



# Minutes #17

(Adopted June 12, 2019)

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

Wednesday, May 8, 2019

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:**

Kevin Klauer

Claire Lane

Greg Swinton

Catherine Koehn

Justin Kliewer

Amanda Twiss

James Welcher

Lisa Fitzhugh (Alternate)

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

Maureen Sheehan – DON

Mike Hanson – Sabey

Mike Denney - Swedish

---

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

Mr. Justin Kliewer opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed

### **2. Housekeeping (01:20)**

A comment was made to make the minutes available sooner and it was noted that the minutes becomes a data source for comments and previous discussion.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will work to have the minutes available to the Committee more than a week in advance of the meeting. Minutes are sent only to the Committee members for their review and adoption before it becomes available to the public.

A motion was made to adopt the April 10, 2019 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

### **18<sup>th</sup> Ave Building Update:**

Mr. Hanson reported that there is no update and is waiting for a response from SDCI regarding the MUP application.

### **Campus Activity Update:**

Ms. Tufts, property manager at Sabey, reported that there was a campus transportation fair on April 10<sup>th</sup> with 160 attendees and a Bike Everywhere Day event on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Lane asked about why these transportation fairs is important, and Ms. Tufts noted that as part of the MIMP, there is a Transportation Management Plan. The goal is to reduce the Single Occupancy Vehicle

(SOV) commuter rate below 50% before the first permit can be issued for the new MIMP's projects. The MIMP requires Swedish to achieve further reductions in commuter SOV rates every two years in order to get a permit for future buildings. There will be a survey coming up in October to measure the SOV rate. The plan summarizes methods to improve transportation options to the Swedish campus by offering transportation fairs, ORCA passes, biking and walking awareness etc.

**Context and schedule:**

Mr. Kliewer commented about reviewing what was discussed at the last meeting and answering any questions or clarifications that the Committee may have. The goal is to begin drafting a letter to SDCI, incorporate any additional inputs and begin to discuss a broader topic such as hotel use before addressing the design guidelines.

Ms. Koehn mentioned about having the transportation working group as a standing agenda item for a report back, and Mr. Klauer commented that the ITB (Integrated Transportation Board) meeting was moved later in the month. He added that the board is currently analyzing and interpreting the data from the last survey. The board was looking and reviewing at various transportation improvement opportunities.

Mr. Denney added that as the executive sponsor of the ITB, the board has the draft analysis and is in the process of reviewing the data at the end of May and will have Mr. Klauer to report on data in the upcoming Committee meeting.

**3. Community Involvement Outreach (15:23)**

Ms. Lane expressed her concerns about community involvement in these meetings and she would like to gather feedback on ways for this Committee to actively and responsibly engage and do outreach to the neighbors about the projects around Swedish.

A comment was made about posting the meeting information on Next Door or other social media such as Facebook, etc.

Ms. Lane commented that most of the neighbors that are engage or participate in these meetings are neighbors that were already engage for a very long time. She noted that engaging new neighbors is important to the process.

A comment was made if there were any thoughts about changing meeting days and times, and Mr. Kliewer commented that having a set regular time provides consistency for Committee members to be able to schedule in their calendar. Ms. Sheehan commented that the City is always looking at bringing the neighborhood to meet their schedule and be accessible. She added that it is a constant conversation between the City and the institution to bring these meetings to a larger population.

Mr. Swinton commented about having an informal Saturday meeting as a meet and greet event between the Committee and the neighborhood. Mr. Welcher added that this will be an informational meeting and not action or decision based.

Ms. Lane suggested that it will be a community event led by the Committee, she also mentioned if an alternate meeting schedule is doable.

Ms. Koehn suggested the quarterly Squire Park Community Council meeting on Saturdays and have the Committee attend the meeting and be on their agenda.

A comment was made about the Committee making a presentation to the neighborhood in this community event, and would it be possible if a representative from Sabey or Swedish be at this meeting to answer any project-related questions from the neighborhood that the Committee cannot respond to.

Mr. Denney asked the Committee to let him know what Swedish can provide at this community event if it is communicated to the neighbors and the community and the opportunity to learn about the project and it is the Committee's job to listen and comment.

Ms. Lane like the idea of a Committee moderated event rather than the institution and more of a neighbor-to-neighbor conversation and have the Committee listen to the neighbors.

Mr. Denney added that there will be big projects happening in First Hill that will have a huge impact to the neighborhood. He noted that during this process, Swedish will have town hall meetings, community notices, project information by the campus lobby, etc. He added that these are some of the thoughts and he encourages the Committee to expand the outreach and be more interactive with the neighbors.

#### **4. Sanctuary Hotel Context & Relationship – MIMP Requirements (33:11)**

Mr. Denney clarified some of the questions regarding hotel use. He noted that Swedish is not a hotel business. Swedish will not have an operational role in the hotel. Swedish loves the idea of having a hotel in the campus for patients and families and that is the extent of the connection between Sanctuary Hotel and Swedish.

Ms. Lane mentioned that there will be a nurse on-site at the hotel and Mr. Denney responded that "the arrangement will be between the hotel and the nurse".

A comment was made if there are any referral relationship between the hotel and Swedish, and Mr. Denney noted that they will inform the patient's families that there is a hotel near the campus that they could stay at a preferred rate for Swedish patient's families, but will not do any advertising.

A comment was made if the Inn at Cherry Hill will remain open once the Sanctuary Hotel opens, and Mr. Denney responded that Swedish closed the Inn at Cherry Hill last year.

Mr. Hanson commented that Sabey and the hotel had regular discussions and agreed to work together to resolve any outstanding issues regarding loading and unloading, parking, setbacks, etc. Any other additional logistics will be dependent on the hotel operator.

Mr. Kliewer reiterated that Sabey's relationship with the hotel is about the logistics of the adjacent buildings and/or land and not a functional or institutional relationship.

Ms. Koehn asked if the hotel will be part of the ITB when it becomes a tenant of the campus, and Mr. Kliewer mentioned that the employees will be and not the guest and asked having the ITB reach out to the hotel and be involved.

## 5. Sanctuary Hotel at Cherry Hill – 1522 Jefferson St (41:51)

The Committee began to review the comments from last month's meeting.

Mr. Kliewer commented that he sent out the draft summary to the Committee for their review. He noted that he received the recording of the minutes and listened through the Committee discussion as he drafted comments. He added that Committee members can request the recording of the meeting if they choose.

The Committee discussed and commented about the hotel use, historical context, benches and seating, parking requirements, exterior spaces, weather protections, explore space for community artwork in buildings, landscaping, interior and exterior lighting spill of the building to the neighborhood, screening, and security issues.

There was a discussion about the amount of parking being provided and how parking is assigned. A comment was made about having clarity around the loading dock plan.

Ms. Sheehan commented that she had conversations with SDOT about curbs and suggested to not focus too much on areas where SDOT is required to do further review, analysis and feedback.

## 6. Public Comment (1:40:04)

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 Larry Knopp:** Mr. Knopp commented that he likes the idea of doing community outreach and a listening session instead of a meeting. On transportation, he commented that as a nearby neighbor, he does not understand the role of the Parking Ambassador and does not feel that Swedish is achieving the 47% SOV, and he would encourage the Committee to do all it can to scrutinize and communicate the methodology, conclusions and techniques used to identify the rate. He also commented that there needs to be a mechanism for enforcing the MIMP's expectations around hotel use other than a discounted rate. He also asked the Committee to make clear to everyone that comments are welcome, and it does not need to be at the beginning of every meeting.

**Comments from MaryPat DeLeva:** Ms. DeLeva commented about the meeting start time and suggested having the meeting to start later and shorter. She expressed her concerns and would like clarity around how the new SAC members were brought on. She also added that the hotel should be exclusively serve Swedish patients, and the way to guarantee it is to rent all the rooms of the hotel to patient's families.

**Comments from Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod commented about hotel use, and the issue of use is primary, rather than its design. She asked the Committee to focus on what the MIMP says. She expressed her concern that the hotel will provide discounted rates, but it will not have enough rooms to accommodate the patient's families. She asked the Committee to look carefully at the hotel use issue as it was outlined in the MIMP. She commented about the designated bike parking next to the front door of the hotel and asked to solve

the bench problem and move the bike parking. She commented about the western and northern façade that appears to be blank and no windows at all. She wanted to know if there is anticipation that buildings will be built on each side. She encouraged the Committee to look at the western and northern façade design. She also commented about the loading dock and garage entry on Jefferson Street is on a slope. When she comes up on an alley on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, she cannot see over the hill. She also commented about the garage and the location for trash pick-up, she encouraged the Committee to investigate how the trash pick-up will be handled.

**Comments from Bob Cooper:** Mr. Cooper commented that the City has known about the proposal for two and half years. The City responded that the proposal complied with a portion of the code. He asked the Committee to carefully look and identify the projects that are in the pipeline and push to learn more about the project. He noted that the hotel use needs to be functionally integrated and substantially related to the mission of the hospital. The developer's letter to the City specifically described how the hotel is independent of - not interdependent with Swedish, as the code requires. He noted that there should be a contractual agreement with the hospital as how the hotel integrates functionally with the hospital. It should be for patients and families and it does not need to be a general-purpose hotel.

**Comments from Bill Zosel:** Mr. Zosel commented that he appreciates that the Committee had discussions about ways of getting additional input in evaluating the project, compliance, design guidelines, etc. He noted that there is a trade off in the land use code that institutional projects do not need to go to a normal design review process. He noted that it does not mean that this Committee cannot do the things that other developers are required to do which is to reach out to several community organizations. He mentioned about the different organizations that can provide land use input and artwork opportunities. He also mentioned that he is a community member of the ITB and he encouraged all to attend the meeting.

## **7. Meeting #18 Agenda & Adjournment**

Mr. Kliewer mentioned that the Committee heard comments about outreach and hotel use.

Ms. Lane commented about need for further discussion about the hotel use, outreach, as well as questions about the make up of this Committee and the process that was involved in adding new Committee members, and how membership in the Committee reflects the MIMP ordinance.

Ms. Koehn commented about adding to the discussion ways that members can participate remotely at the meetings or any tools and resources that the Committee can utilize, and Ms. Sheehan responded that she will talk with Swedish about the tools and resources.

She asked the if the Committee are comfortable or can function having a member participate remotely, a comment was made that if it is executed well, it can function great. A comment was made that it may not be effective consistently - the default for members should be in person attendance.

A comment was made that having members participate remotely puts a burden to the chairperson by checking and making sure that the participants are getting the information accurately.

Ms. Lane commented her concern about size of the Committee and asked for a vote in favor of more inclusiveness rather than restrictiveness in the form of participation in Committee meetings.

Mr. Kliewer suggested having these thoughts and ideas in the agenda for further discussion in future meetings.

A comment was made about clarity and having a timeline to move forward with the design review process, and Mr. Kliewer commented that the initial plan at tonight's meeting was to be done reviewing the guidelines and begin the language and editing around the letter. The goal is to have the discussion about the letter and have it completed at the next meeting, and this will not happen.

Ms. Lane suggested to send and share any ideas about tools and resources that the Committee can utilize to be more efficient. She also asked for assignments to work and review the comments.

She added having the next meeting focus on the design guidelines and an understanding that the Committee will not submit a letter until the hotel use is clarified.

Mr. Klauer suggested assigning a Committee member to do the editing of what was discussed, and have it sent out to the rest of the Committee. He added to focus on getting through and finishing the design guidelines rather than looking and reviewing edits.

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