



Meeting Minutes 33

(Adopted February 12, 2025)

Swedish Cherry Hill Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC)

March 13, 2024

6:00 – 8:00 PM

(Transcriber's Note: The notes 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 video/audio recording and available upon request.)

In-person Location:

Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
Swedish Education Conference Center, Conference Room D
500 17th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

Virtual:

Webex

Committee Members Present:

Claire Lane
Maureen Devery
Catherine Koehn
Kevin Heim
Ellen Sollod
Kathy Yasi,

Swedish Cherry Hill staff:

Camila Level
Rachel Jenner
Kaderius Kolbert

City of Seattle Staff:

Nelson Pesigan, Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Ellie Smith, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Jackson Keener Koch, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Carly Guillory, Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI)
Gordon Clowers, Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI)

Sabey Staff:

Tina Tufts

Opening & Introductions

Nelson Pesigan called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and conducted introductions.

Chairperson's Report

Claire Lane said the meeting's focus would be on transportation and noted the hotel project is not on the agenda. She said last year the committee saw a presentation with modifications to the design. She said there was no notification about comment period extension.

She said she and Maureen Devery met with Sarah Sodt, Department of Neighborhoods, about the inability of the public to comment. She said the city notification process is broken. She said she still has not received notification.

Nelson Pesigan alerted attendees that the room kit camera was not functioning so virtual attendees were unable to see the meeting room / attendees.

Ellen Sollod arrived at 6:21 pm.

Pre SDOT-Presentation

Transportation Management Plan (TMP)

Ellie Smith, Seattle Department of Transportation said the presentation is the same one given last May. Objective is to share information on the Seattle Commute Survey from 2022.

She said the objective is to balance the needs of the major institution to develop facilities while recognizing the need to minimize the impact of that development on surrounding communities.

The TMP is one of key components in identifying ways the campus plans to implement strategies to achieve the goal to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips to the campus, have a more efficient transportation system and reduce congestion.

Commute Trip Reduction (CTR)

Ellie Smith said the 2022 survey showed that while the goal for single occupancy vehicle rate was 44, the performance was 57. There have been shifts in mobility patterns citywide. She noted health and hospitality workers cannot work remotely.

Claire Lane said Swedish did a lot and got the rate down to 47% in 2019. Because it met the goals, the 18th Avenue project was allowed to be permitted which expired or got an extension. She asked what the code says about extending permits if Swedish is no longer in compliance with trip reduction goals.

Gordon Clowers said conditions required were only for the first permit and are not required for each subsequent building. Responding to Committee member concerns he said a goal is something to shoot for, not a hard deadline or throttling of development if you do not reach the goal.

Ellen Sollod said it should be an objective, an achievable measure and something that has a day-to-day impact on the neighborhood.

Gordon Clowers said a forward-looking goal (and it is aspirational) is something an institution can work toward but is not penalized if they fall short.

Claire Lane said the actions of Swedish have an impact beyond the physical boundaries of the building and questioned the role of any community in the process of shaping the MIMP or providing oversight if the goal is just aspirational. She said it is contrary to every other briefing about the TMP for Swedish.

SDCI Presentation (Committee Orientation)

Carly Guillory summarized committee responsibilities as outlined in the Municipal Code. There is process for amendments to Master Plan. Minor amendment could be reviewed administratively; major amendment could require a new MIMP. Nelson Pesigan explained on the Harborview Master Plan a major amendment proposal was increasing the floor area ratio, the other one was requesting an increase in building heights within overlay.

Responding to questions, Nelson Pesigan said the request comes from a major institution and once identified, the amendments are presented to their implementation advisory committee and goes through the process of review. The committee will submit a comment letter of approval.

Carly Guillory said the code says a proposed change shall be reviewed by the Director; it does not say from whom it needs to come.

Ellen Sollod said there have been situations in the past where the institution wanted to pursue something, and the community was involved and said the institution needs to clearly justify why it fits within the current plan and whether it is a minor or major amendment. She said a major amendment would trigger a whole new MIMP process.

Gordon Clowers said the advisory committee shall be given the opportunity to review a minor or major amendment and submit comments on whether it should be considered minor or major amendment.

Master Use Permit (MUP) process was summarized. Carly Guillory said upon issuance of MUP a construction permit may be issued and SDCI must publish the decision on the MUP before construction may start. Regarding the hotel project mentioned earlier he said the code does not require a new notice of extension. She said a notice of extension of comment period is not sent out. Project information is available through the Seattle services portal.

Committee members expressed concern that the public would not know how to make public comments and they asked if their comments carried any weight. Committee members asked how public comments factored in are?

Ellen Sollod questioned how much review goes back to purpose of the MIMP considering the new iteration of the hotel project.

Carly Guillory said it depends. She said it is case-specific but 12 months.

Swedish Presentation Public Comments

2022 Annual Report and Campus Updates

Rachel Jenner said she was committed to being present and engaged in the process.

Camila Level provided an overview of TMP data collection with updated references to SOV goals. She noted the impacts of Covid and unreliable public transportation. She said they are exploring options for surveying including online and paper forms. She said the Northwest Kidney Center is moving so will not participate in the 2024 survey. She provided examples of available options to encourage staff and patients out of their cars including vanpool, shuttle services, and biking.

Ellen Sollod suggested having a shuttle to Capitol Hill light rail station. She noted pressure on local parking due to more multifamily buildings on Jefferson Street and suggested RTZ be extended to 15th and Jefferson.

Sabey Updates

Tina Tufts said Sabey is finishing underground electricity and communication lines although there is no timeline. Capital improvements are being made inside the buildings on campus.

Public Comments

Bob Cooper commented that the whole committee process seems performative. He said he was concerned that the proposed hotel had no notation of the extended comment period. He said the portal is not helpful. He said the hospital stated they would not be willing to share facilities or staff. He said the hospital and hotel do not have common function service or products. He said a hotel should not be permitted as it does not meet the development standards of the underlying zone.

Viky Schiantarelli spoke against a public hotel and wondered why it has even been allowed into the MIMP as it is not exclusively for use by patients and their families. She said she echoed all comments made by Mr. Cooper. She said anyone from the public can challenge a director's decision as to a minor versus major amendment criteria. She said the ordinance allows permits to be denied if demonstrated progress in the TMP cannot be seen. She said being at 56.6% is a failure considering all data provided. She said nothing should be done regarding the hotel without community input.

Committee Deliberation

Claire Lane proposed a meeting just for deliberation and work on public comment for hotel project prior to the next scheduled April meeting (April 10).

Ellen Sollod asked that SDCI not make a permit decision until after it receives this committee's comments.

Claire Lane asked for a commitment to allow CAC time to deliberate and submit comments.

Gordon Clowers said he thought that would be possible and that he would take it to the director.

Kevin Heim asked if committee members could submit substantive policy or legal questions for SDOT to staff ahead of the next meeting so there could be a more deliberative discussion and guidance from the city.

Claire Lane concurred and noted she has questions that have not been adequately answered.

Carly Guillory said the committee has reviewed the hotel project nine times over a nine-month period and met the requirements of the code. She said they can present permit review to the director but there are legal requirements that must be followed, and she wanted to manage expectations.

Claire Lane said this project has eliminated parking and a café that was sold as a benefit to the community so there are substantive comments about impacts. She said she blames delays and low committee membership on the institution and said they hamper the committee's ability to do project oversight. Committee members will put together questions about policy and law for this process; what responsibility of city departments is. Areas of concern to raise include loss of parking, loss of café, permit process as it relates to TMP. She asked if other institutions are meeting TMP goals and how equitably is that conversation happening.

Cat Koehn asked for Swedish commitment to fully staff the required position on this committee. Ms. Jenner will follow up.

Ellen Sollod suggested paid 2-hour parking in the area and noted the large volume of new residences in the area. She asked the city to reexamine its policies that says there are no residences here.

Kevin Heim said the hotel project should be revisited in terms of the project as it is today.

Kathy Yasi asked how a public tourist hotel fits in with the hospital mission.

Ellen Sollod said maybe it is a major amendment to the MIMP.

Maureen Devery said every step is getting further away from hospital use.

Claire Lane said to email Mr. Pesigan availability to meet; this is in addition to the April meeting which will be devoted to updates from other parts of the annual report and for the committee to finalize a letter.

Nelson Pesigan said the 2023 annual report has been submitted. He will send it to the committee.

Cat Koehn asked the date of the renewal on the 18th Street building and said Carly Guillory was going to provide this information. She asked Sabey or Swedish what is the functional relationship of the Candlewood Suites to Swedish Hospital. How does the current proposal relate to the hospital?

Tina Tufts did not have the background to respond in a way that represents an organizational perspective. She said Sabey is not the developer. The developer owns the land that is part of the boundary MIMP.

Claire Laine said the developer owns land.

Carly Guillory said a new architect joined the team, but the developer remains the same.

Adjourn and Schedule Next Meeting

Meeting adjourned at 8:08 pm.