



# Minutes #12

(Adopted February 24, 2020)

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

Monday, September 16, 2019

5:30 – 7:30 PM

Swedish Medical Center First Hill Campus

747 Broadway – 1 East Conference Room

Seattle WA 98122

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

Douglas Holtom

Carl Tully

Brian Parker (Alternate)

Ted Klainer

Susan Zeman

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

Nelson Pesigan – DON

Brad Hinthorne – Perkins & Will

Eric Mott – Perkins & Will

Mike Denney – Swedish

Nicole De Leon – Cairncross & Hempelmann

Nancy Rogers – CairnCross & Hempelmann

---

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

Mr. Douglas Holtom opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

### **2. Housekeeping**

Mr. Tully commented on having the presentation materials distributed to the Committee members before the meeting added to the minutes.

A motion was made to adopt the July 17, 2019 minutes, as amended and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

### **3. Block 95 & NW Tower Update**

Mr. Holtom opened the discussion on Block 95 & NW Tower updates.

Mr. Mike Denney shared that the goal of this meeting is to provide an update to the Block 95 and NW Tower refinements that were presented at the last meeting and provide an opportunity for the Committee to ask any questions.

Mr. Brad Hinthorne commented that the project is executing the 2005 approved Master Plan. He noted that there were a series of public meetings to communicate this project including this Committee, City Council, Design Commission as well as various community outreach. Tonight's presentation will focus on the campus open and green space improvements, landscape enhancements and the design and architecture of the North Tower.

Ms. Nicole De Leon briefly summarized several diagrams showing the proposed landscape and garden views along Minor and Marion and described the different plantings, furnishings, and materials that will be available in these gardens.

Mr. Carl Tully asked about the differences from the previous presentation, and Ms. De Leon noted that there was no significant difference in Block 95, and the landscape architecture is very similar to previous presentations. The biggest changes are in the nuances to the entrance and how cars enter the garage and pedestrians enter the building.

Ms. De Leon noted that the replacement trees are not being replaced with the same species that will be lost. She asked the Committee that if there is an interest in any specific species to let the design team know. Ms. Susan Zeman commented that she supports having the native species to support the ecosystem at large. Mr. Holtom commented not to recommend the use of American yellow woods since they are not native to a moist climate like Seattle.

Mr. Mott showed a diagram of the First Hill Campus evolution and the North Tower program. The focus is to capture open and public space as well as the public mile. The building scale has gotten smaller and there is a significant setback and step back in the building between the surgery and bed floors.

The organization of the building has changed. The public arrival and circulation were moved to the northeast corner with a series of public lobbies for patients, families, and providers to orient themselves when they arrived at the building. The new design externalized the public spaces on the edge of the building.

The infrastructure and utility podium will now become program and clinical space. The intent is to have a similar character to the North Tower.

He noted from the last presentation that there is a potential for the sky bridge to be moved from Level 2 to Level 3. The design team is currently doing a study before it gets finalized. The idea was well-received by this Committee at the last meeting.

Mr. Mott also discussed the oxygen enclosure that may become a site for longer-term infrastructure called the Annex Building. It could temporarily store infrastructure materials from Block 95. The design team is working with the mechanical team to decide what goes in the building and will provide an update to the Committee once a decision is made.

Mr. Mott showed the overall project schedule and the Master Use Permit (MUP) is in review and will be providing an update in the next few weeks regarding the North Tower.

A public benefits summary was presented to the Committee which is the same public benefits summary that was shared with the City Council. There were no changes to the public benefits and the goal is to implement all the benefits.

A comment was made about the crossings along Marion and Boylston and Mr. Denney mentioned that Swedish is currently working with SDOT to address the problem.

Ms. Zeman suggested a rooftop garden available for patients and Mr. Denney mentioned that they will look into how to accommodate a garden that ensures the safety of the patients.

Mr. Tully asked about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and if there are any outstanding issues that relate to the project. He added that it would be beneficial to the Committee to go and review the EIS to make sure that all aspects that relate to glare, light, risk, etc. are adequately addressed and covered by the Committee.

Ms. Nancy Rogers noted that they previously submitted an amended EIS and are awaiting a response from the City. Mr. Tully noted that it will be helpful to look at the amended EIS as well as a response from the City, if any, at the next meeting.

**4. 2018 Annual Report & Transportation Management Plan (TMP)**

Mr. Tully asked about any updates to the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and Mr. Denney noted that Swedish will be conducting its Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) survey to measure any Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) coming to the campus and he can provide an update on the result at the next meeting.

**5. Public Comments**

Mr. Tully opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments

**6. Committee Deliberation**

Mr. Tully opened the discussion for committee deliberation. There were no further committee deliberations.

**7. Adjournment and scheduling the next meeting**

Mr. Denney commented that having the next meeting in October to provide updates, refinements to the project and discuss open issues will be beneficial for the Committee

Mr. Tully requested an advance copy of the materials be made available prior to the meeting to review and develop questions. He also suggested having the EIS document available for reviewing any open items.

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