



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 #24  
 January 15, 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	Patrick Angus
J Elliot Smith	Linda Carol	Maja Hadlock
Raleigh Watts		

**Members and Alternates Absent**

David Letrondo	Ashleigh Kilcup	Laurel Spellman
----------------	-----------------	-----------------

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	

*(See sign-in sheet)*

**I. Housekeeping**

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed. The agenda was approved without changes. Ms. Porter noted that the main purpose of tonight's meeting was to receive a briefing on the Draft Report of the Director of the City's Department of Planning and Development.

**II. Presentation of the Draft Report of the Director of DPD**

Stephanie Haines from the Department of Planning and Development was introduced to provide a brief presentation of the draft report of the Director of DPD. She briefly read the major recommendations. The full report is included in these minutes as attachment 1

Following Ms. Haines reading of the directors report recommendations, Katie Porter commented that many of the recommended conditions appeared acceptable, but that one of the major issues remains enforcement. The Director needs to identify more enforcement mechanism in the event that Swedish is unable to meet the identified

conditions. Ms. Haines responded that DPD does measure performance and the institution have to respond and show that they are making improvements.

Dylan Glosecki asked if a Standing Advisory Committee will be active before the first developmental proposal is brought forward. Steve Sheppard responded that the Standing Advisory Committee would be in place to review development proposals. After the City Council adopted the plan, the CAC is done. Existing CAC members will be asked if they wish to serve terms on the Standing Advisory Committee. After the City Council adopted the plan, the CAC is done.

Steve Sheppard also noted tht the Committee presently differs in major ways from the Draft Director's Report. The Committee has recommended significantly lower heights and there has been a clear indication that setbacks will also be reduced. Therefore the Committee presently disagrees with the conclusion of the Director that the plan should be adopted with the heights proposed in Alternative 12 and setbacks. The Committee's position is currently between that of the neighbors and Swedish. He asked if that was the general consensus of the Committee that Alternative 12 needed further amendments related to heights and setbacks if it is to be adopted. There were not objections raised.

Mr. Glosecki recommends that possible language around design guidelines should have some teeth to it. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that the Standing Advisory Committee will act as a "design review board lite". They will review and comment on the design of individual buildings but will not have the same enforcement authority of a City Design Review Boards.

### III. Public Comments

The floor was opened to public comments.

**Comments from Troy Meyers:** Mr. Meyers said that he appreciated the efforts of Ms. Haines and he would like to see or consider to add an independent external auditor to look at the procedures when certain conditions are met as part of the annual design compliance report.

**Comments from Vicky Schianterelli:** Ms Schianterelli noted that the ratio between patients and employees that are being proposed at this plan. In the current proposed ration for patients versus employees used in the calculations. Other institutions use ratios closer to 60% patients and 40% employees when calculating the amount of parking provided. Here the ratio is 80% employees. This calls into questions how much of this campus is actually devoted to patient care. This campus should be oriented to patient care not other uses.

**Comments from Ken Torp:** Mr. Torp commented that his relationship with Swedish is not always adversarial. What has been presented from DPD is from the dark side. There was nothing in the draft report about height, bulk, scale and it has been consistent testimonies from the neighbors about balancing the needs of the institution and the neighborhood. The CAC has now the responsibility to respond and to comment to this report. He asked the CAC can stand up for the neighbors, for the Squire Park Community Council, for the SEIU, etc. It major issue is not the detailed mitigation but the bulk, height and scale. The CAC should not get lost to the Traffic Management Plan and that this plan is still too big and would encourage the CAC to look at the plan again and enforce your mandate and listen to the neighbors.

**Comments from Jerry Matsui:** Mr. Matsui agreed with Mr. Torp's comments. It is interesting the two years has been discussing this issues, and where the plan has gone is to the point where it should have started with negotiations down from there. We have wasted two years. This feels too familiar. Promises are made and not kept and the neighborhood is not respected. The institution have not mitigated anything in the plan or reduced possible adverse impacts. The projected use of the campus is not focused on hospital use but medical office and related services. He would like to see how will all these come about and have it reduced or break down further.

**Comments from Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod stated that Ms. Haines's DPD presentation is unacceptable. This report lays the groundwork for appeal to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner and the City ensures that the process is authentic and meaningful, and not a sham. The recommendation presented from DPD does not reflect the CAC recommendations nor the neighborhood's. It is insulting. There appears to be no intention to balance the needs and vitality of the neighborhood. DPD has gone toward the institution. It essentially grants the institution everything it wants and ignores both the neighborhood and CAC. She call upon the CAC to not to give up, and to remember that their recommendations are independent and can stand alone. The Hearing Examiner should pay attention to the CAC. The DPD's recommendations are unresponsive. The CAC should declare the DPD report to be inadequate and unresponsive.

**Comments from Xochitl Maykovich:** Ms. Maykovich stated that she was with Washington Can and that she would focus on the results of the Squire Park Community Council meeting on this process. One of the discussion is about community benefits. Swedish has failed on this area regarding charity care. She suggested that Swedish should do some racial and equity impact studies due to the expansion that concerns height, bulk, and scale. She mentioned that Swedish should meet their obligation to equally serve the community and consider their needs throughout this expansion process.

**Comments from Murray Anderson:** Mr. Anderson agreed with all of the previous comments. He agree on what Ms. Porter had mentioned about an enforcement mechanism. Swedish is going to get a pass, that there is nothing written that states "you shall" or "you must". The CAC must put forth a strong recommendation to reflect what the neighborhood is saying all along. Also, he mentioned about hearing the sound of construction and demolition traffic, and is discouraged about how this will be the future of his neighborhood.

#### **IV. Committee Discussions**

Discussion then returned to the Committees initial reactions to the proposal. The discussion started with a discussion of process and timing.

Steve Sheppard directed members attention to the matrix of the recommendations pulled from the Directors report (Attachment 2 to these notes). Prior to the next meeting members should look at each of the recommendations and suggest those areas where the proposed changes or comments to them. He suggested that members forward their initial comments to him and that he would consolidate them into a document to become the basis for the detailed discussion at the upcoming meeting on January 29<sup>th</sup>. A week later, the CAC will have a letter to Ms. Haines about what their comments. Mr. Sheppard noted that there was agreement on height, bulk, and scale on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block. Various members commented that the timeline is very tight and that they did not feel that they had sufficient

time to properly consider comments. Katie Porter agreed but noted that the timeline appears to be no longer flexible.

Mr. Sheppard stated that the CAC's response to the Draft Directors Report is Due March 5, but that this is not the CAC's final report. The Committee's final report is not just a critique of Ms. Haine's DPD report, but an independent report. It stands alone. The CAC will have to craft recommendations that are not dealt by Ms. Haines and will have an equal standing with both the City and the Institution's report. He asked members to forward their draft comments to him by the January 26<sup>th</sup>. The goal for the meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> identify all comments so that the CAC's Letter could be completed on time.

He noted that his job is to write up that report and support the CAC's positions in the most effective way possible. CAC member can put forward minority reports that will be attached as an appendix to the CAC's final report.

Patrick Angus asked when the final report goes to the Hearing Examiner, and how much weigh it would have before the Hearing Examiner. He also asked how the neighborhood can present their positions. Mr. Sheppard responded that the Hearing Examiner will conduct a public Hearing and that anyone can present to the Hearing Examiner. The neighborhood could make a coordinates presentation to the Hearing Examiner. CAC members that have minority reports comes forward and speak. The Hearing Examiner takes the CAC's recommendations into account and the CAC final report is one of the three key documents before the Hearing Examiner. The CAC will have an opportunity to present their report to the Hearing Examiner at the hearing.

Dean Patton asked why the CAC prepares two documents (response to the Draft Director's Report and Committee Final Report). Mr. Sheppard responded that the Code requires both. The CAC has the opportunity to respond to the draft DPD report. Ms. Haines comes back and produce the final report and then the CAC will develop their reaction to her final report and its own positions.

Members asked how often the CAC's recommendation match those put forward by the Intuition. Mr. Sheppard responded that it varies. About 70% or more of the time and the CAC substantially agrees with the institution with minor changes. Others asked how often DPD's reports support the institution. Mr. Sheppard responded that it varies, but DPD is often, but not always, closer to the institution than the CAC.

Discussion then returned to General Comment.

Raleigh Watts commented about the increase in ridership and the insufficient capacity, and asked what can the CAC to in order to increase transit capacity as a recommendation. He noted that the Director's report contained few recommendations related to increase transit in the area. Mr. Haines responded that the basis for the recommendations was drawn from the EIS and the work of Transpo Group and SDOT. She noted that there was additional transit tied to the Children's Hospital Master Plan including increased shuttle service. The CAC can look into adding shuttle services or determine what type of conditions that will provide funds for more transportation.

Mr. Watts stated that in his opinion that the section in the plan and the Draft Director's Report does not include sufficient conditions addressing transit capacity. He will recommend in his comments that the CAC state this and that the Director's report be

amended to include conditions related to this issue including both additional transit capacity more shuttle services from Swedish.

Ms. Porter noted that she remained concerned about tying achievement of benchmarks related to transportation improvements to development phases. Ms. Haines responded that this can be recommended in certain situation and on certain conditions. This is usually done in reviewing each development as it comes forward.

Mr. Watts stated that he was not satisfied with the treatment of the sky-bridge in the Director's report. Ms. Haines responded that this process does not approve the sky bridge. A separate process is required.

Several members asked for clarification on both reporting back to the Standing Advisory Committee and what enforcement is included. Ms. Haines responded that DPD is required to publish annual reports each year and that they are reviewed by the Standing Advisory Committee. The annual report summarizes the development done in the Master Plan. The annual report only sees TMP compliance and what has been developed. If the CAC wants to see either additional reporting or changes to the format then it could recommend such.

James Schell noted that the transportation sections identify major arterials that are evaluated but failed to include 23th Avenue and some others. He stated that he would raise this issue for the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Raleigh Watts comment was made about the SOV goals and the 1% reduction every 2 years. Another section states that Swedish will be allowed a lesser goal if the others in the area fail to meet some general CTR goal. He objected and stated that Swedish should be leader rather than a follower. Ms. Haines mentioned that the CTR goal is set by SDOT and most of the businesses that has 20 or more employees do not have a TMP. SOV goals are based on available transportation and SDOT believes it is an acceptable service. There was additional discussion and members noted that this should be a major discussion at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting and possibly in the Committee's Final Report.

Mr. Watts stated that he would like to move that:

DPD inadequately addresses increased transit ridership and that in order to accommodate a transit use increase, Swedish participation in funding for increase increased transit capacity is necessary.

Ms. Porter stated that stated that there was insufficient information to make this decision at this meeting and suggested that it be dealt with on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Members agreed.

Ms. Porter asked Mr. Cosentino for information from ITB that shows the proposed action items. Mr. Cosentino responded that he would provide that information to Mr. Glosecki.

## **V. Adjournment**

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