



# Minutes #10

(Adopted October 10, 2018)

## **Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

Wednesday, September 19, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17<sup>th</sup> Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

### **Members and Alternate Present:**

Julia Blum

Justin Kliewer

Catherine Koehn

Claire Lane

Kevin Klauer

### **Staff and Other Present:**

Maureen Sheehan – DON

Emily Ehlers - SDOT

Ann Sutphin - SDOT

David West – Swedish

Carly Guillory - SDCI

---

### **1. Opening and Introductions**

Ms. Julia Blum opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

### **2. Housekeeping**

A motion was made to adopt the August 8 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

### **3. Meeting #9 Follow-up**

Ms. Blum opened the discussion on Meeting #9 follow-ups and updates.

### **Campus Activity Updates**

See attached

### **Communication Plan**

Ms. Maureen Sheehan spoke with Ms. Sherry Williams and she informed her that the Swedish website is currently going through an approval process and it will be available as soon as it is ready to go live. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that Ms. Williams is also working on the postcards and asked if the Committee would like to review the postcards before sending it out. Ms. Claire Lane commented that the Committee already provided their feedback at the last meeting and it will be okay for Swedish to go and send them. The Committee members agreed.

## **Schedule & Context**

Ms. Sheehan commented that the Committee will be reviewing the revised annual report and the draft comments to SDCI on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue design. The annual report is a disclosure document and the Committee does not need to take any action. She noted that representatives from the City and Swedish are available to answer any questions. Any feedback about the annual report will be helpful for next year's reporting.

The draft comment letter on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue design, she noted the Committee will be reviewing the comments provided by each of the members. There will be no formal presentation since the information has already been shared by the Design team at previous meetings. The goal is for the Committee formulate and review its comments for SDCI to take into consideration when reviewing the MUP application.

Ms. Claire Lane commented that this is the first time she will be reviewing the comment letter and it does not give her enough time to review the letter. Ms. Sheehan responded that the draft comment letter is being presented to the Committee for the first time at tonight's meeting to comply with the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA). Any back and forth deliberations by Committee members regarding the comment letter outside of Committee meeting violates the OPMA.

Ms. Lane also commented that she would like a draft agenda to be distributed to the Committee members before the meeting, so members can review and weigh in.

Ms. Lane asked about updates with the communication with the 19<sup>th</sup> avenue neighbors, and Mr. Mikel Hansen mentioned that two letters were mailed out to neighbors adjacent to the property and they are waiting for more responses from the neighbors. He noted that they will do a follow-up. Ms. Lane commented if there is a way the Committee can help so the neighbors can respond such as going to speak with each of the neighbors. Ms. Catherine Koehn asked if a copy of the communications letter be provided to the Committee, so they can choose to distribute them to the neighbors. Mr. Hansen mentioned that he will provide the letter to Ms. Sheehan. Ms. Blum commented that it may have confused the residents since it has Sabey's information on the envelope instead of Swedish. She noted that there is a neighborhood activist that has the mailing lists of all the neighbors and could ask them to pay close attention to the emails and letters from Sabey or Swedish regarding collaboration on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue so they could respond.

## **4. Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP Annual Report**

Ms. Blum opened the discussion on the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP Annual Report.

Ms. Blum and Ms. Koehn asked about the transit capacity analysis and if there are any update since it was last conducted in 2014. Swedish is in the process of doing a new transit capacity analysis and it will be shared when it becomes available. Ms. Emily Ehlers of SDOT noted that each new development requires an analysis of potential impact when an institution applies for a MUP application. A response was made that the transit capacity analysis was about the Commute program under the TMP that shows transit use availability for existing users. These are two different items with similar names.

Ms. Lane asked about the time lag when applying for a building permit and how soon any impacts to transit are documented. Ms. Ehlers noted that every institution or developer will analyze potential impacts on new development and if they find that there is a significant impact, a mitigation analysis is done to minimize the

impact. She noted that they do not have enough information about potential transit impact on the 18<sup>th</sup> Ave project. When Swedish submits their MUP, Swedish will do a transportation analysis and SDOT and the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB) will review it and identify the impacts and mitigation.

Ms. Koehn commented that the transportation capacity analysis for 2017 is a work in progress, and Ms. Ehlers noted that the current condition on the project is vague since Swedish does not have enough information about the building and the traffic patterns in the project area which is needed before the transportation capacity analysis can be completed. Ms. Blum commended that any transportation capacity analysis update will be in the 2018 annual report. Ms. Ehlers noted that the annual report reflects changes within the major institution overlay. She added that the Committee may see an update in the capacity analysis when they see the MUP application.

Ms. Blum inquired about the utilization survey and if it is in progress and the response was that Swedish is currently working on it and it will have the results completed by the end of the year. A comment was made the ITB reviewed the preliminary report and the members noted that there were no questions or concerns and asked Swedish to proceed with the process.

Ms. Blum asked how does this affect Swedish/Sabey's progress against the TMP since the analysis is not complete. Ms. Ehlers responded it is one of the elements and requirements for the TMP. The TMP is an ongoing program that Swedish needs to carry out to reach the goal of reducing the drive alone rate which is an established goal. She also mentioned the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) analysis that is done every two years. This additional analysis using the survey results provides a gap analysis on areas that needs refinement to encourage more people to use the transit services. She noted that she has seen the work and it is optimistic about the progress that Swedish has done regarding their commute program.

Ms. Blum commented that since the analysis is not fully complete, will the application process slow down and how will the Committee know if progress is being made. A response was made that the ITB is working closely on the results and the data and will provide the information by the end of the year.

Ms. Lane commented that she appreciates Swedish effort to go way beyond the code requires for bicycle parking infrastructure since the issue of bicycle and bicycle parking has come up in several conversations regarding commute reduction.

A comment was made about cross-training the ITB members to focus on these parking issues to come up with possible solutions. There was also a comment that the ITB has done great work with the analysis and they will have the opportunity to present these results to this Committee when it is ready.

Ms. Blum commented about by LabCorp and NW Kidney regarding non-compliance with their transit subsidies, and the response was that they are having conversations with both LabCorp and NW Kidney to identify opportunities to bring their incentives into compliance.

Ms. Koehn commented about the inconsistencies regarding the transit subsidies for Swedish Cherry Hill, and the response that Swedish Cherry Hill Campus and Swedish Medical Group are subsidizing more than the required goal. Ms. Koehn would like to have clarification between the Swedish Medical Campus versus Swedish Medical Group at the next report.

Ms. Blum asked about if there has been progress regarding vendors parking on the street, and the response was that Swedish is currently updating the vendor policies regarding parking to ensure that they are

following procedures and understand. A comment was made that the ambassadors are going through the neighborhoods to check for non-compliance. Mr. David West commented that this is a concern and he would like to see a report to ensure that these vendors are accountable. Ms. Lane suggested having periodic reminders about what they are looking for since some parked cars are unmarked and they do not know if they are vendors, pharmaceutical suppliers, etc. Mr. West acknowledged that unmarked cars parked in the neighborhood is a challenge for the ambassadors and he does not want to police the neighborhood since there are also several businesses around the area that are not from Swedish, but noted that he will address those concerns.

Ms. Blum commented about neighborhood parking reduction and reducing the amount of unrestricted parking and if whether Swedish/Sabey or the City instilling parking limits to deter people from parking at these spots. Ms. Ehlers commented that she will follow up with Ms. Sheehan with more information.

Ms. Lane asked about real time reader board for bus and any updates regarding installation. She noted that she was closely working with Swedish and Sabey on preserving existing bus stops and adding trash receptacles. She also added about transit screens that is available in the lobby to show bus schedules. She noted that she will follow up regarding real time information at bus stops.

Ms. Lane noted that the revised annual report version is easier to track across the MIMMP and thanked the City Departments for working on the first draft.

Ms. Koehn asked for any updates regarding the placement of recycle receptacles and Swedish noted that they are going through the system in improving the recycle program. A comment was made that the current bus stop improvements including receptacles are under the street improvement permit, it is an SDOT permit.

Ms. Koehn asked about any updates on the parking policy that would encourage employees not to park in residential neighborhoods, and a response was made that Swedish is looking at creative and innovative programs for this year and more information will be available in the next report.

## **5. Public Comment**

Ms. Blum opened the discussion for public comments.

**(Editor's Note: The comments shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in voice recording (.mp3) form)**

**Comments from Vicky Schiantarelli:** Ms. Schiantarelli commented about transitional design and she provided examples of these designs for the Committee to look at. She asked Ms. Sheehan to provide copies to the Committee for reference. She also commented that the proposed structure on 18<sup>th</sup> is different from the neighborhood and the residents in the area, and it does not completely blend or fit the neighborhood. She would like to see a more blending transitional feature. She noted that it does not have to be brick. She also acknowledged and thanked Sabey for reaching out to the neighbors regarding the fence and plantings.

**Comments from Bob Cooper:** Mr. Cooper commented that an incentive is not a subsidy. He noted that subsidy is a reduction on the transit pass price. He asked about what will happen if a vendor is found parking in the neighborhood. There was a discussion about not allowing a vendor to enter the Swedish campus if

they cannot provide a parking stub or needs to check in. He mentioned about the RPZ and if there is a process to extend the RPZ on both sides of the block. He commented about the neighborhood parking reduction and mentioned that the institution can subsidized additional parking patrol officers to patrol the neighborhood. He asked if the institution can strive to subsidize bus lines and additional Metro Transit. He mentioned that the bus stop on the south side of Jefferson is vaguely maintained and the shelter needs to be upgraded.

## **6. Committee Deliberation**

Ms. Blum opened the discussion on committee deliberation.

Ms. Blum instructed the Committee to review the draft document and the Committee will allocate time to discuss any overarching points and themes and aligned them for form a cohesive and unifying document. After the Committee reviews the draft document, a member of the Committee can incorporate the changes to review at the next meeting.

Mr. Kliewer commented that his initial approach is making sure that the draft letter is robust regarding the design guidelines and what the Committee is really asking was very helpful and informative.

Mr. Kliewer asked if the Committee does not reach a consensus, will there be an opportunity for the Committee to come back with Swedish and Sabey and say that the Committee does not recommend or support the design and go through the process for changes. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that this has happened and noted that it is not a question about approving or denying the design, it is a way for the Committee to comment on what they like and do not like and SDCI will work with Sabey to come to a consensus.

Ms. Blum urged the members to refrain from using the language of approving and denying the design but rather focus on the concerns and issues and highlight what the Committee likes. The Committee is making a recommendation and it is not about voting yes or no on the design.

Ms. Lane noted that there is a consensus among the Committee members regarding the overarching general design guidelines, character, eliminating the blank walls, the good use of compatible palettes and respecting the historical context of the institution and the neighborhood.

Ms. Lane noted that there are ongoing issues regarding the health walk, and Ms. Sheehan noted that she will follow up with the City regarding this issue.

The Committee commented about clarifying and making strong statements about the proximity of the building to the resident's backyards, the transition of the buildings into the communities, street activation and frontage, the open seating area that is proposed on 18<sup>th</sup> and the same work to be done along Cherry, the resting areas at the hill climb on Cherry and Jefferson, and the ability of the building to interact with the streets. The Committee commented about clarifications regarding the revised entry points and further review on street activation.

Ms. Lane volunteered to take the next round of drafting the comment letter. Ms. Sheehan asked the Committee to send their suggestions to her by Friday, September 28<sup>th</sup> and Ms. Lane and will incorporate them, and the revised draft letter will be reviewed at the next meeting. Ms. Lane suggested to make a reference to the specific guidelines when making a comment and have a heading and also suggested to liberally use the comments along with track changes function when making updates to the document.

**7. Meeting #11 Agenda & Adjournment**

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