

**MEETING #14: NOTICE & AGENDA
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) FOR
SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY**

Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022
Time: 6:00 – 7:30 PM
Location: Seattle City Hall
 600 4th Avenue, Conf. Rm 370
 Seattle, WA 98104

Virtual Link: [Webex Meeting Link](#)
Dial-in/Access Code: 1-206-207-1700 / 2483 855 0294

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.

Please be aware that Committee members and presenters maybe participating remotely rather than in-person

****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 #15 Context 	Nelson Pesigan, DON Nancy Ousley, Patreese Martin, co-chairs
6:05	Public Comments	Public
6:15	Presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality • Cultural Resources • Public View Protection • Shadows on Open Space 	Michele Sarlitto Kristy Hollinger
6:45	Committee Deliberation	Committee
7:30 PM	Adjournment & Next meeting	Nancy Ousley, Patreese Marin, 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 and Introduction

Nelson Pesigan, Patreese Martin, & Nancy Ousley

- Reviewing 4 of the 8 sections of the EIS: Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Public View Protection, and Shadows on Open Space.
- Following presentation, committee deliberations will begin.

Public Comments

Community/Public

- No public comments.

Presentations

Preliminary Draft EIS, Section III – Michele Sarlitto, Emily Peterson, Lanka DeSilva & Kristy Hollinger
Background: Michele S. presented the EIS and the 5 proposed alternatives. Section III, which will be presented this evening, include: Impacts to Elements of the Environment.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas

- *Background:* Project area is located in a former ozone control area. Considered area is in attainment for pollutants. Air quality is considered Good. There are no specific emission reduction requirements for the project, and nor are there any acceptable limits. King County Greenhouse Gas worksheet is used to estimate emissions over the lifespan of the project. Department of Ecology has begun a process for creating a new rule that will address greenhouse gas emissions and analysis for EIS.
- Presentation on Construction and Demolition impacts. While construction and demolition will occur, it will not significantly impact air quality.
- Presentation on operational impacts. Focused on potential for carbon monoxide emissions to cause localized hotspots based on Environmental Protection Agency guidance. Transportation team provided data with intersections that would be impacted by the project. MIMP and EIS alternatives will not provide significant traffic related air quality impacts.
- Presentation on the greenhouse gas emissions projected over the lifetime of the project. There are no greenhouse gas emissions to evaluate against, but the Department of Ecology is working on a rule to evaluate this.
- Presentation on mitigation efforts. Best management practices can be implemented. There would not be any significant air quality impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.
- Conclusion: No significant air quality impacts should be expected with this project.

Cultural Resources

- Presentation on the affected environment and the potential for discovery. Archaeological discovery, maps, geology, and site were considered, in addition to others.
- Presentation of scientific background on the importance of considering geology in the area.
- Presentation of the potential discovery of archaeological finds via map. The likelihood for sites to be present were highest on the Eastern portion of campus, closest to the water.

- Only one post-contact period site has been recorded within the existing SPU MIO boundary. No pre-contact archaeological sites have been found on the campus thus far, and the likelihood of encountering an archaeological find depends on the location that proposed projects might begin and the potential depths of excavation.
- Presentation on mitigation measures for projects that would impact high and moderate areas for potential discovery.
- Can proceed with an inadvertent discovery plan that provides guidelines for the contractor in the unlikely event that a discovery is found.
- Conclusion: There are no significant unavoidable adverse cultural resources-related impacts from the project.

Public View Protection

- *Background:* City of Seattle has adopted policies to protect views of significant natural and human made features. Of the city's official designated viewpoints, only one, David Rogers park, is proximate to the campus.
- Presentation on the existing viewpoint and the proposed viewpoint that would be present at David Rogers park.
- The new buildings would not impede public view from David Rogers park. No significant changes would occur.
- No significant adverse mitigation efforts are required.
- Conclusion: No significant unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts from protected public viewpoints were identified.

Shadows on Open Space

- *Background:* Evaluation based on Seattle's SEPA policies, which aim to "minimize or prevent light blockage and the creation of shadows on open spaces most used by the public".
- Presentation on the potential shadows to be expected on SU's campus based on the proposed project.
- Shadows were prepared and evaluated based on the Draft MIMP and EIS alternatives on four key days of the solar year: Vernal equinox, summer solstice, autumnal equinox, and winter solstice.
- Presentation on the findings of this evaluation. No significant impacts, but some additional new shading could occur to the key on-campus open space areas. Shadows on off-site open spaces would be the same depending on the alternatives. Shadow impacts from alternatives 2-5 on on-campus open space areas would be much greater than would occur under the Draft MIMP.
- Conclusion: Alternatives 1-5 not expected to result in significant shadows for off-campus open space. Alternatives 2 and 3 could result in significant adverse shadow impacts to on-campus open spaces.

Committee Deliberation

- Question from Sue T.: Is it possible, in the final copy, to reorient the section so that the figures showing the shadow results for each solstice are closer to the accompanying discussion for each figure?
 - Answer from Kristy H. and Michele S.: Yes, we will try to improve that in the next iteration. There are also many in the appendix
- Question from Nancy O.: Difficult to get oriented with the figures that were in the document and also in the screen when it came to shadows. One comment would be to have some landmarks and major streets that would be helpful.

- Answer from Michele S. and Kristy H.: Yes, we will add that information on there and additional identifiers.
- From Dave C.: I do not think W Ewing Mini Park is shown appropriately on the map.
 - Answer from Michele S. and Kristy H.: We will fine tune this.
- Question from Patreese M.: In alternative 2 shadow graphics, buildings and are shown in Tiffany Loop that are not shown in the EIS.
 - Answer from Michele S. and Kristy H.: We will review and get that updated.
- Comment from Patreese M.: LEED Silver standards that SPU has adopted has higher standards than are present in the MIMP. There is a high likelihood that these third-party standards are in affect and should be considered as well, such as dust mitigation.
- From Patreese M.: Debra, I know that you were interested in COVID related to air quality. Do you want to comment on that or do you have any additional questions in terms of this?
 - From Debra S.: I would appreciate some assurance that, with the potential growth of student sand certain programs, that there will be enough air circulation and distancing that will go on into the future. Interested in the operational part of it in terms of internal buildings.
- Question from Patreese M.: Is there any opportunity for virus prevention in the EIS?
 - From Michele S.: This is not scoped into the EIS, this is part of the building code and operation. We are focused on air quality with increased traffic and greenhouse gas emissions.
 - From Abby W.: Indoor air quality is outside the scope of the environmental review.
- From Patreese M.: When we say cultural resources, historical buildings are not considered, however we can include comments with that regarding future MIMP plans?
 - From Abby W.: Yes, you are welcome to include these comments in the MIMP and EIS. We will address them, but that does not mean all of them will be resolved and incorporated into all of the documents. Restate these comments at each stage of the review. Welcome to submit these comments in the record and SDCI will revisit once those comments are received.
- From Sue T.: I am wondering if it may be more appropriate for the committee to submit comments on things such as historic buildings and indoor air quality, that perhaps it's a better idea to include these in the final MIMP report as opposed to the EIS?
 - From Abby W.: If you are raising these concerns now, I think it is good to include these comments at this stage. Establishing a record of the CAC's position on these matters and incorporate in the final report.
- From Patreese M.: Going to create a shared document that will make it easier to collect the documents, and those that are assigned as leaders for a specific section to come up to a level where you think you have a good idea for the comments which will be shared with the rest of the committee. Once that is finalized, coming back to the City with those comments. Is it possible to have comments on these 4 sections returned by July 6th?
 - From Abby W.: I would like to receive one consolidated letter that includes all comments on all sections.
 - From Patreese M.: When will we receive the other sections?
 - From Michele S.: We are working on the rest of the sections, but I do not believe anything will be ready by July 6th.
- John Stoddard to address the "Views" section.

- From Sue T.: Since you are at the draft EIS stage, you don't want any sort of corrections with respect to spelling and placement of commas and grammatical issues at this point?
 - From Michele S.: Sure, send our way.
- From Patreese M.: Is there a motion to approve last weeks meeting minutes?
 - Update and add that David Rice was present.
 - Meeting notes were approved.

Nelson to create a OneDrive document for folks to edit documents and provide comments on the sections reviewed tonight.

Cancel the July 6th meeting and have comments on sections presented tonight ready by the July 20th meeting. Final sections will be available by the July 20th meeting, and the committee will be provided the materials to review prior. Anticipate the meeting will be at SPU's campus and hybrid options will be provided.

Meeting adjourned at: 7:04PM