



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 Carter

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Joy Jacobson

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

David Letrondo

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*

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Meeting #10

December 5, 2013

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Education & Conference Center
 550 17th Avenue
 First Floor - James Tower

Members and Alternates Present

Katie Porter

Andrew Coates

Laurel Spelman

Patrick Carter

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

David Letrondo

Nicholas Richter

Dean Patton

Members and Alternates Absent

Jamile Mack

Eric Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Mark Tilbe

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Marcia Peterson, SMC

Stephanie Haines, DPD

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter, brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping – Approval of Agenda

The Committee briefly discussed a proposed change to the Committee By-laws to respond to concerns over meeting locations. Nicholas Richter presented a suggested change to the by-laws as follows:

Section 4. Location: - The Advisory Committee public meetings shall take place on Cherry Hill Campus unless previously approved by vote of the Advisory Committee at a prior meeting or if required by the Department of Neighborhoods of the City of Seattle. Swedish Medical Center shall arrange a suitable location for Advisory Committee meetings. The Education & Conference Center at James Tower will be the default location of all advisory committee meetings. If Swedish is unable to provide space at the Education & Conference Center at James Tower, then notification and clear signage from the Education & Conference Center at James Tower to the new location on the Cherry Hill campus will be provided.

Mr. Richter moved its adoption. It was seconded by Dean Patton. Brief discussion followed. Marcia Peterson stated that the previous meeting was changed to the First Hill Campus due to a lack of space. She stated that it was not the intention of Swedish to do this routinely. Steve Sheppard noted that under the current by-laws an amendment must be presented and one.

meeting and voted on at the next. The Committee therefore deferred its final vote on this amendment until meeting # 11

III. Public Comments

Comment Bill Zosel – Mr. Zosel stated that he had a chance to look at the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Preliminary Draft Plan and have concluded that neither is adequate. The EIS appears to be an argument in favor of the Swedish Proposal. The purpose of such a document is to provide reasonable alternatives. I do not see the CAC's previous suggestions acknowledged in the PDEIS. I still have a lot of questions, such as how and where the expansion of Swedish.

Editor's Note: Tape failure resulted in loss of a portion of the meeting, including several public comments. The Transcription resumes with discussion of the Committee's comments to the Preliminary Draft Master Plan and Preliminary Draft EIS.

IV. Development of Committee Comments to the Draft Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Alternatives Provided and Need

Laurel Spelman noted that all of the alternatives appear to be too large. She stated that an alternative should be developed that have no boundary expansion and with lower heights. The Seattle Municipal Code appears to require greater attention to matching height along the boundaries. None of the alternatives in the Preliminary Plan and in the EIS appear to meet his charge. Stephany Haines responded that DPD's evaluation is not looking at the total square feet so much as the direct impacts to determine if those impacts can be adequately mitigated.

Ms. Spelman noted that she understood that the Committee can comment on the needs of the institution but that it is ultimately not negotiable. She asked that the City Law Department determine if the interrelationship between Swedish and the Providence System, it that changes the nature of the Committee's ability to comment on need.

Dave Letrondo responded that it appears that Swedish comes up with alternatives. DPD cannot question the volume or area of these alternatives. The Committee reviews and the alternatives. This prelim draft state the impacts that those alternative have, it does not say we should do this. This is the environmental impact; it is up to the CAC, how to mitigate it.

Steve Sheppard stated that the code language defines the CAC's purpose. The Code states in Section 23.69.032 D that you 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. You may discuss and comment on the need but it is not negotiable, i.e. what the institution says t they believe or conclude they need is their consideration. You may question that need in your reports, but ultimately your charge will be to look at the proposed development and determine whether it can be reasonably accommodated within the neighborhood regardless of the need. The Committee can and state that the height, bulk, scale, shadowing, and traffic impact do not represent a balance envisioned by the code and cannot be reasonably accommodated in the neighborhood. The reason for this was the skill of looking at the hospital need, state, region, economy; those kinds of skill are beyond what this Committee has. You need not conform your proposals to Swedish's stated needs. DPD or the Hearing Examiner can evaluate the need.

Katie Porter noted that she and others have questioned the relationship between Swedish and Sabey and that more information is needed concerning whether Sabey owned properties should be

benefitting from code provisions intended to primarily apply to the hospital. What are the legitimate "hospital" uses? I believe it is not covered in the DEIS and should be. Are "medical" research facilities, data centers, etc. legally related to hospital care? We don't have clarity on the uses.

Stephany Haines responded that this is a conceptual plan and that the institution has to identify their proposed range of uses so that issues such as traffic can be addressed. The institution is prohibited from developing institutional uses outside of their boundary but others can take advantage of the provisions of the MIO if they meet certain requirement. These requirements are listed in the Code. Ms. Haines read the code provision as follows:

All uses that are functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of a Major Institution or that primarily and directly serve the users of an institution shall be defined as Major Institution uses and shall be permitted in the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District. Major Institution uses shall be permitted either outright or as conditional uses according to the provisions of Section 23.69.012. Permitted Major Institution uses shall not be limited to those uses which are owned or operated by the Major Institution.

The code also provides criteria for making that determination. A non-related office building could not be built.

Dylan Glosecki stated that there needs to be a major discussion of height, bulk, and scale, particularly along the periphery of the Campus. It is simply unacceptable to see 200 foot towers adjacent to low-rise zoned areas. Swedish need to develop new alternatives and look into the perimeter heights. The disparities across zone boundaries are simply too great. There should be an alternative that includes much greater setbacks.

Patrick Angus asked for clarification concerning how DPD could question square footage needs. Stephany Haines responded that DPD does not define the institution's need, but must determine the balance between need and the impact on the neighborhood.

In response to questions, Steve Sheppard noted that normally hospitals that have gone through this process have included a wide variety of space including research space and medical office buildings. Nicholas Richter noted that in this case buildings accommodation these uses are owned by a separate private agent. He noted that some of the uses such as lab-corps, sever a much wider set of users. He asked if this area derives any special benefit or whether these other clients provide for the mitigation of impacts. He stated that the suspect that they do not do so.

Mr. Richter noted that there are really only two alternative: 1) do nothing; or 2) accommodate substantial growth with only minor variations. There needs to be alternatives that are between these two so that some balance can be achieved. The documents that we have been given provide insufficient information to make informed decisions. None of the build alternatives are reasonable. In addition the both documents appear to confuse this low-rise neighborhood with First Hill. This is a major error. The alternatives that have been proposed to date are so far beyond what is reasonable in a low-rise neighborhood, that if a vote were held today the vote would have to be to reject the plan.

Ms. Porter suggested that members get all comments to Steve Sheppard and that he would combine them all for further review and draft the cover letter that will summarize what is missing in the preliminary draft that was presented to the Committee. Dean Patton suggested a two person group to draft the cover letter. Laurel Spelman noted that Mr. Sheppard had noted that members' comments were amazingly similar and that he could combine those comments. He noted that the thrust of any comments had to be established tonight. Specific swor4ding can be perfected on-line but t=not the general comments. These must be done in open full Committee.

Mr. Sheppard summarized the following items that appeared to be the thrust of Committee comments:

- 1) The three build alternatives presented are simply variations of one alternative. There needs to be alternatives that are less impacting.
- 2) The height, bulk and scale impacts, and by associations traffic impacts, appear to be inappropriate and difficult to accommodate within this low density neighborhood.
- 3) The Spencer Technology Site expansions need much greater justification before going forward in any manner.
- 4) The need to identify mitigation efforts, it is difficult to see the purpose without these information;
- 5) The traffic and the amount of space analysis;
- 6) The public benefits are not just for the region but for the neighborhood as well.

There was further discussion of how to best complete Committee comments. After further discussion the Committee directed Mr. Sheppard informed to write and summarize a cover letter to address these issues, and will need comments from each of the Committee members. Katie Porter briefly reiterated what she considered the main thrust as:

- 1) All of the present Alternatives identified in the PDEIS and PDMIM (Alternatives 5, 6 and 7) are sufficiently similar to be considered variants of one alternative.
- 2) Any expansion of the MIO boundaries or MIO height designations should be more fully evaluated.
- 3) The height, bulk, and scale of all of the alternatives are out of scale with the neighborhood.
- 4) Mitigation efforts are inadequate.
- 5) Traffic impacts are inadequately address and should be given much greater attention.

After further discussion it was moved and seconded that the above represent the thrust of the Committee's comments. The question was called by show of hands. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

There was a question for Stephanie Haines if the Committee would see the document again to do another EIS draft. If there is another preliminary draft, it needs to be distributed to the CAC members so they can add comments. The preliminary draft is for review of the Committee and not for public review.

V. Adjournment

No further business was presented to the Committee. The meeting was adjourned

Attachment #1 – Comment Letter as sent.

**Swedish Medical Center
Cherry Hill Campus Major
Institutions Master Plan
Citizen's Advisory Committee**

Committee Members

Katie Porter –chair

Andrew Coats

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

David Letrondo

Eric Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Ida Woods

*Swedish Medical Center Non-
management Representative*

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

Patrick Angus

Dean Paton

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

Department of Neighborhoods

Stephanie Haines

*Department of Planning and
Development*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical Center
Management*

Christina Van Valkenburg

*Seattle Department of
Transportation*

December 12, 2013

Stephany Haines

City of Seattle

Department of Planning & Development

700 5th Ave Suite 1800

PO Box 34019

Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Ms. Marcia Pederson

Swedish Medical Center

747 Broadway

Seattle, WA 98122

Dear Ms. Haines and Ms. Pederson,

The Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Campus Major Institutions Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is charged with advising the City and Swedish Medical Center concerning the development of the new Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Campus Major Institutions Master Plan (MIMP). One of the statutory responsibilities of the CAC is to formally comment on Preliminary Drafts of the Major Institutions Master Plan for the Swedish Medical Center's Cherry Hill Campus and its accompanying Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement. These two documents were provided to the CAC on November 7, 2013 and the CAC met on December 5, 2013 to formalize its comments.

The CAC directed their efforts to what the proposed expansion would look like and how the level of development proposed would impact the predominately residential Cherry Hill/Squire Park Neighborhood. The proposed level of development, heights, bulk and scale would represent a major change within the current Major Institution's Boundary and greatly affect the entire surrounding neighborhood. While we understand that any viable proposal must meet Swedish Medical Center's needs, we believe it is our role to balance the growth of the institution with long term compatibility of the surrounding neighborhoods consistent with SMC 23.69.025. We are concerned that none of the current proposed alternatives strike this balance.

1. Concerning the adequacy of the current preliminary documents

- a. Both the current Preliminary Draft Major Institution Master Plan and its accompanying Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement appear to be incomplete. The CAC considers these documents to be insufficiently developed to be considered the preliminary draft referenced in SMC 23.69.032D 5 and 6 and recommends that major revisions and additions be made to these

documents. Additions should include additional or substitute alternatives. Neither the present Preliminary Draft Major Institutions Master Plan nor its accompanying Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement contain a full range of alternatives that might be more compatible to the existing neighborhood scale to adequately judge the acceptability of the proposals.

- b. Strong consideration should be given to re-issuing these revised documents and that the revised documents be considered the statutory revised preliminary drafts.
- c. That if significantly revised, these preliminary drafts should be forwarded to the CAC for formal review and timelines adjusted sufficiently to allow the CAC to fully review these documents and provide appropriate comments.

2. Concerning the delineation and description of alternatives.

- a. All of the present Alternatives identified in the PDEIS and PDMIM (Alternatives 5, 6 and 7) are sufficiently similar to be considered variants of one alternative.
- b. The present alternatives should either be replaced by or augmented by others that are more compatible with the surrounding low-rise single family residential zoning and use, and include alternatives without a boundary expansion.

3. Concerning expansion of the MIO boundaries and Heights

- a. The CAC currently considers the bulk, height and scale proposed in all of the proposed build alternatives to be beyond that which can be accommodated within the current neighborhood context, and that, therefore, the current alternatives do not meet the purpose of the Major Institutions code section 23.69.002 B to balance a Major Institution's ability to change – as well as the public benefit derived from change – with the need to protect the livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods.
- b. Any expansion of the MIO boundaries or MIO height designations should be more fully evaluated against the stated purpose and objective of the Major Institutions Code and justified prior to being included in any of the build alternatives. The CAC remains skeptical of proposed boundary expansions. Any boundary expansions should be consistent with all applicable re-zoning standards and respect the existing neighborhood context.

4. Concerning the balance of public benefit derived from institutional development (and need to protect the livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods), and also the identification of mitigation for the impacts of the proposed development.

- a. The preliminary draft plan and preliminary draft environmental impact statement should identify the public benefits that the institution considers accruing to the City, region, and neighborhood, as well as those actions being proposed by Swedish Medical Center as trade-offs from the maximum development goals of the institution intended to create the balance envisioned by the major institutions code that further the livability of the neighborhood. The stated benefits should derive from the activities of Swedish at the campus only, and not the system-wide benefits provided by all of the Swedish Medical Center system.
- b. The preliminary draft plan and preliminary draft environmental impact statements should identify the actions intended to mitigate the unavoidable impact of the proposed development. The initial drafts do not address these.

The CAC is also forwarding more detailed comments received from individual members for your reference. We encourage you to review these thoroughly.

The CAC hopes that a balance can be found that allows continued reasonable growth of the Swedish Cherry Hill Campus along lines that more fully respect its location within a low-density and primarily low-rise single-family neighborhood. We sincerely hope that a constructive dialog can occur and that compromises can be reached that can benefit both the region and SMC without unacceptable levels of adverse impact on the Squire Park and Cherry Hill Neighborhoods. We view reaching such a position as our central purpose and objective.

We thank Swedish Medical Center for the opportunity to make these comments and look forward to further review and comments on any revised preliminary draft documents.

Sincerely,

Katie Porter
Chair

Attachments:

Individual Committee Member Comments