



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 #6

Tuesday, January 22, 2008

University of Washington
Center for Urban Horticulture
3501 NE 41st Street
Seattle, WA 98105

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

CAC Members Present

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
Steve Sheppard (ex-officio)		

Others Present

See Attendance Sheet

Alternates

Theresa Doherty
Shelley Hartnett
Christine Barrett

Ex-Officio Members

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

I. Introductions and Orientation to the Process

Karen Wolf, Committee Chair welcomed everyone to the 6th meeting of the Citizen's Advisory Committee. She noted that this is a working session and as such would not include presentations from others and a more limited opportunity for public comments. However, there will still be a public comment period.

Mr. Sheppard reviewed materials for the Committee: Draft Agenda, two attempts to summarize the most frequently raised issues in everyone's individual comment form; one is just called "Action Agenda on the Master Plan", one is called "Action Decision Agenda on the EIS"; two packets that are Committee members' combined comments; two additional sheets of people who came in late or didn't get pasted into the list: Yvette Moy and Christine Barrett; a 16 page letter from Carol Eychaner; a letter from LCC and their consultants on bed need projections and differences for that; compilation of minutes from meetings 1 – 4; and the EIS and the Plan.

II. Review of Draft Master Plan Comments

The committee proceeded to discuss the areas of their comments as included in the Committee Actions agenda. These were general comments only to guide members to complete their individual comments.



A. Alternative Development

Mr. Sheppard reviewed Alternative Development comments that seemed to be reflected in one way or another in many people's responses.

This was: The plan should be revised, add a new alternative that adds less than one million square feet and shows further significant height and bulk restrictions below 160 feet so as to be more in keeping with the scale of the surrounding residential neighborhood. Such an alternative should become the basis for the development in consultation with the CAC of a preferred alternative. He noted that was raised in many people's comment forms.

Mr. Sheppard noted that in many people's forms, they went through various schemes to lower heights at various parts of the campus. The first one talks about reducing heights; particularly many people commented on reducing heights at the north garage and depressing it totally underground so as to allow no greater than a 50' MIO; the assumption on that was less height in development. Many of the alternatives talked about reducing and decreasing the MIO 90 to lower designations on the corners of the campus. The southwest corner and also near Laurelton on the southwest corner. Alternative # 5 they talked about decreasing the MIO height to 90 along Penney Lane and the area north of there. Alternately, some people raised a simpler idea that all build alternatives, eliminate for further consideration heights above 90 feet. There were a lot of people who said simply remove both alternatives Two and Four; alternative Two is a 240 height alternative and the other takes future expansion onto Laurelton Terrace.

Ms. Wolf recommended going through the alternatives to ascertain they have adequately captured the comments and to get feedback from the CAC. One is the recommendation that CHRCM create a new alternative that would result in less than one million square feet of additional space and that also the heights in varying parts of the campus be reduced; specifically the north garage be completely underground.

Catherine Hennings stated that she hoped CHRCM will come up with new alternative that lowers the height, bulk and scale. Committee members generally agreed. Ms. Muller stated that if there is a blanket height across the expansion rather than 90 here and there, with highest points at the top of the hill. Mr. Rosencrantz said there is a statement that says "keeping in scale with the surrounding"; that the CHRCM expansion keep the same scale it is today and asked if that were captured in the comments. Ms Muller said that both of those things seem somewhat unrealistic; the whole idea is that CHRCM needs to grow and they are already out of scale with the neighborhood. We want it to be less of a difference in scale than currently but the scale of the neighborhood is only a scale of 30' height.

Steve Sheppard noted that he had laid out all comments on a grid. He noted that almost all members stated that they wanted to see an alternative that was more in scale with the surrounding neighborhood. The intent of this combined comment is not to come up with a specific proposal but instead to recommend that CHRCM include one or more alternatives that would show what a less intensive development scheme might be.

Myriam Muller stated that it is extremely difficult to deal with the issue of alternatives when there is so much disagreement concerning the need. She noted that the state and CHRCM's figures seem so vastly different that until that is settled it seems inappropriate to discuss any increases for the existing facility. Catherine Henning responded that she believed that it was best to comment on alternatives.

Steve Sheppard noted that the issue of need is dealt with separately in the proposed comments. He noted that comments concerning need were in many members comment forms. Mr. Sheppard stated that those issues raised most consistently by members included:

- Need

- Development of a less intensive alternative
- Possible inclusion of a no-build off site alternative.

He stated that it was also clear that members did not have great confidence in the information that they had been given to date concerning need.

Michael Omura suggested that the CAC forgo focusing on need at this point and instead look at shaping the development from the outside in. For instance looking at acceptable height, setbacks and open spaces might set a realistic maximum that CHRCM would then have to look at to see what square footage of development might be possible. He noted that it appears that most members favor some lower height and greater setbacks. Others noted that so long as the total square footage of development remains the same, that many of the impacts are unchanged regardless of the height. A set number of square feet and users results in a uniform amount of traffic regardless of whether it is 90 or 75 or 220 feet in height.

Steve Sheppard noted that a synthesis of the comments might reasonably lead to a comment to 1) lower the heights because they have too great impacts; 2) increase setbacks because greater buffering between the campus development and the adjacent single family development is wanted; 3) step heights down significantly towards the edges of campus in order to reduce shadowing and light and glare impacts. He noted that few committee members commented on open space issues.

Myriam Muller asked if the CAC can provide guidelines for the development of new alternatives. Mr. Sheppard responded that the CAC can make any recommendation member wish. Cheryl Kitchin agreed that she would like to provide some guidelines. Karen Wolf suggested that the CAC identify the maximum allowed heights and defining the overall development envelope. Catherine Hennings noted that the criteria would clearly be height and setback. The question is whether the criteria should include a maximum number of square feet of acceptable development.

Steve Sheppard asked if there was a consensus that there should be a new alternative that is none of the current alternatives. He suggested that members might want to form a sub-committee to look at what the criteria for such an alternative might be. Members agreed. Michael Omura agreed to organize such a group.

B. Boundary Expansion

Catherine Hennings noted that there was considerable discussion concerning whether to remove the Hartmann from the MIO. She noted that there appeared to be two alternatives: 1) keeping it within the MIO as is; 2) redesign the MIO height while still leaving it within the MIO or 3) removing the Hartmann from the NMIO and allowing it to be developed by CHRMS under the current zoning. Catherine stated that she preferred that Hartmann be developed under the underlying zoning. Others stated that the combination of the existing heights proposed on campus and Hartman seem too high.

After further discussion it was moved that the CAC comment be basically as follows:

Expansion of the MIO to include the Hartmann, as currently proposed, should be opposed. But that more intense development on this property by CHRCM but at a lower height be considered at either an MIO 50 level or not within the MIO but with a rezone to a commercial zone compatible with the scale of surrounding development.

C. Laurelon Terrace

Various CAC members noted that the possible Laurelon Terrace option did not appear to have merit in that it neither fully utilized that property, nor actually resulted in a reduction in development proposed on the main portion of the Campus. Instead it seemed like land banking for a future phase. Karen Wolf suggested that if

this alternative is retained for future consideration that it would have to be used differently and in ways that would decrease the height, bulk and scale of the rest of the campus. Ruth Benfield noted that the reason that alternative 4 does not result in any immediate decreases in development on the main campus is that the land is not owned by CHRCM and that CHRCM would have to slowly acquire the land. It would not be available for many years. After further discussion the CAC directed that its comment letter state that the plan should be revised to either: 1) remove MIO designation from the Laurelon Terrace Neighborhood, or 2) develop a new alternative for the Laurelon Terrace Neighborhood that more fully utilizes it and results in lesser development and greater setbacks on the rest of the campus

D. Access points

Discussion then turned to access points to the campus. Miriam Muller noted that she lives near the 45th Street access and strongly opposes both the 45th and 50th access points. She noted that this would endanger children. Others noted that there has been no discussion of what level of development actually triggers the need for the second or third access point.

Mike Omura noted that there is insufficient detail on the actual design of the entrances and exits along Sand Point Way and how it would relate to the Hartmann. It was suggested that there be additional detail given on both of these issues in the DEIS and MIMP.

E. Need

Steve Sheppard noted that many members comments to date have gone in two general direction: 1) those that have expressed concern over the lack of believable information; or 2) that if the projected needs actually drive the current proposed bulk and scale of the development, then regardless of whether this need is justified or not the development is simply too intense for this site. In many cases members asked for an unbiased evaluation of the need issue.

Cheryl Kitchin stated that she preferred looking at the ability of the site to accommodate the proposed development rather than look at the need numbers. Miriam Muller responded that the Committee should really consider doing both. Others members agreed with Ms. Muller. Ruth Benfield stated that CHRCM would try to provide better information. Others stated that without that evaluation being by an independent party that there would be little agreement on the numbers. CAC members directed that the CAC letter contain a call for additional evaluation of the need.

F. Dispersion

It was noted that some members suggested that the alternatives be expanded to include development of a new replacement or satellite campus elsewhere in the region. Catherine Hennings stated that she objected to this being considered as a CAC comment in that the Committee had been formed to look at development on this campus. Myriam Muller disagreed and stated that if it is determined that this site cannot adequately accommodate the need being projected, then relocation to some other site or sites would appear to be a legitimate direction to at least be considered. Steve Sheppard stated that this would clearly be an issue to be voted on at the next meeting and asked members to give serious thought to this issue.

III. Review of the Preliminary Draft EIS Comments

Steve Sheppard was asked to go over comments received. He noted many minor detailed comments and more fully addressed those comments that were raised by multiple members. Those comment raised by multiple members were:

A. Traffic

Steve Sheppard summarized comments concerning traffic. He noted that the majority of comments related to traffic and transportation. Many members stated that the traffic impacts appeared to be significantly understated that the Draft EIS needed to look at this in much more critical look at these issues. This was uniform in everyone's comments. Additional comments related to the need to a more aggressive look at things that might be done to limit auto growth etc.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

Steve Sheppard noted that many members noted that the evaluation seemed inconsistent. For instance significant impacts were identified for alternative 2, but not for alternatives 3, 4 and 5. Many members felt that the impacts of each of these alternatives were similar and that all have significant impacts. Others noted that there had not been sufficient discussion of the relationship of the height bulk and scale proposed to the surrounding low density single family development or any discussion of how height bulk and scale is dealt with in other similarly situated institutions where single family development abuts the MIO. Many suggested that there needed to be further discussion of step downs and set-backs near the boundaries, especially as that related to the City's goals and policies related to protect single family areas. Other comments related to views.

C. Housing

The PDEIS did not identify either the existing purchase of housing and conversion from ownership to rental as an impact or the possible loss of Laurelton Terrace. Many suggested that this area needed to be strengthened significantly.

IV. Public Comments

Karen Wolf opened the meeting to Public Comments

Comments of Jeannie Hale – Ms Hale stated that that she is the President of the Laurelhurst Community Club. She noted that she would limit her comments in order to give more time to Carol Eychaner. She encouraged the members of the public and the committee to look carefully at the Major Institutions Codes statement concerning expansion of boundaries. She noted that this is discouraged and that the neighborhood does not need to lose the affordable units in the Laurelton Terrace Condominiums.

Comments of Molly Black – Ms. Black stated that she has heard a lot of fear about the building but that when she thinks of Children's she thinks instead of its critical need in the region and how important it is for the health of children.

Carol Eychaner – Ms. Eychaner stated that she would need more than two minutes and asked the committees indulgence. Ms. Eychaner stated that the Hartmann site is zoned for low rise 3 and as such could only be developed with either a rezone of conditional use. The Laurelhurst Community Club has suggested that this site not be included in the MIO but instead be developed under a Neighborhood Commercial 2 designation with a 45 foot limit.

The single family zone that underlies CHPMC as well as covers the surrounding area allows 30 foot heights plus five feet for pitched roofs does the lowrise multi-family zoning the applies to Laurelton Terrace. She also noted that the EIS states that two access points would be required up to 400 beds with three over that point to 600. However there is no identification of the level below which two access points would be needed.

Ms. Eychaner noted that the expansion is not a small expansion but is essentially the same as inserting an entire new hospital into a single family neighborhood. Its impacts are very large and would generally be

frowned upon in single family areas. She also noted that development at other similarly situated locations outside of urban centers is generally lower and that CHRM C's proposal is unique in this regard. She also noted that two institutions have been adopted since the institution of the urban village format. These are Seattle Pacific University and South Seattle Community College. In both cases the maximum heights were much less than what is being proposed by CHRM C. She also referred to information recently distributed by CHRM C. In their letter they stated that the DOH method automatically applies a 70 percent occupancy standard. This is not correct. For a facility of up to 300 beds a 75% occupancy rate is used. This can be reduced based upon certain factors. In 2002 this was reduced to 70%. If CHRM C expands to anything over 300 beds the occupancy rate is set at 80%. She also noted that there were other errors in the presentation of information from DOH. There has been some disagreement with this by CHRM C she stated that she would send the information directly to the CAC so that members can determine for themselves which interpretations are correct.

CHRM C has stated the DOH found justification for 164 additional short stay psychiatric beds for the target year 2006. The PDEIS looks at 140 psychiatric beds. The analysis does not state that DOH found a need for these beds. Instead it states that "the applicant's description of Children's regional planning area as all Washington residents age 14 and younger application of the normative standard results would result in the 164 beds. It then further states that using other methodology, the DOH has determined a gross bed need for 18.78 beds for the target year 2006. They projected it to 2020 at 20 beds.

Comments of Grace Yuan – Ms. Yuan stated that the cumulative and secondary impacts are not sufficiently analyzed. She noted that the new plan is asking for an increase that is six times the increase requested in 1994. She also noted that the construction process will apparently last almost 20 years and that the impact from this almost constant construction is significant. It is not a short-term temporary impact. She also asked that the EIS evaluate the cumulative impact of simultaneous construction at CHRM C and the 520 process.

Comments of Laura Leman – Ms Leman stated that it is discouraging to have to wait for long periods for service at the Hospital. She stated that she hoped that the critics were not implying that CHRM C should not expand.

Comments of Tonya Clegg – Ms. Clegg stated that the new entrances to CHRM C might represent great job security for the Hospital as more children may be injured by cars traveling on the neighborhood streets. She noted that one of the entrances is on the main street used by children to go to the elementary school.

Comments of Michael Pearlman – Mr. Pearlman noted that the construction period for the hospital would likely extend beyond 20 years as the older buildings would have to be replaced by that time. He stated that he believes that the mission of the hospital would be compromised by this process. Construction on top of the existing patient wings would disrupt current beds. He suggested that building on a second site at some other location would be better.

V. Adjournment

The next meeting was set for February 12 at 6:00 at Wright Auditorium. This will be a working meeting to continue evaluation of the CAC's comments.

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