



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

### **DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

#### **Meeting # 18**

#### **November 12, 2008**

Telaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Seattle, WA  
Cedar Room

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

#### **Members**

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

#### **Alternates**

Nicole Van Borkulo  
Mike Wayne  
Dr. Brice Semmens

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

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

#### **Members/Alternates Present**

Myriam Muller	Nichol Van Borkulo	Karen Wolf, Chair
Michael S Omura	Wendy Paul	Robert Rosencrantz
Theresa Doherty	Delores Pritchard	Cheryl Kitchin
Shelly Hartnett	Bob Lucas	Catherine Hennings
Brice Semmens	Mike Wayne	Doug Hanafin

#### **Ex Officio Members Present**

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

#### **Others Present (Staff and Guests)**

See Attached Attendance Sheets

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Karen Wolf called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda. Steve Sheppard stated that the purpose of the meeting will be to receive briefings on the final documents.

#### **II. Presentation on the Final Master Plan**

##### **A. Children's Presentation**

Allyn Schumaker was introduced to go over the highlights of the final Master Plan. The plan continues to propose 500 to 600 beds over the next twenty years with 400 over the first 10 years. This will result in the development of 1.5 million new square feet. The plan includes an order and phasing of development that matches demand to construction phasing. Each phase would be constructed upon receipt of a Certificate of Need from the State.

Alternative 7R is now identified as the preferred alternative. Heights have been reduced and the maximum height proposed now is 160 foot MIO conditioned down to 140 feet exclusive of the mechanical penthouses. This represents a reduction of 100 feet from the initial 240 foot height. Major efforts have been made to reduce the bulk of the proposal. As a result, the bed wings have been changed and utilization of the train site amended to allow a pulling back of the development further to the east. Setbacks around most of the campus are 75 feet with a few exceptions. The Hartman Building site remains in the proposal, with a height of 75 feet. Phasing is included. Each phase will

require certificates of need, Master Use permits and SEPA review. The majority of open space is in the buffers. Major entries remain off of Sand Point Way and 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There are no entrances off of 45<sup>th</sup> or 50<sup>th</sup>. The plan commits Children's to replacement of housing.

Paul Nunez was introduced to go over the transportation elements of the plan. The goal is to reduce the number of car trips and reduce the need to build parking. In addition, there is a desire to have a positive impact on climate change. The goal is to reduce single occupant auto use from its current 40% to 30% over the life of the plan. There are many actions proposed to meet this goal.

One of the major tools that Children's will use will be the shuttle program. Lines will link to the light rail stations and to south Snohomish County. Bus pass and bicycle programs are included, including purchase of bicycles for staff who agree to use a bicycle and those that either use the bus or bicycle receive a cash payment of \$65 per month. Children's has the third largest van pool fleet after Boeing and Microsoft. As Children's is so much smaller than these organizations this is a major accomplishment. Mr. Nunez noted that with implementation of the trip reduction efforts, trip times from the Montlake Bridge to Children's will increase from the current 13 minutes to 14 minutes in 2030.

Children's is proposing to do a project called intelligent transportation systems. This is a signal project that has sensors that change light timing to maximize flow. This type of system has resulted in up to a 45% improvement in travel flow timing in other corridors. The City also provided Children's a long list of possible projects. Children's looked at those projects and decided that it would provide \$1,400,000 to the City for these projects. Children's is also committing \$2,000,000 for bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the area. Finally, Children's will look at ways to relocate 100 to 200 parking spaces out of the area entirely. None of these projects included in the calculations of trip time so that Children's believes that actual times may prove to be better than projected.

## **B. Committee Questions and Answers**

Miriam Muller asked for clarification concerning the timing of the transportation improvements. Children's staff responded that the elements are tied to each phase. Mr. Nunez stated that the first element (intelligent transportation system) would occur under phase one. He noted that the plan and EIS identify timing tied to phases for each element.

Ms. Muller also asked for clarification concerning the housing elements. She noted that it talks about working with non-profit housing developers, while the actual housing being replaced is market rate. Ruth Benfield responded that Children's goal is to achieve more than a 1 to 1 replacement and to promote more affordable housing in the community.

Brice Semmens asked if the development of the Hartman site is proposed under the existing height limits. Children's responded that the current code allows 35 feet height and Children's is proposing 65 feet.

Robert Rosencrantz noted that it appears that if the MIO were reduced to 90 feet, then portions of the upper two stories of some of the buildings might be lost. He asked what the effect would be of limiting heights on the Hartman site to either 90 or 105 feet, rather than the proposed 160 feet conditioned down to 130 feet. He asked how many square feet would be lost in either of those cases. Children's staff agreed to look at that and bring it back to the CAC at the next meeting.

Bob Lucas noted that the multi-modal transit hub has been somehow tied to the development of the Hartman Building site. Since the CAC has already indicated in its comments to the preliminary plan that it may likely recommend that Hartman not be included in the MIO, would that necessarily mean the multi-modal transit hub would also be lost? Staff responded that in order to make the multi-modal hub work, both sides of the street would have to be used. Mr. Lucas offered the opinion that the Hub might be able to be constructed in either case. Ruth Benfield stated that such development would be difficult. She

noted that the current zoning is very restrictive and the current use is actually non-conforming. Scott Ringgold noted that the site is actually zoned L-3. This is intended for townhouse type development. Catherine Hennings noted that Children's use of the building would almost certainly require a rezone to a commercial zone.

### III. Presentation on the EIS

#### A. Department of Planning and Development Presentation

Katie Chaney was introduced to go over the draft EIS. She noted that the presentation would focus primarily on noting the changes between the draft and final EIS. She noted that the major difference is that the final includes all of the comments received and the responses to them. There were 646 comment letters. Many simply expressed a preference for or against the proposal. The most common comments included: 1) the possibility of considering alternative sites; 2) lowering the height; 3) Questions concerning the need for expansion; and 4) traffic analysis methods.

Much of the analysis is unchanged from the Draft EIS. The major changes focus on several areas. The EIS now focuses on alternatives 7R and 8 and has additional analysis of transportation, aesthetics and noise and housing. The noise analysis identifies a construction noise impact of up to 95 decibels. There is a chart showing the duration of noise impacts during construction. Mitigation for noise impacts is included.

#### B. Committee Questions and Answers

Cheryl Kitchen noted that the EIS does not show any difference in trip generations. Ms. Chaney noted that this is independent of any reductions associated with the mitigation efforts.

Robert Rosencrantz asked what percentage of those who expressed a preference for or against the proposal what percentage were pro and which were con. Ms. Chaney stated that about 70% were pro. Ms. Chaney also noted that comments were received from 6 government agencies, 30 Organizations, 56 Oral comments at the public hearing, 10 written comments at the public hearing and individual letters or e-mails from 544 individuals.

Michael Omura asked if there is an evaluation of operational noise. Ms. Chaney noted that Children's does not plan on a central plant system and instead plans on spreading heating throughout the development. There is a commitment to keeping below all code mandated levels. Scott Ringgold noted that the EIS finds that construction noise impacts are significant but operational noise levels are not.

### IV. Public Comment

**Comments of Lauren Lukjanowiz** - Ms. Lukjanowics stated that she has always received quality care from Children's. She gave examples of positive experiences at Children's. She urged the CAC to allow Children's to expand.

**Comments of Robert Johnson** - Mr. Johnson stated that he is the regional director of transportation choices coalition and wanted to discuss the transportation management element of the Children's plan. He noted that transportation accounts for 50% of our greenhouse gas emissions for the region and most of the pollutants into Puget Sound. He stated that the best way to positively effect our environment, reducing car use is crucial. All of the elements of the Children's Transportation Management Plan are very aggressive and well thought out. Children's deserves a great deal of credit for this. He stated his support for the construction of additional beds.

**Comments of Helen Belvin** – Ms. Belvin stated that Children's is a magnificent organization but that is not the issue. The issue is zoning. The area is a single family and we do not need this to disappear. That means

neither expanding the footprint nor increasing the height of Children's. We need quality neighborhoods and Laurelhurst is such an area. Zoning is intended to protect property owners and should be taken very seriously. In addition, the 20 years of construction and the increased traffic is a problem. Traffic has become a problem at all times of the day. She asked that the single family zoning be honored.

**Comments of Julie Mercer** – Ms. Mercer stated that she was in attendance to represent the Bicycle Alliance. She noted that she had professional experience with transportation planning and expressed support for the Transportation Management Plan elements.

**Comments of Cary Lawson** – Ms. Lawson stated that the height, bulk, and scale of the development is still too great for this single family neighborhood. The area is not zoned for this scale of development. She noted that she has reviewed Nancy Fields bed need statistics and it still appears that Children's is overestimating the future bed needs.

**Comments of Ginny Sharrow** – Ms. Sharrow stated her support for the comments of Helen Belvin and Cary Lawson.

**Comments of Jim Madden** – Mr. Madden noted that much of the traffic is at non-peak hours. This traffic is a concern at all times. He noted that there are other projects being proposed that will add to the traffic. He stated that he was not convinced the bicycle use will be a major factor in reducing traffic.

**Comments of Robert Haney Scott** – Mr. Scott stated that now that the economy has weakened, it is time for Children's to rethink its expensive expansion plans. A recent Wall Street Journal article described another not-for-profit hospital in the United States that was closing. It was located in a lower-income neighborhood. At the same time it was building a new hospital in a more affluent neighborhood. It is important to understand the not-for-profit does not mean not for profit but that the organization does not have to pay business profits tax. It is clear that every successful hospital has to operate as a profit-making institution. That is why the new hospital is being built in a neighborhood that will bring in more revenues than it would realize in a low-income neighborhood. So that is an important reason why Children's wants to expand here. But economic reality that has changed and has led many expected investments to slow or cease. It is clear that donations to Children's will be lower in the future months than they have in the recent years as a result of a recessed economy. So what does the future hold for Children's estimates of future costs and revenues and what are the implications for the profitability of the proposed investment. Should the expansion plans be cut back in response to an uncertain future? By leaving Laurelon unchanged Children's might save the \$90,000,000 plus the cost of demolition. Children's could do this by reducing its proposed expansion from 1,500,000 square feet to 500,000 square feet. This would slow the development of Sand Point.

**Comments of Daniel Elderer** – Mr. Elderer stated that there is no better place for a pediatric hospital than in a residential neighborhood regardless of the zoning. The Hospital provides \$65,000,000 in uncompensated care and is not a for-profit enterprise. The hospital serves a large geographic area and has done an admirable job decentralizing. However, the main campus needs to expand. The Laurelon Campus offers a great way to accommodate this and he stated that he totally supports the expansion.

**Comments of Michael Perlman** – Mr. Perlman asked how many CAC members live within a half mile of the hospital and noted that was about half. He noted that the CAC has been asking few questions. He offered the example of construction noise. Children's stated that the peak would be 95 decibels, but this is the level of a power lawn mower. Exposure to this level of noise for four or more hours requires hearing protection. He noted that many of the transportation figures were stated as averages but this is not the best way to present this as the peak condition – not average – is most important.

Mr. Perlman noted that he had provided a written statement to the CAC. The municipal code in Section 23.69.032 Section d explicitly authorizes the CAC to consider the need for the proposed expansion. Swedish has a fine pediatric facility that treats more children than Children's'. Last year Children's joined a law suit to

block Swedish from building more pediatric beds on the east side. He wondered why Children's isn't prepared to ask Swedish to provide beds rather than build more here.

**Comments of Bonnie Miller** – Ms. Miller stated that she was appearing on behalf of the Northeast District Council. That council represents 16 neighborhood groups in Seattle. In commenting on the draft EIS in July the NEDC asked that additional alternatives be developed with less bulk, height and scale. She noted that the CAC made a similar request. Unfortunately, Children's has chosen to ignore these requests and the same height build and scale remain. The two alternatives in the final EIS do not differ substantially from the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. Children's is entitled to expand and meet its needs. But Children's must also comply with the major institutions code and the City's Comprehensive Plan. Children's is not located in an urban village. She stated that the NEDC has the following comments to the Final Plan and EIS:

- Building heights should be limited to 90 feet – Children's is located in a low-density single family part of the City. Children's is not an area targeted for any kind of infusion of growth. The maximum height ever allowed for a major institution outside of an urban village isn 105 feet. Limiting the height to 90 feet would make buildings more consistent with the surrounding communities.
- Square footage should be substantially reduced – It is disappointing that Children's has remained steadfast in its refusal to compromise in its square footage. A reduction of square footage could be based upon the FAR.
- The MIO boundaries should not be expanded to the west of Sand Point Way .
- Phasing should require confirmation of bed need.
- Specific details concerning the replacement housing for the loss of Laurelton Terrace should be a condition of the Master Plan approval

**Comments of Rick Barrett** – Mr. Barren noted that he is the Vice President of the Seattle Community Council Federation. This is a coalition of community groups across Seattle. As part of the Major Institution process the federation provided comments throughout the process. He noted that the process has resulted in the CAC hearing only from Children's and its representatives and consultants. He urged the CAC to reject both alternatives. Both exceed the reasonable size for development outside of urban villages. Heights should be reduced. The 140 foot level far exceeds any heights allowed in similar areas. 105 feet should be the limit. Square footage should be reduced. Children's is requesting 1,500,000 square feet of new development which is the equivalent of Bellevue Square. In addition, the boundaries should not be expanded across Sand Point Way. Children's must supply comparable housing for that lost at Laurelton. In light of the independent report of the Fields report on bed needs, the Federation questions the need for 350 new beds.

**Comment of Jeannie Hale** – Ms. Hale stated that the Laurelhurst Community Club agrees wholeheartedly with the presentation by the representatives of the NEDC and the Seattle Neighborhood Federation. She stated that the two alternatives should be rejected. They needed to come up with alternatives that have less height and square footage. The last Master Plan had an expansion of only 250,000 square feet and this would seem appropriate for this plan too or perhaps 500,000 square feet.

**Comments of Bob Edwards** – Mr. Edwards noted that his child had received special care at Children's. He still brings his child to the hospital. He stated that the region is growing and it is essential that institutions like Children's grow with it. Our region's interest is best served with this expansion. The degree of expansion proposed is in line with what is needed and will not come on line all at once. He noted that Children's has been at capacity at times. This is not acceptable and the facility needs to be expanded as a unique part of the medical infrastructure.

**Comments of Meghan Quint** – Ms. Quint offered the opinion that many of those who support the hospital are much less likely to come to these meetings and are under represented here. She stated that the alternative 7r is a major positive change from the original proposal.

**Comments of Leonard Nelson** – Mr. Nelson stated that he recently retired from a manufacturing company. At that factory we had periodic sections of the floor that experienced 80 decibels. As a result all persons on the floor had to wear ear protection. Ninety-five decibels is a really dangerous level. He noted that concentrating all services at one location is not prudent. Decentralization is a wise move and a risk mitigation.

**Comment of Judith Platt** – Ms. Platt stated that she questions the bed need projections. Many might prefer a new facility on the east side. Height should be limited to 90 feet. The noise level is too high. Decentralization is also warranted.

**Comments of Corey Caspar** – Mr. Caspar noted that he is a resident of Laurelhurst and physician at another hospital. Children's has impact that go far beyond Laurelhurst and the nation. It is not fair to compare Children's to Swedish. Children's has a special research role that is unlike Swedish. He also noted that he feels that as a physician he is not qualified to comment on the projected bed needs and wondered how others can come forward questioning the need for children's medical care at this location. He also noted that many people move into the area to be closer to Children's.

**Comments of Emily Dexter** – Ms. Dexter stated that the Fields report states that the Children's population in the region is projected to increase by 33% but Children's is projecting a much larger expansion. She offered support for some modest expansion.

## **V. Report on the Possible Phasing Plan**

Karen Wolf noted that the CAC has been discussing a phasing plan for some time. She passed out a phasing plan from Children's. Children's development will not be built all at once. The idea is to look at what the phases might be and what the triggers between each plan might be. Children's has proposed a phasing plan with the first plan ten years and about 800,000 square feet. The CAC might want to include a phasing plan in its report.

Miriam Muller asked who would monitor any conditions or triggers. Scott Ringgold stated that this would be the CAC's recommendation to the City Council and if they agreed the Council could include this as a Council condition. Steve Sheppard stated that the Council conditions that might be included in the Master Plan are normally listed in the Annual Report and the institution reports to the CAC and DPD annually of progress on meeting these conditions. The main responsibility for enforcing the conditions will be with DPD. A few examples from other institutions were given.

Karen asked that the CAC members look at the draft and try to determine if the conditions are sufficient. She noted that the transportation targets are on page four of the hand out. Catherine Henning noted that this has come from Children's and that it might be useful for the sub-committee to look at the phasing and look for additional conditions or triggers. Catherine also noted that conditions on phasing do not mean that we have forgone the option of rejecting the overall bulk, height and scale. Members suggested that phasing be delayed until the CAC has determined if it accepts the overall bulk, height and scale of the plan itself and then develop phasing based upon that.

## **VI. Process and Timelines for Upcoming Events.**

Karen Wolf asked members to list their current issues. Following this we need to decide whether to deal with the issues in sub-committees. The following were listed:

- Phasing
- Height, Bulk and Scale

- Harman Development and Boundary Expansion
- Transportation Issues
- Construction Noise
- Access, especially off of 40<sup>th</sup>.
- Landscaping and permeability

Several members noted that the issues had been dealt with in sub-committees and then brought back to the full committee. A preference was expressed for dealing with the main issues in the whole committee at this point. Steve Sheppard noted that the first issue should probably be Hartman as its inclusion or exclusion would effect how much development would have to occur on the main campus. Members agreed. Bob Lucas suggested that members try to e-mail each other with their major positions on the issues.

## **VII. Adjournment**

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