WA 98122

### Members Present:

Don Anderson

Adam Behrman

Jacobi Boudreaux

McCaella Daffern

Michael Gilbride

Tori Halligan

Cathy Hillenbrand

Erica Loynd

Jamie Merriman-Cohen

Brittney Moraski

Michael Seiwert

Emily Thurston

### Staff and Other Present:

David Ernevad

Lincoln Ferris

Carly Guillory

Jackson Keenan-Koch

Maureen Sheehan

Stephen Starling

Jonathan Williams

Seattle Central College

Seattle Central College

City of Seattle, SDCI

City of Seattle, SDOT

City of Seattle, DON

Schreiber Starling Whitehead Architects

City of Seattle, SDOT

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Maureen Sheehan began the meeting with the introductions of institution, city and committee members.

Ms. Sheehan asked committee members to network with others to inform them of the committee and public comment. It was suggested to post meeting notices at the Institution and invite Student Body representatives to attend during public comment to reflect more of the community's inclusivity and diversity.

The committee would like to flip the Public Comment portion of the meeting towards the beginning to allow more people to comment before other evening responsibilities.

## 2. CAC Orientation

Ms. Sheehan shared general committee information with the group. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is appointed by Seattle City Council and is part of the Master Plan development process. The general commitment on the committee is 18-24 months. After the City Council approves the Master Plan, the Committee will dissolve and a Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) will be appointed to monitor the plan implementation.

Ms. Sheehan discussed the intent of a Master Plan and the definition of an Educational Major Institution. Specific Institution boundaries will be included when a new master plan is in place. The boundary does not change during that Plan. There are no sunset limits on the plans; however, they do age. The plan will be administered using the current City Codes.

The transportation management plan (TMP) may be reviewed by the SDOT in the future to see if any amendments are needed.

This Master Plan does not address the institution's satellite campuses. Neighborhood design guidelines do not specifically apply to the Master Plan; however, institutions will reference the information. SDOT will assist with the TMP and individual TMPs will be done when each building is built.

This committee provides recommendations and is a stop-along-the-way in the process. The project cannot proceed without coming through the committee. Your comments and suggestions carry weight, but they are not set up as 'approvals.' SDOT and SDCI review the Committee's input and have the final say. Ms. Carly Guillory, Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections, said the Seattle City Council has a vote on approving the Master Plan.

A question was raised on how the committee can educate themselves regarding the increasing density of the neighborhood. Ms. Sheehan may share resources. The Concept Plan, an overview of what the College is considering, will be sent to the Committee before the March 2 meeting where the College will present the Concept Plan. The committee is not required to comment on the plan. The Concept Plan will be available to the public at the same time through the DON website.

The College will be conducting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as well and the committee will have the opportunity to comment on the statement.

The committee will eventually draft a report along with the SDCI Director's report. Both will go to the College. The reports will go through more Master Plan review and returned to the Advisory Committee to produce a final report. (The SDCI Director will also be providing a final report.) The final report will go to a Hearing Examiner's administrative judge internal to the City of Seattle before going to the City of Seattle's Council. The hearing will be the first time the public has an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns. The Council then sets an ordinance which will be a binding contract between the college and the City.

This Citizens Advisory Committee is subject to the Open Public Meetings Act. A quorum meeting of members at Starbucks is not ok. The meetings must be open to the public so the public may provide their opinions.

The same applies to producing a report – the review and discussion needs to happen at the public meetings. Individuals may make their own changes and bring them to the meeting. There should be no e-mail strings for vetting a document. No one can access the document on the Internet and insert comments; the public needs to be present in the room to make comments. Note that a meeting document cannot be edited by the group outside of the meeting. Ms. Sheehan asked the group to realize the legitimacy of the group is to come together and discuss items in the open with the Public so the public can see and hear what the Committee members see and hear.

The committee is a tremendous body of work to do in two hours. The job of the City and the College is to prepare the meetings, so you get what you need. If there is a perceived lack of information, please make that comment during the following meeting.

Committee questions may can go through Ms. Sheehan as a general clearinghouse of information. Documents will sit in the Seattle [Department of Neighborhood's website](#). The Major Institution Master Plan is like a pre-negotiation between the city and the college that is informed by the Committee. At the adoption of the MIMP, the Citizens Advisory Committee is dissolved.

The committee is ruled by City of Seattle Code. If the college wants, they may have a community meeting outside of this format. The college has a great opportunity to break down the brick wall and engage the community. This would be invaluable in working with the neighborhood. The hope is that the college will step up to the limited statutory process; however, the process is old and may not reflect today's reality.

The priority is to get the Committee established and be presented with the Concept Plan simultaneously with the public. If the college wants to beautify the campus, it does not easily fall under State funding guidelines – but it important. The bigger question is to get interior/student involvement. The college is considering how citizens can be allowed to make true input to change the plan as opposed to just throwing the plan open and presenting statistics.

Ms. Sheehan shared that outreach and engagement is going to be an ongoing conversation throughout the process. She and Mr. Ferris would like to hear from the committee via e-mail about community engagements in the community. The institution was asked to share any internal feedback to the committee, so they are aware of what's going on.

The committee will be self-governed by a Chair or Co-Chairs according to the by-laws presented earlier in the meeting. Ms. Sheehan would like to have a debriefing after each meeting with the Chair/Vice Chair and the college to make sure that they are prepared for the next meetings.

Ms. Sheehan would appreciate knowing within 24 hours of a meeting if a Committee member will not be able to attend a meeting.

### **3. Review By-laws**

The next meeting in March will be to vote on the standard by-laws. , provide comments on the Concept Plan and If omissions to the by-laws are noted by the Committee, Ms. Sheehan asks that the comments be e-mailed to her so they may be compiled for a possible draft.

### **4. Seattle Central College Context/Background**

Mr. (Steven) presented a brief background of the college and how it came about. The building site dates to 1902 when it was Broadway High School. (The high school closed in 1946.) After World War II, Edison Technical School was opened for returning veterans.

Seattle Central Community College began in 1966 with limited use of the existing building. In the late 1970s, the Broadway Performance Hall was renovated. In the 1980s, the college built the parking garage, renovated Edison and built the bookstore across the street. The Fine Arts building was acquired in the 1990s. In the 2000s, the Math and Science Building was built. He concluded by going over a map of the college.

In general, the college only built one new structure every ten years. One big planning goal the college is working on includes designing a plan to match a maximum target enrollment (7,500 FTE compared to the current 4,800). The college buildings are older and extremely expensive to maintain. Some of the buildings have not gone through the process of historic review process, i.e. the Fine Arts Building.

Funds for the college come through the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges with a very defined process. The college has tried to have the bulk of the plans that are realistic, coming in on time, and compliant with their funding restrictions. There are opportunities for public partnerships. However, they are riskier for the college.

The college has been using the restriction of state-provided funding to keep from over-projecting. State Board funds three kinds of projects. Growth projects may be requested if the college is going to have an increase of growth. If a building still has serviceable life in it, the Board will fund it for renovation, and if a building is beyond its serviceable life, it will be funded for replacement. Most of the college's buildings are beyond 15-years-old. The funding mechanisms play a large role in which parcel we look at for various things.

Mr. Ferris gave the context to help understand what the timelines the college is looking at. In 2008 when the recession hit, the legislature unilaterally cut the capital budget allocation for all 34 colleges in the system by half. It has stayed at half (with some inflation growth) of what the funding level was back ten years ago.

What this essentially meant was it would take 4-6 years if a college had an approved project. Funding would go through 2-3 biannual cycles to get funding to build. Now it is essentially looking at 10-14 years to go from identifying a reasonable project to actual funding. The two problems with this are how can you plan for a building 12 years into the future? And, the cost of construction is well above the cost of inflation; 4-6 percent each year compounded over the last five years. What happens when the state uses a smaller inflation growth factor, the longer you wait, the more you have to make up with building funds. In the College's case, local funds are non-state appropriated which means money comes from what the college saves off tuition, international student enrollment or money made off the parking garage.

There are very limited funds that we can accumulate. Recent projects have been funded using local funds or the college borrowed money to acquire property when it was available. The college bonded against a revenue stream it had. Going forward, key considerations in the Concept Plan show constraints relative to sources of funds and concerns regarding the aging of the infrastructure.

A positive is that new buildings may be designed for where career opportunities are in the future.

## **5. Public Comment**

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for public comment.

*(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 Tony Radovich:** Mr. Radovich asked if a particular property had been bought by the college. Ms. Sheehan reminded the public that questions won't be answered, but the committee can choose to take up the issue during committee deliberation.

[Note: a Reporter from the Capitol Hill Blog asked to take a picture of the committee, and no committee members objected]

## **6. Meeting #2 Agenda**

Ms. Sheehan would like the committee to consider chair/vice-chairs options. Nominations for Chair/Vice Chair can be accepted and voted on at the end of Meeting #2 on March 2.

Ms. Sheehan will send out the Concept Plan to the Committee. She asked the Committee to review the Plan and the By-laws.

**7. Adjournment**

With no new business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.