



Minutes #9

(Adopted April 2, 2019)

Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) for Seattle University

Tuesday, February 5, 2019

5:30 – 7:30 PM

Seattle University

Student Center, 1000 E. James Way, Room 130

Seattle WA 98122

Attendees:

John Feit

Wolf Saar

Bill Zosel

James Kirkpatrick

Pam Stewart

Maureen O’Leary (Alternate)

Michelle Moore

Wes Wheless

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan

Michael Houston

Lara Branigan

Colleen Pike

Robert Schwartz

1. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Pam Stewart opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

Ms. Maureen Sheehan announced that Michael Mead is no longer with the committee as he moved out of the neighborhood. She mentioned that Mr. Michael Houston from SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections) is present tonight.

A motion was made to adopt the September 13, 2018 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Center for Science and Innovation – New Sciences Building Update

Ms. Stewart introduced Ms. Colleen Pike to present an update to the Center for Science and Innovation project.

Ms. Pike commented that the project is underway. The University will present to the Board of Trustees on February 20th and ask to proceed in construction. The formal groundbreaking ceremony is scheduled on May 30th. The permitting process will proceed as soon as possible after the groundbreaking. She noted that the new building is set to open in September 2021.

4. Transportation Management Progress and Committee Discussion

Ms. Stewart introduced Mr. Craig Birkliid to present the transportation management plan.

Mr. Birkliid summarized the overall parking profile and transportation demands for the University. Overall parking demand has declined and there was an increase in transit options and use of alternate transportation modes.

The University helps fund the Residential Parking Zones (RPZs) around the campus property. He added that due to the changes from single-family residence to multi-family residences, the cost of the program has increased. Due to an increase in on-campus housing they have seen a relief in parking and transportation demands. He mentioned that restricting parking for freshman year students also reduced parking demand also helping students learn to navigate the city by transit or walking.

The University also provides a Nighthawk Safe ride program that provides safe rides for students within 6-8 blocks of campus. The availability and proliferation of car services such as Uber, Lyft, Car2Go, Reach, Scoop, etc. also provide viable options for students rather than car ownership. The University has a very robust regional business passport ORCA transit pass for eligible employees as well as discounts for students.

The University continues to support bicycle commuters by having over 450 covered and uncovered bike rack spaces across campus, secured storage rooms and access to showers for all staff and students and lockers for a nominal fee, and other services including the use of fleet vans for educational and recreational outings.

The University's partnered with the City of Seattle Department of Transportation to provide traffic and pedestrian signals at 12th and East Marion and 12th and East Spring St. to improve campus access, traffic flow, pedestrian safety and flow of emergency vehicles.

Mr. Robert Schwartz commented if there is a better alternative for the RPZ that would provide more benefit to the neighborhood instead of subsidizing private developments. Ms. Sheehan noted that the institution could explore alternatives for an equitable way to provide mitigation impacts and benefits to the neighborhood in lieu of an RPZ subsidy.

Mr. Bill Zosel asked if the use of Uber and Lyft are counted in the SOV goal. He also asked about more details and information regarding how the SOV goal numbers were calculated and the CTR survey. Ms. Sheehan commented that SDOT reviews the annual report that the institution submitted and looks at the transportation management plan. Mr. Zosel requested they invite a representative from SDOT to explain what the numbers meant in the SOV rate and CTR for a better understanding about the institution's transportation goals.

5. Proposed Minor Amendment

Ms. Stewart introduced Ms. Pike to present the proposed minor amendment.

Ms. Pike presented an overview of the proposed minor amendment of the 1300 Columbia property and its current location and use. She noted that the property was not owned by the University when the MIMP was approved and was identified as a potential acquisition and development site in the MIMP.

The University is requesting an approval of the proposed minor amendment to continue the use of the property for general storage, support construction projects and parking until developed in the future.

Ms. Pike added that the letter submitted to SDCI that summarizes the University's intent to proceed with the proposed minor amendment request.

6. Public Comments

Ms. Stewart 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 Ms. Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod commented that she served as a former member when the Institution's MIMP is being developed. She noted that the material that was presented about the proposed minor amendment is misleading. On page 127 of the MIMP, the property is identified and designated as planned open space. She added that the City Council makes an amendment to the MIMP and it is a very serious directive. She noted that it was a contentious part of the MIMP development with community outcry and engagement about these two parcels of land. She added that not only the MIMP addresses a planned opened space but also the edges around the University. She encouraged the committee to involve the neighborhood in discussing this minor amendment and have the University make it open space before proceeding to a vote.

7. Committee Deliberation/Vote on Minor Amendment

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

The Committee deliberated and had a back and forth discussion about the specifics of the proposed minor amendment. The committee members asked for more details and clarity about the University's plan for this property and the potential impact to the neighborhood if the requested minor amendment is denied by this committee. The issues that were discussed was around perpetuity, timeline, and ways that could benefit the surrounding neighborhood in an interim basis. The institution commented that there is no immediate development plan in the pipeline for the property. The institution also added that their intent was not to make major changes or back away from having an open space.

Ms. Sheehan commented that if there are questions that would help the committee decide to recommend or deny the proposed minor amendment request, she can make a request from SDOT or SDCI to come to the future meeting. She also recommends putting in conditions on the minor amendment and the committee could have SDCI explain the different parameters of these conditions. She added that SDCI will make the final decision, but it is up to this committee to present the pros and cons of granting or denying the minor amendment request that the SDCI can enforce.

She mentioned that she will work with the institution and the City (SDCI, SDOT) to find a date for the next meeting to present in more details about the proposed request and the reference to the MIMP. She is looking at scheduling the next meeting within 30-45 days.

8. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

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