



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

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Lara Branigan

Committee Alternates

James Schell

Dean Patton

Ashleigh Kilcup

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

*Department of
 Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of
 Planning and
 Development*

Andy Cosentino

*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #26

February 5, 2015

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Dean Patton

Dylan Glosecki

Katie Porter

Leon Garnett

James Schell

Dave Letrondo

J Elliot Smith

Linda Carol

Ashleigh Kilcup

Patrick Angus

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Members and Alternates Absent

Raleigh Watts

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Andy Cosentino, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

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

Ms. Porter informed members that the goal for the meeting is to walk through all comments on the draft director's report. She noted that Katy Chaney from URS to present answer any questions and concerns regarding the draft director's report.

Mr. Steve Sheppard briefly went over the process going forward. He noted that the Committee is now beginning its final. The Director of DPD has issued her draft recommendations. The Committee must now both provide comments to the Draft Director's recommendations and begin to establish their position for incorporation into the Committee majority report. Mr. Sheppard noted that he will write drafts of the Committee report and attempt to justify positions as completely as possible.

Minority reports will be attached to the final report, and those in disagreement with the thrust of the majority positions should begin to formulate any minority reports at this time.

Comments tonight are technically to the "Draft Report of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD). The goal is to have all Committee's positions established by March 5th. The final report will be

available for a couple more weeks after the March 5th meeting.

Ms. Porter asked Mr. Sheppard when the last meeting would occur. Mr. Sheppard responded that is not set in stone at this point. There will likely be a few meetings after March 5th. It depends if there are any further discussion on open issues. Mr. Sheppard noted that an extension of time may be forthcoming.

II. Committee Comments to Draft Director's Report

Comments to the DPD General Recommendation to Adopt the Master Plan - Ms. Porter noted the Director's Report starts with the conclusion that for the most part, the plan represented an adequate balance. Steve Sheppard noted that a clear majority of members have indicated that they disagree with that conclusion and most provided language that the plan did not represent an adequate balance and should be further modified to reduce heights and increase setbacks from Alternative 12 and that without those additional changes the Committee would recommend rejection. Those comments were combined, and are included as recommendation 1 in Final Report. He noted that this was provided to members prior to this meeting.

Katie Porter asked that members confirm this position. Steve Sheppard noted that this position was the lead-off recommendation in the current draft of the lead in sections of the Final Report. The Committee was polled by show of hands. A clear majority voted in the affirmative, and that position was adopted as Recommendation 1 for both the comments to the Draft Director's Report and the Committee Final Report.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #1 - Design Review - There was a brief discussion of the nature of design review. Dave Letrondo asked if the project developed under the plan were subject to the City Design Review Process. Mr. Sheppard replied that they were not. This exemption is a major provision of the Major Institution Code that exempts these projects from the lengthy design review board process. Instead projects are reviewed by DPD through SEPA and Standing Advisory Committee given the opportunity to comment. In essence the Standing Advisory Committee fulfills the role of a design review board. However it does not have the same formal authority as these boards. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that in most cases the advice of the standing committee weighs more than DPD. Mr. Letrondo agreed. The Committee choose not to make comments on this recommendation.

Discussion of FAR - There was a brief discussion of FAR. Members suggested that any data Center not be exempted from FAR and/or not be allowed. Others suggested that the 3.5% reduction for mechanical penthouses be eliminated from the FAR calculation. Ms. Porter raised a question to Mr. Andy Cosentino about the community's concern regarding data centers built on the campus as a general concern. Mr. Cosentino responded that not in the current condition in Swedish and it requires server space to support the data center.

After brief further discussion the Committee it was moved that the Committee agree with DPD's recommendation on Item #32 Exemptions from FAR. The Committee was polled by show of hands. The motion passes unanimously.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #2 - TMP Goal Prior to First Building Permit - Ms. Porter noted that the TMP usage rate was 50%. However, she noted that many members disagreed with the details of this recommendation and that many amendments were suggested.

Ms. Porter read Mr. Letrondo's comments and asked if the Committee disagreed with the language. Mr. Patrick Angus asked how the 50% goal is was established and how it is monitored. Christina Van Valkenburgh responded that compliance is established every other year in the fall and monitors the

progress. Ms. Laurel Spelman noted that she particularly agreed with the recommended response language provided by Dylan Glosecki.

Mr. Sheppard suggested that the various comments might be combined as follows:

Each additional permit shall also require that Swedish Medical Center be in Compliance with its most recently established SOV rate requirement for the Cherry Hill Campus. SMC shall be required to demonstrate continued compliance with the above SOV rate prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy (CFO) and shall have a three month period to remedy failure to meet those goals.

After brief further discussion, Ms. Porter mentioned that the committee will be voting in two parts: 1) Agreement with the general recommendation as put forward by Ms. Haines; and 2) insertion of the combined member comment language as shown above.

The Committee was polled by show of hands for agreement with Ms. Haines general statements. Mr. Sheppard noted that there was clear majority and the motion passes.

Ms. Porter moved insertion of the combined member comment language as shown above. The motion was seconded. Mr. Sheppard noted that since this was a major action he would poll the Committee. The following votes as follows:

James Schell – Yes
Leon Garnett – Yes
James Elliot Smith – Yes
Maja Hadlock – Yes
Dave Letrondo – Yes
Linda Carol – No
Dylan Glosecki – Yes
Laura Spelman – Yes
Patrick Angus – Yes
Katie Porter – Yes
Ashleigh Kilcup – Yes

The vote was 10 in favor and 1 oppose. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

III. Public Comments

The floor was opened for public comments.

Comments from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw encouraged everyone to take a look outside and observe the surrounding areas. She mentioned that the building that this meeting is being held in is only 2 stories over the proposed height on the east side of 18th avenue. There is a potential light as well as noise invasion during the sleeping hours and the neighbors complain about the noise. She mentioned about her concerns about what the neighbors do not know especially with the FAR and the noise the mechanical rooms would make. She noted that the responsibility of the Committee is to address the livability of the neighborhood. She also commented that design of the building is aggressive architecture that is being proposed is designed to push people out of their homes.

Comments of Ellen Sollod – Ms. Sollod noted that the heights of buildings along Cherry will block sunlight. She suggested that the upper level setbacks need to be brought down lower. She also recommended that the upper level setbacks along 15th Avenue should be 80 feet to bring heights along that street closer to the height on the SU Campus.

Comments from Ken Torp: Mr. Torp noted that SMC had stated that any servers on Campus would serve only SMC uses. He asked that the CAC request in writing regarding the commitment that the server is specifically for medical and building use of the campus.

Comments of Sonja Richter – She noted that the area to the north of the campus will be exceedingly impacted. The area is already greatly shadowed. There is also a major noise impact related to mechanical penthouses. She noted that she was not happy with the demeanor of SMC staff and had written a letter to SMC management concerning that issue.

Comments from Jack Hanson: Mr. Hanson commented that he appreciates the CAC's efforts and time commitment. He noted his concerns about the size of the institutional expansion. Neighbors would like to review the details regarding the space needs. Information provided to date is insufficient conduct a proper evaluation of this issue. He formally requested that SMC provide the public and CAC and would like to encourage the CAC more detailed information on that issues. He noted that this information should already be in SMC's possession and providing it should not be a great impositions. He encouraged the CAC members to join him to get this request.

Comments of Joy Jacobson – Ms. Jacobson suggested that the upper-level setback above the garage along Jefferson be set at the structural bay rather than a specific distance.

IV. Committee Response to the Public Comments

Mr. Dean Patton asked the Committee about their reaction to the issue of servers raised by Mr. Torp concerning servers. He noted that Sabey is a major provider of these services and that they should not do likewise on this campus. Mr. Cosentino responded that due to information sharing among campuses, a system of campus servers are here for health related purposes. Ms. Porter noted that if there is enough time to deal with this issue at the meeting tonight and suggested that this be dealt with at a subsequent meeting.

V. Continued Committee Discussions Concerning Comments to Draft Director's Report

Discussions returned to the draft director's report.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #3 – TMP Goal Reduction over the Life of the Master Plan - Ms. Porter introduced Item #3: TMP goal reduction over life of Master Plan as part of the discussion. She noted that there was considerable discussion of this at the previous meeting. There are also several suggestions for amendments, provided by Dave Letrondo, Elliott Smithy and Dylan Glosecki. In each case the recommended changes call for a more aggressive reduction in the goal over a lesser period of time. She asked members whether they agreed that a more aggressive goal needs to be established. Members agreed.

Laurel Spellman asked for clarification on: 1) how the 50% goal, 1% reduction, and ultimate 38% goal was established; and 2) the rationale for allowing SMC a higher goal related to the First Hill average CTR goal. Ms. Van Valkenburgh responded that the reduction goal was established in 2012 and the City looked at different neighborhoods. The CTR goals and purposes looked at other groups at a different time and that the CTR and TMP goals are two different things and each are implemented separately. She briefly went over some of the technical aspects of the CRT goal, particularly noting that it is different than the TMP goal.

Laurel Spellman Responded that that it her contention that SMC should not benefit from others failure to reach aggressive goals and strongly suggested that the Committee recommend that this provision be stricken from the DPD recommendation.

Mr. Letrondo commented that he wanted to see a more aggressive goal but that it needed to be realistic and achievable. Ms. Kilcup stated that the 44% goal was aggressive but might be achievable and that she could support that level.

Ms. Porter commented that she personally in favor and agree of a more aggressive goal, but felt uncomfortable with Mr. Glosecki's suggesting that the goal be reduced to 30% at this point but could support that or something close. Others suggested calculating the ultimate level based upon a reduction of 1.5% over a number of years. Mr. Cosentino commented that a starting goal of 50% and after two years reduced it down to 44% is a very aggressive goal that requires a very aggressive policies. There was a discussion of the proper goal which resulted in adoption of a 32% goal at the end of 25 years.

After brief further discussion, Ms. Porter Moved that the Committee disagreed with the recommendation in the Draft Director's report and recommend an alternative recommendations; The Committee was polled by showoff hands. The motion assed.

Ms. Porter moved the language stated earlier as follows:

The TMP SOV goal of 50 percent shall be further reduced by 1.5 percent every two years to a maximum 32 percent SOV goal in 15 years (estimated time of full build out of the master Plan.

It was noted that by rejecting the DPD condition outright the portion granting higher SOV rate tied to the First Hill CRT goal was eliminated and such would be indicated in the Committees recommendation.

The question was called and the Committee polled. The votes were as follows:

James Schell – Yes
Leon Garnett – Yes
James Elliot Smith – Yes
Maja Hadlock – Yes
Dave Letrondo – No
Linda Carol – Yes
Dylan Glosecki – Yes
Laura Spelman – Yes
Patrick Angus – Yes
Katie Porter – Yes
Ashleigh Kilcup – Yes

The vote was 10 in favor and 1 oppose. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #4 – Capital Improvements Prior to the Issuance of First Master Use Permit - Ms. Porter noted that Dylan Glosecki has suggested more specificity concerning the actual improvements. The suggested improvement covered under his suggestion were listed as follows:

- a. 16th and Cherry (traffic signal build out for four intersection)
- b. 14th and Jefferson (traffic build out)
- c. 18th and Cherry (traffic signal build out for four intersections)
- d. 17th and Cherry (build out for three intersections)
- e. 16th and Jefferson (build out on all four corners)
- f. 18th and Jefferson (build out on all four corners)
- g. 17th and Jefferson (build out on all four corners)

Mr. Cosentino mentioned that all other intersections listed are fine and Swedish is comfortable with these build outs. The Committee was polled on approval of the DPD recommendation with the clarifying language as proposed by Mr. Glosecki. Mr. Sheppard noted that it was unanimous and the motion passes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #5, 6 and 7 –There were no substantive comments concerning DPD conditions 5 and 6 and 7 and the Committee endorsed each with unanimous votes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #8, - Transportation Review as Part of Future MUP Review – Ms. Porter stated that she was comfortable with the language for Item #8, but the current route planning language was soft. She noted that Mr. Letrondo had offered several strike outs and that Linda Carrol has suggested language to extend those truck delivery routes to include 23rd Avenue. After brief further discussion, it was moved to endorse the DPD condition with amendment of part g to read

g) Assess truck delivery routes between Swedish Cherry Hill and I-5 and along E-Cherry, I-90, 23rd Avenue E and E. Jefferson Street to identify potential impacts to roadways along these routes.

The Committee was polled by show of hands. The vote was unanimous and the motion passes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 –There were no substantive comments concerning DPD conditions 9 through 18 and the Committee endorsed each with unanimous show of hands votes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Condition to Master Plan Approval #10 – Concept Street Designs – Members noted that the statement concerning review by the Standing Advisory Committee was combined with others into a single Committee recommendation. Members also recommended that the last sentence in this conditions that allowed SDOT to modify plans was too vague and should be removed. With these minor changes the condition was approved.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #19, - Features to exceed MIO Height Limits - Members suggested addition with an edit that states no more The Committee was polled and the change was approved unanimously.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #20 - Modulation Dylan. Glosecki suggested he would like a further reduction. He noted that maximum modulation occurring only every 125 feet was too great, especially when abutting residential Development. He stated that After brief further discussion, Mr. Sheppard stated that Mr. Glosecki's concern could be address if

Modulation – with the exception of the facades facing he east property line of the 18th Avenue half block, no un-modulated façade shell exceed 125 feet in length, nor 90 feet along either E. Cherry Street or 15th Avenue.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 - There were no additional substantive comments concerning DPD conditions 22 – 25. Ms. Porter noted that many these were dealt with as part of the broader discussion of the 18th Avenue half block and the previous meeting 18 and that those decisions would be reflected in the comments to DPD.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #26 – Detailed Landscaping Plan - Ms. Porter noted that Ms. Hadlock has recommended addition of the statement that the landscaping shall be located at grade and not below street level as it is in the case of Cherry Street. Members agreed to include this statement as an addition to this condition and recommend such to DPD. The Committee was polled and the vote unanimous. Introduced a motion to vote in agreement with DPD's recommendation on Item #26 Detailed Landscaping Plan with Each MUP Application along with Ms. Hadlock's additional language. Mr. Sheppard noted that it was unanimous and the motion passed.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #27 –There were no substantive comments concerning DPD conditions and the Committee endorsed each with unanimous votes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #28 Streetscape Activation
There was a brief discussion of retail uses. This inclusion of retail was not included due to zoning issues. The condition was amended to add canopies as a strategy. With this change the Committee was polled concerning approval of the general language. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #29 Skybridges

Ms. Porter noted that various members had weighed in on this provisions David Letrondo stated that his change was intended to accommodate patients rather than “People” as many patients are in stretchers or wheelchairs. Dylan Glosecki stated that he objected to the possibility of a stacked skybridge and would prefer side-by side. Katie Cheney stated that if the skybridge was side by side there should have to be separations between the general patients and patients. She noted that it would also be difficult to re-do hallways and access points. Others stated that the stacking might be better. After brief discussion the Committee determined that they would remain silent on this issue and instead add the following language at the end of the provisions.

Because skybridges by their nature are ugly, the skybridge should be designed as an iconic modern architectural feature) Not just cement and glass, and be design to make it interesting. Any future skybridge along 16th Avenue should remain on the same level as each other and be limited to 2 total.

The above language was approved.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #36 to #45 –There were no substantive comments concerning DPD conditions, other than eliminating the words “and light” from the first sentence of #45 and the Committee endorsed each with unanimous votes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #46 Dylan Glosecki stated that the statement be amended to specifically relate to LEED standards. The language suggested was as follows.

During demolition and construction, recycle construction and debris waste to the extent feasible based on the existence of hazardous materials and meet LEED standards for the amount of recycled materials with a minimum of 75% achieved.

The above language was approved.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #47 to #52 –There were no substantive comments concerning DPD conditions and the Committee endorsed each with unanimous votes.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #53 Members noted that this is the proper location to add the green factor language. After brief discussion the following wording was recommended to be added to the end of that condition:“

A campus-wide green factor of 0.5% shall be considered the minimum goal.

The above added language was approved.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #54 the following wording was recommended to be added to the end of that condition:“

No trees should be removed from the City right of way. During construction the root system shall be maintained.

The above added language was approved.

Comments to DPD Recommended Conditions to Master Plan Approval #55 to 76.

Committee members noted that they were in substantial agreement with the remaining conditions, with the addition of minor provisions as follows. Note that these additions had been previously forwarded to members:

Condition	Change
55	Add to the end of this condition: "to the extent feasible all plants should be pollinator pathway certified."
57	Add to the end of this condition: "All buildings should be required to meet LEED or similar certification such as the Green Guide for healthcare due to the location within a residential neighborhood."
59	Amend the condition as follows: All garage venting shall be directed away from residential uses adjacent to the east property boundary of the campus.
60	Amend the condition as follows: Alternatives to mechanical maintenance equipment (e.g., leaf blowers, power washers, etc.) should be explored (such as sweeping or using a hose to wash driveways where feasible) or equipment that produces lower sound levels used. <u>No such equipment utilizing internal combustion engines should be utilized.</u>
68	Amend the condition as follows: To minimize the potential for noise impacts resulting from regular testing of <u>new and existing</u> emergency generators, the location of such equipment should be considered during building design relative to residences, and equipped with noise controls to minimize noise intrusion.
69	Add to the end of this condition: <u>Particular care should be taken along the east margin of the 18th Avenue half block to assure that no views from the Medical office buildings are available to the immediately adjacent single-family residences. The fenestration pattern along this facade shall be reviewed both with the CAC and adjacent property owners.</u>

With the changes noted above conditions 55 through 76 were approved.

Steve Sheppard stated that he would draft a letter containing the changes suggested by members. He urged members to review the wording that will be forwarded carefully to assure that it matches their intentions.

V. Adjournment

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