



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

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

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

Meeting # 11

June 10, 2008

Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Seattle, WA 98105
Main Dining Room

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

Members/Alternates Present

Myriam Muller	Dr. Gina Trask	Karen Wolf, Chair
Michael S Omura	Wendy Paul	Robert Rosencrantz
Catherine Hennings	Delores Prichard	Cheryl Kitchin

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 and Housekeeping

Chair Karen Wolf called the meeting to order. Brief introductions followed. The meeting agenda was amended to include a brief discussion of the plan for review of the DEIS and MIMP as a Housekeeping item.

Ms. Wolf asked Mr. Sheppard to go over the process for review of the Draft Plan and Draft EIS. Mr. Sheppard distributed copies of the review forms and asked that CAC members make an effort to complete and initial review prior to the next formal CAC meeting on July 15th.

II. Presentation on and Discussion of the Draft Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center Master Plan

A. CHRMC Initial Presentation - Ruth Benfield was recognized to lead the CHRMC presentation on the Draft Master Plan. Ms Benfield briefly outlined the alternatives and briefly discussed some of the alternatives that were dropped from further consideration. Alternatives that were dropped included: 1) The initial Concept – The initial concept plan contained fairly tall building, and while it met the CHRMC needs, there was a great deal of concern raised from the surrounding neighborhood; 2) What was previously called alternative 5 – which spread development north of Penny Land. This alternative was partly developed in response to Citizen Advisory Committee comments; and 3) the Later Stage Development of Laurelon Terrace - At the request of DPD. CHRMC also looked at possible expansion of boundaries to include the Laurelon Terrace areas in later phases of the plan. This option was also eliminated from further



consideration after discussions with representatives of Laurelton Terrace.

Ms Benfeld noted that four alternatives remain under consideration.

- Alternative 1 **No Build** – This is required by the process.
- Alternative 3 **Proposed** – This is similar to the initial concept plan with major modifications to reduce heights
- Alternative 6 **Modified North Campus Expansion** – This alternative was developed in large part from the work of the CAC Design Sub-committee. It includes lower heights, more spread out development, and greater setbacks
- Alternative 7 **Early Laurelton Development** – This is the new alternative that anticipates earlier acquisition and development of the Laurelton Terrace Property.

When the opportunity arose to purchase Laurelton Terrace at an earlier date, CHRCM evaluated it and concluded that it offered many potential benefits both to CHRCM and the community. This alternative: 1) offers that opportunity to lower density and overall height on the campus; 2) responds to concern raised by the community about additional accesses on 45th and NE 50th; 3) because of topography differences across the campus, allows the placement of development lower on the hillside and allows the possibility that overall development be no higher than the highest 1953 building when viewing from 45th; 4) moves major development away from abutting single family development and towards Sandpoint Way which is a commercial street; 5) allows a better focus on transit; and 6) reduces the impact to existing hospital facilities and staff during construction as it would allow construction in phases to be shorter.

CHRCM Staff briefly reviewed development under alternative seven. It was noted that the phasing would generally be as shown in the Draft Plan. However this is not totally set yet. The principal entries to the campus would be off of Sand Point Way both at the new Emergency Department access and off of Penny Drive. There would also be access off of 40th Avenue NE. Both the proposed 50th and 45th Entries would be eliminated. Moving development out to Sand Point Way would allow the ability to utilize transit more efficiently to get people out of their cars and deal with reducing the carbon footprint of the institution. Parking would be spread around campus with 181 spaces at the emergency garage, 724 spaces in the new Southwest Garage, 1332 spaces in the North Garage, 255 spaces at the Hartmann Site and 608 spaces in the existing Whale Garage.

Internal access on campus would be through a series of pedestrian bridge and internal walkways. Special efforts will be made to separate pedestrians from traffic is easier to deal with on private campus than on public road.

B. Committee Questions and Discussion

Robert Rosencrantz asked for clarification concerning the possible operational efficiencies or inefficiencies under the Laurelton Terrace expansion alternative. He noted that in earlier discussions, CHRCM staff had stated that one of the reasons for clustering the higher towers was to keep various uses close to each other. Ruth Benfeld responded that all the inpatient beds have been aggregated into one area; between Laurelton up to the mid-point including the existing Train and Giraffe beds. She noted that this alternative appears to be efficient and creates logical use zones on campus

Myriam Muller noted that she was concerned with the treatment of 4th west of 42nd. She noted that the garage appears to be set back only four feet and that there still appears to be a secondary

entrance. CHRC staff responded that the entrance is a secondary service access only. It was also noted that the actual details of the access to the southwest garage is still being evaluated.

Catherine Henning asked for clarification concerning where the main patient parking entries would be. CHRC staff responded that the intention is that the existing main entry at the Giraffe off of Penny Drive would remain. The new entry off of Sandpoint would be primarily to service the emergency populations. CHRC is also looking at developing off of 40th the additional hospital entry point that could be a secondary entry point for bed units.

Myriam Muller asked if it looked like the Laurelon acquisition would move ahead. Ms. Benfield responded that it looked like it would; assuming that they fully move through the Master Plan approval process it would be the best option for CH.

Myriam asked for information concerning the ongoing purchases of adjacent homes by CHRC. Ms. Benfield responded CHRC is no longer pursuing purchase of additional houses. They will follow through on purchases that were already being negotiated. CHRC had agreed to purchase from people who approached CH and wanted to sell their houses. Given that development would be to the west of the hospital, the impact would be much less on the eastern/southern border homes.

Several members asked for clarification concerning the aesthetic impacts of the Laurelon Terrace Development on both the residential and commercial properties to the west. CHRC staff went over the impacts to the people living near the west side. They noted that impacts to the west are clearly present but are reduced by topography. Karen Wolf suggested that additional drawings and photos be taken from the Ravenna side to allow a better understating of this new impact. Ruth Benfield agreed that more photos are needed from the cemetery down towards the Burke Gilman.

There was a brief discussion both of possible locations for new photos and the degree of possible impacts. It was noted that the impacts to properties on the west side of 40th would be significant as well as around the Hartmann site and uphill on 37th, 38th and 39th.

III. Presentation on and Discussion of the Draft Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center Environmental Impact Statement

A. DPD and URS Presentation

Scott Ringgold from the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) was recognized to lead off the presentation on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Ringgold stated that DPD is charged with administering public process associated with the plan and the Environmental Analysis and mitigation.

The public process started in July. Starting yesterday they have begun public comment period with current extensions will last 45 days and ends on July 25. DPD will hold a public hearing on July 10 at the Center for Horticulture at 6:00 pm; the members of the public have until July 25 to comment on the draft. After that DPD and URS will incorporate and respond to all comments and include those in preliminary final EIS and will share the working draft of the final EIS with CAC, City Agencies, CH. They expect to finish the final EIS by the end of the year. He directed people to a box of Executive Summaries, and discs of draft EIS to take home for review. He said the draft would also be available on DPD website; seattle.gov/dpd/chrc_deis and CH would have it available on their site as well.

Jody Blakesly, from URS briefly went over the organization of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. She noted that the document contained the following sections:

- Section 1: summary of entire draft EIS
- Section 2: description of alternatives
- Section 3: impacts and mitigation measures
- Appendices include additional technical information that is summarized in section 3.

There were eleven elements of the environment plus secondary and cumulative impacts; they are the same elements of the environment that were included in the preliminary draft. They categorized the impacts considering both the construction and operational impacts of the various alternatives; looking at each element of the environment, the existing conditions and what changes may occur during construction or as a result of the hospital being in operation. One example is noise; there are potential impacts of noise during construction and also due to operation of the hospital whether traffic or HVAC systems. When all are considered, SEPA has you look at impacts to see if they are significant or not; if they are, are they unavoidable even after trying to mitigate, or can they be mitigated to a level that is less than significant. Some examples of unavoidable but less than significant impacts are things like shoring needed for steep slopes, dust emissions during construction activities that are temporary, vehicle emissions during operation, potential erosion, potential fuel spills, changes to land use.

The DEIS identifies the following impacts:

Noise impacts – There could be intermittent significant impacts during certain phases of construction (demolition, excavation, or structure erection) and not throughout the entire period. In section 3.5 there are graphs that show how the potential noise impacts could fluctuate over time. Mitigate identified for example: noisy construction activities would be limited to non-holiday weekdays, during certain time periods; impact pile driving could be avoided and nearby residents could be informed of coming activities.

Housing impacts – Alternative 7 would result in the demolition of 136 multi family units. The multi-family units being demolished are not low income and the code does not require a straight-to-straight value.

Aesthetics – There are aesthetic impacts for each of the build alternatives with alternative 7 shifting impacts to the west.

Traffic and Transportation – Drew Cogburg, with the Transpo Group, was introduced to discuss traffic and transportation impacts. Mr. Cogburg stated that the DEIS evaluated transportation impacts over a 20 year at over 35 intersections for morning and afternoon peak hours. Most of the intersections evaluated, and most of the impacts, occur along Sandpoint Way, along Montlake to 520 and over the hill on 45th to I-5. They also looked to the north on Sandpoint Way to 65th Avenue NE. CHRM future demand was based on their current level of TMP performance which results in the 38% single occupant vehicle rate, without further improvements in order to capture a worst case. He felt it was best to do a snapshot of where we are at now and project that forward as a worst case and start the discussion from there. Mr. Cogburg stated that they also looked at parking, pedestrian and bicycle travel, safety, and transit.

Mr. Cogburg went over the effects of increased traffic on the overall travel times in the various major transportation corridors accessing CHRM. He noted that development at CHRM will generate about 700 new trips in the key peak hour. This will result in some increases in total traffic volumes. For instance, on Montlake Blvd would see impacts that range from very little to as much as a 10% increase in volumes. Similarly, 45th could see impacts ranging from a 6 – 15% increase in the am and between 0 – 10% in the pm peak hour. At Five Corners, could see an 8% impact in the am and

13% in the pm. He noted that the draft EIS contains a table that compares the change in the rate of annual growth in traffic as a result of the development. It shows the % changes growth over time.

In terms of time to move through a specific intersection they focused on a few bellwether locations. Three intersections are listed: Five Corners shows an increase of about 54 seconds without mitigation; Montlake Blvd at 45th about 7 seconds; and Montlake Blvd and SR 520 ramp east bound about 12 seconds, unmitigated. Because of the size of this project, and its location at the NE end of two very well traveled corridors that already have regional significance and congestion, they also did corridor travel time analysis. All the corridors have some degree of congestion in both AM and PM peak hours but PM is as high or higher in both corridors so that is what they chose to do their travel time work. They did calibration runs, multiple floating car analysis where they got existing travel time in the corridor through a weighted average and then calibrated that in with a forecast model. Northbound on Montlake in the PM which is not the critical direction, the impact would be about a minute and the southbound would be about 3 minutes. The impact of 3 minutes is over a baseline of 18 minutes which will happen in the future if CH doesn't expand. By comparison, the model forecasts 11-12 minute range for existing conditions right now. The impact at 45th will be about 3 minutes in either direction with a baseline of about 10 – 15 minute range with the 3 minutes on top of that.

CHRM C is working other consultants to look at developing an aggressive transportation management program. Using models from this effort, CHRM C believes that they can achieve between a 35 and 45% reduction in generated traffic from that projected here. What that means is you could take those added seconds or minutes of and in roughly cut them by about a third. He also noted that the impact of CHRM C on the area is only one factor affecting the Northeast. Many other factors also affect the picture. CHRM C should take a leadership role in encouraging cooperation between the many parties to this problem.

Additional mitigation to boost use of alternative transportation modes e.g. connections to Burke-Gilman trail, enhance connectivity between CH and the trail, sidewalk improvements. The funding level is identified as \$1 million. New traffic signals are likely. This would likely result in signals at Penny Drive, at 40th, at 45th and at Five Corners; a high concentration of signals in a small space.

B. Committee Questions and Discussion

Robert Rosencrantz asked if the model represents the best estimates of what will occur. Mr. Cogberg responded that the model that is consistent with all the transportation modeling that is being done for every other significant regional process. It is the best information available right now for 2030.

Myriam Muller asked for clarification concerning the projected delays. For instance how was the projected "18 minutes" on Montlake determined. Mr. Cogberg responded that there are color graphics in the EIS that show each travel run at each point and each line; they ground counted, ground validated what the existing travel time was based on multiple runs over peak hours over three different days. People actually go in a car to get the times; they typically try to do the traffic counts Tuesday – Thursday because Mondays are sometimes low, Fridays are sometimes weird. There will be some days that are a little worse and some days that are a little better; there are a lot of numbers in this work but it is not an exact science.

IV. Public Comments

Karen Wolf: opened the meeting to public comments.

Comments of Gisella Schimmelbusch – Ms. Schimmelbusch urged one additional view on Option 7 from the condominium area north of the Hartman complex. She has a picture with a straight up wall from the Hartman Building; need one from north of there to show what the inhabitants of those condominiums in that complex see. She also noted that she had received a CHRC good neighbor letter and noted a line in she found particularly troubling: “in March we came to an agree with the property owners of Laurelton Terrace and are currently working very hard with the Citizens Advisory Committee, this City and our architects to develop a new alternative to utilize this property in the initial phase of our expansion”. She asked what the later phase of the expansion is as the sentence implies that in addition to Laurelton Terrace area growth there will be other areas incorporated into CHRC.

Ruth Benfield responded that the initial work was to look at Laurelton in the late phase; the sentence is speaking to being able to utilize Laurelton in Phase I of the master plan.

Comments of Carol Eychaner: Ms. Eychaner noted that she will be submitting detailed comments to DPD and will copy CAC and hopes to get them done the Friday before the next CAC meeting.

Ms. Eychaner noted that a lot has been discussed about what changes to the alternatives. However some key factors remain unchanged and this should be noted. All of the alternatives still include a full 1.5 million square feet of new additional development. That is 1 ½ times what is currently on campus for a total of 2.4 million square feet and 600 total beds at 4000 square feet per bed. These are two critical fundamental factors of the development plan that drive everything. She said they have seen 7 alternatives that CH has been willing to pursue; when you look at them, no matter how it is configured or laid out on the campus, spread out to Hartman, spread out to Laurelton Terrace, all result in significant impacts one way or another. So long as you have the projected level of total development concentrated on campus then we have height and bulk that is grossly incompatible with the residential uses to the north, the east, and the south.

The Laurelton Terrace alternative also has unique housing impacts. If development is expanded to Laurelton Terrace then there is a loss of over 130 garden townhouses. What hasn't been talked about is the loss of the potential multi family development on the Hartman site. The Hartman site at about 1.75 acres could be developed with almost 100 units. That is a total of 130 existing and 100 potential multifamily units that would be forever changed, converted into institutional use and changed from multi family residential housing. A lot of neighborhoods get very agitated over the loss of two or three houses; this is 230 + units. In addition to that the Laurelton Terrace alternative the impacts of the height and bulk is simply shifted from the east to the west. There are towers still at 160'; it is still higher than any other major institution outside of the urban village, the maximum height on those campuses is 105'. It shifts the towers to the west and impacts those properties to the west as well as the gateways into the Laurelhurst residential neighborhood. In addition, associated with this development is the doubling of parking on campus from 1500 on campus now going to about 3000 and will generate traffic.

She stated that despite all of this there has been no alternative that looked at a lesser amount of growth, lesser bulk, lesser height than 160' and lesser square footage of development. The EIS that identifies housing impacts as significant but land use impacts were not; the conversion of zoning to institutional use that results in the loss of 130 + 100 potential residential units are a significant land use impact. She also mentioned other properties in the area owned by CH and sees this institutional ownership as a significant impact. She asked the CAC to look at the land use section of the EIS very closely esp. regarding transportation; the transportation presentations she has seen thus far on traffic volumes provide figures on the number of trips that they have estimated CH expansion will generate. The number of new trips estimated is 8400. She hasn't seen a figure that if all the mobility plans etc. are applied, what will the volumes be and asked that be provided.

Comments of Joyce Hinkley – Ms. Hinkley noted that she is resident of Laurelton Terrace and asked about the speed of traffic on 45th and what mitigation factors are in play to slow down traffic. She thanked the CAC for their work but asked they wait until a presentation is complete before asking questions.

Comments of Reed Stevens - Mr. Stevens noted that he is a resident of the Bryant neighborhood, He noted that this alternative shifts a great deal of the impact to his neighborhood which includes traffic impacts, a failure to mention what will happen at 40th and Sandpoint Way. He said no viewpoints from his neighborhood were considered. Nothing has been discussed about the Hartman Building and its impact on the people who live directly behind it. He understands this is an ongoing process but there are people who will be greatly impacted who need to have a greater voice. He asked why earthquake impacts from 3, 6 and 7 have not been discussed; 7 is much closer or on fill. He said putting two tall towers on fill is dangerous.

Comments of Bryce Semmens – Mr. Semmens noted that he too resides in the Bryant neighborhood and asked if the Hartman Towers would shade the Burke Gilman trail and the houses there. He expressed concern about the mechanical on top of the buildings because the existing mechanical units are loud now; he is concerned about the impacts of the building to his and his neighbors' homes. He was also concerned that people working on the Hartman property would park along the BG trail. Topographically, the Bryant neighborhood goes up from the trail; there are 5 blocks of property with Mt. Rainier views and all will be heavily impacted by the towers.

Comments of Molly Black – Ms. Black asked for another viewpoint from the south and then also another one from NE 45th at 42nd Ave NE looking down toward Laurelton. She expressed concern about air quality/dust and asked what kinds of mitigation measures are planned.

Comments of Jeannie Hale – Ms. Hale noted that she is the President of the Laurelhurst Community Club, said the code requires CHRM to provide comparable housing. 50 units of low income housing at Magnuson Park is not the same as 50 units of moderate income housing which is what is being lost. She said the role of the CAC is to balance the institution's need to grow and the public benefit with maintaining the livability and vitality of surrounding communities.

Comments of Leonard Nelson – Mr. Nelson expressed concern that the rate of change of technology and said in 20 years time CH will have outgrown what is being planned now.

Comments of John Ramsey – Mr. Ramsey said he understand that CHRM is working on the 2030 plan. He noted that there are other major developments going on in the area. For instance University Village is planning another major expansion that will attract many more shoppers and assumes significant increases in parking. They are projecting construction of a new two stories parking garage. He noted that CHRM property used to be his grandfather's farm.

V. Preparation for the July 15th Meeting

Robert Rosencrantz stated that aid one thing that has come into greater focus for him is the increased potential impact on the areas to the west and the need for additional viewpoints. He also noted that that area had not been part of the initial CAC's tour of the campus. Mr. Rosencrantz moved:

That the CAC as organize a formal tour of the areas to the wet of the proposed Laurelton Terrace Expansion prior to the deadline for submission of comments on the draft EIS, and that this include the use of balloons to indicate the height of the proposed buildings.

The motion was seconded.

Karen Wolf suggested that photographs with computer generated imposition of buildings are helpful. She suggested that people could meet as a group to see viewpoints and asked that Bryce Semmens and Reed Stevens provide suggested viewpoints

The original motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

VI. Adjournment

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