



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

MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 20

December 16, 2008

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

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

Members

Karen Wolf, Chair
Catherine Hennings, Vice chair
Cheryl Kitchin
Dolores 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 Wayte
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	Dolores Pritchard	Cheryl Kitchin
Bob Lucas	Catherine Hennings	Brice Semmens
Mike Wayte	Doug Hanafin	Karen Wolf
Kim O Dales	Dr. Gina Trask	Yvette Moy
Mike Wayte		

Ex Officio Members Present

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

Others Present (Staff and Guests)

See Attached Attendance Sheets

I. Welcome, Introductions and House keeping

Karen Wolf called the meeting to order. Introductions followed. She then briefly went over the agenda

Sheppard went over the schedule. He noted that tonight the committee will attempt do wrap up its discussion of Hartmann and develop initial comments to the draft Director's report. Votes on height, bulk and scale will tentatively occur at the next meeting. He also noted that the next meeting will be both a meeting a public hearing and will therefore include an extended period for public comment. This will allow the Committee one final opportunity to hear in detail from your constituents, the City, the people who live in this neighborhood and users of the hospital concerning their reaction to all the documentation that is out.

He stated that the reason for dealing with Hartmann property early is that its inclusion or exclusion from the plan has a very large factor impact on the amount of square footage that might have to be accommodated on the main campus and therefore the heights, bulk and scale and overall development of the main campus.



II. Continued Discussion of the Hartmann Property

Karen Wolf noted that members have been provided with a packet of information listing possible Hartmann conditions. This was developed in part from the drawings that we saw, what is in the MIO plan that most of us think is positive and puts it into descriptive text. Those conditions are:

- Retention of trees.
- Connection to the Burke Gilman Trail; in partnership with Seattle Dept of Parks and the neighborhoods.
- Setbacks as described in chart last week.
- It be landscaped to the north, the south and at the west edge of the property.
- The frontage on Sand Point Way should have amenities.
- The height limit be restricted to 65' as measured from the elevation of the property
- The lot coverage would be limited.
- That Hartmann development be shifted from phase 2 to phase 4

Ruth Benfield noted that moving Hartmann development to phase 4 presents problems both in terms of cost and functionality. Doing this would required that Children's demolish the existing garage earlier in the before it is needed and at a significant increase in cost.

Catherine Hennings stated she preferred the development of Hartmann as part of Phase 1 in order to effectively put in place the traffic management plan, complete connections to the Burke Gilman Trail, and develop the transit center on Sandpoint Way sooner. Delaying development would not appear to have a significant public benefit.

Theresa Doherty asked if the varying heights are intended to be conditions from the existing heights or trigger different MIO heights. Mike Omura responded that the height will be measured from some point along Sandpoint Way and that the maximum elevation will then will remain the same so that the height from the rear of the site will be much less than 65 feet.

Ruth Benfield went over the uses that might be located in the facility as follows: 1) faculty support and offices; 2) clinical support like a clinical lab; and 3) a small clinic for pregnant moms coming in for diagnosis of a fetal anomaly; This facility will generally be open Monday through Friday during the day. It will not include any a surgery center.

Dave Neal presented section drawings of the proposed development he noted that the Burke Gilman Trail is shifted to the west of its 100 foot right of way and is on the western 50 feet of the path and the eastern half is the wooded area. He also went over the height of the building. He noted that southeastern corner is roughly at elevation 64 with a 4 foot rise in elevation from the northeast corner to the southeast corner. The 65 foot height would be calculated from midpoint which would be 62 feet in elevation and call that the point at which they would measure the 65 feet. Along the west edge towards Burke Gilman Trail the height would be 26 feet 8 inches and the building would be set back 20 feet. At the NE corner where the Sequoia trees are, there is a 60 feet setback. If you took everything from the edge of the trail to the face of this building potentially, is 110 feet from the edge of the developed portion of the Burke Gilman Trail. It is set back 20 feet on the south and a minimum of 20 feet on the north. On the north edge is where the possible connection to the Burke Gilman trail will likely be. It is the shallowest slope on the north side; there is a steeper decline on the south side.

Theresa Doherty asked what the height of the trees was at the rear of the site. Dave Neal responded that the trees shown on the drawings are not to scale and vary between 60 and 80 feet. The Sequoias are probably over 100' and are on Children's property. There are other conifer and deciduous trees in the right of way of the Burke Gilman trail.

Karen Wolfe asked if the building would be shorter than the trees. Staff briefly went over the drawing and noted that there are a variety of setback and heights. The setbacks include

1) 100' feet from the right of way for BG trail; and -2) 25' from the right of way for Blakely Street but most are set back farther. The rear elevation of the building will be about 26 feet above the grade of the Gilman trail. Karen Wolfe noted that it appears that the trees are higher than that.

Brice Semmens stated that he disagreed and that the trees might not screen the building. Most of the trees back there are deciduous and most of those don't go more than 20' off of the trail. He also noted that the 26' does not count the mechanical penthouse which can be an additional 15 feet giving a total height of 40' above the trail. Others noted that this would be limited to a certain percentage of the rooftop area.

Mr. Semmens further stated that there will be a large visible building wall the whole way; especially in the winter. It is great that the trees are being saved, and that while Children's has the ability to do some screening, there still would be a 40' high wall- along 150' of BG trail. He noted that this is the angle that most winter sun comes from and that the combination of the building and screening trees might block winter light and sun to this area.

Ruth Benfield stated Children's has worked with its neighbors on 44th and tried to tailor the design with the neighbors' wishes. A green wall may not be much better than a gray wall. Addressing this will require some individual work with the neighbors affected and then looking at all the options. Brice stated that he would give it less height – make the building less tall. Make the height of the BG trail the height of where the building goes to and then we don't have these problems.

Gina Trask asked for additional clarification concerning how far back the building would be from adjacent residences. Children's Staff responded that there is a 20 foot setback from the property line which is located 50 feet back from the east edge of the Burke Gilman trail or 70 feet. This area is presently in vegetation. Myriam Muller noted that she has noted that noise from the mechanical penthouses can be very disturbing. Staff noted that they had evaluated moving the mechanical off of the roof area but that this had been found to be impractical.

Mike Wayte asked if the Hartmann building on street grade along Sand Point Way. Staff responded that the building is just above that elevation and is about a foot above Sand Point Way. It is lower on that side than the existing building.

There was considerable back and forth discussion of the details of the rear setbacks. Steve Sheppard observed that it appears that there is actually a 60' setback above 30' along the rear.

Theresa Doherty moved:

-
- 1. Sequoia retention – all of the trees, so long as they are healthy
- 2. Burke Gilman Trail connection – form a partnership between Seattle Children's, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, Hawthorn Hill and Ravenna Bryant to guide this important link,
- 3. Setbacks, as described in Draft Hartmann Chart, attached
- 4. Landscape/Green Screen at the north, south and west edge of the property with neighborhood input
- 5. Sand Point Way frontage streetscape and amenities
- 6. Height limit of 65 feet as measured from the elevation on the property closest to Sand Point Way
- 7. Lot coverage, as described in the Draft Hartmann Chart, attached.

Editor's Note: The specific working of the possible conditions is included in the motion as written above. During the statement of the initial motion it was simply stated as "accepting the conditions as stated in the Possible Hartmann Condition form the December 16, 1008 meeting".

The motion was seconded.

Myriam Muller stated that she believed that the height issue was too controversial to deal with as part of this list and asked Ms. Doherty if she would consider removing the height from this list as a friendly amendment to the motion. She noted that the rest of the conditions are fine but the height should be taken out and we need to talk about that separately.

Theresa Doherty responded that she would prefer the motion as is. It says "height limit of 65' as measured from the property closest to Sandpoint; and that will actually be 26' 8" by the Burke Gilman trail plus the 15' for the penthouse. It is not 65' all the way across.

Mike Omura suggested that the list be expanded to add the phrase: "That the rear setback for the Burke Gilman Tail shall be no less than 60 feet from the west- property line".

Steve Sheppard noted that members can move to amend the motion if it is germane to the specific motion at hand and it meets certain specific guidelines: to add words or phrases, or add additional condition; to strike out specific word or phrase; or to substitute by striking out and adding. You can move to amend the motion but that motion must be voted on separately before it amends the motion. The specific wording from the rules is: To amend a motion means to change the wording of a motion to make it clearer, more complete, or more acceptable before the motion is voted upon. The amending process allows the group to change the proposed motion to more clearly represent the will of the group. It is a perfecting motion. There are three ways to amend: 1) you may add words or phrases; 2) your may strike a word or phrase; or 3) you may substitute one for another. It must be germane to the existing motion.

Theresa Doherty agreed to amend her original motion- motion to strike condition 6 above and insert the phrase: The height of the west façade of the building shall be no higher than the average grade of the Burke Gilman Trail within 60 feet of the west property line.

Shelley Hartnett suggested that the same setback apply to the frontage along the Laurelcrest condominiums.

The motion was called. Steve Sheppard re- stated the motion as follows:

That the Children's Major Institutions Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee final report shall include a recommendation that extension of the MIO to the Hartmann Site be conditioned as follows:

1. Sequoia retention – all of the trees, so long as they are healthy
2. Burke Gilman Trail connection – form a partnership between Seattle Children's, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, Hawthorn Hill and Ravenna Bryant to guide this important link,
3. Setbacks, as described in Draft Hartmann Chart, attached
4. Landscape/Green Screen at the north, south and west edge of the property with neighborhood input,
5. Sand Point Way frontage streetscape and amenities,
6. Lot coverage as described in the Draft Hartmann Chart, attached
7. Height limits of the west façade of the building no higher than the average grade of the Burke Gilman trail within 60 feet of the west property line.

A vote was called and a vote taken by show of hands with 12 in favored and 3 opposed. The motion therefore carried.

Robert Rosencrantz suggested that the CAC tour the site prior to taking a vote on height. CAC members indicated that this might be possible after the first of the year.

Myriam Muller noted that Scott Ringgold had stated that the Hartmann site was contiguous to the proposed Laurelton Terrace area. She offered the opinion that this was not the case as it was separated by both 40th Avenue and Sand Point Way, as well as the Wells Fargo and the triangle with other uses and ownerships.. Scott Ringgold responded; the Laurelton Terrace site is contiguous with the Hartmann site. A portion of the site is separated only by Sand Point Way and is therefore considered contiguous. He pointed to a portion that is directly across Sandpoint Way.

Editor's Note: This related to a discussion of drawings and was not easily re-stated verbally.

Bob Lucas stated that he wanted to add an additional condition to the Hartmann. Bob Lucas moved

That the Children's Major Institutions Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee final report shall include a recommendation that extension of the MIO to the Hartmann Site contain the following additional condition:

That the a 40 foot setback be included along the north margin of the property, except that such a setback may include pedestrian, bicycle and non-motorized vehicle access to the Burke Gilman Trail

The motion was seconded by Shelly Hartnett.

Mike Omura asked Mr. Lucas for clarification on his reason for proposing this setback. Bob Lucas responded that he wanted to avoid the possibility of a very high wall along this property line. Mr. Omura also noted that even though the building isn't designed yet – it looks like there is some kind of pie-shape to this at that end which is wider at Sandpoint and then the setback narrows down to 20' at the west end. It looks like it is capable of accepting another 20'. Dave Neal put up the sketch showing NE corner of Hartmann property. He noted that Children's had left a wide area there to create a place to come down off the Burke Gilman trail – it is also the place where the shuttle will be. They are trying to create a pedestrian zone there to gain access and use the space.

A vote was called and a vote taken by show of hands with 9 in favored and 6 opposed. The motion therefore carried.

III. Public Comment:

Comments of Joan Quint: Ms. Quint stated that she was Ravenna/Bryant resident; mechanical engineer; reviewing Children's expansion plans was impressed with their goals – particularly the reduction in energy consumption, potable water usage reduction, reduction in construction waste and also reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. She hoped that Children's would be seeking accreditation throughout the construction. She stated that she supports expansion.

Comments of Jim Madden: Mr. Madden stated that he wanted to discuss traffic issues. He noted that after he spoke last week, a professor of planning at U.W. advised the CAC there were no worries because the intelligent traffic management system would be installed and there were sensors that would take care of it. During the break he asked the Professor where he could go to see this intelligent traffic mgmt system work; he recommended all members of the committee make themselves aware of it as well. The professor advised there wasn't a system like that installed in Seattle – that there may be one in Anaheim or Los Angeles (California). He visited it and said there is more traffic on Sandpoint than that area likely sees in a week. He stated that he wanted to avoid waking up one morning to read that the neighborhood had been fooled and that intelligent traffic management system was "pie in the sky" and wondered if it actually existed. He recommended really looking at the traffic issue.

Comments of Erin Kinch: Ms. Kinch noted that she was representing the Puget Sound blood center. She noted that Children's is a premier facility in the treatment of pediatric cancer and provides a great deal of uncompensated care. She gave various examples of this uncompensated care. She stated that she definitely supports children's expansion.

Comments of Jeannie Hale: Ms. Hale stated that she was from the Laurelhurst Community Club. She stated that she wanted to remind all in attendance that we are not here to talk about all of the important work that Children's Hospital does. That is already known and all support that mission. We are here to talk about land use issues and make land use decisions, not listen to stories of individual children's experiences. She further stated that the major institutions code requires the Committee to balance the needs of the hospital with maintaining the livability of the surrounding community. If the expansion is too big and you cannot meet that delicate balance, then it has to be smaller. This is a single family zone and outside of any urban center. This would be the biggest rezone in the history of the City. She stated that several CAC members have been in touch with her about communications among CAC members about expansion of the boundaries with regard to Hartmann. She hoped that Steve would educate the chair on Roberts Rules that at the first of each meeting anybody can ask that the agenda be changed to add items of discussion – that never happens at these meetings. It seems like the whole discussion is driven by the supporters of the hospital regardless of the square footage they wanted. It is also driven by the 2nd citywide rep on the committee – Theresa Doherty – who has a lot of experience with major institutions because she leads that process with the U.W. Ms. Doherty is very skilled and is leading everything. She encouraged the CAC to get more engaged and study the issues and get involved; and asked the CAC to follow the rules for fairness to everyone. She stated that she hopes that once the CAC moves on height, bulk and scale, the CAC will settle on a square footage that is consistent with what this site can handle; and certainly no more than 750,000 square feet. She also stated that there are so many questions concerning the need for the psych beds that just eliminating those would reduce the square footage significantly. She noted that she had been forwarded a study from a consultant that dealt with this, but that the firm appeared to have no experience in this field and hadn't even contacted the LCC independent consultant that Laurelhurst CC hired.

Comments of Rabbi Jonathon Singer: Rabbi Singer noted that he was from Wedgewood. His neighborhood has higher rise apartment buildings coming in and as a result – more children in the community. Schools are booming with children and his school went from 300 to 650 kids in 10 years. This facility addresses the need of the wider community. Children's draws from a broader area and is meeting the needs of the entire City. He stated that he supports the growth of the hospital to serve the City; and provide needed jobs in the City.

Comments of Kobe O'Donnell: Mr. O' Donnell stated that he supported expansion. He noted that he is a former Board member of Children's. He noted that he now lives in Seward Park and children there also rely on Children's. He noted that he has been advocating for mental health beds at Children's for twenty years. We are in dire need of mental health beds for our community. Presently we send children to other states because there are not available facilities here. Support of mental health beds to be added. He stated that he appreciates the concerns of Laurelhurst by the institution.

Comments of Jan Kirkwood: Ms. Kirkwood thanked CAC for service. She stated that she wholeheartedly supports the expansion of Children's Hospital. She noted that she grew up in Laurelhurst but now lives in Madison Park and she sometimes thinks that people of Laurelhurst don't often get south of Montlake cut – they don't have a lot of open space. She drives through an urban canyon but lives in a neighborhood that is surrounded by commercial buildings, hospitals, mental health facilities etc. – it is still a neighborhood that functions as such. Transportation is a real issue – neighborhood underserved by public transportations. Don't lose sight of the larger issue for the larger area.

Comments of Katherine Wozak: Ms. Wozak stated that she supports expansion. She stated that she considers the expansion of Seattle Children's as an investment in the future. She noted that she currently lives at Laurelon Terrance and that she considers Children's an asset to community. Children's is a good environmental steward and a leader in transportation management.

Comments of Arlene Ehrlich: Ms. Ehrlich stated that appreciated work of CAC. She noted that she was a retired social worker. Her house is important. She stated that the emphasis on Laurelhurst Neighborhood is a bit misplaced as the Hospital's expansion will have an impact on other nearby neighborhoods. She also stated that it is unfair to Laurelhurst and those who don't live in Laurelhurst to have their concerns cast as being unsupportive of Children's.

IV. Continued Committee Discussion of Hartmann.

Nicole Van Borkulo noted that some have questioned the worth of having people discuss their experiences with Children's. She stated that she believes that this is directly related to the Issue of bed need and that people should be allowed to talk about the important emotional aspect of how they feel about Children's. She stated that she would feel very uncomfortable if we asked people not to discuss this issue.

Steve Sheppard responded that when we ask for public comment we can't exclude any comment and the extent to which people wish to talk about their feelings about Children's is appropriate. It is also appropriate for folks to say they don't believe that it is the immediate issue to say that also. We all need to keep in mind – weigh in your own minds how much you take it into account. This is an emotional issue for everyone on both sides.

Kim O Dales stated that she believes that the group is having a problem divining what we need to do. She stated that while she is supportive of the hospital, there is a difference between supporting the hospital and looking at where and how it should grow. It sometimes feels as if we are trying to shove a size 12 foot into a size 7 shoe. The hospital has outgrown this little corner of Northeast Seattle. If this expansion goes into motion it will negatively impact all of the surrounding neighborhoods and ultimately the quality of care, which to her as a nurse is very important. She stated that when she worked there there wasn't a shift she worked that there wasn't some type of detour or construction wasn't disrupting the accountability of her getting from point A to point B and ultimately patients being calm and sedate when they needed to be; it was noisy. It is disruptive to always have a detour, have an elevator that is down or having to go down a hallway that you are not familiar where you are going to come out. It was typical in the hospital. During the ten years she worked there the in the outpatient day surgery area it was moved three times. The parking sounds good but when you have to deal with shuttles it is not very inconvenient and is exhausting. It is not secure parking. There are a lot of things that we don't talk about. Last Friday at 3:00 PM the traffic started getting bad; it took her 45 minutes to get across the cut. If you don't live nearby, this hospital is not in a good location – it is hard to find, traffic bad, it is too spread out.

Steve Sheppard asked if the Committee preferred discussion the issue of height at Hartmann separately or along with all other heights. Mike Omura stated that prior to making that decision; he wanted to consider adding an additional condition regarding Hartman. He noted that the Draft Director's Report included an upper floor setback but that this did not appear to be included in the currently adopted CAC position. Steve Sheppard stated that his was the case. Mr. Omura moved:

That the Children's Major Institutions Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee final report shall include a recommendation that extension of the MIO to the Hartmann Site contain the following additional condition:

That the CAC endorses the extension of the proposal in the Draft Report of the Director of the Department of Construction and Land use calling for the Inclusion of an upper level setback 40' along the east side of Sand Point Way with no building

height greater than 50' within that setback, to also include the Sand Point Way Frontage of the Hartmann Site.

The motion was seconded. Discussion followed.

Mr. Omura noted that the specific proposal would be 40' back from the property above an elevation of 50'. Scott Ringgold noted that this upper level setback is included in the Draft Director's Report as a condition on the east side of Sand Point and that Children's had voluntarily included this in its current proposal.

A vote was called and a vote taken by show of hands with 14 in favor and 1 abstaining. The motion therefore carried.

Karen Wolf noted that the remaining issue is height. Mr. Rosencrantz stated that he would prefer that a vote on height be delayed until the next meeting after he has had a chance to do a walk around observation. Brice Semmens stated that he continues to propose that the height be no greater than level with the grade of the Gilman trail. This would be zero feet at the trail side. He noted that at the setback that would be about 30 feet above Sand Point Way.

Ruth Benfield noted that this would appear to take the top two floors off of the Hartmann and reduce its square footage by roughly 75,000 square feet. Scott Ringgold stated that he believed that there is already substantial mitigation on the west side as it is already about the same height as a single family home would be at the upper side of the site. Myriam Muller stated that she and supports lower height there.

Brice Semmens noted that the MIO they say 30' plus 15 for mechanical which is 45'. Theresa Doherty noted that the height is 26 feet without the mechanical and asked if those 26 feet are acceptable. Mr. Semmens responded that this was an improvement. Mike Omura stated that it might be possible to condition the project to relocate the mechanical or otherwise condition it. Ruth Benfield responded that it depends on what you are putting into the building. We look at ways to minimize roof top mechanical to the extent reasonable. Some could be taken off but not all of it.

A decision was made to delay a final decision on height until it could be considered along with the height issues on the remainder of the campus.

IV. Initial Discussion of Draft Director's Repots

Steve Sheppard stated that the Committee is encouraged to make comments to the Director's draft report. He pointed out that in several places in the Draft Director's Report it the Committee's final recommendations would be referenced, but that is technically not correct since our report is not made final until the end. Scott Ringgold had left some areas blank as he is hoping for some guidance from the CAC. Cheryl Kitchen noted that she too sees a conflict as the CAC has not yet determined all of its positions.

Steve Sheppard stated that the code asks the CAC to inform the director where the sense of the Committee is that an issue has been insufficiently addressed or where the Committee may disagree with the Director and gave some examples of what might be stated.

After further discussion, the Committee decided to focus on the development of its positions and simply inform the Director of its positions to day.

Mike Wayte stated that he continues to be frustrated with the conflicting information he has received concerning the major issue of bed need and the use of the State Certificate of need process. He stated that it would be helpful to have some sort of process or a certificate of need from Department of Health. Ruth Benfield responded that you can't have a certificate of need until you meet the local jurisdiction's requirement and have a construction budget that you will commit to being within 12% when you are done. What is the jurisdiction here that we have to meet before we define what we are building – it is the Major Institution Master

Plan. It has to first be in place before we can even start to develop a design because we have to know height, bulk and scale to do it.

Mr. Wayte also asked it was possible to put limitations on what you build in order to assure that development was absolutely needed on site. Steve Sheppard stated that there have been some instances where CAC's have addressed this issue. Generally this has related to other private ownership within an MIO.

Ruth Benfield stated the struggle we would have with getting so specific in terms of a medical use is what you don't know is what is coming. She gave burn center as example and said they used to do that there and explained why they don't anymore. They currently do give care to pregnant women who have a child with cardiac problem. In the future it is possible they would do fetal surgery – right now they don't know.

Myriam Muller asked if Children's can obtain a letter of intent that is not the certificate of need. Jodie Corona responded in order to get an letter of intent to issue, which to date has been for new hospitals and not expansions of existing, you have to go through certificate of need process. The stated determines if the project is needed, is financially feasible, meets all quality standards and is the best available alternative. If you are missing an EIS, they will issue a letter of intent to issue a certificate of need. This is a separate process and since Children's does not have the MIMP in place yet that would allow the hospital to finalize its project and to develop its costs; she stated that she believes that issuing a letter of intent is not an option.

Robert Rosencrantz stated that the Draft Director's Report suggests that "Children's could meet its obligation to provide replacement housing by making a payment in the form of a grant or equity sufficient to cause the construction of at least 136 housing units". He stated that in his experience Children's can be in a position to contribute a negligible amount – ½ of 1% of total development costs or 1% of total development costs and complied with this condition. He suggested that the Committee have a discussion where a dollar amount for each of the units is established, or some other minimum threshold is identified that Children's has to rise to in order to be in compliance. Cheryl Kitchen stated that she believes that the Committee should waiting until we have some reasonable data by which to make recommendation to this report in this area. Leaving it blank or vague is not the intent of this committee.

Karen noted that the Committee has limited time and that she didn't see how the Committee could submit comments on director's draft report by February 6 without scheduling additional meetings .

Steve Sheppard noted that the Committee is moving slowly and asked everyone to expect to stay late at subsequent meetings and to be prepared on the major issue of height, bulk and scale and need. He pointed out all the information CAC has received on the need: report from Carol Eychaner, Nancy Fields, Judy Corona and Cedar Rivers. He asked if everyone had the reports and if anyone needed to get them again. He instructed CAC members to be sure to have read everything and are familiar with them.

VII. Adjournment

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