

**MEETING #19: NOTICE & AGENDA
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) FOR
SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY**

Date: Wednesday, August 17, 2022
Time: 6:00 – 7:30 PM
Location (in-person): Seattle City Hall
 600 4th Avenue, Conf. Room 370
 Seattle, WA 98104

Virtual Link: [Webex Meeting Link](#)
Dial-in/Access Code: 1-206-207-1700 / 2480 985 4948

You may access the meeting by the Webex Event Link or the telephone call-in line.

This meeting will be recorded, and the recording is available upon request.

****PUBLIC COMMENT** Sign-up to provide verbal Public Comment at the meeting [here](#).

You may submit written public comment any time. We encourage you to submit written comment well in advance of the meeting to give the Committee sufficient time to review them. If you would like to ensure that your written public comment is forwarded to the Committee prior to the Committee meeting, please submit your comment to nelson.pesigan@seattle.gov no later than 3:30 pm the day prior to meeting.

This group advises the City of Seattle and Seattle Pacific University on development of the Seattle Pacific University Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP).

Time	Topic	Presenter
6:00 PM	Welcome & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping Meeting #19 Context 	Nelson Pesigan, DON Nancy Ousley & Patreese Martin, co-chairs
6:05	Public Comments	Public
6:15	Presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Height, Bulk & Scale 	Michele Sarlitto/Gretchen Brunner
6:45	Committee Deliberation	Committee
7:30 PM	Adjournment & Next meeting	Nancy Ousley & Patreese Martin, co-chairs

Not all agenda items were known at the time of the mailing of this notice and agenda, and items may be added or deleted, and their order on the agenda changed, prior to, and at the start of, the meeting.

For more information contact Nelson Pesigan (206) 684-0209.



Welcome & Introductions

In Attendance

Committee Members

- Patreese Martin – Co-Chair
- Nancy Ousley – Co-Chair
- John Rush
- Debra Sequeira
- John Stoddard
- Sue Tanner
- David Rice

City Staff

- Nelson Pesigan – DON Staff
- Dipti Garg – DON Staff
- Abby Weber – SDCI

SPU Staff

- Dave Church – SPU Staff
- Cindy Harper – SPU Staff

Presenters

- Michele Sarlitto – EIS
- Gretchen Brunner – EIS
- Kristy Hollinger – EIS

Goals of Meeting

- Adopt Previous Meeting Minutes from 07/22
 - Minutes adopted.
- Listen to Presentations
- Committee Deliberation to follow

Public Comments

- None

Presentations

- Discussion on the elements of the environment analyzed in this EIS.
- Presentation on EIS Transportation/Traffic/Parking to come.

Land Use – Michele S. & Gretchen B.

- Presentation on the existing land uses on campus and off campus.
- Presentation on the existing land uses within the boundary expansion area.
- Presentation on the existing campus zoning, including the expansion areas.
- Presentation on the proposed land concentrations as identified in the Draft MIMP – including areas for Mixed Use, Athletics/Recreation, Education & General, and Housing.
- Presentation on changes in campus and proposed boundary expansion areas and impacts to expect with implementation of the Draft MIMP, including displacement and/or relocation of existing institutional and non-institutional land uses.
 - Land use impacts to areas surrounding campus would be a function of proposed use, development intensity, and location on campus.
- Presentation on development in the northern and central portions of campus.
- Presentation on the proposed MIO boundary expansion areas.

- Presentation on impacts and incompatibility due to MIO boundary expansion, such as increased noise, traffic, and pedestrian activity to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Presentation on commercial mixed-use areas and discussion on alternatives under the Draft MIMP.
- Presentation on displacement of industrial zoning in the northwest boundary expansion area. Further discussion on alternatives under the Draft MIMP.
- Presentation on street and alley vacations.
- Presentation on planned employment and population growth in the area.
- Presentation on increased campus population and pedestrian activity, in addition to expected impact on business.
- No significant impacts identified for development associated with Draft MIMP, so no mitigation measures required.
- Presentation on significant unavoidable adverse impacts. No significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land use anticipated under the Draft MIMP.
- Presentation on relationship to plans and policies regarding 2035 Comprehensive Plan and the elements analyzed. Draft MIMP and EIS Alternatives are largely consistent with 2035 Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.
- Presentation on potential inconsistencies.
- Presentation on height increases against the shoreline.

Height, Bulk, Scale

- Presentation on the existing height/bulk/scale conditions on the campus, expansion areas, surrounding area, and shoreline area.
- Presentation on the environmental impacts:
 - Campus area and density of development would increase;
 - Number and locations of building and open space would change;
 - Taller and bulkier buildings proposed in the north and central campus;
 - Proposed 65' height limit to the west and south would allow taller buildings that could impact adjacent development, even with existing slopes/vegetation.
- Presentation on density conditions on campus currently compared with Draft MIMP.
- Presentation on potential development and campus area expansion. 47 new projects identified under the Draft MIMP.
- Discussion on comparison of Draft MIMP & EIS Alternatives.
- Presentation on the video simulations provided and potential impacts to viewpoints, including the addition of 3 new viewpoints.
- Presentation on mitigation efforts that could be used to reduce perceived height, bulk, and scale impacts. These mitigation measures could be included in the design and development regulations in the approved MIMP.
- Although development does result in changes to the height, bulk, and scale conditions on campus, with implementation of identified mitigation measures there are no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to be anticipated.

Committee Deliberation

- From Debra S.: I'm curious about those that live close to the university and their impressions about the height.
- From Nancy O.: This would not be very noticeable looking down the street, but would be a different look from the neighborhood.
- From Patreese M.: I'm a little disappointed that we are not able to view the other viewpoint corridors at this point in the draft. This feels like a template of a draft report but I wish we could see views from the other viewpoints to have a more robust discussion.

- From Abby W.: I'll remind that there is the first preliminary EIS provided and as additional materials are provided, it'll be formalized in a final draft and a final EIS. This is being developed blind to the changes occurring in the SPU MIMP. There are identified placeholders for additional analysis and graphics that would be helpful to the changes from additional comments. There will be revisions to the preliminary draft before it becomes published. It would be helpful for the CAC to let us know if there are additional views to consider. We are looking at impacts on the preliminary of the site where sensitive areas are that might warrant further analysis.
- From John R.: No comments at the moment. One very basic question, in some of the material we got there was a section on the view shed character – is that the same as these view simulations? There are rejected viewpoints, but I'm not sure what that means.
 - From Kristy H.: That was an internal graphic that we decided to drop from this EIS. The ones in this presentation are the ones to be used going further.
- From Debra S.: Not too many extra comments, but I do feel very good about the push-out area of the draft in terms of what's going on with mixed use along west Nickerson Street, Dravus. I was curious about the people living closer in to know what they feel like about the center of campus.
 - From Patreese M.: Perhaps this is something we can consider as we stroll through the center of campus and can add to our list of questions and thoughts.
- From John S.: I feel that the direction this is moving is good, but I am an outlier and a commercial user. My enthusiasm for this is in that regard.
- From Sue T.: Overall, my comments are very specific to the document as I was going through and reading it and is designed to refer to a particular page or paragraph. The idea of a residential use buffer, I pretty much disagree with that as far as using campus housing as a residential use buffer to adjacent housing. In my opinion, it is neither. I am not saying I object to having housing near existing residential areas, but that language to me means promotional ESI and I think there are other ways of putting it without having it look as we are trying to say that when new residents are [put on campus and next to single-family or low-rise that it is a kind of buffer. That particular use can be just as busy at different times of day as other areas on campus, so I disagree with that term and concept. There was one area in the land use section that talked about a particular policy as it applies to MIO and MIMP that it is not clear that the entire expansion is justified, and I am wondering if you are suggesting a reduced expansion is necessary and recommended? Is that the idea you are looking at?
 - From Abby W.: SPU will need to provide a response to the criteria applied to this site, and there are certain criteria that speak to the boundary expansion and height limits. Through this analysis, we are also waiting to see how the proposal evolves in response to earlier comments and we expect to see some changes in response to all of that.
- From Sue T.: You asked about the possibility of additional viewpoints. I do not believe people on the north side of the street would think that Ashton Hall is something to look over, but I am wondering if they could do a viewpoint from there? How visible will the next dorm be to the East?
- From Nancy O.: Reading through this, the number of new buildings is substantial. I didn't have time to remind myself what the horizon is of the MIMP. What is the time horizon?
 - From Michele S.: This is 15-20 years or more.
 - From Abby W.: There is no specific timeline, the MIMP does not have an expiration date but maybe SPU can speak to a timeline.
 - From Dave C.: This is most likely 10-20 years out. It will be a long while before we do any significant development. We will address the height, bulk, and scale concerns identified today, and one of our responses to expansion is that they are relatively small compared to prior MIO. We likely will be placed with a lot of historical preservation, and future needs will derive our expansion. We have received feedback to explain why we need expansion, and we will explain that and hear what your comments are and whether you agree or not. Happy to engage in that dialogue.

- From Debra S.: I'll add that it is also useful to mention that the expansions area includes buildings that exist already that need to be larger or come down.

Adjournment & Next Meeting

- From Nelson P.: I know there are questions regarding document sharing and quorum guidelines, and this will be a good time to remind the committee. Discussion on document sharing.
- Dipti providing feedback and guidelines from the City Attorney's office to follow OPMA guidelines for committee members.
- Dipti to create a master document for folks to see all information and capture everyone's comments. Feedback from Sue T. to create a document that is only accessible to the folks tasked with leading certain subcommittees.
- Schedule for next time: Transportation is still being reviewed and will have something to submit to the City later this week or early next week, and then it would go to the CAC for their review. For the next meeting on September 7th, should the CAC expect the transportation group?
 - From Michele S.: Cannot promise that.
 - From Nelson P.: An opportunity for the CAC then to go through past presentations in the EIS to work on comments and response and jot down any outlying questions.
 - From Sue T.: I thought we would hear again from the height, bulk, and scale folks, but should we expect that then?
 - From Michele S.: No, that will come out with the draft MIMP and EIS and will be presented again once that is finalized. Go ahead with transportation and put questions in sheet with respect to land use, height, bulk, and scale.
 - From Abby W.: I wanted to agree that the next meeting would be good to review comments and questions so far. We would like to have a comment letter prepared in which as the pDEIS develops, they can respond then.
 - From Nancy O.: I'd like to know when we can anticipate discussion the street vacation proposals and it would be good to know when those would be discussed as there are several.
 - From Michele S.: This is part of the transportation section and will be discussed then.
 - From Nancy O.: It would be good for the consulting team or city team to share policies as they relate to street vacations so the committee can know.
- From Patreese M.: Meeting September 7th as a recap for everything so far. I'm sensing impatience as we go meeting by meeting without any clarity. It would be good to know where we are at in the process.
- From Abby W.: Nelson had asked earlier for a more detailed schedule to be drawn out, so I am working on that and can present that at the next CAC meeting. It'll be a list for code on all of these steps, and I'll provide dates to give an idea of what's to come and deliverables.

Meeting adjourned (not sure at what time)