



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

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

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

Alternates

Mike Wayte
Dr. Brice Semmens
Nicole Van Borkulo

Ex-Officio Members

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

July 25, 2008

Dianne Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning and Development
PO Box 94649
Seattle, WA 98124 - 4019
Attn: Scott Ringgold

Dr. Tom Hansen
President and Chief Executive Officer
Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
PO Box 5371
Seattle, WA 98015-0371
Attn: Suzanne Pederson

RE: CHRMC CAC Comments and Recommendations Concerning the Draft Major Institutions Master Plan and Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center.

Dear Ms. Sugimura and Dr. Hansen,

In accordance with SMC 23.69.032.D(11), the Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) submits the following comments on the Draft Major Institutions Master Plan (DMIMP) and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

The CAC directed its efforts to what the proposed expansion would look like and how it would impact the surrounding neighborhoods. CAC is concerned about the scale and position of the buildings; the setbacks and open space; parking; and impacts such as traffic. While the CAC understands that any viable proposal must meet CHRMC's needs, the CAC understands that it is the primary role of the CAC to balance the growth of the institution with long term compatibility of the surrounding neighborhoods consistent with SMC 23.69.025.

The CAC respects the continued efforts of Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center (CHRMC) to respond to the comments submitted by the CAC, and individuals, and community organizations. The CAC is universally supportive of the mission of CHRMC but must ensure that the expanded hospital fits well proposed growth is compatible with the surrounding community. The CAC appreciates the new alternatives that have been developed to respond to its concerns and the expanded transportation mitigation efforts to help curb the effects of increased traffic on the neighborhoods but believes that additional modifications and mitigation measures are needed before the CAC could recommend approval of the Master Plan.

The Committee's specific comments follow.



A. Identify a Modified Alternative 7 as the Preferred Alternative

The CAC supports the designation of Alternative 7 as the preferred alternative with significant modifications. Although the city code regulating Major Institutions encourages concentration of development on existing campuses and discourages the expansion of boundaries, the advantages of Alternative 7 in terms of mitigation justify allowing the expansion of the MIO onto the Laurelton Terrace property. Alternative 7 shifts the impact of the expansion away from immediate adjacency with a single-family residential neighborhood, allows new entrances to be sited on a major arterial (Sand Point Way), and permits the creation of an enhanced transportation center or "hub" for the hospital complex on Sand Point Way.

The CAC understands the development on the Laurelton Terrace property must include sufficient development potential to warrant the purchase of the property. However the present proposal outlines a development envelope that clearly impacts the surrounding area and can be improved in significant ways. The CAC strongly recommends that CHRM C modify Alternative 7 to reduce its height bulk and scale and aesthetic impacts on the neighborhood and particularly to the west towards the Ravenna Bryant Neighborhood.

Specifically, the CAC recommends that strong consideration be given to:

- Spreading some of the development currently placed on the Laurelton Terrace Site to the existing campus with at least some of the development moved north of Penny Drive;
- Reducing the height of the proposed three towers either by going underground or building above the proposed southeast garage;
- Stair-stepping the height of the buildings down toward all of the boundaries of the campus including on the Laurelton Terrace site; and
- Identifying various design or other techniques to significantly reduce the looming nature of the identified development for all the buildings facades that front 40th Avenue NE and NE Sand Point Way to create a more "pedestrian-friendly" entrance to the hospital.

B. Include an Alternatives for Impact Evaluation Purposes that has Less Square Feet of Total Development

While the CAC is recommending that the greatest attention be put on modifying Alternative 7, the CAC wants to ensure that the other alternatives continue to be fully reviewed in case Alternative 7 is not implemented.

In its comments to the Preliminary Draft Master Plan the CAC requested the development of "a new alternative that adds less than one million square feet and shows further significant height and bulk reductions below 160 ft." in order to allow a full evaluation of the range of impacts. The CAC notes that no such alternative was evaluated in the EIS. Therefore the committee continues to recommend that an alternative that includes less than an additional 1,500,000 square feet be included in the EIS for evaluations purposes. This may be accomplished by an evaluation of the initial impacts of any Phase one development as outlined in Section C below.

C. Develop a Specific Phasing of Development be Included in the Plan and EIS for all Alternatives

The CAC understands that the proposed plan is a long term vision to ensure the viability of CHRM C and to provide certainty for the future. However, the CAC is concerned that the proposed 1.5 million square feet may be too much to approve at this time. The CAC members continue to struggle with this

issue. Some have concluded that the full 1.5 million square feet of development should be included in the plan, others do not. No consensus has been reached on this issue at this time and the CAC neither endorses nor formally opposes any specific square footage proposal. However, there continues to be concern regarding the ability of the neighborhood to accommodate the full 1.5 million square feet of growth while maintaining its livability. CHRM C has clearly stated that it does not intend to construct more space than is needed. The CAC accepts this assurance on face value. However to preserve the option for re-evaluation of the future scale of development, the CAC recommends that a meaningful phasing plan be developed for the construction of the expansion.

The CAC understands that unmet needs must be taken care of as soon as possible. Significant initial development will have to occur. Greater than existing height may be necessary to preserve CHRM C's long-range options. However the CAC is concerned that the initial developments do not automatically allow the institution to construct its first buildings at a 160 foot level. Instead the CAC would like to see lower initial development heights and some mechanism to review actual needs prior to exceeding some specific height. The CAC therefore recommends that the Institution, CAC and the City of Seattle staff jointly develop a phasing plan that will meet the needs of CHRM C and be sensitive to compatibility with the neighborhoods. This plan should be reviewed with the CAC during its public meetings.

The CAC is not suggesting specific heights or square footages at this time and is relying upon CHRM C to work cooperatively to identify a plan that would work within CHRM C's evaluation of their short and long-term needs. We suggest the following as a possible initial starting point for discussions:

1. That phase one development be identified as that development anticipated within the first ten years after plan adoption;
2. That phase one development include no more than 800,000 square feet of new development;
3. That phase one height be conditioned to a heights lower than 160 feet on all portions of the campus
4. That development above the phase one height limits be allowed only after a demonstration that additional development above that level cannot occur under the lower heights.

The CAC recommends that any such phasing plan be included in the legislation adopting the Plan as a Council Condition.

D. Provide Consistent 75-foot Landscaped Buffers Along the Edges of the Campus –

The CAC recommends that the plan be modified to include a uniform 75 foot landscaped buffer and setback along all perimeters of the campus including that area along NE 45th Street adjacent to the proposed garage where a 40-foot buffer is included. The sole exception should be the areas along 40th Avenue NE and Sand Point Way NE where CHRM C has committed to develop a plan to create a transit hub and pedestrian oriented streetscape. In these areas a combination of possible lesser setbacks including plazas and other features should be explored.

E. Exclude the Hartman Building from the MIO Boundary

A majority of CAC believes that with the exception of the possible incorporation of the Laurelon Terrace site into the MIO, CHRM C should not expand its boundaries. While the CAC fully appreciates the move of CHRM C to lower the height of the Hartmann building, the CAC concluded that it would not serve the neighborhoods broader interest. The Major Institutions Code discourages the expansion of the MIO boundaries but allows boundary expansion during the development of a MIMP subject to specific criteria outlined in SMC 23.34.124B.

The criteria established in SMC 23.34.124B state in part that the preferred locations for boundaries shall be streets, alleys or other public rights-of-way and should emphasize physical such as arterials. Based in part upon these criteria, the CAC notes that the logical western most boundary of the CHRCM Campus would appear to be Sand Point Way N.E. To leapfrog Sand Point way at this time sets an undesirable precedent and might signal eventual further expansion in that area. The CAC concluded that the development of that site should be governed by underlying zoning.

F. Increase the Amount of Open Space Identified in the Plan and EIS

There are several references in the Draft Master Plan to "the opportunity to provide public open space on campus" and a plan to "connect neighborhood green spaces to and through the hospital campus." However, neither an increase in public open space nor public access to this space from neighborhood green spaces is apparent in the alternatives presented, particularly in Alternative 7. The figures cited in the Master Plan for the identification of the open spaces are not specific enough to define the size and location of the open spaces.

In addition, a table that appeared in the preliminary draft EIS (Table 3.7-1) showing lot coverage percentage for each alternative was removed from the draft EIS, making it difficult to compare the revised alternatives with regards to open space. However, in Alternative 7, it appears that essentially all of the Laurelon Terrace property will be covered in buildings and that an existing playground with surrounding gardens close to NE 45th St would also be eliminated in this alternative, leading to the conclusion that the lot coverage percentage is much higher than the existing campus.

Recommendations:

1. Include a table in the EIS showing percentage of the total site area that will be open space (in measured area) or lot coverage percentage for each alternative, including the existing campus/"no build" alternative (Alternative 1).
2. Revise all alternatives to retain the lot coverage percentage (% open space) on the existing campus. For Alternative 7, consider displacing some of the density shown on the Laurelon Terrace property to the existing campus in order to create more open space on the lower portion of campus.
3. The open space on campus should emphasize, in addition to the heavily planted buffers, landscaped pathways that connect neighborhood green spaces to and through the campus (as described generally in the Master Plan) and pocket gardens accessible from the surrounding neighborhoods rather than paved plazas and roof gardens.
4. The planned open space should be specifically identified as to size, location, and type (on grade, above grade, etc.) for each alternative.
5. A plan should be presented for how the large trees on the current Laurelon Terrace property will be retained and moved to other areas of campus.
6. Any plan to develop Hartmann, whether as part of the MIO or through a rezone, should include a plan to save the grove of redwood trees in the northwest corner of the property.
7. As described on p. 3.3-3 in the draft EIS, all proposed alternatives (other than Alternative 1, No Build) significantly increase the percentage of impervious surface on the campus. For example, the Master Plan/EIS needs to include a more detailed description of how the storm water drainage issues will be mitigated.

G. Maintain a Strong Commitment to Environmental Stewardship

The Draft Master Plan discusses in general ways how CHRCM has demonstrated a commitment to environmental stewardship and how the new Master Plan will continue those goals. What is lacking is

specificity of these goals, and there are a number of tools which can be used to set targets for these general goals of environmental stewardship that should be applicable to all build alternatives.

As an organization devoted to the health and well being of children, CHRM should take a leadership role in the environmental stewardship in the development and operation of future facilities.

Recommendations:

1. The Master Plan should identify measurable targets for demonstration of Environmental Stewardship. All alternatives should set LEED Gold as a minimum target. For Alternative 7, LEED ND should also be considered. For all alternatives, meeting the 2030 Challenge should also be identified in the Plan as a target.
2. The Plan should consider aggressive approaches to energy by looking at on-site generation of energy through PV's, geothermal, etc.
3. In addition to the above Recommendation 7 (under Section E), specific targets for minimizing storm water runoff should be set that go above and beyond the City of Seattle requirements.

H. Further Increase Commitments to Reduce Traffic and Transportation Impacts

After careful review, it is the conclusion of the CAC that the proposed enhanced traffic management plan outlined in the EIS would fall short of the traffic mitigation necessary to insure the livability and viability of the surrounding neighborhoods. Projected increases in traffic on Sand Point Way N.E., N. E. 45th, 40th Ave. N. E. and Montlake will significantly reduce the ability of the community to thrive in that environment.

The CAC acknowledges the wisdom of the three strategies offered by the Hospital to reduce traffic in the area:

- Enhancing the transit shuttles operated by the Hospital to carry employees to off site parking areas and connecting employees to major transit hubs.
- Transportation demand management programs which give commuter bonus cash awards to employees who do not drive alone to campus.
- Parking management policies which charge employees a fee for SOV parking.

The CAC believes these strategies must be maximized to have any chance of mitigating the impact of the growth in number of patients and employees offered by any of the CHRM proposed alternatives.

1. Further reduce the number of vehicle trips to and from CHRM generated by the Draft Master Plan.

To accomplish this the CAC strongly recommends that:

- All employees must be subject parking management policies, with the only exception being those called in on an emergency basis. That includes doctors, medical staff, students, medical residents, fellows and CHRM employees.
- CHRM Employee parking lots should be regulated by gates and accessed only by key cards.
- More off site parking must be found to diminish the need for individual trips to and from campus.
- CHRM initiate geographic based parking assignments for employees with shuttle service from those lots. This method assigns employees to off site parking lots based on their home addresses.

- CHRCM develop more aggressive fees for employee parking in all sites, with the highest fees for on site parking. The proposed fee of \$ 65 per month does not seem to be an adequate deterrent. Parking fees should generally be market based.
- CHRCM should greatly expand its efforts to work with Metro, Community Transit, Sound Transit and WSDOT to link its shuttle service to the major transit hubs.
- Create a plan for non emergency patient transportation. This should include fees for patient parking. Opportunities exist for patients to be assigned to an outlying parking lot and the related shuttle when they make an appointment for a planned hospital visit. The plan could include valet parking at the Emergency Room.
- The City perform overall monitoring, reporting and review to ensure that the goal of the reduction of vehicle trips each month is being accomplished.
- DPD should identify specific actions to be taken and conditions to be imposed on future development in the event that CHRCM fails to meet its trip reduction targets.
- CHRCM seek to collaborate with local partners, e.g. UW and U Village on sub-area solutions.
- CHRCM explore relocating 225 parking spaces currently planned for Hartmann to an off-site parking lot.

2. Reduce Parking impacts on neighborhood associated with added development at CHRCM

To accomplish this, the CAC strongly recommends that:

- CHRCM expand the number of parking enforcement personnel. They will need to enforce the parking rules on campus, at off site lots and within surrounding neighborhoods.
- Neighborhoods should be protected from the added pressure to seek "other" parking options that would be caused by aggressive fees charged for parking for employees and visitors.
- CHRCM conduct community outreach to help neighborhoods understand the steps necessary to apply for Residential Parking Zones (RPZ) and the possible benefits.
- CHRCM be required to pay for implementation of RPZ, as well as for the annual permits and enforcement.

3. Significantly expanded marketing programs be undertaken to enhance the desirability of pedestrian and bike access to work.

To accomplish this, the CAC strongly recommends that:

- CHRCM use relevant marketing tools to present to employees the positive effects of exercise (walking and biking). It is understood that over 40% of CHRCM employees live within five miles of the Hospital.
- CHRCM should also use every marketing tool available to educate employees on the positive contribution each person could make to the environment by walking or biking to work.
- Bike parking should be increased to accommodate 600 cyclists around campus.
- Shuttles be equipped to carry bikes.
- An improved bike path be added to connect CHRCM to the Burke Gillman Trail that is consistent with the existing trail greenway. This path should provide a seamless connection to CHRCM.
- Comprehensive review of pedestrian circulation on campus and access paths to and from campus.

- Excellent pedestrian connections to and from public transit stops near campus and provision for better shuttle loading and layover facilities at outlying transit hubs.
- Suggestion # 3 from page 2 of the Heffron report be taken very seriously. It states, "The Final EIS should provide details about how the CHRM \$2 million contribution for local bicycle and pedestrian programs will be managed and allocated." It further recommends that a fund be established through the Seattle DOT or its designee. That fund would allow the City to match grants for local sidewalk and bicycle enhancements with the highest priority to be the improvements that would serve the area surrounding CHRM.
- In the event that the Hartmann property is developed within the MIO, CHRM develop specific plans for minimizing the visual impacts of the development on Burke-Gilman trail-users across all seasons (e.g. terracing on the trail side, increasing the setback from the greenway)

4. Impact of traffic impacts on 40th Ave. N.E. in relation to the entrance and exit of the proposed southwest corner parking garage should be reviewed further.

To accomplish this, the CAC **strongly recommends** that (as the Heffron Report states on page 2 #4, #5, and #6) :

- If alternative 7 is selected as the preferred alternative, lane channelization changes may be needed at the intersection of NE 45th Street/40th Ave. N.E. the analysis should evaluate whether a left turn pocket on eastbound NE 45th Street should be provided.
- If alternative 7 is selected as the preferred alternative, improvements may be needed at the NE 45th Street/Sand Point Way N. E. intersection. Comments taken at the May 6th Transportation Workshop suggest that long westbound queues now exist on NE 45th Street approaching the intersection with Sand Point Way. For Alternative 7, additional traffic that exits the site to 40th Avenue N.E. may add to the volume and queues on this approach. The analysis should consider reconfiguring the lanes and parking on NE 45th Street to provide a second westbound lane during the peak hours. This might be possible by moving the parking to the north side of the street, and restricting that parking during the peak hours.
- Mitigation is suggested to retime several traffic signals, including the intersection at N.E. 45th Street/Montlake Boulevard as well as the signals on Sand Point Way near the site. However, SDOT typically will not retime single intersections, and would prefer to optimize an entire corridor. It is recommended that the mitigation be changed to "optimize traffic signals along the Sand Point Way/NE 45th Street Montlake Boulevard corridor, between NE 50th Street (if signalized) and 25th Avenue N.E." In addition, signal controller upgrades may be needed at some of these intersections to allow the signals to be interconnected. CHRM should contribute to upgrading the signal controllers.

5. **Work with Metro to Allow nearby residents have access to the shuttles (on a space available basis) to access local transit hubs. It would also be necessary for the Hospital to widely publish the shuttle schedules and routes.**
6. **Install a traffic light at 50th Street and Sand Point Way and coordinate its timing with the light at Penny Drive.**
7. **CHRM study the possible traffic safety issues related to helicopter landings so near to Sand Point Way. The CAC suspects that with high visibility from the street, accidents could happen while drivers are distracted.**

I. **Develop a Housing Replacement Plan Prior to the Demolition of Units at the Laurelon Terrace Site**

SMC 23.34.124 B 7 states that new or expanded boundaries shall not be permitted where they would result in the demolition of structures with residential uses or change of use of those structures to non-residential major institution uses unless comparable replacement is proposed to maintain the housing stock of the city. In the event that the Laurelon Terrace Site is acquired, and the MIO boundary thus expanded, the CAC recommends that the final Plan MIMP should include a specific complete plan for the addition of comparable replacement housing in the general vicinity of that housing being lost. Replacement housing should be in addition to any housing currently in the planning phases.

J. **Further Minimize Construction Impacts**

CHRM C should commit to having construction and construction-related activities, such as deliveries, arrivals and departures of trucks, people and equipment occur only during the hours and on the days promised. Additionally, CHRM C should use every reasonable means available to minimize the noise, vibration, dust, dirt, etc. from construction. Construction will occur over an extended period of time. There will be significant impacts and cumulative impacts on neighbors

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. The CAC looks look forward to our continued work with CHRM C, community members, and City of Seattle staff.

Sincerely,

Electronic Copy
Original to be signed and mailed

Karen Wolf, Chair
CHRM C CAC