



CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER MAJOR INSTITUTIONS CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
Major Institutions
Citizens Advisory
Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 10

May 5, 2008, 2008

Wright Auditorium at Children's Hospital
4800 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105

Members

Cheryl Kitchin
Delores Prichard
Myriam Muller
Kim O Dales
Doug Hanafin
Catherine Hennings
Dr. Gina Trask
Karen Wolf
Michael S Omura
Wendy Paul
Yvette Moy
Robert Rosencrantz
Bob Lucas
Theresa Doherty
Shelley Hartnett

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
Scott Ringgold – DPD
Ruth Benfield – CHRMC

Editor's Notes: The following meeting notes for the transportation workshop were prepared by Hefton Associates.

Meeting Subject Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
Major Institution Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC)
Transportation Mitigation Workshop

Attendees: Children's Hospital CAC members, Ex Officio members, and supporting staff (see attached) Paulo Nunes-Ueno, Children's Hospital Manager of Transportation
Charles Kelley, ZGF Architects Marni Heffron, Heffron Transportation, Inc. Laura Van Dyke, Heffron Transportation, Inc.

Members of the public (see attached)

Notes by: Laura Van Dyke, Heffron Transportation, Inc.
Marni Heffron, Heffron Transportation, Inc.

This workshop was held to discuss transportation mitigation for Children's Hospital's proposed Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP). Karen Wolf, chair of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), welcomed workshop attendees and introduced Marni Heffron. Ms. Heffron explained that her role in this project is as an intermediary between the CAC and the many transportation consultants working on the Children's MIMP. Marni described how the input from the workshop will be incorporated into meeting notes and a report for the CAC. The CAC will be able to use this information to prepare its comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being prepared for the MIMP.

Ms. Heffron explained that the first half of the workshop would include presentations of Children's Hospital's Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan and infrastructure improvements by Paulo Nunes-Ueno, and its site alternative and access by Charles Kelley. After a break, the second half of the workshop would be for CAC members to ask questions about the plans. At the end of the workshop, members of the public would be able to make comments about what they heard.



Ms. Heffron also stated how input from the workshop would be integrated into the process. The information that Children's presented at the meeting related to mitigation will be detailed as part of the Draft EIS, which is scheduled for release on June 9. However, because that document is already in final production, any input or questions made at this workshop would not be able to be reflected. Therefore, the intent is to provide the CAC with feedback that it will use in its comment letter to the Draft EIS, and to provide the project's design team information that it can use in the final MIMP. The sections below summarize the questions and comments made by the CAC and public at the workshop. Answers provided during the workshop are noted in italics. The questions and comments that still need to be addressed by the MIMP and companion EIS are repeated at the end of each section. For clarity, the discussions have been categorized by topic.

Children's Presentation

Paulo Nunes-Ueno, the Manager of Transportation Planning and Policy at Children's, presented the proposed mitigation plan for Children's. Then Charles Kelley at Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) Architects presented information about the site design and access. The entire PowerPoint presentation that they made can be found at: [http://masterplan.seattlechildrens.org/documents/May_6_Presentation_FINAL\[1\].small.pdf](http://masterplan.seattlechildrens.org/documents/May_6_Presentation_FINAL[1].small.pdf)

Mr. Nunes-Ueno's presentation focused on the mitigation measures that Children's is proposing for the MIMP. These will be detailed in the Draft EIS. The goals of Children's *Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan* are to:

- Get people to campus other than by car
- Reduce the need for parking
- Take a leadership role in climate change

There are three components to Children's plan:

1. Transportation Management Plan (TMP)
2. Bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements
3. Lead partnership to improve area mobility

The TMP includes improvements to existing programs and new programs aimed at reducing travel by non-single-occupant vehicle (SOV) to 70%, which is same goal as has been set for the University District by 2020. The key TMP elements include:

- Shuttle connections to transit hubs (including the downtown Seattle transit tunnel). Children's proposes to have 21 vehicles serving 4 new routes.
- Employee trip demand programs including increasing the incentive for using an alternative mode of travel, expanding the FlexPass (transit pass) program to include medical residents and fellows, providing an annual bonus to bike riders and walkers, increasing on-campus bike storage, continuing incentives for carpools and vanpools.
- Innovative bicycle programs including Flexbike (a program that allows a one-way trip on power-assist bikes to partner locations at the University of Washington and perhaps U-Village), purchasing bikes for employees who commute by that mode, and providing safety classes for bicycle riders.
- Parking management programs that include increasing the employee's cost to park, introducing a pay-per-use parking charge (to encourage alternative modes of travel some days per week),

changing the assignment to off-site lots based on home address to reduce travel through the 5 Corners intersection.

Children's also proposes to make off-site and near site improvements, and will work with the community to identify the highest priority needs. Children's proposes to:

- Allocate \$2 million to make off-site pedestrian and bicycle improvements that would make it easier to walk or bike to the campus.
- Provide \$500,000 in seed money to fund a study of off-site transportation improvements that are aimed at increasing the person-carrying capacity of the roadway system. This study would start with recommendations that were made as part of the University Area Transportation Study (UATS) and find those that would be most beneficial to serving person trips to and from Children's.
- Contribute a fair-share cost to improvements identified in the above study.

Charles Kelley, of ZGF, presented information related to the internal and street frontage connections for the three alternatives that will be presented in the Draft EIS. He sought input related to key design elements, including:

- What form and function should 40th Avenue NE take to support Alternative 7 (the Laurelon Terrace alternative)?
- Should the campus be more permeable to foot traffic so that neighbors can walk through the campus to reach enhanced transit services? The downside of this is that it might make it easier to park in the neighborhood.
- Where should transit services be consolidated for each alternative? Alternative 7 provides the opportunity for some transit to be along 40th Avenue NE.

Discussion with CAC and Public

1. Travel Demand Management

CAC Discussion

Question – What is Children's doing to reduce patient trips?

Answer – Children's Hospital provides outpatient services in off-site locations such as Bellevue, Snohomish County and Pierce County in order to reduce trips to the main campus. The Ronald McDonald House provides a place for families of chronic patients to live. Children's provides guest services such as shuttle vans to take families to and from the airport and to run errands around town. Many families do not bring a car to Children's. Children's is looking into improving its shuttles to allow strollers, car seats and more storage space to increase the number of patients that will use Children's shuttles.

Question – What is Children's doing to reduce the number of visitor trips?

Answer – Children's is planning to charge visitors for parking with its new parking plan. This change is expected to reduce the number of visitors that drive to Children's. In addition to visitors, Children's

also generates a lot of volunteer trips. Children's is working on a plan to give free Metro tickets to volunteers to encourage them not to bring a car to the main campus.

Question – What is being done to make it easier for moms working at Children's to get to and from work without a car?

Answer – Working moms are a difficult population to serve since they need a mode of transportation that supports such things as child seats and strollers. Children's provides an on-site daycare at its administration building at NE 70th Street and Sand Point Way. Children's is looking into improving its shuttles to allow strollers, car seats and more storage space to make it easier for working moms and dads to use the shuttles.

Comment – We need to understand the total traffic increases that would be generated by the MIMP.

Comment – I am inspired by this proposal. I should have walked to the site today. I like having Children's in my neighborhood. We can't have growth in the City without some sacrifices.

Public Discussion

Comment – It is hard to comment on the Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan without the traffic impact analysis to look at. How much does the transportation management plan (TMP) reduce trips?

Questions/Comments to be addressed:

1. What is the total traffic increase that would be generated by the MIMP?
2. How much does the transportation management plan (TMP) reduce trips?

2. Off-Site Improvements

CAC Discussion

Comment – A high priority would be to complete the sidewalk on NE 50th Street between 40th Avenue NE and Sand Point Way.

Question – Could local transportation plans that evaluate traffic calming measures be funded through the neighborhood councils?

Comment – The intersection of NE 45th Street/Sand Point Way needs to be evaluated. Long queues extend east from the signal on NE 45th Street, particularly in the morning.

Comment – Children's should look beyond the CAC for input about off-site improvement options.

Comment – Sidewalks are needed on Sand Point Way all the way up to Magnuson Park.

Comment – View Ridge Council talked with SDOT recently. There is an idea to try to get the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to reduce the speed limit on Sand Point Way to 30 or 35 miles per hour.

Public Discussion

Comment – Children's proposed mitigation is great and overachieving. As a member of this community, I am excited about more sidewalks and the new shuttles.

Comment – East and west pedestrian crossings of Sand Point Way are difficult. A causeway (pedestrian bridge) should be considered.

Comment – A Bryant resident thought a pedestrian overpass over Sand Point Way is a great idea.

Comment – The NE 50th Street/Sand Point Way intersection needs improvement. It is a dangerous intersection where a recent fatal accident occurred.

Comment – What is the \$2.0 million for off-site improvements based on? What does it cover? What if more money is needed?

Questions/Comments to be addressed:

1. What mitigation does Children's propose for the NE 45th Street/Sand Point Way intersection?
2. What mitigation does Children's propose for the NE 50th Street/Sand Point Way intersection?
3. Has a pedestrian bridge across Sand Point Way been considered?
4. What is the \$2.0 million for off-site improvements based on? What does it cover? What if more money is needed?

3. Transit

CAC Discussion

Question –Should Routes 75 and 25 be diverted to 40th Avenue NE to create a transit hub on 40th Avenue NE?

Discussion: Most CAC members thought that this would adversely impact the area by adding more buses to NE 45th Street, forcing transit riders from Bryant to cross Sand Point Way to reach inbound buses, and using capacity on 40th Avenue NE. Most of the participants thought that the existing transit stops on Sand Point Way should be improved instead of relocating the route.

Comment – Children's needs to make it easier for people to not drive by putting bicycle lockers and transit right by Children's front door.

Comment – Children's should think about impacts to the neighborhood (like congestion on 40th Avenue NE) when planning its transit improvements.

Comment – I like the idea of a bus/transit hub. Perhaps it should be located on Sand Point Way.

Question – Could we get a bus that goes directly downtown?

Discussion: Children's is proposing a shuttle to downtown that will connect to the downtown bus tunnel.

Question – How will someone in the neighborhood know when the Children's shuttles are operating?

Public Discussion

Comment – Would like to establish an Express 75 route to serve area.

Comment – I want a direct bus route to downtown. Route 25 only runs once per hour and Route 75 goes through UW campus. I want a direct connection to express buses downtown. I want to change the thinking that the neighborhood is “anti-transit.”

Comment – For a historical perspective, there used to be two express buses from Laurelhurst to downtown in the AM and PM.

Questions to be addressed:

1. How will someone in the neighborhood know when the Children’s shuttles are operating?
2. Can more direct transit service to downtown Seattle be provided?

4. Safety and Mobility Study

CAC Discussion

Question – It was estimated in the pre-draft EIS that the MIMP would generate about an additional 4,000 vehicle trips per day. Prior analysis on NE 45th Street was LOS F about 15 years ago. With University Village expanding again, could some of the transportation mitigation be combined with money from the City of Seattle to increase the capacity of this corridor?

Answer – Children’s Hospital’s Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan includes \$500,000 seed money to fund a Safety and Mobility Study. This study would identify projects within the neighborhood and along nearby corridors that would increase person capacity and travel time. The study would also identify costs and funding sources for these projects.

Question – What would be the study area of the Safety and Mobility Study?

Answer – It would likely include the NE 45th Street corridor from I-5 to Sand Point Way, Montlake Boulevard to SR 520, Sand Point Way, and other corridors in northeast Seattle.

Question – What is the timing of the study?

Answer – Children’s proposes to fund the study as a condition of its MIMP approval. It would also commit to funding its fair share of recommended improvements.

Question – How is the Safety and Mobility Study different than the University Area Transportation Study (UATS)?

Answer – Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) led the UATS, which covered the University District, Montlake, University Park and Ravenna neighborhoods, with boundaries at I-5 on the west, 35th Avenue NE on the east, NE 65th Street on the north and the Ship Canal and the Montlake interchange at SR 520 on the south. Many improvements were suggested. The Safety and Mobility Study would start with the UATS recommendations to determine which would be the most beneficial or if there are other projects that would provide more person-moving capabilities.

Comment – The study area of the Safety and Mobility Study should extend north of Magnuson Park.

Comment – The SR-520 Study is still a big issue. Until more is known on the results of that study, it will be difficult to pin down the study area for the Safety and Mobility Study.

Public Discussion

Comment – I am confused about the Safety and Mobility Study. Is it to look at impacts of the MIMP? If so, it doesn't make sense to do the study after the MIMP is approved. Children's should pay for the study now.

Comment – I live in Bryant and there are a lot of young children in the area. The study area should expand the area to include the Bryant neighborhood.

Comment – I am concerned that the traffic study won't be funded until the project is approved.

Questions to be addressed:

1. What is the study area for the Safety and Mobility Study?
2. How does the timing of the study relate to the approval for the MIMP?
3. How will Children's commitment to improvement recommendations be addressed?

5. Bicycling

CAC Discussion

Question – Have any studies been done to determine the maximum capacity of the Burke-Gilman Trail? Can it take the additional demand proposed by Children's?

Question – The Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan mentions bicycle parking for 600. What percentage of Children's employees does that account for?

Answer – It accounts for 10% of Children's employees at the main campus in 2020.

Public Discussion

Comment – I didn't realize there were such things as power-assisted bikes that give you a boost over hills!

Questions to be addressed:

1. What is the capacity of the Burke-Gilman Trail? Can it accommodate the proposed demand from the MIMP?

6. Parking

CAC Discussion

Question – How long will Children's be able to use parking at Magnuson Park?

Answer – Children's has a lease for five more years.

Question – Where is Children's thinking about shifting its off-site parking once parking at Magnuson Park goes away?

Question - The Comprehensive Safety and Mobility Plan mentions providing 3,100 parking spaces and charging \$65 per month. Isn't this a lot of parking and isn't the price too low?

Answer – The pre-draft EIS noted that without mitigation there would be a need for approximately 4,200 parking spaces. In response to that, Children's hired Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates to come up with a comprehensive transportation strategy to reduce the parking demand. Children's current proposal of charging \$65 per month for a parking space reflects a fee that is 24% less than the area parking price. The University of Washington currently charges \$85 per month for parking. This is consistent with its parking strategy for its downtown location in the Denny Triangle. The parking fee would likely increase in the future, and will continue to be benchmarked to the UW parking fee.

Comment – It is understood that Children's parking pricing is incremental, but perhaps it shouldn't be. Children's should think hard about its approach to reduce from 4,200 parking spaces to 3,100 and think about what the price of parking should be.

Question – Should the condition on Children's existing permit—that they pay to implement a Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) if the neighbors obtain the needed approvals for it—continue with the new MIMP?

Discussion: Children's does a good job at patrolling and enforcing parking in the neighborhoods. They maintain a database of employee's license plates, and make it known to employees that they could be terminated for parking in the neighborhood. They have been very responsive in the past if a neighbor calls to complain about parking. However, if visitors are charged to park in the future, it may increase the need for a future RPZ.

Public Discussion

Comment – I am concerned that the current parking program won't work because Children's is proposing to increase its size by 1½ times. There may be a lot more parking infractions due to the size of Children's.

Comment – My number one question is why there are so many new parking spaces proposed. How is this much parking consistent with Children's desire to be a leader in mobility and climate change? Children's should focus on corridor improvements, not adding parking.

Comment – It would be great if Children's doesn't need that much parking. However, Children's shouldn't ignore its needs for additional parking.

Comment – Parking fees at Children's should be higher. It is \$20 per day in downtown Seattle. Children's is only paying \$0.22 per day to park its cars at Magnuson Park.

Questions/Comments to be addressed:

1. Why are so many parking spaces needed?
2. Should parking fee be higher to further discourage driving to the site?
3. Where will off-site parking not at Magnuson Park be located in the future?
4. Children's should continue to enforce neighborhood parking restriction, but keep option of future RPZ as possibility.

7. 40th Avenue NE

CAC Discussion

Comment – A traffic signal is proposed by SDOT at 40th Avenue NE/Sand Point Way. The signal would provide signalized pedestrian crossing of both 40th Avenue NE and Sand Point Way. The signal (and associated changes in lane geometry) would make it easier to cross Sand Point Way in a vehicle and on foot. It would also reduce queue that now extends beyond left turn pocket on Sand Point Way.

Comment – Having a garage access on 40th Avenue NE may be problematic, and could add to the queues on NE 45th Street approaching Sand Point Way.

Comment – 40th Avenue NE warrants further study to see if a transit hub makes sense.

Comment – Adding buses to 40th Avenue NE would make it more difficult to get out of Children's parking garage.

Comment – I like the drawing presented for 40th Avenue NE, but where would the parking garage go?

Public Discussion

Comment –It may be a reach to put a transit hub on 40th Avenue NE.

Comment – What are the traffic volumes on 40th Avenue NE? Does it make sense to reroute transit there and create a transit hub?

Comment –Will 40th Avenue NE be a pedestrian boulevard? This is the main access to go north from Laurelhurst.

Comments – There are single-family residents on the south side of NE 45th Street across from 40th Avenue NE, and there are multi-family residences on the west side of 40th Avenue NE. Changes to the street should address these neighbors.

Questions to be addressed:

1. How would the parking garage on 40th Avenue NE be accessed?
2. How will design of 40th Avenue NE address the residents on the west side of the street and those who live just south of NE 45th Street?
3. How will parking garage at this location affect operations of NE 45th Street intersections at both 40th Avenue NE and Sand Point Way?

8. Site Design

CAC Discussion

Comment – We need to find a balance with site permeability. Neighborhood access to transit improvements would be an enhancement, but too much access to the neighborhood could lead to parking problems.

Comment – Children's may want to think about the site access on NE 45th Street.

Public Discussion

Comment – There is single-family zoned property across NE 45th Street from Children's. A better border on the south side of Children's is needed to protect these uses.

Comment – I am concerned about the proposed lower-level retail on Sand Point Way. I want to protect the fragile businesses in the area. This area is not designated as an urban center.

Comment – I am concerned about the height of the buildings.

Comment – Where will deliveries be made on site? And how many delivery vehicles and trucks would be generated by the project?

Questions/comments to be addressed:

1. Should pedestrian access through the campus be enhanced, reduced, or remain the same?
2. Where will deliveries be made on site? And how many delivery vehicles and trucks would be generated by the project?

9. Construction Impacts

Public Discussion

Comment – I am concerned about construction impacts on the neighborhood, especially big construction trucks on neighborhood streets. There already are a lot of cars and the streets are already a problem.

10. Committee and Study Process

CAC Discussion

Comment – Children's should go early and often to local community councils with ideas for off-campus improvements such as 40th Avenue NE.

Question – I am concerned that I didn't get an email from the chair on whether or not to hire Marni Heffron for this process. Is it Karen Wolf's decision to ask to hire Marni?

Answer – The CAC talked about wanting to hire a transportation expert to help understand the transportation issues related to the MIMP. The City was asked by CAC representatives if they could hire Marni to help review the transportation information on the MIMP. She is being paid by Children's, which is similar to other City review staff whose time is paid by Children's.

Comment – I think Marni has helped, but I am concerned about the process of her being hired without all of the CAC involved.

Public Discussion

Comment – I am concerned about a lack of accountability. It is important that Marni reports to the entire CAC, not just the chair.