



City of Seattle
 Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
 Bernie Matsuno, Director

**SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS
 MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER
 CHERRY HILL CAMPUS
 MAJOR INSTITUTIONS
 MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S
 ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair

Patrick Angus

Dave Letrondo

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Leon Garnet

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

Dean Patton

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

*Department of
 Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of
 Planning and
 Development*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #13

March 20, 2014

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Katie Porter

Dylan Glosecki

Laurel Spelman

Patrick Angus

Leon Garnet

Maja Hadlock

David Letrondo

Nicholas Richter

Members and Alternates Absent

Jamile Mack

J. Elliot Smith

Eric Oliner

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Marcia Peterson, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

Ms. Porter noted that the Committee received meeting minutes #9, 10, 11, and 12 to review; meeting minutes #10 is in progress.

Ms. Porter noted that there was an ongoing discussion of possible sub-Committees to review portions of the plan. Mr. Sheppard stated that after the last meeting, the Committee members decided to get together as possible sub-Committees and exchange ideas and get some help to formulate their positions regarding height, bulk and scale. Mr. Sheppard advised that since this process is quasi-judicial; it is best to be very conservative and careful concerning the public meeting law. Members can get together to discuss positions, but, if more than of four or five people are present, the meeting is considered a public meeting, and would require public notice. Mr. Sheppard cautioned members to inform him if they intended to meet as a small group so that he could determine if

it was a formal meeting requiring notice etc. Mr. Sheppard emphasized that the State public meeting law is very strict and that it would be best to use caution. City operating procedures require ten days' notice. If a significant number of members decided to meet and discuss the work of the Committee, exchange proposals, etc.; it might be considered as a public meeting, if they appeared to be doing the work of the Committee. Members asked several questions concerning this and noted that previously it had appeared that member's could meet so long as a quorum was present. Mr. Sheppard noted that he wanted to know if several members were meeting to determine whether it might appear that they were doing the work of the Committee. He noted that appearance is an issue. Members can meet to clarify their positions but not to form a common position to then bring to the Committee without that being a likely public meeting.

III. SMC Progress on Current TMP Implementation

Ms. Porter asked Swedish for an update regarding compliance and progress on the TMP (Transportation Management Plan). Marcia Peterson introduced Dr. John Henson for a brief update on the TMP.

Dr. Henson noted that he is the Vice President of Medical Affairs at Swedish. He noted that the TMP is an important tool to manage the impact of traffic around this campus. The presentation at this meeting will focus on progress to meet the goals and conditions contained in the current TMP. Dr. Henson then introduced Michael Moy to discuss this issue further.

Mr. Moy stated that he works for CommuteSeattle, a non-profit organization that it is a public and private partnership between King County Metro and City of Seattle. Its role is to reduce drive-alone commuting and make room for economic growth, reduce congestions and more accessibility. Swedish Cherry Hill campus brought the group along to help resolve and reduce traffic congestions around the area, parking issues, and bring the campus in compliance with their TMP. The goal of the TMP is to achieve reductions in single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use to, a 50%. Mr. Moy noted that this effort combines information from the different employee groups on campus - transit, ride share, bike resources, etc. The evaluation also combines the efforts of the various independent programs:

For the Swedish Medical group, about 488 employees have access to a transportation passport pass; this annual discounted comprehensive pass makes a huge impact on people's transportation choices. CommuteSeattle is working King County Metro to pilot a new orca pass program, for fewer than 20 employees; right now any smaller companies do not have access to this pass, and we are working with them to get access. There is currently access to free van pool parking to all tenants on this campus. Also, Swedish Cherry Hill joined the Seattle2030 District, this is a private, public partnership measuring strategy through reduce environmental impacts of buildings and operations, it is a green building program, and a great effort by different property owners, architects, designers to make downtown Seattle more environmental friendly. CommuteSeattle will host transportation events for employees in campus and a community transportation fair on April 15 at the James Tower entrance. There will be seminar on the current transportation cuts, and the Move King County Now campaign, educational fairs regarding Commuters and computers to

get more transportation options and about the current technology. There will be a Bike community seminar 101, during the Bike community month, and bike to work day.

A question was raised regarding if there would be a dedicated employee transportation coordinator and was asked if this will be a full-time job. Mr. Moy responded that there will be such a position and that this individual is responsible for the organization of the TMP, providing reports to State and City, and to monitor their drive-alone rate.

Dylan Glosecki: asked for more details concerning the "2030 district". Mr. Moy responded that that the 2030 district is about internal benchmarking, energy, transportation, water use, idea of historical, and hospital buildings need of different kinds energy or requirements; extending resources across the districts and to have a communal target by sharing experiences and information.

Several members noted that there are many good suggestions, but that enforcement appears to be lacking. Dr. Henson responded that there are discussions underway regarding enforcement policies that will address parking in the neighborhood. Dr. Henson mentioned that he will work on how to enforce it but could not give any specific details on how it would look like.

Mr. Moy stated that CommuteSeattle will undertake research studies of the existing supply and demand and how people's behaviors are affected by this and other factors. This will include looking at the zip codes of where people live; study transit maps that is going straight to the campus; educating people about available transit services and availability.

Ms. Porter asked how often the information is updated. Mr. Moy responded that a transportation survey comes every other year. All participating groups on campus will have the same survey schedule in order to get better information.

Ms. Porter suggested using Children's as an example of best standard to which how an institution managed their parking enforcements in a residential settings. Dr. Henson responded that he is in contact with Children's and recognized that their plan works well around the neighborhood. He will be looking at best practices and see what direction Swedish will be heading. Mr. Moy also noted that he will be meeting with Sabey, Swedish and Children's.

Nicholas Richter asked Dr. Henson if a meeting took place between Swedish and the Transportation director from Children's. Dr. Henson responded they will be talking to Children's in the near future. Mr. Richter asked that he and others be provided a date for that meeting.

IV. Presentation of the New Alternative 10

Editor's Note: Much of this presentation referred to graphics and was not easily presented in written form.

Ms. Porter introduced John Jex from Callison to present the new Alternative 10.

Mr. Jex mentioned that the new Alternative 10 is an attempt to create less impact in the neighborhood and provide additional mitigation in bulk and scale issues through increase setback, and reduced heights. Mr. Jex also noted that there was additional information

regarding the shadow studies that were requested in the previous meetings that will be available in addition to alternatives 8, 9 and 10.

Mr. Jex noted that the largest changes between previous alternatives and alternative 10 relate to the treatment of the 18th Avenue half block. Starting on Cherry Street on the north, the building on below will be 37 ft. at Cherry Street instead of 50 ft.; at 18th and Cherry, the site drops to approximately 30 ft. to Jefferson. The topography will be used to provide height mitigation along 18th and the boundary on neighbors at 19th; this will cut the building in half and a proposed separation of the building down to 15 ft. and the connectivity to the ground floor between the north and south buildings will have building entry canopies in which the features are not yet designed. Along the 50 ft. height zone that continues south to Jefferson, there will be a drop to 37 ft. There will be additional setbacks on 16th Avenue to mitigate the distance between the 200 ft. and the 160 ft. tower; the 105 ft. height on Cherry Street matches the James and East Tower. He noted that the 200 foot height buildings are now confined to the far west portion of the campus where elevation is lowest.

In the 18th Avenue half block he noted that the building would respond to the topography to reduce the height and a low area (15 feet in height) would be placed in the middle of the site to help make the building appear as two buildings. He noted that the rear of the underground parking does extend above grade to a maximum of six feet at some points. He went over setbacks noting that there would be a 25 foot setback along the rear lot line at grade and an additional 5 feet above 37 feet.

Mr. Jex also noted that the average distance between the houses along the west side of 19th Avenue and the proposed new construction is more than 80 ft. He noted that research shows that this distance creates a perceived zone of privacy.. There is a proposal for to do landscaping around the perimeter that is yet to be designed along the 25 ft. zone.

Mr. Jex also briefly walked through the shadow studies for spring, fall, and summer was also presented.

Ms. Porter mentioned that this is the first time this Committee saw and heard this presentation and it will be challenging for the Committee members to comment on what is being presented. Ms. Porter also noted that this is also the first time the public saw and heard this presentation.

IV. Public Comments

The meeting was opened for public comments.

Comment from Troy Meyers: Mr. Myers commented that in response to Ms. Porter's request to provide acceptable solutions and present back to the CAC, there was not enough facts or data to make a presentation; the PDEIS was too vague. He also noted that the Squire Park Community Council had adopted two motions at their last meeting, agreeing to be the owner of legal agreements if needed from the community and to support individual community efforts as needed.

Comment from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod encourage the CAC to look more closely at the Children's MIMP as an example in order to recognize that this is a low rise, residential neighborhood. At Children's, the height limit is 125 ft., the MIO is 160 ft., that has been agreed upon and in addition, all the boundaries that are adjacent to residential are at 37 ft.

with extensive setbacks, and the development does not exceed 2.1 million sq. ft. She stated that she was still waiting for the new PDEIS that the CAC requested, and would like to see additional alternatives that further reduce height, bulk and scale to less than shown in; alternative 10 which is still too large.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper stated that it is hard to comment on the new alternative as the target keeps moving and new alternatives keep coming forward and he does not know exactly what is on or off the table. The proposal still shows an expansion. By looking at the two alternatives, Mr. Cooper agrees with Ms. Sollod that it is packing too much property in too little space and it is completely out of proportion. In some ways the 50 foot proposal along 18th is worse than the previous 37 foot building that was rejected by the Hearing Examiner. In addition it is not clear if this new alternative includes additional height for the rehab/kidney center; it needs to spread further. He noted that the previous plan had 50,000 square feet of development underground. Some of the proposed development in these alternatives could be underground too.

Comments from Jerry Matsui: Mr. Matsui stated that Alternative 10 is still an abomination and is no better, but even worse, than previous 37 foot building that the neighborhood blocked during the last process. It is the same configuration; if you try to mitigate by putting in vegetation, it is totally unacceptable. Any ultimately acceptable plan will need to be lower and further setback from the property line.

Comment from Chris Genese: Mr. Genese noted that he works with Washington Can. He noted that Providence is a huge multi-state organization. Washington Can has canvassed the neighborhood. There are many concerns and different desires from this process; it needs to slow down, the community needs to come together and figure out what the community wants. Washington Can is working with the Squire Park community to organize a meeting to further discuss their concerns.

Comment from Aleta Van Patten: Ms. Van Patton stated that she needs to see the PDEIS because majority of the decision will be based on it. In addition there needs to be want more open space, bigger setbacks, less height and more functions placed. Swedish needs to come up with options that are more palatable for the community.

Comments from Lorie Lucky: Ms. Lucky stated that she agreed with others that the PDEIS needs to be made available. She also noted that undergrounding development would be desirable.

Comment from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen stated that she was stunned as being part of the neighborhood. These are very tall buildings in a residential neighborhood that have a tremendous impact on the shadow studies. She concurred with others that 8th Avenue needs to be broken up into smaller units of buildings and appreciated the comments about what Children's has done.

Comment from Craig Cooper: Mr. Cooper noted that like to go the SOV goal in the current TMP is to reduce SOV use from 58 to 50%. He stated that he believes that Swedish Medical Center can do better than that. He further stated that he was surprised to hear that patient's gets free parking.

Comment from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw stated that in the shadow studies; her entire house is under a shadow. That will have a tremendous impact on trees, gardens, in the

neighborhood. The plan needs to pay attention that people's backyard, and how they will be impacted by these shadows.

Comment from Julie Popper Ms. Popper noted that she was with SEUI Healthcare 1199 Northwest that represents union workers at Swedish Cherry Hill. The members were warned that cardio and neuro are moving to First Hill as well as acute care. If they are moving, why does Swedish need to build this building? Is this really for Swedish or just to service Sabey to manage more property? She emphasized that the MIMP is for Swedish, which is a local community hospital, and it is not for either Providence or for Sabey.

V. Continued Discussion of the EIS

Stephanie Haines was introduced to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The MIMP process is very detailed and requires a cycle of reviews. There will be plenty of opportunities for public comments once the draft is published. Ms. Haines mentioned that there is a schedule and the draft is set to publish on May 22nd.

Katy Chaney from URS summarized the upcoming schedule with regards to the draft EIS. The draft EIS and draft MP will be published on May 22nd; there will be 45 day comment period. There will be a public meeting tentatively scheduled on June 12th, the public are welcome to bring their comments. The public can submit written comments to be considered in the EIS. There will be preparation and the final EIS and final MP will be available sometime in October; at that time, the CAC and the City of Seattle will develop their own recommendations.

VI. General Committee Discussion

Brief general discussion ensued. Members noted that they needed more time to consider alternative 10 before having a meaningful discussion. Members determined that a follow on extra meeting would be needed to develop comments to Alternative 10 and suggested April 10th from that date. Members agreed

Ms. Porter asked if there is a response with regards from the SEIU comments about the move of cardio and neuro to First Hill. Ms. Peterson noted the decentralization is being discussed. Various programs and services may be moved around, but there has been no proposal to remove either of the major proposed programs from the Cherry Hill Campus.

Nicholas Richter stated that the reduced heights over the non-Swedish owned parcels in the western portion of the campus is a major missed opportunity that should be re-considered. Dave Letrondo asked why greater height there is more appropriate. Mr. Richter responded that it is adjacent to Seattle University. Other members agreed that this should be considered. Patrick Carter noted that some neighbors raised a question about excavating below ground to achieve square footage goals. She asked if this was possible.

Mr. Sheppard responded underground space is not counted when determining wither floor area ration or total square footage of development ; When the Committee looks at the bulk and height it is the areas above ground.

Mr. Jex clarified that the campus has significant square footage underground; the proposals under these alternatives continues that approach; there are codes that prohibits some hospital functions underground.

Ms. Haines made a comment that here are two measurements in the Master Plan that is being used: 1) gross sq. footage; how much sq. ft. are the institution is putting on this campus; this is used to measure parking, and traffic studies, whether it is above or below ground; 2) floor area ratio, for the site, this is looking at the bulk, and how much sq. footage is above ground as it relates to the property

Ms. Porter thanked Swedish, Callison, and Sabey for introducing another alternative; this shows their effort and willingness to get closer to meet the needs of the community.

VII. Adjournment

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