



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
 Majo 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 #21

November 20, 2014

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Dean Patton	Dylan Glosecki	Lara Branigan
Leon Garnett	James Schell	J Elliot Smith
Laurel Spelman	Linda Carol	Patrick Angus
Raleigh Watts	Dave Letrondo	

Members and Alternates Absent

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	
Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT	

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Katie Porter opened the meeting and briefly went over the agenda. Ms. Porter noted that a new Alternative 12 had been developed and that the meeting would including a presentation of Alternative 12.

The minutes for Meeting #13 to #19 that were forwarded earlier were - introduced for approval. After brief discussion Mr. Dylan Glosecki moved adoption of minutes #13 through #17. Steve Sheppard noted tht grammatical errors would be taken care of internally at DON and that members need not address those. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Adoption of meeting notes for meetings #18 and #19 were deferred until a future meeting.

II. Transportation Mitigation and Bicycle Pedestrian Safety

Cristina Van Valkenburgh and Reiner Blanco with SDOT Traffic Management division were recognized to discuss Transportation mitigation and bicycle pedestrian safety issues

Mr. Blanco stated that the City evaluates the safety of intersections operations. In the area around the Swedish Cherry Hill campus, the intersections at 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th and 18thand Jefferson and Cherry have been evaluated. Some improvements will be recommended including curb

bulbs and cross walks etc. He noted that many of these areas are priority pedestrian corridors. In addition some remote locations may be ultimately included that are not necessarily directly adjacent to the Cherry Hill Campus.

Ms. Valkenburgh noted that many of the improvements would be tied to implementation of specific projects arising from the master plan. Mr. Blanco noted that the level of improvement and which intersection should be improved are outlined in the guidance document (in this case the EIS and transportation analysis). The actual specifics of the improvement will be determined at the time specific projects are build. The scope of improvements may change up to the time the permits for a specific project growing out of the master plan are approved.

Members asked if this might include traffic mitigation fees. Stephany Haines responded that the City does not generally impose a traffic mitigation fees. When the building comes in for a permit, there will be new environmental review which will include an analysis that looks at specific traffic impacts and includes development of a basic list of traffic mitigations attached to the specific project to be completed at the time the building is constructed.

John Jex stated that Swedish Medical Center had added language indicating its commitment to bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements and its goal to participate with SDOT to achieve such. The information presented at the meeting was taken directly from the EIS. Mr. Blanco also noted that under the Bicycle Master Plan, a greenway along 18th Avenue will be designed with involvement by the surrounding neighbors. Ms. Porter urged Swedish, Providence and Sabey to take this issue seriously. Elliott Smith asked when the greenway might be established. Mr. Blanco responded that it would be 2015 or 2016.

Members noted that in previous discussions the CAC had recommended a possible shift of the bikeway to 19th Avenue and asked if Swedish would support that change. Mr. Cosentino responded that any Swedish position on this depended on the design of the garage. While Swedish could live with either, he gave the opinion that the current preference would be use of 19th Avenue for this purpose. SDOT's recommendation concerning safety would also greatly affect the Swedish position concerning this issue. Dylan Glosecki stated that crosswalks and curb bulbs would be good at almost all major intersections leading to the campus.

Dean Patton stated that it is a given that traffic will get worse and asked how much worse on the scale of 1 to 10 this deterioration of traffic conditions might be. Mr. Blanco responded that he could not say, but SDOT has been aggressive in advocating that other modes of transportation be available to help mitigate future traffic congestion. Stephanie Haines acknowledged that traffic impacts will increase and it is up to Swedish to identify how they would mitigate those impacts attributable to their development.

Ms. Spelman stated that about 15 years ago, there was a project on 12th Avenue where pedestrian improvements were made and the situation was greatly improved. However broader underlying background traffic citywide has continued to grow.

Discussion turned to TMP compliance Ms. Porter noted that Cherry Hill is not currently in compliance. Katie Porter asked what enforcement might be used to assure compliance with TMP goals. Ms. Haines responded that DPD has discussed holding building permits but is not committed to that.

III. SMC Presentation of new Alternative 12

Mr. Cosentino stated that SMC is continuously modifying proposals and considering changes so long as they still achieve adequate square footage to meet Swedish's future needs. Particular attention is being given to the west tower, between 16th and 15th and modifications to the 18th Avenue half block.

Mr. John Jex briefly summarized Alternative 12. He noted that the main difference is in the west block. Setbacks are increased on 15th with the tower back an additional 5 ft.

Concerning the 18th Avenue half-block, he noted that in conversations with the Committee it was clear that a 37 foot height was considered most appropriate, as well as significant modulation to make the development appear as several buildings. The institution has tried to work within those parameters. As a result most of the block is now 37 feet. However, in order to preserve level floor plates, very small portions project above 37 feet where topography forces that. For instance the building is depressed at Cherry below 37 feet but with the downhill slope exceeds 37 feet slightly just north of the 15 foot height central break. A similar situation develops south of that dropped area near Jefferson Street.

There are no changes in the center block between Alternative 11 and 12 and the square footage remains at 2,750,000.

Mr. Jex noted that further efforts are ongoing to better define the design guidelines and create architectural character that mitigates bulk and scale.

Mr. Mike Rimoin provided a brief update on the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB). The ITB is working on employee vendor parking policies, as well as the Live Close To Work program. Ms. Porter asked whether this program include all ranges of employees. Mr. Rimoin responded that it includes all employees. Mr. Rimoin also noted that the ITB is currently working on the purchase of parking enforcement vehicles to enforce proposed prohibition of employee parking in the neighborhood' exploration of possible changes to RPZ timing, and expanding shuttle operations. The latter included working with the City to identify where the shuttle stops would be.

IV. Public Comments

Ms. Porter opened the floor for public comments.

Comments from Jack Hansen: Mr. Hansen thanked the members of the CAC for their continued service. Mr. Hansen stated that the new Alternative 12 is still completely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. He also commented that Swedish/Providence has not demonstrate a need for an institutional expansion under the MIMP; and the Appendix G on the draft MIMP does not show genuine evidence of a need for a 2.75 million sq. ft. of space.

Comments from Tom Wasserman: Mr. Wasserman stated that the reason the process has dragged on, and the neighborhood remained so opposed, is because of the involvement of Sabey Corporation. Mr. Wassermann purchased his home in 1992 knowing that the Sisters of Providence stood across the street. Shortly thereafter the Sisters of Providence choose to sell much of their properties to Sabey. Now they claim that they need more space. Sabey envisions a downtown style medical office complex that includes retail space, not hospital space. Sabey's plans are more commercial and this is a major difference between this process and others. This is completely wrong for this neighborhood and the City of Seattle. The expansion should be limited to hospital use only.

Comments from Jerry Matsui: Mr. Matsui read a letter from Olivette Taylor. (Letter included in record of correspondence). Mr. Matsui noted that Ms. Olivette was very critical and dissatisfied and did not support the expansion of Swedish due to the problems it will create in the neighborhood. Mr. Matsui provided a copy of the letter to Mr. Sheppard and Ms. Porter for reference.

Comments from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod noted various letters she had send to the CAC describing the precedent set by the Office of the Hearing Examiner regarding Children's Hospital. Ms. Sollod also mentioned a letter she sent to Ms. Haines, Mr. Sheppard and members of the CAC that addressed relative to the design guidelines and the relationship to the Children's guidelines; that Alternative 12 is just more like a lipstick on the pig and it does not improve the surroundings, and it

is still the same 2.75 million sq. ft. This amount of development is just simply too great and the cause of most disagreements here.

Comments from Mary Pat Deliva: Ms. Deliva stated that there is still not enough parking in the neighborhood and it is still a disaster should this expansion go forward.

Comments from Sonya Richter: Ms. Richter stated that she continues to have concerns about the mitigation that is happening on 18th. However, while much attention has been paid to that edge of campus there has been less attention to other edges. She noted that she lives on 17th Avenue north of the Campus. Huge buildings are proposed and the CAC needs to pay much more attention to that edge of the Campus. She also presented an article describing how a huge development with large buildings bring forth a nuisance to neighborhood.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen thanked the CAC for their service and acknowledged that this is a big project for the CAC members to take on. She stated that in her opinion, alternative 12 is just a shell game; moving the height from one part of the campus to another. A 150 ft. building on 15th Avenue is outrageous. She noted that the City's comprehensive area for major growth – Urban Villages. Squire Park is not identified as an urban village and it is not set-up as an employer. She also noted that the traffic diagram that was presented showed the pedestrian routes along Cherry and Jefferson Streets, but there was no north/south routes shown. She also stated that both setbacks and transitions are not being adequately addressed and the neighborhood asked for separate buildings and not for the movement in height and the neighborhood also asked for lower heights on 15th avenue.

Comments from Greg Harmon: Mr. Harmon thanked the CAC member for their continued efforts. He noted that neither alternatives 11 and 12 resolve problems with the lack of adequate transitions to for the surrounding low rise single family community. Height, bulk, and scale are still too great and setback insufficient. He also noted that Squire Park is not identified as an urban village.

Comments from Lori Lucky: Ms. Lucky agreed with Ms. Sollod's comments that the square footage at 2.75 million is inappropriate. She also noted that the neighborhood will have to accommodate 2,000 plus cars and people that will be showing up.

Comments from Aleeta Van Petten: Ms. Van Petten stated that after months of testimony, consensus has not been achieved. She noted that the success of this expansion can only be achieved if the vitality and livability of the neighborhood is protected. She described this process as David versus Goliath, where Swedish and Sabey is Goliath and the neighborhood as David. She encouraged the CAC members to take action, make an ethical choice and try to be objective and do the right thing. She noted that this expansion would ruin the neighborhood and asked that Swedish and Sabey expand elsewhere where they can thrive. She also commented that her testimony be entered in the public record.

VI. Committee Discussions

Ms. Porter noted that the issue of urban village designation had arisen and asked for clarification. Ms. Haines noted that the comprehensive plan, allows a major institution outside of an urban village. For instance, Children's Hospital is not located in an urban village and the Hearing Examiner could not deny the expansion based on whether or not it is located on an urban village. Mr. Sheppard noted that both the Hearing Examiner and the City Council decided that the purpose of the major institution code was to allow development of Major Institutions regardless whether they are within an urban village or not.

Dave Letrondo asked to be recognized. Ms. Porter stated that he was a Citywide representative from outside of the neighborhood and that she wanted to hear from neighbors on the Committee first. Mr.

Letrondo responded that he felt that was not right. Ms. Porter reiterated her position and recognized Dean Patton.

Mr. Patton commented that it still seemed inappropriate for the major institution' to become so large that it would have such adverse impacts to the neighborhood. Mr. Patton argued that gridlock and congested intersection does not minimize adverse impacts and that these are serious impacts that degrades the quality of life of the community.

Mr. Letrondo stated that he did not appreciate being bullied by Ms. Porter, and would like to have his comment inserted in the minutes. Mr. Sheppard reminded the CAC that all members are appointed as individuals and have an equal voice in this process.

Mr. Letrondo noted about the intent of the urban village is to promote growth in certain areas and that supporting facilities should be correctly planned so that the infrastructure and the building types can be intensified in specific areas, for example, West Seattle.

Mr. Sheppard responded that the intent of the urban village under the comprehensive plan was to accommodate additional growth established by the Puget Sound Regional Council through the Growth Management Act and thus identify portions of town which would accept specifically greater density, greater housing, and buildings with an understanding that there will be infrastructure improvements. Most of the Urban Villages have neighborhood plans tht identify needed priority public improvements.

Ms. Spelman asked Mr. Jex how many beds are proposed,. She mentioned that there is a license from the state for 385 beds and that it takes a height of 160 ft. to accommodate these 385 beds. Mr. Jex responded that the campus currently is licensed to have 385 beds. The west center bloc hospital block is 160 ft. That level of development will provide state of the art, single care patient rooms for 385 patients. The medical center and the nursing units go back in the 1960's and are very out of date, way too small and cannot provide the type of care that is needed that is why an expansion is needed.

Mr. Patton stated that there appeared to be two competing goals; 1) preservation of low rise single family neighborhood, and 2) concentration of medical facilities in one spot. If Swedish had acknowledged the obvious conflict between those two competing goals at the beginning of the process, perhaps the level of contention associated with the proposed 3.1 million sq. ft. of development could have been avoided. Mr. Patton noted that it is a complicated issue and noted that just because the state has licensed the facility to have 385 beds, does not mean that a low rise single family neighborhood can handle this kind of expansion.

Mr. Glosecki noted that there are other important issues that need to be addressed in order to move forward Such as public benefits and transportation issues.

Ms. Porter began to ask a question about taking votes concerning heights. She suggested votes on each area.

Mr. Raleigh Watts asked if alternative 12 was the final alternative. Mr. Cosentino responded that Alternative 12, is what the Committee will see in the final MIMP.

There was considerable discussion of how to proceed with votes on alternative 12. Mr. Sheppard noted that votes at this point establish quasi final positions, but that members would be free to change their positions up until the publication of the Committee's final report. That report is the last item completed. He noted that minority reports are also allowed. Ms. Porter noted that there are sufficient differences between alternative 11 and 12 that it might be difficult to get to a full vote at this meeting. Ms. Haines noted that the timeline remains unchanged and Mr. Glosecki observed that it might prove necessary to have additional meetings. Mr. Sheppard noted that interim meeting were not uncommon at this period.

After further discussion, members agreed to devote the next meeting completely to votes on alternative 12 height, bulks and scale for each of the major blocks. Mr. Sheppard provided a summary of the following items where the Committee members do not have any consensus, and these are: 1) the west block; 2) central campus and 3) 18th half block north. In many cases there is agreement on many areas with a few exceptions. He suggested that the focus be on the areas where there was not agreement. That was the height of the 160 foot tower in the Center block, the height of the west block and some issues on 18th. Mr. Glosecki agreed to update the matrix and that we would go forward from there.

VI. Adjournment

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