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This document is intended to provide information regarding the environmental impacts associated with an Amendment to the Shoreline Community College (“SCC”) Long Range Development Plan (“LRDP”) and the associated Master Development Plan (“MDP”) submitted for approval by the City of Shoreline. SCC adopted the LRDP on March 16, 2011, following two prior iterations of master planning and environmental review.

In 2003, SCC began a master planning process to accommodate future growth and improvement of campus facilities. In July 2003, SCC issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluating the first Campus Master Plan. SCC subsequently scaled back initial growth projections in a 2006 proposal entitled the Concept Master Plan (“2006 Draft Plan”). SCC evaluated the 2006 Draft Plan and its alternatives in a Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”), issued on June 20, 2006. The LRDP replaced the 2006 Draft Plan, further scaling back growth projections and focusing instead on incremental replacement of campus buildings and “right-sizing” SCC facilities to meet current code and academic institution requirements. SCC conducted environmental analysis of the LRDP in a SEPA Addendum issued on March 8, 2011 (“First SEPA Addendum”).

SCC is considering amending the LRDP in order to include on-campus student housing (“LRDP Housing Amendment”). The LRDP Housing Amendment does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts or alternatives discussed in the FEIS and the First SEPA Addendum.

**Long Range Development Plan and Prior Proposals**

The LRDP proposed six major capital projects over the course of 30 years. The first 15-year phase (referenced as the MDP phase) consists of two buildings replacements and one building expansion.[[1]](#footnote-2) The remainder 30-year phase (referenced as the LRDP phase) consists of three building replacements.[[2]](#footnote-3) When combined with campus development completed since the 2006 Draft Plan, the LRDP resulted in a net increase of campus building square footage of 206,000 GSF (gross square footage) by 2035. The LRDP also calls for phased improvements to storm water quantity and quality, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, parking, landscaping, and civil site infrastructure. These accompany replacement of campus buildings on a project-by project basis.

The First SEPA Addendum evaluated potential environmental impacts resulting from the LRDP in comparison to impacts evaluated in the FEIS for three alternatives described in the 2006 Draft Plan. The Preferred Alternative included thirteen major capital projects, resulting in a net increase of campus buildings by 225,600 GSF. Both the Modified Alternative and Expanded Alternative considered a slightly less increase in campus building square footage, but anticipated a structured parking facility accommodating between 600 and 750 parking stalls would replace the athletic track and fields. The Expanded Alternative further included an amphitheater and soccer field and baseball field. The structured parking facility, amphitheater, and new athletic fields were evaluated in the analysis of impacts, but excluded in the total square footage increase.

All three Alternatives in the 2006 Draft Plan used student enrollment in the year 2003 as a baseline and a 10% enrollment growth rate, resulting in anticipated enrollment of up to 6,770 FTEs (full-time equivalents) by 2015. In contrast, the LRDP modified enrollment growth projections in light of significant enrollment decline below year 2003 levels. The LRDP only anticipated restorative growth over the 30-year horizon with enrollment of 5,300 FTEs in 2020 and 5,600 FTEs in 2035.

**LRDP Housing Amendment**

The LRDP Housing Amendment would add a 400-bed student housing project to the LRDP. The addition of student housing will not result in new significant adverse impacts. The proposed student housing will be located on the site of the existing athletic track and field, located in the north portion of campus. The LRDP identified this area to be fully converted to parking lot facilities by the end of the LRDP phase. Both the First SEPA Amendment and the FEIS previously evaluated conversion of the entirety of the athletic track and field to accommodate either surface parking or a structured parking facility.

The LRDP Housing Amendment anticipates that the 400-bed dormitory-style student housing project would consist of building(s) that are three- to four-stories, with an overall building square footage of approximately 145,000 GSF and a building footprint of approximately 44,000 square feet. Additional pervious and impervious surfaces would surround the buildings for pedestrian and vehicular circulation and parking, initially for 158 vehicles in the MDP phase. The student housing buildings would likely include space for on-site food services, study rooms, and academic or recreational gathering spaces. Space efficiencies achieved with multi-story buildings allow room for the inclusion of courtyards with green space. On-site stormwater detention and treatment would be provided with outfalls through the existing Boeing Creek conveyance storm main. With the exception of reconfigured circulation in the vicinity of the proposed student housing and parking facilities, there are no other changes to the LRDP.

On-campus student housing will likely increase enrollment over time, with reasonable estimates of up to 400 additional FTEs by 2020. Housing would only be open to SCC students, the majority of which are expected to be full-time students. Students already enrolled at the college would be expected to become the initial residents, although student housing will increase SCC’s competitiveness abroad over time. Overall, the LRDP Housing Amendment could result in total enrollment estimates of 5,700 FTEs in 2020 and 6,000 FTEs in 2035. This is still less than anticipated in the FEIS.

Trip generation rates resulting from student housing are estimated to be minimal during AM and Midday peak hours as these students would already be living on campus. It is estimated that only 10% of the resident students will have vehicles so that most off-campus travel is anticipated to be by walking, bicycle, or transit.

With regard to parking, the LRDP concluded that the campus’s existing parking supply would meet parking demand from projects built by 2025 under the MDP. By 2040, the LRDP anticipated that the athletic field would be used for approximately 424 surface parking stalls to meet parking demand from additional projects developed under the LRDP and to replace parking lost as a result of those projects.

Development of the student housing project could result in the loss of up to 116 existing parking stalls and an increase in parking demand by approximately 42 vehicles. Additionally, the student housing project would eliminate available space on the athletic track and field for the approximate 424 parking stalls anticipated during the LRDP phase.

To meet parking demand by 2025 under the MDP, an additional 158 surface parking stalls are planned adjacent to the student housing facility. The LRDP Housing Amendment illustrates the revised conceptual parking supply plan on the current athletic track and field. By 2040, in addition to parking developed on the remainder of the athletic field, up to 425 additional parking stalls may be needed through the addition surface stalls, structured parking, and/ or new off-site satellite parking lots. Increases in transit use, participation in on-line learning, and other factors reducing parking demand may decrease the future need for additional parking supply.

**Evaluation of Impacts**

Environmental analysis of the LRDP Housing Amendment is being conducted in the form of a SEPA Addendum. Pursuant to WAC 197-11-600(4)(c), an addendum is appropriate where it “adds analyses or information about a proposal but does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document.” The following information is presented as a comparison table. For each element of the environment, there is a comparison between the impacts evaluated in the FEIS, the changes in impacts (if any) evaluated in the LRDP and any additional changes to impacts as a result of the LRDP Housing Amendment. The column labeled “FEIS” addresses impacts of the 2006 Draft Plan unless specifically distinguished as impacts from an alternative considered in the FEIS.

The information presented below shows that the LRDP Housing Amendment does not substantially change the impacts or alternatives discussed in the FEIS and the First SEPA Addendum. No new significant adverse impacts are identified. Most mitigation measures outlined below are those measures that were identified in the FEIS and the LRDP. Any new mitigation measures applicable to the LRDP Housing Amendment are identified in **bold** print. No further environmental analysis or compliance is needed.

1. **EARTH**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS**  | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Grading, clearing, and filling necessary for replacement and renovation of existing buildings, but no significant adverse impacts are anticipated
* Excavation and export of soil material off-site, as well as import of structural fill
* Additional truckload trips and truck activity during the excavation phase
* While the risk is not expected to be significant, earthquake-induced geologic hazards could include liquefaction, lateral spreading, slope stability and ground surface fault rupture.
 | * Impacts from building replacement less than 2006 Draft Plan, due to less gross square footage to be built.
* Impacts from northwest parking lot similar to or less than the Modified Alternative from the FEIS.
 | * Impacts from student housing and parking lot similar to the Modified Alternative from the FEIS.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* Prior to undertaking grading or clearing activity that exceeds 500 cubic yards and is separate from a Building Permit, SCC will submit an application for grading and clearing to the City of Shoreline for authorization.
* In order to reduce impacts from truck activity, SCC should use a combination truck routing, timing, re-use of on-site fill.
* Contaminated soil discovered during construction will be remediated consistent with the requirements of the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA).
* SCC will prepare a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) and should implement best management practices (BMPs). As needed, excavation areas should be protected from erosion during construction by placing plastic sheeting on exposed areas, straw or hydro seeding.
* Building design will meet the City’s International Building Code seismic standards.
* Large grade differences will be accommodated through the proposed building replacement layout, phased improvements to interior and exterior accessible pathways, and proper grading to the extent practicable. The proposed landscape plan and grading within pedestrian routes of travel shall comply with the applicable Federal and State accessibility requirements.
* Stormwater infiltration should not be allowed within 50 feet from the top of steep slope areas or on the slope itself. Stormwater should not be allowed to flow over and onto the steep slopes.
1. **WATER**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP** | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Construction-related activities may result in sediment-laden runoff, but TESCP measures would be implemented.
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |
| * In some cases, the footprints of new buildings or building additions encroach on existing storm drain utilities.
 | * No change. Small storm drainage conveyance systems will be rerouted and improved with developments of new buildings.
 | * No change. Small storm drainage conveyance systems will be rerouted and improved as necessary with development of the student housing and associated site improvements.
 |
| * Additional structures would increase impervious surfaces on-site, in-turn increasing surface water runoff.
 | * Proposed building replacements will result in smaller building footprints than the 2006 Draft Plan.
* Use of LID design, including permeable paving, rain gardens, and increased plantings, will result in smaller impervious area than existing campus conditions.
* Improvements to drainage include phased implementation, on a project-by-project basis, of a conveyance system to infiltration and treatment pond in the current Greenwood Parking Lot, on-site detention and treatment facilities for the Automotive Building expansion (if project funding permits), and an underground detention and treatment lot for the parking lots in the southwest campus.
 | * An underground detention and treatment facility will be built with the student housing facilities and related site improvements.
 |
| * No significant, long-term impacts to stormwater quality or quantity anticipated.
 | * Positive effects are expected to result from phased improvements to stormwater drainage systems.
 | * No change.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* SCC will prepare and implement a TESCP that incorporates BMPs. As needed, excavation areas should be protected from erosion during construction by placing plastic sheeting on exposed areas, straw or hydro seeding.
* All building and infrastructure projects will be designed in accordance with applicable City of Shoreline stormwater codes and adopted standards during and after construction.
* Use of LID design will accompany building replacements and drainage system improvements to the extent practical.
1. **PLANTS AND ANIMALS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP** | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| Habitat and Wildlife |  |
| * Short-term unavoidable environmental impacts to plant communities and wildlife as a result of individual building projects. These should be temporary and plant and wildlife populations are expected to recover over time with proper mitigation measures.
* Noise and increased traffic during construction would have temporary impacts on wildlife on the campus and surrounding plant communities.
 | * Less impacts due to fewer construction projects spread out over a longer, 30-year timeframe
 | * Less impacts than identified in FEIS.
 |
| Potential Impacts from Parking Facility/Lot/Student housing |
| * Short-term construction related impacts could include erosion and runoff.
 | * Short-term impacts are unlikely, as proper implementation of TESCP measures would eliminate impacts to onsite streams during construction.
 | * Short-term impacts are unlikely, as proper implementation of TESCP measures would eliminate impacts to onsite streams during construction.
 |
| * Potential long-term impacts include loss of 1 acre of forested cover and cumulative impacts on stand of Pacific madrone trees due to proximity of parking structure and increased automobile emissions.
 | * Long-term impacts to surrounding habitat less likely, due use of LID design and conveyance of stormwater to new treatment ponds in Greenwood parking lot. Loss of forested cover from northwest parking lot, limited to vegetation between the current athletic field and central campus.
 | * No change from LRDP.
 |
| * Overall adverse impacts to wildlife should be minimal, and potentially positive effects would result from the centralization of parking and enhancement of other habitats.
 | * Overall impacts should be the same or less.
 | * No change from LRDP.
 |
| Fisheries |  |
| * No significant environmental impacts are anticipated
 | * Positive effects are expected. Phased installation of filtration and treatment ponds in the Greenwood parking lot will intercept surface runoff that currently discharges directly into Boeing Creek, help attenuate flows, and improve water quality. Potential disturbance or encroachment of the existing buffer to Boeing Creek could trigger a requirement to improve the quality and function of the buffer through planting of a more natural native riparian vegetative community.
 | * No change from LRDP. On site detention and treatment at student housing site will attenuate flows, and improve water quality.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* SCC will prepare and implement a TESCP that incorporates BMPs to mitigate potential short-term impacts.
* SCC will comply with the City’s Critical Areas Ordinance.
* The landscape plan should incorporate sustainable landscape strategies, such as retention of existing vegetation to the extent practical, transplanting significant trees and plants if likely to be disturbed by new construction, reuse of materials, and use of native and drought-tolerant plants.
* To avoid and reduce stormwater impacts, the proposed parking design will integrate LID features, such as permeable paving and bioretention, to the extent feasible depending on soils. Runoff will be conveyed to new treatment and infiltration ponds in Greenwood parking lot or to on-site detention and treatment facilities.
1. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP** | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Includes the storage, use and production of hazardous materials, but no significant increase in the amount of hazardous materials produced on-campus is expected.
 | * No change**.**
 | * No change**.**
 |
| * The new Allied Health and Science Center would generate hazardous wastes from activities associated with nursing, dental hygiene, chemistry, and biology, similar to current operations, but the Center would have its own central collection point for hazardous wastes. Hazardous waste generation could increase somewhat both during construction and relative to additional enrollment, although probably not significantly.
 | * Allied Health & Sciences I building would consolidate collection of hazardous waste generated from dental hygiene, chemistry, and biology programs. No change otherwise.
 | * No change.
 |
| * The number of deteriorating buildings would be reduced significantly, which in the case of the Annex building, would eliminate existing air quality and safety issues associated with the existing science and medical-related programs.
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* In the event of a spill during construction, SCC will contact the Shoreline Fire Department and hazardous materials clean-up will occur according to SFD protocol.
* Construction procedures will minimize the potential for cross-contamination of clean soil by contaminated soil. Potentially contaminated soil should be stockpiled prior to loading on trucks for transport to approved off-site disposal facilities.
* During campus operation, hazardous materials will be kept within designated areas according to protocol established for containing and/or handling the waste in the event of a spill. A central hazardous waste collection areas will be located nearest to the area of greatest hazardous waste generation.
* SCC will comply with Department of Ecology guidelines concerning hazardous waste collection and disposal.
1. **NOISE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS**Expanded Alternative | **LRDP** | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Short-term noise and vibration from construction equipment and construction activity would be generated on-campus as a result of on-site construction and construction-related traffic. Adjacent land uses that could be affected by construction-related noise would be single family residences and the elementary school.
 | * Less impacts due to fewer construction projects.
 | * Less impacts than FEIS.
 |
| * Once operational, no significant, long-term noise-related impact is anticipated. Sounds originating from sports fields and the proposed amphitheater would at times be noticeable to residents in the area.
 | * Impacts would, for the most part, be the same with the exception of the sports fields and amphitheater. The exclusion of these would decrease the noise impact.
 | * Impacts from student housing would be comparable or less than the noise impact from the sports fields and amphitheater. Some additional noise during evening hours could occur with students living on campus.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* Construction and operational activities will be managed to comply with applicable noise control requirements.
1. **LAND AND SHORELINE USE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Proposed development results in intensification of uses on campus.
 | * Less intensification of current uses due to less projected enrollment growth.
 | * Proposed development results in intensification of uses on campus, similar to or less than the Expanded Alternative from the FEIS.
 |
| * Net increase of square footage of general campus buildings is 225,600 GSF (compared to 2006 baseline).
 | * Net increase of square footage of general campus buildings is 138,900 GSF (total net growth of 206,000 GSF compared to 2006 baseline). Building replacements will “right-size” aging facilities in order to accommodate existing and changing program needs and to comply with current building codes and energy efficiency standards.
 | * Addition of 400-bed 145,000 GSF housing project over an area of approximately 44,000 square feet. This would be a smaller footprint than the parking garage evaluated in the Expanded Alternative from FEIS.
 |
| * The proposal does not include changes to the campus boundary and would not significantly change the type, character and pattern of land uses on campus.
 | * No change. Phased pedestrian improvements to accompany building replacement, including new open spaces and landscaping, should enhance student interaction and use of outdoor space on central campus.
 | * Addition of student housing constitutes a new land use on campus. However, student housing is permitted accessory use to college use under city zoning code.
 |
| * Proposed development would be compatible with the pattern of surrounding urban land uses and would not result in a substantial change in the general land use character of the area.
 | * No change.
 | * No change. Student housing is accessory to college use and compatible with pattern of surrounding urban land uses.
 |
| * Proposed development would not introduce a new use to the area, therefore no significant indirect land use impacts are anticipated.
 | * No change.
 | * No change. Student housing adds accessory use consistent with other existing and planned college uses.
 |
| * Construction related impacts would include additional amounts of localized air pollution as a result of fugitive dust from disturbed soils and emissions from construction vehicles and increased noise levels from construction activities and construction-related traffic.
 | * Less impacts due to fewer construction projects.
 | * Less impact than the Expanded Alternative from FEIS.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* SCC will adhere to RCW 39.35.020, which requires energy conservation practices and renewable energy systems are employed in the design of publicly owned facilities. New buildings should be sited and configured to utilize the benefits of the site’s topography and access to daylight. Also pursuant to RCW 39.35.020, construction activities, including waste disposal, will meet goals for LEED Silver compliance.
* As existing buildings are replaced, new facilities will be organized around a campus promenade, or landscaped pedestrian spine, and provide a variety of new open spaces, including plazas and courtyards.
* SCC has developed a sustainable development plan that addresses building design, siting, landscaping, and civil infrastructure, set forth in the LRDP.
* **Housing shall be limited to students enrolled at SCC.**
1. **AESHETICS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Proposed development would alter the aesthetic character of portions of campus.
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |
| * Proposed development would result in larger buildings.
 | * No change. Phased pedestrian improvements will accompany building replacement, including new open spaces and landscaping.
 | * Housing structure would likely be 1 or 2 stories taller than parking structure evaluated in the Expanded Alternative from FEIS but would still not be visible from off-campus due to topography and tree buffer.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* Design of new facilities should be sensitive to maintaining a continuous sense of identity for SCC. For example, use of public quads, garden courtyards and other landscape could serve as unifying elements between existing and redesigned sections of campus.
* Because proposed three-story buildings may not mimic the existing pagoda-style pavilions, new buildings should make use of materials that “fit in” with the existing campus architecture. The facades of the buildings should incorporate brick that is similar in size and color to that used in the existing campus buildings.
* As existing buildings are replaced, new facilities will be organized around a campus promenade, or landscaped pedestrian spine, and provide a variety of new open spaces, including plazas and courtyards.
* SCC has developed a sustainable development plan that addresses building design, siting, landscaping, and civil infrastructure, set forth in the LRDP.
1. **LIGHT AND GLARE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS**Expanded Alternative | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Planned development would result in additional light associated with stationary and mobile sources.
 | * Additional mobile light sources are less, due to less projected enrollment growth. No change to increase in stationary light sources, to be located in parking lots and interior pedestrian walkways.
 | * Some additional light may be anticipated from the student housing project but not likely visible to surrounding properties due to location of housing and tree buffer.
 |
| * Additional traffic associated with more-intensive campus development would result in additional light from motor vehicles entering and existing the campus and traveling within the campus.
 | * Additional traffic is less than anticipated, resulting in less light from motor vehicles.
 | * Some additional light from traffic associated with student housing as compared with LRDP but overall less than in the Expanded Alternative from FEIS.
 |
| * The provision of a baseball field, soccer field, an amphitheatre, all of which would be lighted, would increase the amount of ambient light in the area during evening hours.
 | * No increase in ambient light due to absence of additional recreational facilities.
 | * Similar impacts as LRDP with some added lighting from student housing
 |

1. **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * There are no known places or objects that are listed on or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers on or next to SCC.
 | * No change.
* Many buildings may be over 50 years of age when scheduled for replacement, and thus eligible for listing with DAHP
* Ground disturbing activities are planned in the location of the current athletic track and field.
 | * No change from LRDP.
 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* If not exempt from Governor’s Executive Order 05-05, SCC will initiate consultation with the DAHP and affected Tribes before completing building and civil infrastructure design. If during consultation DAHP identifies a known or potential culturally significant site on the area of the SCC campus, SCC will further comply with Governor’s Executive Order 05-05.
* If campus buildings to be replaced are over 50 years of age at the commencement of building design development, SCC will initiate consultation with the DAHP regarding eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. If the buildings are determined eligible for a national, state or local register, SCC will propose a mitigation strategy at that time.
1. **TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FEIS**(2006 Draft Plan - 2015) | **LRDP**(MDP phase - 2025) | **LRDP** (LRDP phase – 2040) | **LRDP Housing Amendment**(MDP phase - 2025) | **LRDP Housing Amendment**(LRDP phase – 2040) |
| **Student FTE’s** | 6,426  | 5,300  | 5,600 | 5,700 | 6,000 |
| **Vehicle Trip Generation**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *-AM Peak* | 1,310 | 1,055 | 1,114 | 1,061 | 1,120 |
| *-Midday Peak* | 1,442 | 1,055 | 1,114 | 1,055 | 1,114 |
| **Parking** |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Total Supply* *(On campus/Off campus without new parking)* | 2,353(2,153/200) | 1,846(1,636/210) | 1,941(1,731/210) | 1,888[[3]](#footnote-4) | 1,559 |
| *Necessary Supply*  | 2,584[[4]](#footnote-5) | 1,838 | 1,940 | 1,880 | 1,984 |
| *New Supply Needed* | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |

**Mitigating Measures:**

* SCC will continue to encourage participation in the Commute Trip Reduction program.
* SCC should promote awareness of subsidies for bus passes and further promote use of the subsidy by students, faculty, and staff.
* SCC should consider increasing the cost of on-campus parking for students and charging faculty and staff for parking in order to raise money for mass transit programs.
* Existing parking spaces will be eliminated in phases, as parking lots are restructured to improve circulation, meet contemporary landscaping standards, and to accommodate the new stormwater treatment and detention facilities.
* SCC should continue to provide priority parking for carpools and hybrid or alternative fuel vehicles and continue to explore ways of increasing mass transit ridership to decrease parking demand.
* **SCC must develop an alternate parking plan in the event that factors such as loss of leased parking supply or increased enrollment necessitate additional parking supply.**
* **Additional parking will need to be supplied to meet projected demand in the LRDP Phase. Projected supply and demand will be updated prior to each project. Additional parking may be supplied by construction of structured parking or increasing off-campus satellite parking. Trip reduction programs may also help decrease parking demand.**
* **Implementation of policies prohibiting student housing residents from parking or maintaining cars on campus would decrease necessary parking supply.**
* **Increases in transit use, participation in on-line learning, and other factors may decrease the future need for additional parking supply.**
1. **PUBLIC SERVICES - FIRE, MEDICAL, AND POLICE SERVICES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS**  | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * Increased student population is not anticipated to impact campus security nor demand for police services.
 | * Less student enrollment growth is anticipated.
 | * Student housing could increase demand for these services.
 |
| * Fire and emergency service calls are not anticipated to increase significantly based on additional enrollment
 | * No change.
 | * Student housing could increase demand for fire and emergency service calls.
 |
| * During construction, traffic flow on existing campus roadways would be disrupted. Impacts could include minor auto accidents and illegal parking, which could place additional demand on campus police services.
 | * Less impacts due to less construction projects over longer development phases.
* Phased improvement and redesign of the campus loop rood will improve access and circulation for emergency vehicles.
* Phased water main improvements will include new fire hydrants in the interior of campus and fire sprinkler systems for new buildings
 | * Some additional impact from student housing construction as compared with LRDP but overall less than in the Expanded Alternative from FEIS
 |

**Mitigation Measures:**

* SCC should coordinate building design with emergency personnel to ensure effective location of ingress/egress points, building access options, and security-related design.
* All campus pathways and outdoor areas should be designed to improve security and crime prevention. Potential improvements include an emergency speaker and announcement system, emergency telephones in easily accessible areas, and lots with lighted pedestrian pathways.
* **Student housing should include secure-access facilities and policies to limit visitors and guests.**
* **Additional campus security may be necessary to respond to overnight and weekend incidents.**
* **SCC should coordinate student housing design with emergency personnel to ensure effective location of ingress/egress points, building access options, and security-related design.**
1. **PARKS AND RECREATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS**  | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| * New and redesigned pedestrian trail connections and open space areas (including plazas) would occur
 | * New open space areas (including plazas) are proposed. Pedestrian activity in surrounding forested areas should decrease as parking lots are consolidated to central campus.
* Replacement of athletic field with parking lot could create additional demand on City parks, trails and facilities.
 | * Addition of student housing residents could create additional demand on City parks, trails and facilities.
 |

**Mitigation Measures:**

* Prior to implementing the LRDP, SCC will continue to work with the City to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, from the loss of the athletic field.
1. **UTILITIES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEIS** | **LRDP**  | **LRDP Housing Amendment** |
| Dry Utilities |  |
| * Construction of improvements will require re-routing existing dry utilities outside the footprints of the new construction
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |
| Water |  |
| * Water usage is estimated to increase on-site due to the estimated increase of the campus population.
* Improvements to the water system improvements meet projected need.
 | * Increase in domestic water usage would be less, due to lower projected enrollment growth. Demand for fire protection flow would likely increase due to larger sizes of new building.
* Phased improvements and modifications to the water system in central campus will meet requirements for projected building developments. No major water main improvement is required.
 | * Domestic water usage could increase due to student housing. Demand for fire protection flow would likely increase due to larger sizes of new building.
 |
| * The proposed capital project improvements to the water system would be adequately sized to serve the increased population.
 | * The college campus water system was replaced and improved in 2006. The water system improvements included new water mains, new fire hydrants, and a booster pump station. The improved system has capacity to provide the required flow and pressure for the LRDP.
 | * No change
 |
| Sanitary Sewer |  |
| * Preliminary analysis of existing sewer capacity indicated that the system may be undersized from handling the existing demands of the campus. This preliminary analysis appears to be incorrect since the existing system is not failing.
 | * No sewer problems have been found based on more recent assessment. No capacity problems are anticipated for future development.
 | * Adequate sewer capacity exists to accommodate student housing.
 |
| * In locations where the footprints of new buildings or building additions encroach on existing water utilities, the pipes would be relocated around the new construction, as required.
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |
| * Based on the general site topography, it is assumed that all sanitary sewer conveyance pipes would be capable of gravity conveyance.
 | * No change.
 | * No change.
 |
| Solid Waste |  |
| * Solid waste generation could increase both during construction and relative to additional enrollment.
 | * No change.
 | * No change, although solid waste increase could be greater due to student housing.
 |

**Mitigation Measures:**

* SCC will comply with the design criteria contained in the City of Shoreline’s Engineering Development Guide and build into the campus design water- and energy-saving features to the extent practical.
* Potential disruptions to operational buildings resulting from construction or demolition of adjacent buildings that use the same connections will be indentified prior to construction.
* Advance notice will be provided to the surrounding community when utility service may be interrupted during construction.
* SCC should continue efforts toward expanding the existing waste recycling program to include plastic, glass, and aluminum items.
1. 1) Science/Allied Health building replacement; (2) Science/Allied Health II building replacement; and (3) Auto Tech program expansion if financed privately or as a matching funds project. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. (4) Student Services Building replacement; (5) Music/Music Tech/Film/Drama Building replacement; and (6) Multi-purpose Classroom and Administration Building replacement. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. A net gain of 42 parking spaces results from the addition of 158 new parking spaces adjacent the student housing facility and the loss of 116 existing parking spaces necessary for design of the student housing facility. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Parking impacts from the FEIS are converted to the methodology used in the Transportation Technical Report for the LRDP. The FEIS used an alternative method to calculate parking supply deficit. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)