

II. Overview of Preliminary Draft Master Plan – John Jex

John Jex, from Callison was recognized to make a brief presentation about the Preliminary Draft Master Plan. Mr. Jex noted that the first section of the Draft Master Plan contains introductory background information about the Swedish campus. It summarizes program components along with the alternatives that were presented in the past meetings; these alternatives are: 1, 5, 6, and 7. Additional information has been incorporated to these alternatives including: diagrams, development of standard components, landscaping, open space, parking spaces, and transportation, etc. There are several other components of this Draft Master Plan that are currently “works in progress” and have not been completed. This includes the transportation elements. He also noted that the structure setbacks have not yet been discussed.

Mr. Sheppard noted that once this Preliminary Draft Master Plan moves forward to the draft, there will be significantly more information provided including: streetscapes, landscaping, setbacks, etc. Mr. Sheppard informed the Committee that developing statements and comments to the current preliminary draft document is critical so that the next draft contains all the vital information.

IV. Overview of Preliminary DEIS contents and schedule of comments

Katy Chaney, from URS was recognized to present the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS). Ms. Chaney passed out the PDEIS. The PDEIS is provided to the applicant and Committee only and is not subject to public comments. She briefly went over the contents of the DEIS and noted that the draft PDEIS is currently a work in progress and new information will be added once several ongoing studies are completed. She also cautioned the Committee to understand that the visuals in Appendix B are very preliminary and based upon what was included in the Concept Plan, not the current alternatives, and will be amended significantly prior to the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Ms. Chaney briefly went over the organization of the PDEIS. Ms. Chaney noted that the PDEIS is being distributed to get comments from Swedish, Sabey, City of Seattle and members of this Committee.

Editor's note: The CAC received the PDEIS copies at the meeting

V. Overview of transportation analysis, approach and findings

Mike Swenson, from the Transpo Group, was introduced to make a presentation concerning the transportation analysis. Mr. Swenson stated that the Transpo Group has more than thirty experience in this field. The firm worked on a variety of transportation projects such as master plans focusing on multi-modal planning and analysis.

Mr. Swenson noted that the full analysis is not yet included in these preliminary documents. The transportation analysis will provide data and evaluate the impacts on both traffic generation and, transit utilization forward to 2040 and include vehicular, non-motorized impacts, and connectivity to parking, level of service at key intersections (a measure of time delay and congestion), traffic safety and neighborhood connections. Mr. Swenson further noted that the studies will be looking at a seven to eight year build out.

The Transportation analysis is also taking into account increases in traffic associated with projected development in other areas will impact and generate traffic and especially that associated with Seattle University or Virginia Mason. He noted that the choice of study area and which intersections and locations were included was made in close consultation with SDOT and DPD. Transpo will also be conducting studies and analysis to get better information regarding the parking utilization and will also include pedestrian and transit connectivity to be added to our list for improvements as we go through the process.

Mr. Swenson also mentioned that as a future goal, Transpo will look at the level of service for TMP for SOV in the studies. Currently the goal is a 50% SOV rate.

VI. Public Comments/Questions

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper asked if the alternatives presented at the meeting are the only alternatives in the table. He also asked if the Traffic data and analyses had been included in this scenario.

Response: SMC staff responded that the alternatives included in the Preliminary Draft Plan are the alternatives that are moving forward. These alternatives will be included in the draft EIS. As part of the draft EIS process both the public and various agencies can comment on impacts and alternatives.

Regarding the traffic planning, the response was that it couldn't be answered at this time.

Comment from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that he was concerned about both parking and traffic flow. He strongly suggested that Swedish consider the possibility of validation of parking for patients so that patient parking would be lower cost so that patients and immediate family members would not have an incentive to park on the nearby streets. Swedish should strongly encourage its employees to use the bus and subsidize bus passes.

Response: Swedish subsidize bus passes at 50%.

Comment from Greg Harmon: –Mr. Harmon stated that he lives at 9th and Cherry. He expressed concern about light and glare emanating from parking garages in the broader area. He stated that similar problems might occur with the proposed increased development

Comment from an Undisclosed Individual: An individual who lives on 16th and Cherry made a comment regarding the options going forward regarding the Preliminary Draft MIMP. He stated that the only compelling logic for the irregular shape of the MIMP boundary is an opportunistic logic since Sabey owns the adjacent properties. He would like to see a very substantial compelling logic, for why the shape of the MIMP should include this that have a potential impact to the neighborhood particularly around traffic and parking.

Comment from an undisclosed Individual: An individual commented that it is important for the CAC members to review the EIS document and think about the environment. He noted that this is not a Swedish EIS but the City's and CAC's EIS. He urged CAC members to review this carefully and make sure it answers questions concerning the environment impacts.

VII. Committee Discussion

Steve Sheppard informed the Committee that the next step in the process is to review the document that was presented. In the past, the Committee has either reviewed the whole document or split the document into sections. Each Committee member would then forward their comments to Steve and he would create a matrix that summarizes all the comments from each members. That compiled document would become the basis for development of the Committee's position at its formal meeting. It is very important for the Committee to look at the alternative sections carefully; and submit comments as early as possible so that the institution could come back with their response.

The Committee decided to split the document into sections and develop specific comments to each section and their comments to Steve Sheppard. Mr. Sheppard agreed to create a summary document to track these comments with follow up actions for the institution to review and respond.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 5th. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that at this meeting, the Committee will have the opportunity to discuss and review the comments.

VIII. Adjournment

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