



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



Seattle Children's
HOSPITAL · RESEARCH · FOUNDATION

MEMBERS

Janice Camp
Kim Dales
Theresa Doherty
Shelley Hartnett
Cary Lassen
Richard Loo – *Vice-chair*
Bob Lucas
Myriam Muller
Judith Nielson
Wendy Paul
Josephine Pompey
Gina Trask
Karen Wolf - *Chair*
John Ellis - *Alternate*
Adam Vraves - *Alternate*
Sarah Swanberg - *Alternate*

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods
Todd Johnson,
Seattle Children's
Colin Vasquez,
Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections

**Seattle Children's
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

Meeting Minutes

Meeting #20

August 14, 2017

Adopted July 19, 2018

Seattle Children's
4800 Sand Point Way NE – Ocean Cafe
Seattle, WA 98105

Members and Alternates Present

Janice Camp	Gina Trask	Shelley Hartnett
Richard Loo	Judith Neilson	Wendy Paul
Josephine Pompey	Karen Wolf	Bob Lucas
Carry Lassen		

Staff and Others Present

Richard Fink	City of Seattle, DON
Colin Vasquez	City of Seattle, SDCI
Todd Johnson	Seattle Children's, Facilities & Supply Chain
Tobin Thompson	ZGF

I. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Karen Wolf opened the meeting with brief introductions and a summary of agenda items.

II. Housekeeping

The Committee voted and adopted Meeting minutes #19 from July 18, 2017.

III. Final Exterior Design

Ms. Wolf opened the floor to Mr. Tobin Thompson to discuss the final exterior design for Forest B.

Mr. Tobin Thompson commented that tonight's presentation will discuss the comments and feedback from the last session. He added that he will show a series of images of the final design that will be submitted for the MUP (Master Use Permit) and the ways the Committee's feedback were incorporated to the final design.

He briefly summarized the key inputs on the concept renderings including support for a slender column at the west elevation, a darker material palette, break down the mass and scale of the building, appreciation for the colored glass fins found on Forest A as an element of playfulness and "art", different building views with the existing landscape buffer, and the lack of stone material proportional to the metal and glass cladding elements compared to Forest A.

Ms. Josephine Pompey commented about the bright lights that will come out of the new building and how it will be distracting to the nearby streets. Mr. Todd Johnson noted that in the newer buildings, an automated shades system is put into place. He also

added that the lights are turned down in the evenings and Forest B will not be a 24-hour use building and building rooms will be naturally dimmed.

Ms. Pompey noted about the mini park by the bus stop and how people are used to it, if it will be obscured by the new building. Mr. Richard Loo noted that because of the different architecture and the new additions will have the same material and should remain as is. Mr. Johnson added that they plan on cleaning the entrances to allow separate flows for pedestrians, bicyclists and shuttles.

Mr. Thompson showed a view from Sand Point Way NE that shows the landscape buffer omitted. He commented on the darker columns, and the design team revived the expression of the canopy in addition of more stones to the palette without mimicking Forest A.

Mr. Bob Lucas commented if Forest C will also be different. Mr. Thompson noted that the current thinking since Forest C will be a bed-tower will call back to Forest A.

IV. Open Discussion

Ms. Karen Wolf mentioned that this is the first time she saw the rendering and she observed about the point of entry and its location. Mr. Thompson commented that the marked entry will be visible by the change in architectural materials as well as the lettering signs. Ms. Wolf asked if because of the awning will the lettering be visible from the street level. Mr. Johnson mentioned that they may repeat the letterings at an eye level, but it is not sure what signs will be up there. Ms. Wolf added that since there are many changes around the buildings, a clear direction to the entrances is appropriate.

A comment was made about how she loves of the whimsical nature of the building and how it relates to a Children's Hospital. She commended the design team for gathering all the feedback and comments to organize all the materials together.

Ms. Pompey asked about a user-friendly wayfinding mechanism across the campus like animal figures to direct the public. Mr. Thompson noted that they are enriching the landscape perspective and identify graphics to assist the public in getting to places across the campus. Mr. Johnson added that there was discussion on enhancing and improving the wayfinding during the site walk by using few words or phrases as possible and have more images.

Ms. Pompey asked if the empty space where the Pronto bicycle racks were to be located will be addressed. Mr. Johnson shared that the area will be under construction and there will be trucks coming in and out of the jobsite, and once the construction is complete, there will be plans to address the space.

A question was asked if Lime Bikes will be allowed around campus, and if there are any designated parking area for these bikes. Mr. Johnson noted that he encourages the use of Lime Bikes and are allowed on campus and they may have to do a supplemented round-up for these bikes, so it will not be a hazard around the campus.

Mr. Lucas commented about changes in the pedestrian traffic along Forest A and C. Mr. Johnson mentioned that the design team spent a lot of time separating the flows of traffic and they have had challenges in Forest A. He noted that the shuttle hubs will be moved further up the hill and it will have its own closed loop on their own, so they will not compete with bicyclists and pedestrians.

Ms. Pompey asked about preventing and controlling vendors that use the campus entrances. Mr. Johnson commented that they have control of the vendors and they inform them about the what hours and entrances to go. He added that the challenge is the visitors that comes and goes to the campus. The team will be looking at a robust wayfinding plan that allows these visitors access around campus. Ms. Pompey mentioned that during the weekends, she noticed vendors do not follow traffic directions around campus. Mr. Johnson noted that it is challenging, but if they observed and noticed that vendors and visitors are behaving discourteously or inappropriately, they will be informed and corrected, but it is a challenge to monitor them all the time.

V. SAC Comment Letter

Ms. Wolf opened to discussion on the Committee's decision about the comment letter.

Ms. Wolf commented that Ms. Maureen Sheehan did an excellent job in capturing the information from the last meeting. She added that she sent her some minor comments and asked the committee members to go through the letter and if they have any suggestive changes.

Mr. Colin Vasquez of SDCI mentioned that the letter along with the application should be submitted by tomorrow.

Ms. Wolf noted that based on the committee's conversations on the previous meetings, the committee agreed that these new additions fit within the Master Plan and have noted the specific elements that was raised in the Master Plan including circulation, amenities, etc. The committee commented on about these elements and they were consistent.

Ms. Wolf opened the discussion for any additional comments or recommended changes to the letter.

Mr. Lucas made a motion to accept the letter and have further discussion, and it was seconded by Ms. Shelley Hartnett.

Ms. Mueller commented about the colored driveways for the separation of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Mr. Loo commented that it was his suggestion to have a different textured colored concrete for the driveways going through 40th to the ED entrance to pay attention to the specific entrance.

Ms. Mueller commented about adjacency to make sure that transit riders are visible. Ms. Wolf commented that the comment was about the bus stop and making sure that people can see the bus are coming. Mr. Johnson noted that they are working with Metro to get a new location for the bus stop so that bus drivers can see the waiting transit riders.

Ms. Muller asked if there are any action items for adjacency. Ms. Wolf noted that there are no action items, and Mr. Loo suggested to change the word "adjacency" to "sight lines".

A comment was made about pedestrian accessibility and if the campus is welcoming nearby neighbors to come in. Mr. Johnson noted that there are a lot of people that comes in the campus. There are staff members that lives close to the campus as well as neighbors that enjoy walking around the campus. People cannot necessarily come inside the building unless they have appointments or any patient care.

A comment was made about getting more signages for wayfinding instead of opening more pathways around campus.

Ms. Wolf mentioned that the only change to the letter is to change the word "adjacencies" to "sight lines". The Committee voted to approve the comment letter and was approved.

Mr. Loo asked Mr. Vasquez to summarize the MUP process, next steps, and what can the public expects.

Mr. Vasquez noted that the public expects a notice of application within two to three weeks. Along with the notice is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that can slow down the process. There will be environmental signs on each of the public streets on the site. Once these signs are in place, the applicant notifies SDCI that is already for inspection.

There is a website available to the public that has all the information about the application and materials received. Once the notice of application has been made, there is a 14-day comment period. An extension for an additional 14-day comment period can be requested. They do not set aside the comments that were submitted after the initial comment period. All comments are given consideration.

Ms. Judith Neilson inquired about construction time around campus. Mr. Vasquez commented that the building permit can be applied for once the MUP is submitted, but it is highly unlikely it will be done. Most applicants would want to see what comes out of the comment period and any analysis or decisions from SDCI. Any decision from SDCI may result in a change to the design and there may be an evolution to the design. There will be a review process and at the end of the process, an issuance of the MUP along with the set of plans will be approved. Once these plans are approved, a notice of decision will be issued. There will be an opportunity to appeal the decision and the appeal goes to the Office of the Hearing Examiner. The appeal period is a 14-days.

The current workload on any decision will be about 3-5 months and any building permits to be applied for by the applicant will take about 6-9 months.

Mr. Johnson added that the hospital has a significant need for the new clinical labs, operations rooms and a cancer care clinic. They will be working as quickly as possible with Mr. Vasquez, SDCI, and the City and he is hoping to break ground in about a year and it will be about a 27 months construction period.

He added that there will be commissioning of the building to ensure that the new building is operating under the LEED status, several staff will undergo training and learn about the new building. He projected about late 2021 or early 2022 for the new building to be open for patients. During the construction period, they will be relocating the helistop to the roof of Forest A and it will be its temporary location.

VI. Public Comment

Ms. Wolf opened the floor for public comments. There was no public comment.

VII. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Wolf opened the floor for committee deliberation.

VIII. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.