

Minutes: Meeting #14
5/29/2024

**University of Washington Medical Center – NW Campus
Development Advisory Committee (DAC)**

Wednesday, May 29, 2024

6:00 – 8:00 PM

1550 N 115th St — Seattle WA 98133-9733

In person and Remote Meeting, via WebEx – video recording is available on request (Note: audio starts at 03:07).

DAC Members Present:

Karoline Derse	Kippy Irwin
Carol Whitfield	Andy Mitton
Shawn MacPherson	Joan Hanson
Scott Sheehan	

Staff Present:

Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington - <i>online</i>
Pam Renna	University of Washington
Crystal Torres	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections - <i>online</i>
Kelsey Timmer	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT Development Review) - <i>online</i>
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Donna Hartmann-Miller	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Audrey Spang	SCDI (<i>online</i>)

(Transcriber’s Note: The notes shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions; these have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the video recording which is available upon request.)

1. (3:14) **Housekeeping, Agenda review, and Introductions**
 - a. Welcome and Introductions
 - b. Committee Business – DAC letter (re: Director Report) review
 - c. Public comment
 - d. Next steps, timeline, and scheduling
2. **Introductions**
 - a. (5:06) See DAC Members Present and Staff Present lists from above
3. **Committee Business: Draft Letter on Director’s Report (Scott Sheehan)**
 - a. (7:26) Scott discusses meeting goals
 - Purpose of meeting is to vote on the Draft Director’s Report comment letter
 - Thanks to Kippy and Karoline for taking comments and consolidating them into a straightforward, logical, and easy-to-understand letter
 - Want to make sure everyone has read through it, want to give everyone to have a chance to comment on it.

- b. (9:06) Dipti brings up a request from SDCI for clarification on MIO2 (re: potential bike lanes) and question “is there any consideration for how SEPA Recommendation 10 could be added to MIO6?” (suggesting this is a time for DAC to ask Crystal questions about these two issues)
- (10:25) Andy: felt a little out of left field; will the public get a chance to comment on the improvements?
Kelsey: This would be triggered by development (buildings constructed) that would prompt this mitigation and that can be part of the public process that SDCI calls for. Also note: the recent approved Seattle Transportation Plan does call out for a protected bike lane as well (a publicly available plan)
 - (13:48) Conversation to put it in the form of a statement instead of a question (includes topics that include neighbors not being informed about planning; concerns of identifying what triggers what outreach action and what the process is; “when can the public comment” is a common theme; Julie Blakeslee – this is the time to put this in because this is about mitigation)
 - (15:10) Conversation about it is not the timing of the trigger for mitigation/certain things to happen but rather what are the mitigation actions that the IAC will be processing – how to provide input is a continued community concern and they would like to understand the process better to ensure they will have input; Kelsey will be looking into clarification on what sort of input will be available once the IAC is established.
 - (17:13) Julie Blakeslee supports asking these questions at this point is good; conversation about past improvements and the input that did or did not occur then.
 - (19:26) How SDOT works with the public; Kelsey believes the plan has already been approved by Council. Notifications are sent out on specific projects. Community speaks to communication to them on these projects isn’t thorough.
 - (21:50) Karoline suggested updated statement re-write: “basically keeping the first couple statements, so saying installing the protected bike lanes is recommended by SDOT and SDCI on Meridian Ave N has not been reviewed by the public. While this generally will provide a benefit to promote cycling, this will have an impact on the neighborhood. Then instead of the question asked, what if we made a statement such as, the DAC understands that the Northgate transportation plan has already been approved, but we recommend additional public outreach prior to implementing any improvements even if triggered by a specific project?” DAC likes this.
- c. (23:01) Dipti brings up clarification on MIO4 (re: potential mediation at a specific intersection)
- Would like the location (115th & Meridian) to be specified; DAC agrees to this.
- d. (25:45) Dipti brings up discussion at the last meeting re: MIO6 and if there is any consideration for how recommendation 10 (trees related) can be added to MIO6 (this was not decided definitively).
- Question re: when does tree review take place; Crystal clarifies it takes place at the time of the permit. Crystal recognizes the concern by the community for a landscape buffer, but the tree review is only called out in the right-of-way.
 - Andy points out there is a second issue that the letter seems to indicate the community is ONLY concerned about the right-of-way trees and they are concerned about more than just those. Discussion of tree inventory, canopy, tree removal permitting process, tree replacement requirements.
 - (32:43) North border tree concern conversation. There are layers of permitting for tree protection. There is some flexibility in tree replacement, but still need to follow the code for permitting. Kippy feels north border trees are not honored in the MIMP and trees could be removed if the road or building is done in that area. MIO8 discusses road drive condition.
 - (37:36) Connecting SEPA recommendation 10 to MIO6 and Karoline suggestion for changing it into a statement: “The DAC recommends adding language to clarify that SEPA recommendation 10 will be triggered by any development permits for specific projects, including paving or other improvements along the property lines abutting the right-of-way or residential parcels.” DAC likes this.

- e. (39:48) Dipti brings up MIO8 that Kippy wants more clarification/discussion on regarding the setbacks because it is only covered in context of residential. DAC is requesting that the trees on 120th vs 115th are considered as an important buffer that benefits the neighborhood. Crystal will need to review with her internal team these concerns and consider it for her report; she cannot make a recommendation at this meeting. Reminds that these can be refined at the Hearing Examiner meeting.
 - DAC members are concerned they will not have a say later on over something that was, with no ill intent, missed in the Draft Director Report when it was understood as important earlier.
- f. (47:20) The letter with the comments discussed this evening will be sent out Friday (May 31, 2024).X
- g. (47:53) Andy - move for a vote that the letter as amended tonight be approved.
 - Unanimous approval. No opposition.

4. (48:37) **Public Comment**

- a. Sean Chapdelaine (SP) – first public meeting, appreciate the process and vote
- b. Pamela _____ - didn't hear initial presentation; live in neighborhood, appreciate preserving trees (wildlife ecosystem); hard time accessing how to have input in the process, would appreciate any links to provide input. Dipti will follow up with links to documents.

5. (55:01) **Next steps for DAC – Crystal to provide overview**

- a. Discussion of next steps of the process
 - Two weeks to finalize the Director's Report (around June 17)
 - Back to the DAC for them to prepare their final report that will go to Hearing Examiner (send to Crystal who will send along to Hearing Examiner)
 - 1. Can be reviewed again in a meeting or by email
 - a. Dipti will compile for submission
 - b. Everyone will need to sign (maybe by Docuprint)
 - 2. ~July 1 deadline for Crystal to send to Hearing Examiner
 - Hearing Examiner meeting
 - 1. Will be scheduled after everything is submitted
 - 2. Pre-hearing conference where DON, SDOT, and UW meet

6. **Adjourned**