



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

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 21

Extended Public Comment/Hearing

January 6, 2009

Telaris Confernece 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	Karen Wolf, Chair	Shelly Hartnett
Michael S Omura	Wendy Paul	Robert Rosencrantz
Theresa Doherty	Dolores Pritchard	Cheryl Kitchin
Bob Lucas	Catherine Hennings	Mike Wayte
Mike Wayte	Karen Wolf	
Dr. Gina Trask	Yvette Moy	

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 opened the meeting and thanked people for their attendance. Introductions followed. Ms. Wolfe went over the agenda.

Steve Sheppard stated that this meeting has an extended public comment period. The purpose is to allow the community to address the Committee one last time prior to the Committee having to make their major final decisions. He also urged members to read material that is sent out and particularly highlighted the list of issues sent previously

It was noted that Mike Wayte will be voting in the absence of Kim O Dales.

II. Public comments/Hearing:

Comments of Mark Ellerbrook: Mr. Ellerbrook stated that he works with Seattle Office of Housing. The Office of Housing is involved in this process as a result of possible loss of 136 housing units at Laurelon Terrace. Those units must be replaced and – replace at least 136 units that are lost and look at the needs in City. In replacing those units we are primarily considering workforce housing – 60% - 100% median income. The Office of Housing has settled on a sum of \$5,000,000 for mitigation; which is greater than Virginia Mason or Harborview needed to provide as part as changes to their master plan. \$5 million will result in more than 136 units. He also stated that he is confident will be able to replace the lost housing in

the vicinity and hopes that the provision of these funds will be a catalyst for quick development.

Comments of Jim Madden: Mr. Madden stated that he would primarily discuss traffic. He noted that at the last meeting there was some discussion of "Intelligent traffic management systems". He noted that this is less of a system than a description of various methods. There was one project developed about 2002 in West Seattle, but it appears that it was not successfully implemented. The evaluation of this included the statement that one of the important lessons learned was to have to have effective communication. Mr. Madden also referred to LCC paper – 5 different issues where they tried to get information on traffic. Concerned – can't increase traffic without changing the road system. Sandpoint can't be made any wider, no parking. University area traffic strategy completed in August 2008 – they have been working on that for a long time and Children's area is not even mentioned. Concern about traffic issues; getting increasing numbers of people here.

Comments of Jeannie Hale: Ms. Hale stated that she wanted to remind members to reference handouts prepared by LCC and especially the white paper outlining laws, differences and the reasons for differences between independent hospital's study and those done by those employed by Children's. She noted that the committee is beginning to address key issues and prior to preparing the report she wanted to go over a couple of important issues. The first is deciding on an appropriate square footage for this site - - what actually fits on a site that can be mitigated in terms of performing your role in addressing the public benefit of the expansion and the impact's equally important value of maintaining the livability of the surrounding communities. Ms. Hale stated that LCC hand initially thought the 250,000 square foot expansion that occurred the last time around was massive. Now Children's is asking for 1.5 million. While we still would prefer 250,000 square feet, the bed need at minimum, as determined by independent consultant, is 700,000 square feet would meet Children's needs. We hope that the Committee will consider this amount. Concerning height, LCC would prefer that the maximum height be 90 feet, but in effort and willingness to compromise we would go for a 105' height limit.

Ms. Hale also noted that LCC has prepared a memorandum in response to issues brought up at the last meeting on conditioning phased development on certificate of need. LCC did some research on this issue and has provided it to the CAC. She noted that they also spoke to the development director at the Washington State Department of Health who clarified some of the miss-information that was provided to you at the last meeting by Children's Hospital consultant and asked that the Committee member look at that.

Ms. Hale agreed with Mr. Madden that traffic and transportation issues are key and they can be mitigated in large part by reducing the height, bulk and scale of the project. 42,000 trips per day is not something easily mitigated. She also stated that it seems like the CAC is being rushed to complete the most important part of its process – preparing its report and responding to DPD's draft report, and encouraged CAC to consider giving this process at least an additional month so that the Committee can do the thoughtful work and conduct careful deliberations so that the final report that will be useful for the Hearing Examiner and City Council.

Comments of Bill Block: Mr. Block stated that he is the Project Director of the Committee to End Homelessness in King County. He noted that there is a housing crisis across King County. He has been involved in trying to save affordable housing. This is a very different situation; two things are different. One, residents who are being displaced in the condos are actually leaving with enough money to buy housing to go into – that is huge. A lot of other situations had people displaced out of their apartments and there was no place to go. Second, Children's has put up \$5 million mitigation fund which will create yet more affordable housing on top of whatever the people purchase at whatever they decide to purchase. He would love to see more institutions do this in more settings which is really mitigate on both sides.

Comments of Lee Murray: Mr. Murray stated that she is the Deputy Director of Housing Resources group and will discuss the Laurelon replacement housing and to speak in support of the affordability component. Housing Resources Group is a private non-profit housing provider. The group builds multi-family apartments and buys and renovates existing apartments. These units are then rented to folks making between about \$10,000 and \$60,000 per year. That is persons making between 50 – 80% of that area median income. These units are for working folks and fixed incomes. HRG also tries to site housing close to jobs and transportation to help people stay financially stable. She also noted that according to the Housing Development Consortium research Seattle-King County has recently completed, we will need another 155,000 units of affordable housing by 2015 in order to meet the needs that are out there and that she is therefore pleased that City is requiring Children's to build replacement housing for Laurelon Terrace and that it is to stay affordable for 50 years. It is clear that Seattle Children's wants to do the right thing – she commended them for that.

Comments of Mary Hodgson: Ms. Hodgson stated that she is the president of the Laurelon Terrace Association. Most people don't understand that the complex is old and its infrastructure antique. The complex has knob and tube which would cost millions to replace, and until replaced their general liability insurance is iffy. The Board has understood for some time that the costs to bring the complex to code might be prohibitive and force replacement of the complex whether or not the Children's expansion project proceeds. The loss of this housing is not actually due to the Children's situation in some ways – it is more due to the millions of dollars it would take to bring it up to code. This possible sale to Children's is fortuitous as owners will have money to move elsewhere and the replacement housing will be additional.

Comments of Michael Pearlman: Mr. Pearlman referred to the mission of Children's which is listed on its web site as follows: "the hospital of choice for serving the pediatric needs of the northwest". At the same time he recently saw that their certificate of need application to expand on the eastside had been denied. He noted that both Swedish and Children's are contentious. It appears that the main reason for the denial is that the need presented by Children's was not adequate. He stated that the Committee Members should remember that the Seattle Municipal Code does not distinguish between hospitals and universities; the rules and regulations that deal with major institutions are the same for each. He asked if the conclusions of the Committee would be the same if the request was to locate a 2 ½ million square expansion of the University of Washington in the area. He offered the opinion that the Committee would likely take perhaps two meetings to reach a negative - not twenty two meetings. He believes that a denial of the large expansion is the only conclusion the Committee can reach.

Comments of Steve Ross: Mr. Ross stated that he is a co chair of Friends of Children's Hospital. This group has over 1000 members who have stated their support of Children's expansion on the Laurelhurst Campus. He noted that he is also a resident of Laurelhurst. He observed that the current plan is a tremendous improvement over what was being looked at a year ago. He stated that he supported alternative 7R and has seen tremendous steps in terms of addressing transportation issues, height, bulk and space.

Comments of Arlene Erlich: Ms. Erlich thanked committee. She stated that she hopes CAC will raise its concerns regarding bulk, traffic, parking, noise among others. She also stated that she disagreed with the person who said contiguous properties were separated by two streets or major arterial Sandpoint Way; contiguous means touching. Yesterday's Seattle Times talked about Convention Center wanting to expand 400,000 square feet – that is a lot less than what the hospital is proposing to do in a residential neighborhood.

Comments of Kobe O'Donnell: Mr. O'Donnell noted that the neighborhoods have shown the willingness to compromise with such a large building such as Hartman being proposed – right in front of our properties and in some cases blocking our views, and to accept some increased noise issues and traffic. However, the hospital doesn't appear to seek to compromise one inch on the bulk and size. He stated that if he was on

the committee he would say "sure we can approve and expansion, but the hospital needs to compromise too".

Comments of Sally Kinney: Ms. Kinney stated that she is with the Taskforce on Homelessness and is concerned about traffic and commuting problems. She stated that she supports a 1 to 1 replacement for housing lost and that it be kept affordable.

Comments of Dr. Adrian Whorton: Dr. Whorton stated that he is an Eastside health care provider whose practice is comprised 25% treatment of children, he continues to have concerns that placing all the region's future pediatric beds in one place – Laurelhurst – may not be in the best interest of children in this region. Not only would a massive expansion on this campus damage Laurelhurst and the surrounding communities but would potentially jeopardize future certificate of need approval for pediatric beds elsewhere in the county where pediatric population growing and place further geographic limits to pediatric health care access. He stated that he also agrees with the LLC arguments in its white paper outlining discrepancy in bed need between reports made by consultants paid by Children's and independent bed need expert. The independent report found the bed need at only 18% of that which Children's Hospital has proposed. Why inflict tremendous disruption, noise, and traffic on neighbors, patients and their families for unneeded beds? Approving a master plan based on a bed count generated by the State Certificate of Need formula is the only reasonable action the CAC can take. The approach previously suggested by the LCC to limit construction to beds approved by letter of intent by the state would ensure that benefit of construction was truly being met and would assure neighbors that the need for construction and all its attached inconveniences is legitimate. This option is not currently before you for consideration but there is no current objective evidence to support the scope of the expansion alternatives that are before you. I believe the only reasonable action the CAC can take is to reject all current options and move the Certificate of Need itself, a letter of intent be issued and a future building plan be based on the beds generated by the Certificate of Need.

Comments of Carrie Lawson: Ms. Lawson stated that she had just read white paper field report from LCC this afternoon. She noted that there was a huge discrepancy between what Children's says they need and what the Department of Health is saying. She stated that she wanted to discuss the overall plan's relationship to previous promises made in the past. Twenty years ago, when the Whale Garage was being built, Children's promised to include a berm and trees in order to mitigate the flooding of the light from the parking garage on the houses facing the hospital. The berm and tree plantings that were constructed were insufficient and didn't work. It took serious arm twisting and many phone calls over several years – of trying to get the trees planted and get the lighting situation mitigated. She stated that the CAC should make sure that any action that Children's says they are going to do needs to be tied to formal conditions so that there is some assurance of follow through. In addition she stated that she didn't know how an institution can buy residential houses and not be considered expanding their boundaries. She stated that she wants the CAC's final report to include recommendations that Children's sell these homes back to families and not use them as temporary rentals. Keep in mind the zoning – this is zoned as a low-rise residential – this development is mammoth and does not belong in a residential neighborhood.

Comment of Noah Sorschor: Mr. Sorschor stated that he was concerned with traffic and had originally thought expansion being proposed was an overbuilding in anticipation of scaling back and that Children's needs less than they are proposing.

Comments of Tom Byers: Mr. Byers stated that he is a partner at Cedar River Group, and the author of paper that was distributed to CAC. He stated that he is here tonight to clarify the nature of his firm's work and the purpose of the paper that was prepared for the Committee and address some of the ways that report was characterized in the LCC White Paper. He stated that the Cedar River Group is a Seattle-based public policy consulting firm and was founded in 1990 to carry out projects in the public interest. Its recent projects include the development of the 2008 Seattle Parks Levy, staffing Sound Transit's Expert Review

Panel, creating a long term financial management plan for the Washington State Ferry System, and helping Children's Hospital to develop its Transportation Plan. The firm has also carried out a series of projects in the Health care field for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Pacific Medical Center, the Seattle Biomedical Research Institute, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle Children's and many other organizations. He noted that his own background includes past experience as a community health center director, membership on two regional health planning agencies, service on two national health planning commissions for the Carter Administration and as past member of the State Hospital Commission. In November of 2008 his firm was asked by Children's to prepare a paper on demographic trends that were shaping future need for inpatient beds and to identify key differences between the needs assessment prepared by the HFED and Field Associates. He stated that he believes their paper meets those objectives and fairly reflects the current conditions of Children's and highlights changes in national health trends that will affect need for future beds. He further stated that he believes that the paper accurately outlines key differences in methodology between two previous studies – differences which will ultimately have to be resolved by the Certificate of Need process and the Department of Health. He also stated that he wanted to correct earlier statements that there is no difference between children's and the Department of Health. The Department of Health methodology and how to interpret it is the fundamental difference between the two studies and ultimately the DOH in the Certificate of Need process will decide if Field and Associates or the previous study by Children's is correct.

Comments of Ross Radley: Mr. Radley stated that he is a resident of north end and a land use attorney. He stated that he is happy that the proposal is for affordable – not low income – housing.. Thinks it is positive addition.

Commentsx Received 1/6/09

Comments of Jim Madden: Mr. Madden stated that he would primarily discuss traffic. He noted that at the last meeting there was some discussion of "Intelligent traffic management systems". He noted that this is less of a system than a description of various methods. There was one project developed about 2002 in West Seattle, but it appears that it was not successfully implemented. The evaluation of this included the statement that one of the important lessons learned was to have to have effective communication. Mr. Madden also referred to LCC paper – 5 different issues where they tried to get information on traffic. Concerned – can't increase traffic without changing the road system. Sandpoint can't be made any wider, no parking. University area traffic strategy completed in August 2008 – they have been working on that for a long time and Children's area is not even mentioned. Concern about traffic issues; getting increasing numbers of people here.

Comments of Jeannie Hale: Ms. Hale stated that she wanted to remind members to reference handouts prepared by LCC and especially the white paper outlining laws, differences and the reasons for differences between independent hospital's study and those done by those employed by Children's. She noted that the committee is beginning to address key issues and prior to preparing the report she wanted to go over a couple of important issues. The first is deciding on an appropriate square footage for this site - - what actually fits on a site that can be mitigated in terms of performing your role in addressing the public benefit of the expansion and the impact's equally important value of maintaining the livability of the surrounding communities. Ms. Hale stated that LCC hand initially thought the 250,000 square foot expansion that occurred the last time around was massive. Now Children's is asking for 1.5 million. While we still would prefer 250,000 square feet, the bed need at minimum, as determined by independent consultant, is 700,000 square feet would meet Children's needs. We hope that the Committee will consider this amount. Concerning height, LCC would prefer that the maximum height be 90 feet, but in effort and willingness to compromise we would go for a 105' height limit.

Ms. Hale also noted that LCC has prepared a memorandum in response to issues brought up at the last meeting on conditioning phased development on certificate of need. LCC did some research on this issue

and has provided it to the CAC. She noted that they also spoke to the development director at the Washington State Department of Health who clarified some of the miss-information that was provided to you at the last meeting by Children's Hospital consultant and asked that the Committee member look at that.

Ms. Hale agreed with Mr. Madden that traffic and transportation issues are key and they can be mitigated in large part by reducing the height, bulk and scale of the project. 42,000 trips per day is not something easily mitigated. She also stated that it seems like the CAC is being rushed to complete the most important part of its process – preparing its report and responding to DPD's draft report, and encouraged CAC to consider giving this process at least an additional month so that the Committee can do the thoughtful work and conduct careful deliberations so that the final report that will be useful for the Hearing Examiner and City Council.

Comments of Bill Block: Mr. Block stated that he is the Project Director of the Committee to End Homelessness in King County. He noted that there is a housing crisis across King County. He has been involved in trying to save affordable housing. This is a very different situation; two things are different. One, residents who are being displaced in the condos are actually leaving with enough money to buy housing to go into – that is huge. A lot of other situations had people displaced out of their apartments and there was no place to go. Second, Children's has put up \$5 million mitigation fund which will create yet more affordable housing on top of whatever the people purchase at whatever they decide to purchase. He would love to see more institutions do this in more settings which is really mitigate on both sides.

Comments of Lee Murray: Mr. Murray stated that she is the Deputy Director of Housing Resources group and will discuss the Laurelon replacement housing and to speak in support of the affordability component. Housing Resources Group is a private non-profit housing provider. The group builds multi-family apartments and buys and renovates existing apartments. These units are then rented to folks making between about \$10,000 and \$60,000 per year. That is persons making between 50 – 80% of that area median income. These units are for working folks and fixed incomes. HRG also tries to site housing close to jobs and transportation to help people stay financially stable. She also noted that according to the Housing Development Consortium research Seattle-King County has recently completed, we will need another 155,000 units of affordable housing by 2015 in order to meet the needs that are out there and that she is therefore pleased that City is requiring Children's to build replacement housing for Laurelon Terrace and that it is to stay affordable for 50 years. It is clear that Seattle Children's wants to do the right thing – she commended them for that.

Comments of Mary Hodgson: Ms. Hodgson stated that she is the president of the Laurelon Terrace Association. Most people don't understand that the complex is old and its infrastructure antique. The complex has knob and tube which would cost millions to replace, and until replaced their general liability insurance is iffy. The Board has understood for some time that the costs to bring the complex to code might be prohibitive and force replacement of the complex whether or not the Children's expansion project proceeds. The loss of this housing is not actually due to the Children's situation in some ways – it is more due to the millions of dollars it would take to bring it up to code. This possible sale to Children's is fortuitous as owners will have money to move elsewhere and the replacement housing will be additional.

Comments of Michael Pearlman: Mr. Pearlman referred to the mission of Children's which is listed on its web site as follows: "the hospital of choice for serving the pediatric needs of the northwest". At the same time he recently saw that their certificate of need application to expand on the eastside had been denied. He noted that both Swedish and Children's are contentious. It appears that the main reason for the denial is that the need presented by Children's was not adequate. He stated that the Committee Members should remember that the Seattle Municipal Code does not distinguish between hospitals and universities; the rules and regulations that deal with major institutions are the same for each. He asked if the conclusions of the Committee would be the same if the request was to locate a 2 ½ million square expansion of the University of Washington in the area. He offered the opinion that the Committee would likely take perhaps two

meetings to reach a negative - not twenty two meetings. He believes that a denial of the large expansion is the only conclusion the Committee can reach.

Comments of Steve Ross: Mr. Ross stated that he is a co chair of Friends of Children's Hospital. This group has over 1000 members who have stated their support of Children's expansion on the Laurelhurst Campus. He noted that he is also a resident of Laurelhurst. He observed that the current plan is a tremendous improvement over what was being looked at a year ago. He stated that he supported alternative 7R and has seen tremendous steps in terms of addressing transportation issues, height, bulk and space.

Comments of Arlene Erlich: Ms. Erlich thanked committee. She stated that she hopes CAC will raise its concerns regarding bulk, traffic, parking, noise among others. She also stated that she disagreed with the person who said contiguous properties were separated by two streets or major arterial Sandpoint Way; contiguous means touching. Yesterday's Seattle Times talked about Convention Center wanting to expand 400,000 square feet – that is a lot less than what the hospital is proposing to do in a residential neighborhood.

Comments of Kobe O'Donnell: Mr. O'Donnell noted that the neighborhoods have shown the willingness to compromise with such a large building such as Hartman being proposed – right in front of our properties and in some cases blocking our views, and to accept some increased noise issues and traffic. However, the hospital doesn't appear to seek to compromise one inch on the bulk and size. He stated that if he was on the committee he would say "sure we can approve and expansion, but the hospital needs to compromise too".

Comments of Sally Kinney: Ms. Kinney stated that she is with the Taskforce on Homelessness and is concerned about traffic and commuting problems. She stated that she supports a 1 to 1 replacement for housing lost and that it be kept affordable.

Comments of Dr. Adrian Whorton: Dr. Whorton stated that he is an Eastside health care provider whose practice is comprised 25% treatment of children, he continues to have concerns that placing all the region's future pediatric beds in one place – Laurelhurst – may not be in the best interest of children in this region. Not only would a massive expansion on this campus damage Laurelhurst and the surrounding communities but would potentially jeopardize future certificate of need approval for pediatric beds elsewhere in the county where pediatric population growing and place further geographic limits to pediatric health care access. He stated that he also agrees with the LLC arguments in its white paper outlining discrepancy in bed need between reports made by consultants paid by Children's and independent bed need expert. The independent report found the bed need at only 18% of that which Children's Hospital has proposed. Why inflict tremendous disruption, noise, and traffic on neighbors, patients and their families for unneeded beds? Approving a master plan based on a bed count generated by the State Certificate of Need formula is the only reasonable action the CAC can take. The approach previously suggested by the LCC to limit construction to beds approved by letter of intent by the state would ensure that benefit of construction was truly being met and would assure neighbors that the need for construction and all its attached inconveniences is legitimate. This option is not currently before you for consideration but there is no current objective evidence to support the scope of the expansion alternatives that are before you. I believe the only reasonable action the CAC can take is to reject all current options and move the Certificate of Need itself, a letter of intent be issued and a future building plan be based on the beds generated by the Certificate of Need.

Comments of Carrie Lawson: Ms. Lawson stated that she had just read white paper field report from LCC this afternoon. She noted that there was a huge discrepancy between what Children's says they need and what the Department of Health is saying. She stated that she wanted to discuss the overall plan's relationship to previous promises made in the past. Twenty years ago, when the Whale Garage was being

built, Children's promised to include a berm and trees in order to mitigate the flooding of the light from the parking garage on the houses facing the hospital. The berm and tree plantings that were constructed were insufficient and didn't work. It took serious arm twisting and many phone calls over several years – of trying to get the trees planted and get the lighting situation mitigated. She stated that the CAC should make sure that any action that Children's says they are going to do needs to be tied to formal conditions so that there is some assurance of follow through. In addition she stated that she didn't know how an institution can buy residential houses and not be considered expanding their boundaries. She stated that she wants the CAC's final report to include recommendations that Children's sell these homes back to families and not use them as temporary rentals. Keep in mind the zoning – this is zoned as a low-rise residential – this development is mammoth and does not belong in a residential neighborhood.

Comment of Noah Sorschor: Mr. Sorschor stated that he was concerned with traffic and had originally thought expansion being proposed was an overbuilding in anticipation of scaling back and that Children's needs less than they are proposing.

Comments of Tom Byers: Mr. Byers stated that he is a partner at Cedar River Group, and the author of paper that was distributed to CAC. He stated that he is here tonight to clarify the nature of his firm's work and the purpose of the paper that was prepared for the Committee and address some of the ways that report was characterized in the LCC White Paper. He stated that the Cedar River Group is a Seattle-based public policy consulting firm and was founded in 1990 to carry out projects in the public interest. Its recent projects include the development of the 2008 Seattle Parks Levy, staffing Sound Transit's Expert Review Panel, creating a long term financial management plan for the Washington State Ferry System, and helping Children's Hospital to develop its Transportation Plan. The firm has also carried out a series of projects in the Health care field for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Pacific Medical Center, the Seattle Biomedical Research Institute, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle Children's and many other organizations. He noted that his own background includes past experience as a community health center director, membership on two regional health planning agencies, service on two national health planning commissions for the Carter Administration and as past member of the State Hospital Commission. In November of 2008 his firm was asked by Children's to prepare a paper on demographic trends that were shaping future need for inpatient beds and to identify key differences between the needs assessment prepared by the HFED and Field Associates. He stated that he believes their paper meets those objectives and fairly reflects the current conditions of Children's and highlights changes in national health trends that will affect need for future beds. He further stated that he believes that the paper accurately outlines key differences in methodology between two previous studies – differences which will ultimately have to be resolved by the Certificate of Need process and the Department of Health. He also stated that he wanted to correct earlier statements that there is no difference between children's and the Department of Health. The Department of Health methodology and how to interpret it is the fundamental difference between the two studies and ultimately the DOH in the Certificate of Need process will decide if Field and Associates or the previous study by Children's is correct.

Comments of Ross Radley: Mr. Radley stated that he is a resident of north end and a land use attorney. He stated that he is happy that the proposal is for affordable – not low income – housing.. Thinks it is positive addition.

III. Continued Committee Discussions

A. Report on the Denial of the Bellevue Certificate of Need

Ruth Benfield stated that Children's was surprised to not have approval of Children's Certificate of Need for the Ambulatory Surgical Center and immediately connected with the DOH to ask them to reconsider – which they have agreed to do. DOH advised Children's to apply for an exemption which Children's is also doing. This is obviously important in terms of their decentralization process. Part of

the missing piece is the number of cases they are actually doing that are Eastside cases and help with this campus volume capacity. She also noted that the LCC letter commenting on Cedar Rivers' report and trying to define differences between the Field study and the Health Facility study and restated that Children's believes in the data they have from their studies and that is the basis for their projection for square footage.

B. Continued Discussion of the Hartmann Building

Karen Wolfe noted that over the last two meetings the Committee first approved expansion of the MIO to cover the Hartmann site and then established conditions on that expansion. One issue remains undecided – height.

Brice Semmen noted that at the last meeting he had expressed the desire that the top of the Hartman Building, including mechanical penthouse, be even with the height of the Burke Gilman Trail. After further consideration and discussions with his neighbors, he now realizes that this is "pie in the sky", and that further compromise is warranted. He noted that other recommendations of the Committee had the effect of pushing development out toward Sandpoint and that that is very important for neighbors in terms of noise and light impacts. He stated that he would like to see that formalized as a condition. He reported that he and neighbors are willing to live with MIO at Hartman of 50' which means dropping one story instead of 65' so that with mechanical hat it goes no more than 30' above BG trail and would like to put that forth as motion.

Brice Semmens moved:

That the Children's Major Institutions Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee final report shall include a recommendation that Hartmann Property be Designated MIO 50 and that no portion of the development on the site extend beyond an height of 15 feet above the Burke Gilman Trail

The motion was seconded by Dolores Pritchard. Discussion followed.

Karen Wolfe stated that it was her understanding that with a height of 35 feet that is not only from Sandpoint Way and that the building would be higher along Sand point way.

Mike Omura asked for clarification concerning Mr. Semmens' specific intention concerning the height along the trail. Mr. Semmens responded that he is essentially proposing dropping the existing envelope of the proposed building by one 15 foot floor.

Dave Neil then outlined the changes to the setbacks as requested at the previous CAC meeting. He noted that the plan shows a 20 foot setback along south property line; a 20 foot setback along Burke Gilman trail property line; 60 and 80 foot setbacks in the area near the sequoia trees; a 20 foot setback along north property line; and a 10 foot structure setback along Sandpoint Way. The CAC voted its previous meeting to recommend that the north setback be increased to 40 feet and asked for an upper level setback of 60 feet at the rear along the Burke Gilman Trail from the height of the center line of the trail. The removal of an additional floor would reduce the total development by 35,000 to 40,000 square feet. If the height is further reduced then the lost square footage would have to locate elsewhere on main campus.

Ruth Benfield stated that she has struggled with idea of dropping the building to that level because Children's would have to find out where to replace the lost square footage. It is a fairness thing – if we were to develop this under L3 code on that back side we would have the ability to take it higher. It doesn't seem fair that you are proposing that we lower particularly given we have a significant setback on the Burke Gilman side. Brice responded that many believe that Children's should not

expand to this location at all and that the neighbors are already making a significant concession agreeing to this development. In addition she stated that the development might create a canyon effect on Sand Point Way and that he is trying to mitigate that.

Catherine Hennings stated that Children's is sticking with their projective need and if we reduce size of Hartman that means they are going to want to put that square footage elsewhere and it will affect others. She further stated that she is not as concerned with any "canyon affect" along Sand Point Way. It is a major arterial and is the location that can accommodate height better than anywhere else.

Cheryl Kitchen observed that the statement that any reduction of development at this site assumes that overall request for 1.5 million square feet is absolute. However, this is only the current Children's proposal and may not be the CAC's recommendation.

Doug Hanafin stated that he sees a direct linkage between Hartmann and rest of campus and would like to discuss height of main campus along with height of Hartmann. He stated that he is convinced that the height on the main campus is too great and would like to reduce height there and push some of that sq. footage to Hartmann.

Theresa Doherty stated that she would like to make a decision on this issue and moved to call the question. This motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Steve Sheppard re-read the original motion as shown above. A vote was taken by show of hands. The vote 7 in favor, 7 opposed and 1 abstaining. The motion therefore failed.

Robert Rosencrantz stated that he believes that the CAC needs to focus of the core issues.

Robert Rosencrantz moved:

That Alternative 7r be recognized as the preferred alternative and the platform upon which the Children's CAC will develop its specific recommendations concerning each of the following topics:

- 1) Growth and balance, overall level of development,
- 2) Floor Area Ratio – a means by which the CAC can gauge how much development will occur
- 3) Heights and transitions
- 4) Phasing
- 5) Access and parking
- 6) Pedestrian and transit
- 7) Open space
- 8) Housing replacement
- 9) Traffic and transportation plan elements
- 10) Uses

Robert Rosencrantz noted that item ten is new. He had talked with a neighbor who said "we don't want to Amazon Laurelhurst, and after that discussion concluded that the uses of CH campus need to be clearly identified as to why the community is willing to allow additional development to take place in a single family zone by a major institution just to make sure that development is what they bargained for. Direct medical care is acceptable but some other spaces might not be.

Myriam Muller stated that she agreed with and thinks especially the last one should be written in as a condition that the additional square feet are for bed use.

The motion was seconded by Bob Lucas.

Steve asked for clarification concerning the old #2 that Robert had removed. He asked that the Committee consider keeping that in the list that the Committee is indicating. Robert Rosencrantz agreed and re-stated the motion with additional clarifying wording from the information provided by e-mail to the committee as follows:

That Alternative 7r be recognized as the ~~preferred~~ alternative and the platform upon which the Children's CAC will develop its specific recommendations concerning each of the following topics:

1. **Growth and Balance** (Overall level of development) – Evaluation of the reasons for the proposed institutional growth and change and whether a reasonable balance has been maintained between the public benefits of institutional development and change and the need to maintain the livability and vitality of the adjacent neighborhood.
2. **Boundary Expansions** – The acceptability of the two proposed boundary expansions
 - a. Laurelon Terrace
 - b. Hartmann
3. **Floor Area Ratio** – The means by which the CAC can determine overall level of development allowed.
4. **Heights and Transitions** – Whether the heights proposed provide an adequate transition between the Major Institution and the surrounding area, the need to protect public views, and the extent to which design features such as building setbacks and topographic features etc. mitigate the impacts to adjacent areas.
5. **Phasing** – Whether the proposed phasing plan with triggers and limits on moving to latter phases provide sufficient assurances that only needed development will occur and that the phasing occurs in a manner which minimizes adverse impacts on the surrounding area.
6. **Access and Parking** – The impact of planned access to institutional parking that is off of an arterial street and the specific treatment of major access point (Penny Drive and 30th) and the specific treatment of 40th Ave NE.
7. **Pedestrian and Transit Connections** – The adequacy of proposed connections to the Burke Gilman Trail and adequacy of pedestrian circulation.
8. **Open Space** - The extent to which designated open space is adequate, provides a public benefit, and is physically and visually accessible to the public.
9. **Housing Replacement** – Whether the proposed replacement housing plan is reasonable to mitigate for the loss of housing from the expansion of the MIO to the Laurelon Terrace site:
 - a. Number of Units proposed
 - b. General location
10. **Traffic and Transportation Plan Elements** – Adequacy to mitigate traffic impacts to surrounding areas.

11. **Uses** – The uses allowed on campus and monitoring and review of uses developed.

Myriam Muller stated that she not comfortable with word “preferred”. Robert Rosencrantz agreed to remove it.

Mike Wayte stated that he had sent out email earlier discussing his concern that there is a huge disparity between the information from various consultants concerning the bulk and scale of this institution and that he is uncomfortable identifying any alternative as preferred at this point. All of the alternatives to date are predicated on information from experts that CH hired. He stated that it appears that Children’s could have applied for a certificate need and that this would have taken the guess work out of this process. He further stated that he believed a discussion of this issue needs to be in the preface to the Committee’s report that we are voting on 7R based on the criteria that was given to us.

Steve Sheppard noted that we have a difficulty in that the code states that the Advisory Committee may review and comment on the mission of the institution, the need for the expansion, public benefits resulting from the proposed new development and the way in which the proposed development will serve the public purpose mission of the Major Institution, but these elements are not subject to negotiation nor shall such review delay consideration of the master plan or the final recommendation to Council”. That somewhat constrains the Committee from saying that “until we have certainty on need provided by some third party that we can’t go forward with our recommendations” Perhaps one way to deal with that is to have an introductory statement that says something along the line as “the issue of height, bulk, scale, need, and public benefit has, and continues to be, the subject of a great deal of controversy” and then state that you feel that there has been enough disparity in information that you are not as comfortable as you would like to be but you are going ahead. That would be as an alternative to saying “stop the process until some future date.

Catherine Henning stated that this was not what she was recommending.

Mike Wayte stated that he wants to continue and also make it clear that he is proceeding under the premise that the needs are real and that these number are tangible. If it comes back that they are not then he wouldn’t support it. He said he felt painted into a corner.

Cheryl Kitchen stated multiplying the beds by 4000 square feet per bed is how you get to 1.5 million square feet. If bed needs are less than the size might be less. However once the total square footage is approved, then children’s could build other uses and the City is not going to look at the bed needs in quite the same way; they are just looking at the square footage we’ve approved. If the certificate of need comes out and says they need less beds it does not mean they can’t transfer that need to other purposes and continue on with square footage, it would therefore seem appropriate to discuss restrictions on use as proposed by Robert Rosencrantz.

Theresa Doherty stated that page 69 of the Final Master Plan states “the State Department of Health Certificate of need is a requirement for each phase of new bed development. Were additional beds are proposed, this information would also be provided to the SAC”. We could put something in our recommendation that says “and they have to submit their Certificate of Need or whatever to DPD.

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

That the CAC recognize or identify Alternative7R as the alternative and platform upon which the Children’s CAC will build its recommendations concerning the topics listed in the original statement of the motion. Members agreed that this was correct. . A vote was taken by show of hands. The vote 13 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstaining. The motion therefore passed.

Dolores Pritchard stated that she had a few additional comments concerning how construction at Hartmann might affect the Laurelcrest Condominium and other surrounding uses. These are:

1. Legal assurance that the water table under our building will not be changed to the detriment to Laurelhurst condos.
2. Setback on south side of Hartmann should be 50' or more to provide buffer zone of vegetation.
3. Traffic signal in place at 40th NE before phase 1 starts.
4. Require annual noise monitoring equipment by Children's.
5. Light pollution should be used at Hartmann site reducing glare (sic).
6. A system to keep dust from getting through windows and vents; wash and clean building when construction is complete.
7. Soundproofing Laurelhurst Condos and surrounding neighbors.
8. Assurance that construction workers will not use the Laurelcrest parking area adjacent to Hartmann.

Steve stated that point 2 above that would change conditions to Hartmann while the others relate to mitigating impacts to surrounding properties. Mr. Sheppard suggested that one motion deal with all of the issues except #2 and that deal #2 be dealt with that separately. Ruth Benfield suggested that it might be a better to pretest the ambient noise and commit to that designs not exceed the existing sound. Members generally agreed with this direction and suggested that the approach be applied to the entire surrounding community.

Following brief additional discussion, Dolores Pritchard Moved:

That the following conditions be appended to the conditions related to the expansion of the MIO boundaries to the Hartmann site, and applied to the Laurelhurst Condominiums and where appropriate to other nearby uses surrounding both the Hartmann site and the main campus:

1. The building be washed when construction complete.
2. A system to keep dust from entering through windows and vents be implemented.
3. Building design be done in a way that the noise received in the surrounding community be no greater than present based on pretest of ambient noise levels conducted by Children's Hospital.
4. Traffic signal be in place at 40th NE before Phase I starts.
5. Annual noise monitoring be conducted by Children's Hospital.
6. Methods to reduce light and glare light pollution should be used at the Hartmann site.
7. Legal assurances that the water table will not be changed to the detriment of the Laurelhurst condominiums.
8. Assurance that construction workers will be precluded from using the Laurelhurst condominium parking areas adjacent to Hartmann.

The motion was seconded.

Paolo Nunez noted that the capital investment process in Seattle is changeable and that there is some uncertainty concerning exactly when the State and City might get the 40th Avenue Traffic signal installed. Steve Sheppard suggested that the wording might be changed to: "traffic signal be in place at 40th Ave NE before Hartmann prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the Hartmann Building. Members agreed.

The question was called. Steve Sheppard re-read the motion. The vote 14 in favor, 1 opposed. The motion therefore passed.

Mike Wayte stated that he wanted to discuss the extent of the mechanical hat. Mike Omura noted that the proposal is for no greater than 40% while the current plan restricts mechanical penthouses to 25%. Dave Neil noted that the code allows lab buildings to exceed 40% to as much as 60%, and that it is therefore not unreasonable to request 40%.

Cheryl Kitchen noted that this was a CAC recommendation and moved:

That the mechanical hat (penthouse) at the Hartmann Building be restricted to no more than 25% of the roof area and that it be shifted east toward Sandpoint as far as reasonable.
--

The motion was seconded by Dolores Pritchard

Robert Rosencrantz noted that the Committee is putting a great many restrictions on development of Hartmann. Mr. Wayte responded that the Committee will likely subject the main campus to similar scrutiny. Mr. Rosencrantz re-stated his concern that too many conditions are being layered upon each other. Theresa Doherty stated that she intended to vote against the proposal since we do not know the uses that might go in the building.

Following brief additional discussion the question was called. A vote was taken by show of hands. The vote 8 in favor, 4 opposed and 3 abstaining. The motion therefore passed.

Mike Omura moved :

That the Hartmann Building be included with in the MIO 65 .

The motion was seconded.

Several members expressed reluctance to vote on this.

Myriam Muller moved to postpone the consideration of this motion. The motion was seconded

Steve Sheppard noted that this was privileged motion and had to be dealt with prior to proceeding. The vote was taken by show of hands with 8 in favor, 7 opposed, the motion therefore passed.

VII. Adjournment

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