

**Minutes: Meeting #10**  
(Adopted 2/12/2024)**University of Washington Medical Center – NW Campus  
Development Advisory Committee (DAC)**

Monday, January 22, 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
Shawn MacPherson	Kippy Irwin
Scott Sheehan	Andy Mitton
Joan Hanson	

**Staff Present:**

Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington
Pam Renna	University of Washington
Cindy Hecker	CEO, UWMC NW Hospital
Crystal Torres	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Audrey Tay	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Katrina Nygaard	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Kelsey Timmer	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Donna Miller	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Sarah Sodt	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Ranu Singh	NBBJ
Mike Swenson	Transpo Group for Master Plan
Rich Schipanski	EA Engineering (SEPA/EIS Consultant)

*(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

- Welcome and Introductions
- Committee Business
- Presentation
- Public Comment

**2. Committee Business: •**

Meeting #9 Minutes from 9/11/2023: Minutes accepted

### **3. Presentation (minute/second starts from recording of meeting of each slide)**

#### **SLIDE 1 (10:15)**

UWMC-Northwest  
Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP)  
Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting #10  
January 22, 2024

#### **SLIDE 2 (10:33)**

Committee Business — Draft MIMP & Draft EIS Public Comments Summary — Overview of Prelim. Final MIMP & EIS — Project Schedule — DAC Meeting Schedule

#### **SLIDE 3 (10:54)**

DAC & Community Process – Entering these last comments to be incorporated into Final MIMP & EIS and the DAC letter to the hearing examiner

#### **SLIDE 4 (11:26)**

Reminder: Draft MIMP/EIS SEPA Comment Period is closed  
Comments responded to in this version draft MIMP/EIS

#### **SLIDE 5 (11:52)**

All Comments & Responses Included in Prelim Final EIS  
Comments numbered and itemized so they could be followed through the documents

#### **SLIDE 6 (12:27)**

Overview of City Comments from SDOT and SCCI – mostly clarifying procedural issues and working on transportation plan details (access point issues; bicycle usage support; bus & light rail connections)

#### **SLIDE 7 (13:31)**

Overview of Public Comments

- Access; heights; setbacks; parking; view analyses and shadow studies questions; construction impact; bike/pedestrian connections

#### **SLIDE 8 (15:25)**

DAC Comments  
Recommended Revisions from Oct 2023 DAC letter

- Access; heights; setbacks; parking garage locations; campus loop drive; & some assorted general comments

#### **SLIDE 9 (16:38)**

Project goals – MIMP Growth

- Accommodate future growth of patient care requirements; replace/expand facilities as needed; create flexibility

#### **SLIDE 10 (17:49)**

Campus Access Points

#### **SLIDE 11 (18:23)**

Heights & Setbacks

#### **SLIDE 12 (18:49)**

Testing DAC Alternative Height & Setbacks

**SLIDE 13 (19:30)**

Testing DAC Alternative Height & Setbacks with MIMP Strategies

**SLIDE 14 (20:20)**

UWMC – northwest Response – Alternative #3 NEW (points)

**SLIDE 15 (21:21)**

UWMC – Northwest Response – Alternative #3 NEW (map)

**SLIDES 16, 17, 18 19, 20, 21 (21:38)**

Alternative #3 NEW: Heights

**SLIDE 22, 23 (24:53)**

Alternative #3 NEW: Setbacks

**SLIDE 24 (26:15)**

Alternative #3 NEW (proposed for FMIP / FEIS)

**SLIDE 25 (26:20)**

Alternative #3 NEW: Testing Scenarios (graphics)

**SLIDE 26 (26:58)**

Alternative #3 NEW: Views Studied in Prelim. Final EIS

**SLIDE 27 (27:20)**

Defining Parking Garage Locations (points)

**SLIDE 28 (28:02)**

Campus Loop Drive

**SLIDE 29 (29:10)**

General Comments / Changes in Preliminary Final MIMP

- Chapter V: Transportation Management Plan; Lot Coverage Development Standards; Open Space Development Standards; Updates to Definitions; Appendix F: Potential Development Strategies

**SLIDE 30 (30:15)**

Preliminary Final EIS

- Alternative 3 Introduced and Assessed; N. 115<sup>th</sup> St described as Preferred 3<sup>rd</sup> Access; References Final MIMP's new loop drive development standard; Exceptional tree references updated to City's new language as "Tier 1" and "Tier 2" Trees; Text added to Transportation Analyses; All Comment Letters provided with UWMC Responses – see chapter 4

**SLIDE 31 (31:21)**

DAC Questions or Comments

DISCUSSION OF PRESENTATION summary

(~32:00) Clarification of heights and setbacks conversation that includes defining terms, vegetation discussion, and sidewalks

(39:40) Parking Garage placement conversation: location will depend once the building locations are decided upon since parking needs to accommodate patients; prefer to not build more parking than necessary; emissions and heights questioned; intention that screens and buffers would be on garage on the side facing residential neighbors (emissions, lights, noise); above ground vs below ground; open vs closed walls to building; car emissions are lowering each year

(~45:20) Discussion of setbacks and sensitive areas around the edges – new buildings will affect quality of life

(46:20) Confusion regarding heights and tiering shown in the height overlay slides that show the zoning

(49:38) Discussion of these scenarios showing where the growth and replacement that will need to take place may possibly occur. There will be phasing of any growth/building that will need to adhere to the MIMP standards. Concrete answers on what it will eventually be built out are not available.

(52:15) Conversation re: how the shadow studies were done. Shadow is taken for the whole campus

(55:15) Q: Once a plan for the buildings is firmed up, will there be community input on the individual project? A: there IS process. If significantly different from the plan, there would be more process. Key is IAC, which is how the MIMP is overseen.

(56:30) Andy M Q: in figure 3.25, would it be worth to strike language re: potential future garage? A: can look at this, but the DAC asks for circulation and parking garage.

(58:35) Joan Hanson Q: re: building heights in Alternative 3 what are the distances from the property line to the 145 and 175 foot high buildings?

Q: What kind of building can be built there?

Also would prefer to have parking garage on north side option removed from consideration

(1:03:11) Q: Zoning attached to property or to this use? A: Zoning is an overlay and is connected to UWMC

(1:04:34) Q: Communication tower – what will it be like and where will they be located? A: 5g network is small and unobtrusive. Conversation about other communication tower situations.

1:08:50 Q: Traffic signal at 115<sup>th</sup> – when would something be done on this? A from Mike Swenson: SDOT will be involved with any changes; when it happens is based on EIS guidance development trigger. Sliding scale that factors time and square footage as well as area growth rates and background traffic.

Q: would traffic only be impacted at 115<sup>th</sup> and Meridian or would it impact other intersections in the area?

A: Studies showed the other intersections would not be impacted with the information that was known. Roundabout at this point in time would not work in this location.

Q: Ashworth improvements on 120th A: Completion in 2024 – [Link to project](#) provided by Kelsey

(1:20:00) Q: What is happening with parking? A: Signage has changed. Part of it is 2 hour parking and the rest is no parking Question being forwarded along to get an accurate answer.

#### **4. Public Comment:**

D. Garg reads aloud a letter submitted online prior to the meeting. Letter attached to minutes.

## 5. Next Steps

**1-29 Compiled comments will go out by Dipti AND board comments are due to Dipti**

**2-5 Draft letter to review on Feb 5<sup>th</sup>**

**2-12 Next meeting on February 12 to vote to approve.**

6. Meeting #11 Scheduled for 2/12/2024.

## 7. Adjourned 7:35 PM

January 22, 2024

Via email: dipti.garg@seattle.gov

Dipti Garg Major Institutions and School Coordinator City of Seattle

Dear Dipti-

I am President of the Stendall Homeowners Association. I have reviewed the preliminary power point presentation and happy to see some of the modifications that were made to address concerns we raised with the proposed master plan. While we appreciate the effort to address some of our concerns we do not believe it goes far enough to strike an appropriate and reasonable balance with the livability and vitality needs of Stendall Place.

The new site plans depict, for the first time, a parking garage where the E-Wing is currently located. The impacts associated with locating a parking garage in this area were not assessed in the EIS. A parking garage will have significant adverse impacts in this location that require study and mitigation. For example, car lights from cars parking at night in an elevated garage will likely shine into Stendall Place and into the homes of those who reside there. There will also be significant noise impacts that will impact residents at Stendall Place including, and without limitation, tires squealing from tight turning radiuses, car alarms and key fob beeping. None of these impacts of been assessed and no mitigation measures proposed. We request that the site master plan remove the reference to a parking garage in this location. At a minimum, additional study of these impacts is required before the EIS may be finalized.

We are disappointed that some of the issues we raised in our earlier comment letter do not appear to have been addressed including, but not limited to the following issues:

- Complete Shading and View Assessments--To our knowledge, no specific shading and aesthetic assessments have been completed based on the building envelopes proposed in the new master plan. Cherry-picking a possible building design that occupies only a portion of the allowed building envelope for shading and view analysis does not adequately addresses the impacts of the proposal.
- Buffers—The proposed master plan significantly increases the height of the buildings and more than doubles the amount of developable space. Despite the proposed increases in development capacity, the alternatives keep the buffer the same or increase the existing buffer by, at most, 1/3 next to Stendall Place. And, under all scenarios the buffer is not a true buffer because the loop road is permitted within the buffer space. The buffer should be a true buffer that insulates adjoining property from the campus—not just portions of it. The magnitude of the increase in development capacity will significantly increase the impacts from the campus and a larger buffer is required to mitigate surrounding neighborhoods from those impacts. The 40' buffer proposed is less than the

50' buffer imposed by the City of Seattle to protect the environmental functions of Class IV wetlands (the lowest category of wetland) from development. A larger buffer is needed to protect adjacent residential neighborhoods from higher intensity campus that is proposed.

- Loop Road—The proposed loop road should be located outside of the buffers for the reasons noted above. There appears to be adequate room outside of the buffers to accommodate internal roads without having to locate it close to adjoining residential properties. We appreciate that a 15 mph speed limit will be posted. In addition, the streets should include traffic calming mechanisms like speed bumps to ensure those limits are adhered to.

We renew our request that these concerns be meaningfully addressed in the master plan before the EIS and master plan are finalized.

Sincerely,

Paul Whitfield President, Stendall Homeowners Association

