



# Minutes: Meeting #3

(6/26/2023)

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

Monday, May 22, 2023

6:00 – 8:00 PM

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

### Members Present:

Scott Sheehan  
Andy Mitton  
Susan White  
Kippy Irwin  
Joan Hanson  
Carol Whitfield  
Shawn MacPherson

### Staff Present:

Cindy Hecker	University of Washington
Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington
Pam Renna	University of Washington
Kelsey Timmer	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Molly Wolf	NBBJ
Ranu Singh	NBBJ
Kassi Leingang	Transpo Group
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)

*(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. Introductions

**Meeting start time:** 6:05 pm

- Meeting Minutes from 4/24/2023: Minutes adopted. Scott Sheehan, Chair

### 2. Committee Business: Discussion on Concept Plan Comments Letter -Andy Mitton

Andy explains the purpose of the letter. It was a collection of all the input received from the committee and public comments. The letter is not intended to give answers but more to historically document what the committees’ questions are that need to be addressed. The goal is to ask for a motion to approve the letter or a secondary motion to adjust. This would occur after there was a discussion that would include new input and a revision to the letter.

- 5/22/2023 Motion Presented, Motion Seconded Letter Passed as Presented
- 5/22/2023 Bylaws Motion Presented, Motion Seconded, Bylaws Passed as Presented

### 3. Address Meeting #2 Questions

Julie Blakeslee and Molly Wolf addressed questions from Meeting 2.

- Slide showing comparison of alternatives for the building height overlays and their sections. Molly W. explains the unique situation given that the designs haven't been created yet. This is conceptual of what the University could see in growth over the next 20 years. Molly reviewed the future development constraints used to create the potential development scenarios they studied.
- Slide showing 5 tested potential development scenarios Alternative #1. Molly W. explains this was done to see the possible growth scenarios and to see what square footage was possible for the campus.
- Slide reviewing Alternative #2. Julie B. points out this alternative has reduced height in some areas, so it takes up more of the volume to get to the same size of square footage.
- Slide showing Scenario #1 "Maximum Efficiency" In Fewest Phases Scenario #2 Budget Driven Smaller Projects.
- a Central Utility Plant (CUP)

### 4. Presentation: Transportation and Parking Analysis

Kassi Leingang

- Slide showing Transportation Analysis Scope
  1. Trip generation
  2. Traffic Volumes
  3. Traffic Operations
  4. Safety
  5. Transportation Mgmt.
  6. Site Design
  7. Multimodal Affects
  8. Parking
- Slide showing Study Area Map
  1. Analysis on key intersections in SDCI and SDOT staff discussions.
  2. Analysis to be conducted for the weekday AM and PM peak hours.
- Slide Showing EIS Analysis of Development Alternatives
  1. Existing Conditions- What is out there today?
  2. Future without MIMP-No Action (2030&2040) What do we imagine in the future once Behavioral health and other developments come online.
  3. MIMP Alternative 1
    - A. Option 1 Additional access via 115<sup>th</sup>
    - B. Option 2 Additional access via 120<sup>th</sup>
  4. MIMP Alternative 2- SF identified in the MIMP is the same.
- Slide showing Campus Traffic Volumes
  1. Existing traffic volumes
 

From Resident- So as a hospital you still consider these to be your peak hours?  
Response It is consistent with city standards.
  2. No Action traffic volume
    - a. Existing Condition plus traffic associated with BHTF.
    - b. Annual background growth rate of 1%
    - c. Traffic associated with approved but not occupied developments.
  3. Alternatives 1 and 2

- a. Trip rates based on existing counts and adjustments to reflect “right-sizing” of hospital.
- b. Adjusted trip rates applied to proposed 860K gsf of campus development.

- Slide showing Intersection Level of Service (LOS) Analysis.
  1. Graded LOS A-LOS F Good to poor.
  2. Intersection delay considers roadway/intersection geometry and existing/ forecast volumes.
  3. Comparison of No action to Action alternatives.
- Slide showing existing and forecast future without MIMP (2040).
- Slide showing Alternative 1 & 2 Trip Generation Estimates (2030-2040).
- Slide showing trip distributions patterns.
- Slide showing Parking Analysis.
- Slide showing Additional Analysis Areas.
  1. Multi-modal options.
  2. Safety access and circulation.
  3. Transportation related Development Standards.

**From Committee Member:** How are you addressing the traffic patterns that you indicated in morning and afternoon with adding an additional entrance at 120<sup>th</sup> and what have you considered so far?

**From Committee Member:** Why is 120<sup>th</sup> considered an option when most of the time the traffic comes from the south anyway? When will an analysis be done?

**From Nelson Pesigan:** In the MIMP you have a single occupancy goal rate, would the goal rate change within your master plan?

**From Committee Member:** Is the study area capturing the new roundabouts at 145<sup>th</sup>?

## 5. Public Comment

**From Resident** Francisca (online) wanted to know how the public comments are going to be addressed? Will it be a document? Will it be addressed by UW in its environmental sustainability impact statement? She would like to understand how this process works. Will her present comment be in the public comments and where would that be?

## 6. MIMP Schedule Update.

Julie provided an update on MIMP schedule.

## 7. Meeting # 4 scheduling 6/26/2023 @ 6PM

## 8. Meeting Adjourned