

**Minutes: Meeting #11**

Adopted: 3/25/2024

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

Monday, February 12, 2024

6:00 – 8:00 PM

1550 N 115<sup>th</sup> St — Seattle WA 98133-9733

In person and Remote Meeting, via WebEx – video recording is available on request.

**DAC Members Present:**

Karoline Derse	Keith Slack
Carol Whitfield	Susan White (online)
Shawn MacPherson	Kippy Irwin
Scott Sheehan	Andy Mitton
Joan Hanson (online)	

**Staff Present:**

Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington
Pam Renna (online)	University of Washington
Katrina Nygaard (online)	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Gordon Clowers (online)	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Audrey Spang (online)	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Kelsey Timmer (online)	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Ellie Smith (online)	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Sarah Sodt (online)	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan (online)	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Donna Hartmann-Miller	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Mike Swenson	Transpo Group
Rich Schipanski (online)	EA Engineering (SEPA/EIS Consultant)
Mollie Wolfe	NBBJ

*(Transcriber’s Note: The notes 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 video recording and available upon request.)*

1. **Agenda review and Introductions**

**Meeting start time:** 6:00 pm

Housekeeping reviewed by Dipti Garg

- Welcome and Introductions
- Committee Business
- Presentation

- Public Comment
- 2. **Committee Business:** •  
Meeting #10 Minutes from 9/11/2023: Minutes accepted as presented
- 3. **Presentation (minute/second starts from recording of meeting of each slide)**

(copy of presentation attached or available upon request)

*Presentation begins with Julie Blakeslee*

**SLIDE 1 (7:28)**

UWMC-Northwest

Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP)

Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting #11

February 12, 2024,

**SLIDE 2 (7:35)**

Agenda: Committee Business — Overview of Transportation Management Program (TMP) — Prelim. Final MIMP & EIS Comment Letter — Public Comment — Project Schedule — DAC Meeting Schedule

*Turned over to Mike Swenson for the presentation.*

**SLIDE 3 (8:07)**

Transportation Management Plan Summary

**SLIDE 4 (8:54)**

Transportation management Plan Elements

TMP Requirements (SMC 23.69.030.F, 23.54.016.C)

**SLIDE 5 (9:47)**

TMP SOV Reduction Focus Areas

SOV Target – 50% (pre-COVID 75%)

**SLIDE 6 (10:41)**

TMP Strategies

1. Transit; 2. Shared-Use Transportation

- Employee survey (CTR – Commute Transit Reduction) out right now to determine what to focus on supporting

**SLIDE 7 (14:48)**

TMP Strategies

3. Parking Management

- Push and Pull re: employees and Patients/visitors parking supplies
- Plan to discourage employees from parking there

**SLIDE 8 (17:31)**

TMP Strategies

4. Bicycle use

- Very low number; working to figure out why and how to support bicyclists

**SLIDE 9 (18:42)**

## TMP Strategies

### 5. Pedestrian

- Much analysis of the whole area facilities and how safe and easy to use

### 6. Marketing & Education

- Continual making sure everyone aware of benefits

## **SLIDE 10 (19:57)**

## TMP Strategies

### 7. Telecommuting

- Limited opportunities because of type of work

### 8. Institutional Policies

- Parking regulations and work schedule adjusting to avoid peak hours; nurses already are

### 9. Monitoring & Evaluating

- Continued surveys to track patterns

## **22:15 QUESTIONS?**

Gordon Clowers – how did you decide the goal % would be?

Mike Swenson – lots of staff conversations

Gordon Clowers – City council might want to know how this was decided

Julie Blakesley – many pieces, the institution is cautious in aiming for that; LINK at Northgate, once it connects north may help. Committed to get there, but not sure

Pam Renna – all anxious to get surveys back because the results will help with strategizing

Gordon Clowers – LINK will be a big factor to overcome barriers; good faith efforts are appreciated.

Prefer appropriate, realistic goals.

## **27:40 Review of Comment Letter diagram**

Karoline went through the diagram with the Opening Statement and Summary page being viewed

Tried to illustrate what concepts were still explored

Will compare to alternate 3 and previous version of the diagram

Same vs where variations are

Similar to Alt 3 – Setbacks have matched the 40 foot around perimeter except south side which is at 20

- 105 foot area (yellow) was matched to Alt 3 except for western border, the northern transition point moved north, which allows for extra space for parking garage expansion; think little impact for neighbor close to there

- NW corner has most changes; 65 foot tried to match in footprint except for corner it allows for step approach similar to previous diagram. Tiers changed; steps increased by 30 and 48 rather than 20 and 40.

- Green area that was 145 foot in alt 3 is now 120 feet, and the area has grown a bit to the south for B & C wings and part of behavioral health

- 175-foot maximum core area matched to Alt 3, but aligned with 105-foot area; different scenarios were looked at

- conceptually Alt 3 much closer to matching concept, these ideas trying to capture ideas coming up

## **39:37 Review of Traffic, Parking, Access, and Circulation**

- Karoline Derse: Glad to see Access point to 120<sup>th</sup> taken off table was a big point. Still made comments on garage location language re: loading docks, request noise screening around that;

- 41:32 Carol Whitfield – not on sub-committee but would like to comment – doesn't like the phrase "potential development" that replaced words "potential garage". She doesn't want a parking garage on

the edge and wants the language to say it shouldn't be a parking garage.

Follow up conversation (42:05 to 47:25) concludes with agreement the language does reflect this is potential development and can't be as prescriptive as saying a parking garage cannot go there.

Scott Sheehan – proposes committee take a vote section by section, to see if majority approves as presented

**47:58 Shawn MacPherson I move that we vote on the Parking/Transportation section; Kippy Irwin seconds. Passed with one opposition from Carol Whitfield**

49:00 Open Spaces and Tree Preservation, Aesthetics, Stormwater management section.

- Andy Mitton discusses alternatives made re: wording on “Potential Development” from “Potential Parking”, confusion from “abutting”, “adjacent”,

**52:13 Shawn MacPherson I move that we vote on this section (Open Spaces and Tree Preservation, Aesthetics, Stormwater management); Kippy Irwin seconds. Passed unanimous.**

52:50 Views, Shadows, air Quality, Noise, and Utility Infrastructure

- Carol Whitfield – on that subcommittee; no further comments or changes from what is in here, can't speak for Keith or Kevin.

**54:09 Shawn MacPherson I move that we vote on this section (Views, Shadows, air Quality, Noise, and Utility Infrastructure); Kippy Irwin seconds. Passed unanimous.**

54:37 Land Use, Height, Bulk, Scale, and Setbacks

- Shawn MacPherson – Alt 3 was an improvement, pleased that biggest development in the south area; Scott Sheehan – feels bulk of comments carried through.

- Long conversation on language (58:30 to 1:14:33) because of the feeling that there is a tone change in the language differences between General Intent & Recommendations and the bullet points included in the following topics of Land Use, Height, Setbacks, Concerns by Kim Selby and Julie Blakeslee about pushing heights down, in order to make the square footage space needed, will cause the buildings to spread out. A patient tower is needed. Conversation about the overlay and what that means.

Conversation about floor heights, # of beds, access issues, connections, possible order of construction.

- 1:14:40 Andy Mitton clarifies: Vote on Comment letter tonight. Team goes back to make revisions.

Then one more opportunity to review everything. There is one more chance to discuss this as a group.

Dipti clarifies process: you submit the letter to SCDI, institution will print a final EIS and Final MIMP

Report. Then SCDI puts a Director's report together based on these comment. At the same time the DAC will be putting the final comment letter together. There is a five-week period in which these are worked

on. Then the Institution and DAC will have the opportunity to comment on the Director's Report put

forward by SCDI. Then three weeks (this time needs to be confirmed) to comment on it.

Then to Hearing Examiner, then to City Council.

**1:18:48 Andy Mitton: I move we proceed with this section (Land Use, Height, Bulk, Scale, and Setbacks) with slight modifications to the language to better identify what it is we're asking to be responded to the next iteration of the process. Shawn MacPherson seconds. Passes unanimously.**

**1:20:08 Shawn MacPherson moves for approval of the whole letter with the changes from the previous votes on the individual sections. Second by Kippy Irwin. Call for a vote, motions carries with one dissenting vote by Carol Whitfield.**

4. **1:21:03 Public Comments:**  
None
  
5. **1:21:26 Next Steps**
  - 3-1 Julie plans to deliver the final and other documents to DAC members.**
  - 3-8 DAC member comments due to Dipti, who will circulate to Kippy and Karoline**
  - 3-18 Kippy and Karoline will get letter to Dipti; Dipti will circulate to DAC members for review**
  - 3-25 Next meeting to vote to approve.**
  
6. Meeting #12 Scheduled for 3/25/2024.  
*Julie wants to warn people that the 120<sup>th</sup> access point WILL show up in one point in the documents because the alternatives need to show progression in the decision making.*
  
7. **Adjourned 7:28 PM**