



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 #1

Tuesday, August 14, 2007

Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
4800 Sand Point Way
Wright Auditorium

Members

Cheryl Kitchin
Delores Prichard
Myriam Muller
Kim O Dales
Kathleen Sabo
Doug Hanafin
Catherine Hennings
Dr. Gina Trask
Karen Wolf
Michael S Omura
Wendy Paul
Yvette Moy
Robert Rosencrantz
Bob Lucas
Cathy Higgins

Members/Alternates Present

Cheryl Kitchin	Myriam Muller	Catherine Hennings
Dr. Gina Trask	Karen Wolf	Michael S Omura
Wendy Paul	Yvette Moy	Robert Rosencrantz
Bob Lucas	Cathy Higgins	Kim O Dales
Kathleen Sabo	Theresa Doherty	Shelley Hartnett
Christine Barrett		

Members Absent (Excused)

Delores Prichard Doug Hanafin

Members Absent (Unexcused)

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

The meeting was opened by Steve Sheppard at 6:10 PM. Mr. Sheppard noted that this is the first formal meeting of the Committee. He noted that there had been previous orientation meetings and independent public meetings sponsored directly by Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center. He noted that the first part of the meeting would be a presentation by Children's on its initial Concept Plan. This will be followed by public comments and following this, the Committee will meet to deal with its business.

II. Formal Presentation of the Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center (CHRMC) Concept Plan

Ruth Benfield, Vice President for Facilities and Psycho-Social Services for CHRMC, was recognized to lead off CHRMC's presentation. Ms Benfield stated that CHRMC had begun the process with an

evaluation of the needs of CHRMC. She stated that CHRMC has experienced more rapid growth in its service than anticipated and now recognizes that it must grow to meet those needs. She noted that CHRMC staff and consultants will present their initial thinking concerning how to meet CHRMC's needs while minimizing as far



as possible the impacts on the community. She noted that this is an early proposal and will likely change over the next two years as the community weighs in.

Ms. Benfield stated that the proposal focuses on honoring the existing boundaries of the institution rather than expansion of the boundaries. It does not include the Hartman Building across Sand Point Way. This building is owned by CHRCM and its use will allow a reduction in the total square feet of development on the central Campus. She noted that there have been questions raised concerning whether CHRCM is working with Laurelon Terrace to facilitate purchase of Laurelon Terrace. She stated that while CHRCM has heard from some residents in that condominium that they might wish to go in that direction while others have indicated no interest in such a direction. CHRCM has stated to its immediate neighbors that if they have an interest in selling their properties to CHRCM, CHRCM would entertain some consideration of that. However, that is not anticipated in the Master Plan.

Editor's Note: The presentation related to a series of graphics and models and was not easily summarized verbally. Discussion of the graphics is not included here. Copies of the graphics presented are included in the formal Committee files and available at DON for review.

Paul Sonberg with Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) Architects was introduced to go through the proposal. The existing hospital has 350 beds in 199 rooms. The proposal is to go to 600 beds in 600 rooms. This will result in an increase from 900,000 gross square feet of space to 2,400,000 gross square feet. He noted that there are currently 1400 cars on campus and that will increase to 3000.

The first phase of the expansion is a three-story building to house the Emergency Department. This was authorized under the last MIMP. Following that, the new bed towers would be constructed in phases. Eventually, two additional nursing towers would also be constructed. A variety of cross sections and elevations were presented and are included in the Committee files. Mr. Sonberg also noted that CHRCM has identified a series of locations throughout the neighborhood where views of the proposed development will be generated.

Mr. Sonberg also noted that additional access points are proposed from both 45th and 50th Streets. This will include location of new traffic signals on Sand Point Way. Mr. Sonberg then briefly went over the model and this was followed by a break to allow members of the public to come forward and view the model.

III. Public Comments and Questions and Answers

The meeting was opened to public comments and questions.

A member of the public asked what rules apply to the setbacks and size of the facility. Steve Sheppard responded that the Major Institutions Code allows the institution to propose the development standards (zoning restrictions) that will apply to them. That includes heights setbacks and total square footage of development. The Code allows an absolute maximum height of 240 feet. The code also has a variety of lower heights from 37 feet up. The purpose of this entire process is to determine the zoning standards. The code also contains provisions that the development standard apply only within the boundaries of the Overlay Zone which is essentially the campus boundary. In this case, CHRCM is proposing to expand that boundary to include the Hartman Building site.

A member of the audience asked what the footprint of the proposal would be. Mr. Sheppard noted that the maps show a boundary. The institution may not develop outside of that boundary. The institution is proposing an expansion of the current boundary.

A member of the public asked what the effect of CHRCM's purchase of homes outside of the overlay boundary would be. Mr. Sheppard stated that CHRCM can purchase property outside of its boundaries but could not use that property for any use other than what is allowed under the current zoning. He noted that if Children's purchased a home in a single family zone and it was not within their boundary, then they would have to use it for single family uses.

A member of the public asked what the process would be if Children's then wanted to use acquired property outside of their boundary for institutional use. Mr. Sheppard responded that they would have to propose a boundary expansion as a major amendment to whatever plan existed at that time. In essence, they would have to go through the master planning process all over again. The City has the option of denying any boundary expansion. This also applies to the current request to expand the boundaries to cover the Hartman site.

A member of the audience asked for clarification concerning open space. Children's staff responded that the concept plan identifies both current and proposed open space.

A member of the public asked for clarification on how CHRCM arrived at the conclusion that it needed 500 to 600 beds. Ruth Benfield responded that CHRCM had taken into account growth projections nationally which estimated an average of 3.1% per year growth. They looked at this area and estimated a 3.5 % growth in need over the next twenty years. She noted that 60 to 70% of the patients are children with chronic or severe needs that cannot be easily treated elsewhere. What is proposed is to remove non-critical functions such as research, and consolidate in-patient services at the Laurelhurst campus. She noted that the hospital is currently operating at over 74% occupancy using double rooms or up to 94% if only single occupancy was used. Children's is trying to go to single rooms and to a more reasonable 65% occupancy.

A member of the audience asked what percentage of patients comes from Washington State. Ms. Benfield responded that about 50% come from the Puget Sound area, 95% from Washington State and 5% from elsewhere.

Jeannie Hale asked: 1) if federal guidelines require single beds and 2) how Children's arrived at the need for 4,000 square feet of space for each bed.

Children's staff responded that only about 300 square feet of the projected 4,000 square feet is the actual patient room. The remainder includes the access, nursing stations, surgery imaging and support services and some teaching and faculty offices. This is not a federal guideline but is general industry standard for leading academic medical centers.

A member of the public asked if a geotechnical study has been completed to determine if the soils are stable. Children's staff responded that a study has not been completed at this time.

Various members of the public noted that the new entrances to the campus could have significant impacts. Steve Sheppard responded that these issues will be dealt with in the environmental review process.

A member of the audience noted that most who had moved to the area had done so with the understanding that Children's was a residentially scaled hospital. The current proposal changes this in ways that no one anticipated. Others noted that given the large scale change, that the information provided include views from various locations and better elevations.

A member of the public noted that the model shows a level of development that is very troubling. She asked that Children's consider going back to the drawing board and consider other locations. She noted that she had looked at other state-of-the-art facilities and that such a facility could probably be constructed at South

Lake Union for less than the cost of expansion here. She urged the CAC to press for financial and environmental analysis of areas where bulk and height conflicts were not so great. She noted that in that case the Laurelhurst campus could be converted to an outpatient facility.

A member of the audience asked if it was prudent to locate all of the facilities at one location. He noted that it might be better to decentralize facilities.

A member of the audience stated that the proposal is totally out of scale with a residential neighborhood and that the 240 foot height would create excessive shadowing and view blockage. Noise impacts will also be significant.

Jeannie Hale, president of the Laurelhurst Community Club, stated that environmental review and scoping process is the community's chance to suggest to the CAC and Children's other alternatives that have not been considered. She noted that there are essentially two alternatives that are virtually the same. According to the land use consultant hired by the Community Club, this would be the largest rezone in the history of Seattle. This is a single family neighborhood, not a commercial area or high-rise area like First Hill. She noted that all support Children's but that Children's should consider an expansion more in scale with the area. She suggested that a reasonable alternative might be 250,000 square feet of new development rather than the 1,500,000 square feet of new development. In addition, she stated that she is concerned with the leapfrogging over the Hartman Building and what this might signal for the area between Hartman and Children's. Cumulative impacts of this and other proposed development is also a concern.

A member of the audience asked if the CAC members consider themselves as representatives of the community. He noted that the CAC appears to be heavily weighted to women.

IV. Committee Deliberations on the Development of its Formal Comments to the Concept Plan

The Committee reconvened to discuss its comments. Each member was asked to briefly discuss their comments and observations concerning the concept plan. Individual comments were as follows:

Comments of Myriam Muller – Ms. Muller stated that the Committee needs to keep in mind that this is primarily a residential neighborhood and that there needs to be a wider range of options than CHRC might be able to live with.

Comments of Kim O Dales – Ms. Dales noted that she had missed the previous meetings and that she is trying to catch up but has many ideas. She noted that she has lived in the area for about five years and was previously a nurse at CHRC. She stated that there are many ramifications to the proposed design. She noted that she is a realtor and offered the opinion that the bulk and scale of the proposal was making potential buyers to the area nervous. She stated that she was intrigued with the observations of Ms. Gisela Schimmelbusch. *(editor's note: Ms. Schimmelbusch provided written comments to be distributed to all Committee members. That document is being forwarded to all members in hard copy as it is not available in electronic form.)*

Comments of Christine Barrett – Ms. Barrett noted that it appears that half of the campus land area is devoted to parking under the concept plan. She suggested that concepts that spread development more evenly across the campus should be considered. She suggested a reduction of maximum height by better utilizing the areas north of Penny Lane by developing over the proposed parking.

Comments of Kathleen Sabo – Ms. Sabo stated that she was concerned with the bulk and height of the proposal, especially as viewed from the Laurelon Terrace side. With the Hartman Building build out, she observed that the Laurelon Terrace area might be like the bottom of the Grand Canyon. She noted that light and noise are also important issues.

Comments of Catherine Hennings – Ms. Hennings asked for greater clarification concerning why a total of 4,000 gross square feet of development per bed was needed. She asked that CHRCM look at other similar facilities nationwide to see if this is in the proper range. She asked if it were possible to move some additional functions off site in order to reduce the total number of square feet needed at this location and thus reduce both the total square footage and height. She also stated that a great deal of attention needs to be given to the access and egress points off of 45th and 50th and suggested that one or more of these entrances might be converted to an exit only.

She stated that another concern is the relationship of open space to the campus and community. She noted that the argument was made previously that one of the reasons for CHRCM selection of a “towers alternative” rather than the spread alternative was to preserve open space on the campus. But in reviewing the concept plan, it is not obvious that any open space has been preserved by going up.

Comments of Bob Lucas – Mr. Lucas noted that CHRCM is clearly needed. He asked why alternatives that include building above the garages to the north of Penny Lane, which might result in a lower and less bulky design, are not being evaluated. He stated that he is concerned with the transportation impacts of the proposal and how it affects both Sand Point Way and 40th Avenue.

Comments of Cathy Higgins - Ms. Higgins stated that the alternatives provided are very similar and that both appear to be shockingly high. She noted that she too was very concerned about the transportation impacts of this proposal. She noted that the EISD and other documents need to include many superimposed drawings showing what the facility would look like from a wide variety of locations in the community.

Comments of Wendy Paul - Ms. Paul stated that she agreed with most of the comments made previously and that she was concerned with noise, lighting and open space.

Comments of Theresa Doherty – Ms. Doherty noted that there needs to be a more careful look taken at other alternatives. She noted the testimony during the community comment period that CHRCM should consider relocation to a new campus and stated that she was not sure that such an option was the way to go. However, she stated that there are other alternatives that should be considered, including less square feet of total development and a “spread out” rather than a “go up” alternative. She noted that the two alternatives presented in the concept plan are too similar.

Ms. Doherty also stated that the EIS should definitely cover all of the major elements that related to the impacts of the bulk and scale, such as light and glare etc. She further noted that almost all of the elements of the environment should be looked at.

Comments of Shelley Hartnett - Ms. Hartnett stated that she was concerned with the impact of traffic on the major entrance from Sand Point Way as well as the addition of the two new proposed entrances. She further stated that she was concerned that other alternatives need to be evaluated.

Comments of Michael Omura – Mr. Omura noted that traffic will be a major issue and especially the impacts of the entrances on 45th and 50th Avenues. He also stated that he hoped that CHRCM would take a lead with sustainability and especially in regards to carbon offsetting.

Comments of Yvette Moy – Ms. Moy stated that it is important to strike a balance between the needs of CHRCM and the needs of the community. She noted that she recently experienced being turned away for admission to CHRCM because of a lack of rooms.

Comments of Robert Rosencrantz. - Mr. Rosencrantz stated that he had two areas of major comments. The first is how the Committee will understand what the neighborhood impacts are. He suggested that the Committee needs to take time to get out into the surrounding neighborhood and campus to get a much better feel for what people will face. The second area is to have a better understanding of why this level of expansion has to occur at this site. He noted that he heard this question asked before the meeting from people who question this need.

Comments of Karen Wolf – Ms. Wolf noted that many of her concerns had already been expressed. She stated that the two alternatives presented in the Concept Plan are very similar with one simply adding two stories over the preferred one and that there need to be other alternatives presented and evaluated including digging down and spreading out. There need to be real alternatives. She also stated that there is a need to get a better understanding of the need for the space both by looking at the square feet per room and the total need. Sustainability is also an issue and she suggested that LEED certification be a requirement of development. She noted that strong transportation demand management needs to be incorporated into the proposal. She noted that providing parking encourages people to drive.

Comments of Gina Trask – Ms. Trask stated that she believes that Laurelhurst needs to remain primarily a residential neighborhood. She stated that there needs to be a greater range of alternatives presented. She specifically questioned why there was no decentralization alternative being evaluated. She suggested the following alternatives: 1) moving in-patient functions to a new campus elsewhere and converting this campus to outpatient services; 2) providing new facilities in some of the more distant locations with campuses in Spokane or Montana which might reduce the need for so much square footage here; 3) providing a satellite Seattle East-side campus. She also stated that the impact of families needing to stay in the area needs to be evaluated. Where will families stay and will this result in a need for more nearby hotel development? In addition, the entrances on 45th and 50th appear to be problems in that they would direct traffic into the neighborhoods where greater conflicts with pedestrians might occur. A single entry is better. She also noted that it would be very difficult to screen a 240 foot building with trees. She observed that the tallest trees in the neighborhood would not screen the new development.

She noted that the present facility is not intimidating to children. With the lower height of the present facility, every room has a view of greenery. With the proposed greater height, this will not be the case. The view might be very institutional. She suggested a more spread-out design. She also stated that she too is concerned with general traffic impacts.

Comments of Cheryl Kitchin – Ms. Kitchin noted that she was a member of the previous committee and noted that one of the major agreements during the last process was the elimination of access off of 45th and 50th. She noted that having this come up again is discouraging. She questioned the need to accommodate all pediatric emergency services at this campus and noted that other nearby hospitals such as the UW Hospital and Swedish Medical Center can provide these services. She questioned the assumption that all of the proposed need for square footage be provided here. The cumulative impacts of all of the increased aspects of growth will build on each other. Other alternatives should be evaluated, including building less square footage at this location. She noted that the charge of the Committee is to strike a balance and that negotiating this balance will be difficult. Compromise will be needed. She noted that she lived directly adjacent to the campus and that currently its impact on her is minimal. The campus is well screened with trees and shrubbery. Clearly this would not be the case with the increased development, so great care needs to be taken looking at the impacts.

Steve Sheppard noted that the Committee has the option of having the minutes of this meeting act as its sole comments, or augmenting the minutes with a letter identifying a set of shared and agreed upon comments as follows:

- 1) That a greater range of options or alternatives be presented in the Concept Plan and evaluated in the EIS. The discussion of alternatives should include an evaluation of the existential need for development on this site rather than elsewhere. Alternatives might include:
 - A more spread out alternative that limits height.
 - Decentralized alternatives that result in less square footage on the Laurelhurst Campus.
 - Conversion of the Laurelhurst Campus to outpatient services with a new in-patient hospital constructed elsewhere.
 - Splitting in-patient services in the immediate Seattle area into east of Lake Washington and west of Lake Washington facilities.
- 2) That great attention needs to be given to evaluating the effects of the two new proposed entrances off of NE 45th and NE 50th Streets, including consideration of internal circulation patterns that might eliminate the needs for these two entrances.
- 3) That the relationship of open space to both the campus and adjacent communities needs to be carefully evaluated.
- 4) That sustainability issues, including LEEDS certification requirements, need to be considered as possible requirements for development.
- 5) That the Concept Plan needs to look at ways to reduce the needs for parking through the continued application of an aggressive transportation management program (TMP).
- 6) That the needs for patient and staff housing in the area should be evaluated.
- 7) That the EIS should include a very detailed look at issues related to the impacts or the height and bulk of the facility including light, glare, noise, shadow patterns, view blockage, and other similar impacts.

Mr. Sheppard asked if this was an accurate summary of general comments and if members concurred with these as the Committees' comments. Robert Rosencrantz stated that he would like to have the list amended to add:

- 8) That the EIS and Draft Plan should include detailed street level views, including shadowing at various seasons, of the projected height and bulk of development as seen from a wide variety of locations in the neighborhood.

Catherine Hennings asked for clarification concerning the latitude that the Committee has to require changes to the plans and EIS scopes. Mr. Sheppard responded that the Committee is free to comment on any related issue it wishes to and suggest various alternatives. However, CHRCM need not accept any or all of the comments. For instance, CHRCM might conclude that suggested alternatives do not meet the needs of the institution, so they can not be evaluated honestly because they are unworkable from CHRCM's perspective.

Committee members concurred with the amended list. Steve Sheppard stated that a letter will be produced after the August 23rd meeting. Mr. Sheppard stated that all comments and correspondences addressed to him for the Committee would be provided to the committee.

V. Committee Organization – Election of Officers

Steve Sheppard asked for volunteers to act as a vote counter. He asked that there be two counters. Balloting would be by secret ballot. He stated that the first vote would be for Chairperson and that the person who lost the vote for Chairperson would also have the option of then running for Vice Chairperson. Those running for Chairperson were: Karen Wolf and Cheryl Kitchin and for Vice Chairperson were Catherine Hennings and Miriam Muller. Mr. Sheppard asked if there were others wishing to nominate themselves. No nomination being forthcoming, the nominations were closed. Voting for Chairperson proceeded. The votes were cast and double counted. The result was that Karen Wolf was elected as Chairperson on a vote of 8 to 7. Cheryl Kitchin asked to be considered for Vice Chairperson. Voting proceeded. Catherine Henning was elected as Vice Chairperson by a vote of 8 to 7.

VI. Typical Elements of the Environment that are Normally considered during the Environmental Review Process

Lists of those elements of the environment that are normally considered during the environmental review process were passed out. Katey Chaney very briefly went over the elements.

VI. Adjournment

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