



Minutes #19

(Adopted August 14, 2019)

Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, July 10, 2019

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Justin Kliewer

Claire Lane

Greg Swinton

Amanda Twiss

Lisa Fitzhugh

Staff and Other Present:

Laura Jenkins – DON

Mike Hanson – Sabey

Mike Denney – Swedish

Carly Guillory - SDCI

1. Opening and Introductions

Mr. Justin Kliewer opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

Ms. Laura Jenkins is filling in for Mr. Nelson Pesigan's absence and she is a staff person from the Department of Neighborhoods.

Mr. James Welcher no longer part of the Committee, Ms. Lisa Fitzhugh will move from an alternate to a regular member, open discussion about Committee make up

2. Housekeeping (3:00)

There was a motion to adopt the June 12, 2019 minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

ITB Report:

Mr. Kliewer mentioned that Mr. Kevin Klauer informed him that he will not be able to attend tonight's meeting. Mr. Klauer will present a brief summary of the report at the next meeting.

Meeting #19 Context & Schedule:

Mr. Kliewer noted that the context of tonight's meeting is to have Ms. Carly Guillory of SDCI do a quick presentation and a conversation about the hotel use decision.

3. Sanctuary Hotel Use at Cherry Hill (06:00)

Ms. Guillory asked Mr. Kliewer about the Committee's position and how the questions around the hotel's permitted use came about.

Ms. Lane commented that the developer's presentation and Swedish's comments about how the hotel is going to be used are unclear. She noted that according to the meeting notes in 2016, the City asked the developer about their plans and guidance to ensure that the hotel use is for patients and families only and not the general public, and the Committee has not seen this guidance from the developers throughout the design review process and questioned about how the hotel use fits in the specific guidance of the MIMP.

Ms. Lisa Fitzhugh commented about the lack of trust and communication and hopes that there is transparency across the board regarding the issue of the hotel. She would like to see that the goal of this Committee is to be a bridge between the community and Swedish and not as a barrier. She would like to know the City's perspective on the hotel use as outlined in the MIMP.

Mr. Kliewer commented about the initial minutes from the November 2016 meeting that asked the developer about a programmatic detail on how the hotel will be available to patients and families only and not the general public. He asked if the requirements were met according to the MIMP. The Committee's concern was from the letter that was submitted to SDCI and not providing details about hotel use.

Ms. Guillory mentioned that SDCI began having a conversation with the developer in 2016. In her recent review of the MIMP, the MIMP identifies the hotel as a permitted use as a projection of additional patients and the hotel is intended for patients and families. She did not see the term "exclusively", and this is the opportunity from the Committee to hear feedback and suggestion on how the applicant can demonstrate that they are going to market and serve patients and families and not the general public.

Ms. Lane commented that in previous conversations during the MIMP process, the hotel is referred to as a patient family hotel and the need of having a hotel due to long term projections of patients and families that will be using Swedish. She mentioned about Mr. Mike Denney's presentation of the future of health care will not be overnight or complex stays. She would like to start having the conversation about how this hotel use complies with the MIMP.

Mr. Mike Denney commented that Swedish will not be marketing the hotel. He noted that the level of acuity is based on the type of procedure that is being done. The cardiology and neurology procedures in the hospital are super high acuity that requires long recovery times. Swedish's whole perspective about the hotel is to support patients and families that need to be close to the campus. He noted that Swedish supports the hotel idea and there will be no other role in marketing.

There was a comment if there are any plans to ask the hotel to produce a monthly or quarterly report about hotel use and determine the percentages from patients and families and the general public. She asked about how will this Committee check to make sure that the hotel complies.

Mr. Denney commented that this is a great opportunity for the Committee to summarize what they would like to see and present it guidance or recommendation to the City Council.

A comment was made that once the analysis is done about the hotel use, what will be the next step. She commented about having a business model for the hotel that would allow hotel use if there is not an overflow of patients and families that will use the hotel. She asked about what does the hospital wants about the hotel that makes sense for patients and families.

Mr. Denney commented that he will have to ask the hotel operator about their part. For Swedish's perspective, is to provide a well-being experience for patients and their families, neighbors, and staff and a reasonable and affordable place to stay that is close to family members. He emphasized that there is no deal between Swedish and the hotel.

Ms. Lane commented that the role of this Committee is to implement the MIMP that was negotiated by the CAC, Swedish and Sabey. She questioned the degree of interdependence between Swedish and the hotel. She noted that the Committee has not seen any explanation or clarification about this degree and what criteria did SDCI use to decide about the permitted use.

Ms. Guillory commented that the Committee agreed that it is a permitted use according to the MIMP, and that was her perspective as well. She added when the applicant applies for the MUP, SDCI can ask how they would demonstrate that the hotel targets only patients and families, and it is functionally integrated to the mission of the institution. There is no formal application has been submitted yet and having this meeting is a good opportunity to gather more feedback and information about the relationship between Swedish and the hotel.

Mr. Kliewer commented that since the hotel is identified as a permitted use in the MIMP, Criteria B does not apply, and Ms. Guillory noted that this section of the MIMP talks about the permitted use, and it is important to look at the overall MIMP. There is a land-use code process in the development of the MIMP that was followed including identifying hotel use, evaluating impacts and development standards. Swedish identified in the MIMP about a hotel use.

Mr. Kliewer noted that there will be more discussion among the Committee members about the hotel use. The goal is to keep moving forward and having this Committee make a recommendation to SDCI and there will be another opportunity during the MUP process to identify the details from the applicant about the hotel use.

Ms. Guillory noted that before they decide, SDCI would want to know that the applicant demonstrated that the hotel is primarily for patients rather than putting a condition. She added that if there are conditions during a SEPA process, it must tie into a policy. In the end, SDCI would want to see the documentation that the hotel is for patients and families.

Mr. Kliewer asked about the steps this Committee can take to move the project forward knowing that there are outstanding questions about the hotel use, and Ms. Guillory noted that there is an opportunity for this Committee to add a condition on the project that SDCI will be able to review.

Ms. Guillory added that having a partnership with the Committee is critical to understand the needs of the neighborhood and the institution along with implementing the MIMP.

4. Public Comment (1:18:47)

Mr. Kliewer 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, a nearby neighbor, commented that the testimony before the Office of the Hearing Examiner regarding the Master Plan process with the CAC that was related to the hospital, was the Ronald McDonald House as a sole model that was presented and there was no indication about a privately held hotel that is managed by a third party as a model used for hotel services. She noted that it was either the Inn at Cherry Hill or the old Ronald McDonald Hope Facility on 18th Ave. Any other model that was coming in must fit a non-profit model of a hotel, and this was presented by Swedish administrators. It was clear that the hotel use will not be open to the public.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper, is a nearby neighbor and was connected to the whole process earlier. He echoed Ms. Schiantarelli's comments about a non-profit model that was presented throughout the Master Plan process. He noted that serving the mission of the institution, families, and patients and not the general neighborhood is the purpose of the hotel. He commented about the Seattle Municipal Code that states Criteria A and B should be met. He urged the Committee to look at a contract between Swedish and the hotel and if there is a referral system that exists even though Swedish mentioned that they are not involved in hotel operations. He added that without meeting certain criteria that were outlined in the Seattle Municipal Code, the hotel is not a permitted use.

Comments from Melissa Flynn: Ms. Flynn commented about the current hospital lightning. The new lights that were installed near the Tower were so bright and distracting. She noted that lighting is always part of the MIMP and she was wondering if having bright lighting were allowed.

5. Committee Deliberation (1:26:39)

Ms. Kliewer opened the discussion for Committee Deliberation.

Ms. Lane commented on the design review of the café. She mentioned that the direction from the City to the developer in 2016 that the café would be for allowable for accessory use and not for commercial use. She mentioned that the café was designed only for the people who stay at the hotel and asked about clarification.

Ms. Twiss commented if the accessory use is specifically mentioned in the MIMP. She noted that if the neighborhood could not use the café, she suggested having the Committee recommend that the café should be available to the neighborhood.

Mr. Swinton commented about the use of the word partnership between this Committee, Swedish, and SDCl. He noted that he is looking forward to building trust and partnership.

Ms. Lane commented about continuing to build this partnership and she would like to see a full picture and roadmap about the next steps. She asked about transparency and having new information and conversation about a project being presented to the Committee at the beginning.

Mr. Kliewer commented about the next steps and the upcoming meeting. He noted that he started a preliminary draft letter about the Design Review without the hotel use discussion. He asked if there is someone in the Committee to step forward and take the next step and have three members of the Committee to review the letter. The three reviewers that were identified were Mr. Swinton, Ms. Lane, and Ms. Fitzhugh.

Ms. Lane asked if the draft letter is published, but the Committee did not deliberate, as part of tonight's meeting materials, can a different group of people work on the letter or does it have to be public, and the Committee deliberate on that version before a new group works on it.

Mr. Kliewer commented about the next meeting and a possible discussion about the Committee makeup and community engagement.

Ms. Fitzhugh commented about a Squire Park Community meeting and asked if that is a place for the Committee to discuss and reach out for new Committee members, and Ms. Lane mentioned that having a presentation about the rules and policies about the make-up of the SAC is beneficial to the Committee.

Ms. Lane asked the Committee members about ways to help them be more informed about the MIMP especially the parking and transportation, and Mr. Denney mentioned that generally, all parking and transportation issues rolls up to him. He noted that there is a person that focuses on CTR (Commute Trip Reduction), and a third-party vendor that deals with Swedish's initiatives and innovations around subsidies, vanpools, and carpools. He also mentioned that he interacts and sits at the ITB (Integrated Transportation Board).

Ms. Fitzhugh commented that it will be helpful to her if someone provides the history, context and the expectation around parking and transportation, and Mr. Denney commented that he is not opposed to doing another presentation. He noted that having a presentation series to understand that Swedish went through management and strategy changes in the last three years including health care.

Ms. Lane commented that even though Swedish has gone through several changes, the MIMP has not. She asked Mr. Denney about a preview of the ITB report that Mr. Klauer will present at the next meeting.

Mr. Denney commented that he has seen the preliminary ITB report. The report summarizes the work that Swedish does to meet the SOV goals and various data and analysis on how to improve the use of alternative transportation for the staff and employees that comes to Swedish for work. All of the work is tied back to the CTR and TMP of the MIMP.

Ms. Lane urged the Committee to review the TMP and CTR sections of the MIMP to get a better overview of the ITB report that will be presented at the next meeting. She also mentioned that the Committee will continue the conversation around the design review draft letter and incorporating the hotel use conversation that was discussed at tonight's meeting.

6. Meeting #19 Agenda & Adjournment (1:36:46)

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