



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*

DRAFT Meeting Notes
 Meeting #23
 January 8, 2015
 Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue
 Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Ashleigh Kilcup	Dylan Glosecki	Katie Porter
Leon Garnett	James Schell	Patrick Angus
J Elliot Smith	Linda Carrol	Maja Hadlock
Dave Letrondo		

Members and Alternates Absent

Patrick Angus	Dean Patton	Raleigh Watts
Laurel Spelman		

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephany Haines, DPD
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 noted that this meeting will deal with issues other than height bulk and scale.

II. General Committee Discussion

The floor was opened to a discussion of transportation issues. Mr. Cosentino noted that the Integrated Transportation

Committee has been meeting to continue work on identifying mid and long-term measures to improve the parking and traffic situations around the campus. He noted that Dylan Glosecki was serving on that Committee. Mr. Dave Letrondo asked the Mr. Dylan Glosecki update the Committee on the progress of that Committee.

Mr. Glosecki stated that the committee had set up a series of goals and policies to; achieve these goals. Achieving the goals will take some time. There are a handful of items still being considered that were implemented at Children's. One of the major efforts is to assure

coordination between vendor and SMC uses. There are ongoing discussions concerning the SOV goals and the proper incremental reductions. The immediate first year goal is set and 50% and would be incrementally reduced to the range of 44 to 45%. Mr. Glosecki stated that he is advocating a greater reduction into the 35% range in themed to long-term. Mr. Letrondo commented that he was impressed with the Transportation document and showed about the effort put forth on it. He began to ask if such examples recently and actually works.

Ms. Katie Porter commented that the EIS put forth significant avoidable adverse impacts to a number of transportation areas and would like the CAC to weigh in on these.

Mr. Andy Cosentino responded to the discussion from Mr. Glosecki. He noted that Swedish has put forward a mid-term goal 44% SOV threshold. This is the figure used in the EIS. The City has indicated that they will likely advocate an incremental reduction as development occurs. Swedish is committed to a gradual lowering of the SOV target goal over time however, an ultimate figure has not been determined.

Dean Patton stated that the transportation plan being put forward is impressive and a good effort. He asked. He began to ask if such examples recently and actually works. He asked for examples of instances where the proposals being outlined in the plan worked.

Mr. Rimon from Transpo responded that the measures identified in the TMP are specifically tailored to Swedish. The overall effectiveness is difficult to determine on an individual element. The annual reporting done reflects the success of the TMP, i.e. SOV goals through surveys. He noted that the Commuter Trip Reduction annual report will report progress, or lack thereof, in reaching the Goals

Porter stated that she was recommending that the Committee advocated that certain thresholds be achieved before building permits are issued for various phases.

Mr. Dean Patton noted that the plans still appear to accept a greater level of congestion at key intersections than he thought would be acceptable. He noted that that Cherry Street is becoming worse and worse since he moved in the neighborhood in 1991. Ms. Porter agreed with the concern and observed especially during peak traffic hours. She also noted that many of the improvements being proposed would be welcome additions to the neighborhood the safety.

Dylan Glosecki stated that one of the keys to reducing congestion is incremental reductions being discussed. It is very important that the SOV goal be brought down to a significant percentage and it is critical to have an ambitious goal. He mentioned that Swedish does not seem to know how to get there. Children's has been successful.

Ashleigh Kilcup asked if conditions in this neighborhood are worse than elsewhere in the City or if conditions here mirror citywide trends. Mr. Rimon responded that the levels of congestion identified in the EIS that are not unique. The group is also reviewing the City's bicycle plan as well as reviewing other City's projects and impacts on this neighborhood

He also noted Swedish will also work with SDOT and DPD to determine what elements or phases in the development would trigger improvements. Ms. Stephanie Haines added that DPD is looking at tying implementation of improvement to the issuance of the first building permit.

III. Public Comments

The floor was opened to public comments. Ms. Porter began stated that the goal of this Committee is to balance the needs of the institution and of the community. She said that after two years efforts, she was discouraged to hear neighbors advocating a full rejection of the entire plan. The tenor of comments has been harsh. She also said that she is looking forward in talking to neighbors at the upcoming Squire Park Community Council meeting and encouraged other Committee members to attend.

Comments from Ken Torp: Mr. Torp noted that he had written a letter avocation that the Committee reject the MIMP on its entirety and that this is a legitimate position for the Committee to take when confronted with a proposal that is fundamentally inconsistent with its surrounding residential neighborhood. He noted that the FEIS is damning in that it identifies significant unavoidable adverse impacts. He commented about numerous issues regarding transportation, immitigable adverse impacts such as safety crossings, speed, etc. He asked the CAC to look at the issues very closely and on their decision, that they should be representing the community. He noted that some neighbors on the Committee often vote against neighborhood interests and asked why. The transportation impacts can't be mitigated unless the total amount to square feet of new development is reduced.

Comments from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod reiterated and support that Mr. Torp mentioned about adverse traffic impacts and its direct correlation to the square footage. There is a direct correlation. She noted that this is a low-rise neighborhood. Congestion elsewhere is often driven=n be commercial development. This neighborhood is not similar to those areas. Instead, it is more similar to the area around Children's Hospital. In that case, the amount of new development was less than here and that should be the starting point in this neighborhood. She also noted that the proposed setbacks are inappropriate and inadequate and the only way it can be mitigated is to increase the ground level very significantly.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper commented that he endorsed the comments of the previous speakers. He mentioned that setbacks are nearly zero parking garage in 15th and Jefferson. That was a tradeoff to keep the height down. He also said that this is not a theater; the neighborhood is serious about the EIS and the MIMP. He is baffled about favoring the institution's plans. He said that the CAC should very seriously reject this proposal and encouraged them to go through the documents, look at the detailed problem lists and conflicts of interest. He also described that some of the sections are not supported by facts; the institution continues to promise, but were unable to enforce.

He noted that there were errors in the documents that he would provide in a separate letter. in addition, urged the CAC to reject the plan outright. He also noted that much of the language concerning possible conditions and amenities is very soft and unenforceable. Promises and conditions need to be enforceable.

Comments from Jack Hanson: Mr. Hanson lives stated that appreciated the efforts and the ongoing service of the CAC and thanked the neighbors for hours spent reviewing these documents. The requests in the MIMP would allow Swedish to expand to double its size. This is out of size and scale compared to the culture of the community. He also commented

that the enormous facility expansion is not needed and that the proposed deal with business consideration is to capture market share rather than health care needs. Finally, the CAC is obligated to review the need for the proposed development and the MIMP process is to evaluate the appropriateness of the growth of the institution and public benefit. The process is intended to evaluate the need and balance need against the livability of the neighborhood. With all these reasons, Mr. Henson urged the CAC to reject the Swedish/Providence MIMP and to send it back to them so they can propose a plan that is appropriate to the community.

Comments from Joy Burkholder: Ms. Burkholder spoke on behalf of the SEIU and she felt strongly that by failing to deal with the need of the expansion the CAC is not fully meeting its charge. There is no way to address the issue of balance without fully evaluating the issues of need and public benefit. The Hearing Examiner stated that the CAC fully examined the issue of need related to the Children's Hospital process so there is precedent for this. IN looking at the Code, we believe that the Code was intended to apply to the major institutions and not for profit development partners. The certificate of need for beds is not the same as an allowance to expand the medical office uses. When Swedish sold to Sabey it undermined any argument for expansions. Swedish should first re-purchase the land it sold to Sabey and re-purpose it back to its intended non-profit use. The sale to Sabey set a dangerous precedent. She stated that her organization calls on the CAC to convene a meeting to discuss the need issue including separate experts.

Comments from Xochitl Maykaich: Ms. Maykaich from the Washington Committee Action Network read the portion of the Seattle Municipal Code, which states that the CAC may discuss and comment mission of the institution, the need for the expansion, public benefits and the way in which the proposed development will serve the public purpose mission of the institution. The MIMP has to be a balance between the institution and the needs of the community. Swedish has not demonstrated a need given it sale of land to Sabey. Swedish also places its users into crushing medical dept. Instead of putting resources into expansion that they do not need, Swedish should direct those funds to reducing patients' medical debt. . Swedish needs to look at their mission statement, access to services as needed by the community, and the expansion will not help due to gridlock issues.

Comments from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that the he looked at a program about a similar sized project that involved 2.6 million sq. ft. proposal. That project is the Trump Tower. After a year and a half, the message of the neighborhoods has been consistent; the size of the proposal is inappropriate to this neighborhood. He mentioned after a year later; the whole process is still in negotiations. He said that why is the CAC still negotiating as they have listened to all of the comments that the plan being proposed is out of character for this neighborhood and should be rejected. 2.6 million square feet is 60 acres.

Comments from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw that the neighbors have been saying the same thing for two years. The meetings are depressing given the consistent proposals from Swedish that are inappropriate to this neighborhood. She said that it is clearly inappropriate having this proposed size for this neighborhood.

Comments from Mary Pat Dileva: Ms. Dileva endorsed the previous comments and asked the CAC to listen to her. She said that this project is inappropriate for this community and needs to be rejected.

Comments from Janet Van Fleet : Ms. Van Fleet stated that doubling the size of campus has adverse impacts on parking, traffic and the surrounding lights. She echoed the same complaints that the proposed plan is out of scale in this type of residential neighborhood. She also mentioned that it is CAC's responsibility to consider the needs of the hospital and not Sabey, thus, would like the CAC to reject the MIMP.

Comments from Greg Harmon. Mr. Harmon pointed out that the CAC should not approve Alternative 12 as it stands. It severely impacts the neighborhood. The process is supposed to seek balance and this proposal does not achieve that balance. The institution and its development partner are receiving a great deal without providing mitigation or public benefit. The setbacks need a great deal of work. The setbacks need to provide better transition. Along 15 there should be an 80 foot setback above 65 feet with minimum 15 foot street level setbacks along the other campus perimeters. .

IV. Continued General Discussions

Ms. Porter began reiterated that she will be attending the Squire Park Committee meeting. in addition, encouraged other CAC members to do so. She mentioned that the committee is progressing about the transportation discussion and suggested to continue that path.

Dylan Glosecki asked staff to respond to two issues: 1) the ability of the CAC to address the issue of needs; and 2) whether the CAC may recommend denial of the plan in its entirety.

Mr. Sheppard responded that the code states that the CAC can discuss and comment on the needs of the institution etc. However, the Code also stated that need is not negotiable and cannot be the basis for delaying the CAC's recommendation etc. Essentially the Institution defines its need and while the CAC can review and comment on that, including question it. However ultimately the CAC's recommendation is based on achieving a balance. Swedish Medical Center presented its need to the CAC early in the process and the CAC commented. Ultimately, the CAC chose to base their recommendations on the appropriateness of the proposed development to the neighborhood determined that it would not be bound by needs calculations. He briefly went over the process at Children's and noted that they came to the same conclusion, as this CAC appears to be coming to. The CAC is doing nothing wrong.

With regards to rejecting the MIMP, Mr. Sheppard stated that the Hearing Examiner can do that and the CAC can recommend that the Hearing Examiner do so. The Hearing Examiner has the ability refer the Plan back to the Department of Planning and Development and/or CAC for further revisions etc.

Ms. Porter noted that she agreed with the comments that many of the recommendations appear weak in the EIS. Ms. Stephanie Haines responded that the EIS is a tool to inform decision. DPD will produce a Director's report that will take information from the EIS and put it into enforceable language.

David Letrondo noted that he lives near Children's Hospital and noted that traffic is difficult there too. He stated that it is his observation that traffic impacts from all development are increasing City-wide. Current intersections will be worse due to safety reason and it is

happening all over the City of Seattle; traffic is going everywhere and it is unsafe. Mr. Cosentino responded that the Integration Transportation Board (ITB) came up with different facets and believe that it will have an impact to resolve these issues.

Ms. Porter stated that DPD should not issue building permits unless certain thresholds are met. Ashleigh Kilcup agreed.

Andy Cosentino noted that the Integrated Transportation Board identified a variety of actions; not any one action will likely solve the congestions problem Ashleigh Kilcup responded that the only thing that will work is to make it uncomfortable for people to use Single Occupancy Vehicles. Creating a discomfort will require some actions that people are uncomfortable advocating.

Dean Patton also agreed that the traffic is getting worse and the height, bulk and scale is inappropriate. Unfortunately, Swedish credibility is negatively affected by its poor track record for the past 20 years.

Elliott Smith asked the Transpo representative whether there is a specific growth level for development in this area that would be the trigger for intersections going to level of service F. Transpo staff responded that there is a calculation done for each intersection. The City has no defined threshold for when level of service justifies remedial actions. Instead, it is a wide range of factors that weigh in on this. Trip generation were based on staffing levels and it is tied to the square footage. As each project or phases that comes in the impacts of that project will have to be reviewed. The remedial action can be amended with each of these evaluations. This is done for each individual Master Use Permit. The function of each intersection is a result both of background growth and the addition of development at Swedish.

Discussion then turned to setbacks. Steve Sheppard reminded the CAC an important issue and requires careful consideration regarding sections and setbacks as important as height, bulk and scale. Kati Porter asked for information concerning how other CAC's have treated setbacks Steve Sheppard replied with a few examples from other institutions. He noted that the other CAC's often looked a site lines and how both ground and upper level setbacks affected views from nearby.

Mr. John Jex commented that in prior conversations, the design has increased the landscape buffer along the rear of the 18th Avenue half-block to push the building back. There were a lot of conversation regarding desirability and safe environment and asked for deep setbacks. He also noted that in other locations the Committee expressed the desire to bring street level activity out to the sidewalk to create a more lively environment. Members agreed with the greater setbacks along that half-block and noted that there was discussion about street activations including use of canopies etc.

Ms. Porter commented that it has been awhile since the CAC talked about setbacks and she recalled conversations about proposed setbacks on 15th and 16th block and upper level should have dramatic setbacks. This body needs to decide what acceptable setbacks is. After further brief discussion concerning measurement methodology, the Committee determined that this issue required a great deal more detailed discussion and that there was both insufficient time and information to do this in the short time remaining at the

meeting. Therefore, this issue would be scheduled for consideration at a future date when the entire meeting could be devoted to it.

V. Adjournment

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

DRAFT