



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Matsuno, Director

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Meeting #5

March 28, 2013

Swedish Medical Center
Swedish Education & Conference Center
550 17th Avenue
First Floor - James Tower

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Najwa Alsheikh, Chair

Patrick Carter

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Joy Jacobson

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical Center Non-
management Representative*

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

David Letrondo

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

Department of Neighborhoods

Stephanie Haines

*Department of Planning and
Development*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical Center
Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
Transportation*

Members and Alternates Present

Najwa Alsheikh

Elliot Smith

Dylan Glosecki

Eric Oliner

David Letrondo

Joy Jacobson

Patrick Carter

Andrew Coates

Members and Alternates Absent

Jamile Mack

Nicholas Richter

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

(See sign-in sheet)

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Marcia Peterson, SMC

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Najwa Alsheikh. Brief introductions followed.

II. Purpose of this Meeting

Steve Sheppard stated that this has been primarily DPD’s Scoping Meeting to receive public comments. He noted for the record that the Committee meeting notes will not include that portion of the meeting which will be included as part of the Department of Planning and Development’s record.

The CAC also has the opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIS. The purpose of this post meeting is to begin your deliberations concerning our scoping comments.

III. Committee Discussion of the Elements of the Environment

Members asked if there were any elements of the environment referenced during public testimony that cannot be part of the EIS. Stephanie Haines responded that there were none.

Various members also observed were common theme running through many community comments, including: 1) community cohesion, 2) walk ability, 3)



property 4) flooding, 5) opposition to street vacancy, 6) light, 7) glare, 8) noise, 9) air quality, 10) circulation, and safety, civic space, park space, and open space impacts, retail toxic or hazardous waste generated disposal, 11) boundary expansions impacts on land banking, and 12) long-term air quality issues.

Joy Jacobson stated that she wanted to reiterate that pedestrian circulation and safety is a major issue. She noted that many have questioned the three alternatives and suggested that other alternatives also be developed. Stephanie Haines responded that it's up to DPD to set the alternatives in consultation with SMC. Any alternative studied must meet the needs of, but we're responsible for identifying what those alternatives look like in the EIS. Part of the scoping process is to get comments from the public about the range of alternatives. There could be additional or different alternatives evaluated in the EIS. Ms Haines noted tht at some point one of the alternatives will be identified as the preferred alternative but that all will be evaluated in the EIS. Steve Sheppard noted that various other CAC's have weighed in at this point and asked for an expanded range of alternatives. You can ask for an evaluation of additional alternatives.

Joy Jacobson observed that an alternative that retained current boundaries without street vacations but still included authorization for some additional square footage needed to be developed and evaluated.

After brief further discussion, Dylan Glosecki moved:

That Swedish Medical Center study an additional alternative or alternatives for development at their Cherry Hill Campus that retained current boundaries without street vacations but still included authorization for some additional square footage.

Joy Jacobson seconded the motion. Brief discussion followed. The question was called and the vote: eight in favor, none opposed. A quorum being present and the majority having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

Members stated that they wanted to add more detail to their comments and suggested that rather than vote immediately there be on-line email discussion to see what additional alternative might look like so we have a better sense of not only what we're asking but so that the people that we're asking have a better sense of what exactly it is that we're asking before the next meeting. Members agreed to use this format for development of their final comments. A general discussion followed.

Members also noted that there were many comments at the EIS scoping meeting concerning utilization of on-street parking and Residential Parking Zone enforcement problems. Patrick: Carter stated that good information on this is needed. She noted that what appear to be SMC employees of Sabey tenants are parking there all day long and their in 2 hour zones. However, we really don't seem to have good information to prove if these are Swedish employees.

Staff responded that at Children's Hospital their parking enforcement, people went around and recorded the last digits of the license plates and ran them through the state system and they could tell if it was a Children's employee. They took action against violators. Members suggested tht something similar should be done surrounding the Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Campus.

Joy Jacobson noted that there was a transportation management plan that is appears have not to have been addressed completely. The Squire Parks Community Council has asked DPD to address this. Transportation management plans are adopted through this process but follow-up seems to be an issue. Stephanie Haines with DPC stated that the new TMP will deal with both Swedish Medical Center and all Sabey tenants within the campus. DPD will make sure that the TMP is written that way.

Steve Sheppard stated that the traffic and transportation analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement will look at on-street parking, utilization rates, levels of service at intersections and other issues. He suggested that the Committee highlight this in its EIS scoping comment letter as an important element to evaluate. He noted tht another common comment that he had heard was “community context” or the relationship of the proposed levels of development to the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore the Committee should probably make sure to highlight the need for detailed analysis of bulk, height and scale. Boundary expansions are they automatically considered a rezone, so there’s a rezone analysis required for any boundary expansion. Mr. Sheppard noted that major concerns over the boundary expansion were stated repeatedly. This should also be a major focus of any analysis of the proposed plan.

Members noted that many had heard suggestions that this process look at the broader zoning around the MIO Boundary. Steve Sheppard responded that the MIO process can look at zoning within the proposed boundary only. Any broader neighborhood-wide evaluation would have to be a separate process. Stephanie Haines briefly explained the separate rezone process.

Stephanie Haines stated that DPD has a transportation planner working closely with the transportation consultant chosen for this process. One coordination meeting has already been held to talk about the general scope of possible studies. However, these studies will not start until we have established the range of alternatives. Steve Sheppard noted that the committee will be briefed on the transportation analysis throughout the process.

Najwa Alsheikh asked if parking utilization for the current garages and projections of future utilization were known. She noted that many question the need for large parking structures give possible underutilization now. Stephanie Haines responded that this would be part the analysis. She noted that the Land Use Code sets both a minimum and maximum for allowable parking spaces.

IV. Adjournment

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