



#### **MEMBERS**

Julia Blum

Justin Kliewer

Catherine Koehn

Claire Lane

Dave Letrondo

Kevin Klauer

Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

Maureen Sheehan,

Department of Neighborhoods

June Altaras,

Swedish Cherry Hill

Carly Guillory,

Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections

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

DRAFT Meeting Minutes Meeting #3 June 14, 2017 Adopted TBD

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill 500 17th Ave – East Tower Cherry Hill Auditorium Seattle, WA 98122

## **Members and Alternates Present**

Justin Kliewer Claire Lane Kevin Klauer

Catherine Koehn David Letrondo

**Staff and Others Present** 

Maureen Sheehan Andy Cosentino Sara Zora

Danielle Simpson

## I. Opening and Introductions

Mr. David Letrondo opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

## II. Housekeeping

The Committee decided to postpone the adoption of the May 11, 2017 minutes.

## III. MIMP Annual Report

Mr. Letrondo introduced Mr. Andy Cosentino to give an update to the MIMP Annual Report.

Mr. Cosentino commented that there are no current projects related to the MIMP. He mentioned that there are no activities regarding property ownership and leasing outside the MIO. He noted that Mr. Mark Melnyk, the transportation coordinator for Swedish will present the progress in the TMP. He also added that there is nothing to report on the MIMP condition progress since they are awaiting guidance from SDOT. The focus in the last few months was on the TMP management. He mentioned that they are waiting feedback from SDOT regarding the dock management plan and the streetscape concept design plan for 18th Avenue.

Mr. Melnyk provided a summary on the TMP (Transportation Management Plan) progress.

He summarized the TMP highlights in 2016 including its key achievements and the survey data that was collected during the reporting year.

This was first year that Swedish conducted a survey for the entire population at Cherry Hill. He mentioned that by doing the survey at the same time, they could collect and analyze the commuting habits and have better data.

He mentioned about the enhancements that were done on campus including installing a new garage equipment that can support smarter technology to analyze commuter behavior change, launching the Caregiver Commute Program that is powered by Luum, rolling and expanding various parking programs and services, and participating in the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB).

The ITB takes all the Swedish Cherry Hill campus key stakeholders and work and discuss the various transportation strategies to overcome the shared barriers affecting transportation and parking around the campus. This board is an important vehicle that allows them to work together to bring issues at the table and find solutions.

He mentioned that that are very active in the neighborhood in looking at parking habits around the streets. He noted that they have a traffic ambassador that makes round around the streets of the campus and identify anyone who maybe an employee that was parked at the neighborhood streets. The ambassador approached the vehicle and put a note requesting them to contact their office and have a friendly conversation and reminder about being a good neighbor and discuss about the benefits and options for them not to park on the neighborhood streets. He added that they have a phone number to contact that alerts them about a staff that is parked on the street.

One of the key deliverables for 2016 was the surveyed conducted on campus to get an idea about he mode splits. Mr. Melnyk showed a diagram that summarized the different percentages of mode splits for drive-alone, transit, rideshare, telecommuting/compressed work week, biking and walking. He mentioned that the drive-alone rate was down to 56% in 2016 compared to 57% in 2014 while the transit ridership went down to 19% in 2016 from 20% in 2014. He expressed his concerns because of the two most important pillars of a transportation program is transit and carpool. Having this data enabled him to analyze and determine the different populations on campus and the different modes that they use.

He added that launching new technologies to analyze the data they received allowed him to dig deeper and gather solid information about the commuting habits and behavior. He showed a diagram that summarized the transportation access by the different work groups at Cherry Hill campus. Having this detailed information will allow him to provide viable options and programs to leadership.

For 2017, Swedish is plan oh conducting a survey later this year. He added that they have the information and technology they need, the support of leadership, and viable options they can present to caregivers so that can concentrate on providing healthcare instead of their transportation and commute needs.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that the goal of tonight's presentation was to review the annual report and asked the Committee to review the report. Last year's annual report was quiet with regards to projects, but expect to have more detailed information to review at this year's report. She also noted that if the Committee has any questions or would like to request further information is to go ahead and send a request to her.

A comment was made about if employees are aware about the different transportation modes that are available to them. Mr. Melynk mentioned that it is important to use the information that they are gathering and bring it at a departmental level. The key insights he learned when rolling this program was the need to get at a departmental level because of the work environment the employees are familiar with to craft the transportation message.

Mr. Letrondo asked more information about the garage equipment. Mr. Melynk mentioned that the installation of a new parking equipment would collect information and identify what it can integrated with as the staff member use their badge without overwhelming the data.

A comment was made about a diagram that shows different access by work group. Mr. Melynk mentioned that the graph shows how many people are accessing different modes of transportation by work group. This data identifies if they can provide options to have lesser trips by using a different mode of transportation access.

A comment was made if Swedish has a way to track the use of ORCA cards. Mr. Melynk cannot track the use of ORCA cards individually due to privacy. They can use the data that has an ORCA card and look at the different routing information, and ridership and make assumptions on how they can best utilize them.

Ms. Sheehan asked if there has been a discussion of eliminating the monthly passes and move them into a daily pass. Mr. Melynk noted that it has been discussed and it must go through different layers before it gets implemented.

A comment was made about the parking enforcements along the campus and how often and how long has it's been going on. Mr. Melynk mentioned that the transportation ambassador has been around since 2015. The enforcement is about conversation with the individual and presenting them transportation alternatives. He noted that the traffic ambassador goes around the neighborhood frequently.

A comment was made about how does the ambassador determines who is an employee. Mr. Melynk mentioned that they can identify them with their scrubs.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that other institutions have very strict parking enforcement policy and program especially Children's that includes termination if they are cited several times. Mr. Melynk added that Swedish's program is geared toward conversational engagement.

Mr. Justin Kliewer commented on how does the caregivers respond to the conversation. Mr. Melynk noted that they inform them that this is an educational conversation.

A comment was made on how does Swedish handles non-respondents to the survey. Mr. Melynk noted that he will use the types of programs the respondents are more receptive to especially on drive-alone and parking which is easier to make a connection to.

## IV. Concept Streetscape Design Plan for 18th Avenue

Mr. Letrondo introduced Ms. Danielle Simpson to discuss the concept streetscape design plan.

Ms. Simpson mentioned that they will defer the discussion since they are awaiting feedback from SDOT on the final decision on the greenway.

## V. Dock Management Plan

Mr. Letrondo introduced Mr. Cosentino for an update about the dock management plan.

Mr. Cosentino mentioned that there was no work has been done since they are awaiting to coordinate with SDCI and SDOT on several issues including the position on the greenbelt.

## VI. Schedule Update

Ms. Sheehan asked what does the Committee members expect regarding the upcoming project and schedule. Mr. Cosentino noted that the most important work currently is the Traffic Management Plan and they have been actively engaged with other work and there is no major milestones to report as of yet, but will provide more information as they come in the coming meetings.

Ms. Sara Zora of SDOT commented that there should be a decision made about the greenway before the August meeting. She expects that the SDOT team will engage with Swedish Cherry Hill to discuss the plans and recommendations.

#### VII. Public comment

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comment shown below is a summary 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 Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper commented that it will be useful if Swedish list down all the lessors that are outside the MIO boundary. He noted that even though Swedish is not involved, they are tied to their development partner who are developing properties that he knows of. He commented about the TMP and a plan to develop a work force housing and other projects that were not clear on the report. He commented about council condition #4 where it states that Swedish Cherry Hill should list all the tenants and not only the major tenants. He also added the one of the strategy that were suggested several times in reducing neighborhood parking is how to address vendors who parked along the streets.

**Comments from Abril Bradshaw**: Ms. Bradshaw commented about transition management and if patient-to-patient families are exempt from the TMP.

## VIII. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Committee deliberation.

A comment was made about how much does patient-to-patient family include. Mr. Melynk mentioned that for Swedish Cherry Hill campus that the TMP goal provides everyone who works at least 20 hours a week and it does not apply to patients.

A comment was made on how do Swedish provide and communicate the information to patients. Mr. Melynk noted that they provide transportation options and it is their choice on how to utilize them.

A comment was made about the radius of the traffic ambassador. Mr. Melynk noted that he does not have the information but will look at it.

Mr. Letrondo commented if there is a way the neighbors can take a picture of the car, and license plate and provide that information to Swedish. Mr. Melynk commented that they are thankful for the neighbors that provide that information, and they call and report it to Swedish. The information on where to submit is posted at the Swedish website.

Mr. Kleiwer commented about any plans to do a basic survey of patients on how and where they park as a future goal of the institution. Mr. Melynk commented that they have a lot in their plate and have identified the need for a formal program for patients will be considered.

Mr. Melynk added that the surveyed that they captured includes all the small and large tenants. The smaller tenants are grouped into one in the survey. The reason he emphasized the major tenants was because they have a much more developed transportation programs that Swedish can leverage into what they are looking for.

Ms. Sheehan suggested to have the smaller tenants listed at next year's annual report to eliminate any assumptions.

#### VIII. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

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