



City of Seattle
 Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
 Bernie Matsuno, Director

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

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

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Lara Branigan

Committee Alternates

James Schell

Dean Patton

Ashleigh Kilcup

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

*Department of
 Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of
 Planning and
 Development*

Andy Cosentino

*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #23

January 8, 2015

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Ashleigh Kilcup

Dylan Glosecki

Katie Porter

Leon Garnett

James Schell

Patrick Angus

J Elliot Smith

Linda Carrol

Maja Hadlock

Dave Letrondo

Members and Alternates Absent

Patrick Angus

Dean Patton

Raleigh Watts

Laurel Spelman

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Stephany Haines, DPD

Andy Cosentino, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed. Ms. Porter noted that this meeting will deal with issues other than height bulk and scale.

II. General Committee Discussion

The floor was opened to a discussion of transportation issues. Mr. Cosentino noted that the Integrated Transportation Board has been meeting to continue work on identifying mid and long-term measures to improve the parking and traffic situations around the campus. He noted that Dylan Glosecki was serving on that Committee. Mr. Dave Letrondo asked that Mr. Dylan Glosecki update the Committee on the progress.

Mr. Glosecki stated that the Board had set up a series of goals and policies to achieve the goals of the institution. Achieving the goals will take some time. There are a handful of items still being considered that were implemented at Children's. One of the major efforts is to assure coordination between vendor and SMC uses. There are ongoing discussions concerning the SOV goals and the proper incremental reductions. The immediate first year goal is set and 50% and would be incrementally reduced to the range of 44 to 45%.

Mr. Glosecki stated that he is advocating a greater reduction into the 35% range in the medium to long-term. Mr. Letrondo commented that he was impressed with the Transportation document. A great deal of effort is being put forth. Ms. Katie Porter commented that the EIS identified significant avoidable adverse impacts in a number of transportation areas. The CAC should weigh in on these.

Mr. Andy Cosentino responded that Swedish has put forward a mid-term goal 44% SOV threshold. This is the figure used in the EIS. The City has indicated that they will likely advocate an incremental reduction to this level as development occurs. Swedish is committed to a gradual lowering of the SOV target goal over time however, an ultimate figure has not yet been determined.

Dean Patton stated that the transportation plan being put forward is impressive and a good effort. He asked for examples of instances where the proposals being outlined in the plan worked.

Mr. Rimoin from Transpo responded that the measures identified in the TMP are specifically tailored to Swedish. The overall effectiveness is difficult to determine on an individual element. The annual reporting done each year reflects the success of the TMP, i.e. SOV goals through surveys. He noted that the Commuter Trip Reduction annual report will report progress, or lack thereof, in reaching the Goals. Katie Porter stated that she was recommending that the Committee advocate that certain thresholds be achieved before building permits are issued for various phases.

Mr. Dean Patton noted that the plans still appear to accept a greater level of congestion at key intersections than he thought would be acceptable. He noted that that Cherry Street is becoming worse since he moved in the neighborhood in 1991. Ms. Porter agreed with the concern and especially during peak traffic hours. She also noted that many of the improvements being proposed would be welcome additions to the neighborhood the safety.

Dylan Glosecki stated that one of the keys to reducing congestion is incremental reductions being discussed. It is very important that the SOV goal be brought down to a significant percentage and it is critical to have an ambitious goal. He mentioned that Swedish does not seem to know how to get there. Children's has been successful.

Ashleigh Kilcup asked if conditions in this neighborhood are worse than elsewhere in the City or if conditions here mirror citywide trends. Mr. Rimoin responded that the levels of congestion identified in the EIS that are not unique. The group is also reviewing the City's bicycle plan as well as reviewing other City's projects and impacts on this neighborhood

He also noted Swedish will also work with SDOT and DPD to determine what elements or phases in the development would trigger improvements. Stephanie Haines added that DPD is looking at tying implementation of improvements to the issuance of the first building permit.

III. Public Comments

The floor was opened to public comments. Ms. Porter stated that the goal of this Committee is to balance the needs of the institution and of the community. After two years efforts, she was discouraged to hear neighbors advocating a full rejection of the entire plan. The tenor of comments has been harsh. She also said that she is looking forward in talking to neighbors at the upcoming Squire Park Community Council meeting and encouraged other Committee members to attend.

Comments from Ken Torp: Mr. Torp noted that he had written a letter avocation that the Committee reject the MIMP on its entirety and that this is a legitimate position for the Committee to take when confronted with a proposal that is fundamentally inconsistent with its surrounding residential neighborhood. He noted that the FEIS is damning in that it identifies significant unavoidable adverse impacts. He noted numerous issues regarding transportation, immitigable adverse impacts such as safety crossings, speed, etc. He asked the CAC to look at the issues very closely. The Committee should be representing the community. He noted that some neighbors on the Committee often vote

against neighborhood interests and asked why. The transportation impacts can't be mitigated unless the total amount to square feet of new development is reduced.

Comments from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod reiterated the comments of Mr. Torp. She noted that there is a direct correlation between total square footage of proposed development and various impacts. She noted that this is a low-rise neighborhood. Congestion elsewhere is often driven by commercial development. This neighborhood is not similar to those areas. Instead, it is more similar to the area around Children's Hospital. In that case, the amount of new development was less than here and that should be the starting point in this neighborhood. She also noted that the proposed setbacks are inappropriate and inadequate and the only way it can be mitigated is to increase the ground level setbacks very significantly.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper commented that he endorsed the comments of the previous speakers. He mentioned that setbacks are nearly zero at the parking garage at 15th and Jefferson. That was a tradeoff to keep the height down. He also said that this is not "theater". The neighborhood is serious about the EIS and the MIMP. He is baffled that many on the CAC appear to be favoring the institution's plans. The CAC should very seriously consider a total rejection of this proposal. In addition the EIS needs seriously reconsidered. Some sections are not supported by facts. He also stated that some members have apparent conflicts of interest.

He noted that there were errors in the documents that he would provide in a separate letter. In addition, urged the CAC to reject the plan outright. He also noted that much of the language concerning possible conditions and amenities is very soft and unenforceable. Promises and conditions need to be enforceable.

Comments from Jack Hanson: Mr. Hanson stated that appreciated the efforts and the ongoing service of the CAC and thanked the neighbors for hours spent reviewing these documents. The requests in the MIMP would allow Swedish to expand to double its size. This is out of size and scale compared to the culture of the community. This enormous facility expansion is not needed and is driven by the desire to capture market share rather than meeting immediate health care needs. Finally, the CAC is obligated to review the need for the proposed development and the MIMP process is to evaluate the appropriateness of the growth of the institution and public benefit. The process is intended to evaluate the need and balance need against the livability of the neighborhood. With all these reasons, Mr. Henson urged the CAC to reject the Swedish/Providence MIMP and to send it back to them so they can propose a plan that is appropriate to the community.

Comments from Joy Burkholder: Ms. Burkholder spoke on behalf of the SEIU. By failing to address the need of the expansion, the CAC is not fully meeting its charge. There is no way to address the issue of balance without fully evaluating the issues of need and public benefit. The Hearing Examiner stated that the CAC fully examined the issue of need related to the Children's Hospital process so there is precedent for this. The Code was intended to apply to the major institutions and not for profit development partners. The certificate of need for beds is not the same as an allowance to expand the medical office uses. When Swedish sold to Sabey it undermined any argument for expansions. Swedish should first re-purchase the land it sold to Sabey and re-purpose it back to its intended non-profit use. The sale to Sabey set a dangerous precedent. Her organization calls on the CAC to convene a meeting to discuss the need issue including evaluation by separate experts.

Comments from Xochitl Maykaich: Ms. Maykaich stated that she was representing the Washington Committee Action Network and read the portion of the Seattle Municipal Code, which states that the CAC may discuss and comment mission of the institution, the need for the expansion, public benefits and the way in which the proposed development will serve the public purpose mission of the institution. The MIMP has to be a balance between the institution and the needs of the community. Swedish has not demonstrated a need given its sale of land to Sabey. Swedish also places its users

into crushing medical dept. Instead of putting resources into an expansion that they do not need, Swedish should direct those funds to reducing patients' medical debt.

Comments from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that he looked at a program about a similar sized project that involved 2.6 million sq. ft. proposal. That project is the Trump Tower. After a year and a half, the message of the neighborhoods has been consistent; the size of the proposal is inappropriate to this neighborhood. He mentioned after a year later; the whole process is still in negotiations. He said that why is the CAC still negotiating as they have listened to all of the comments that the plan being proposed is out of character for this neighborhood and should be rejected. 2.6 million square feet is 60 acres.

Comments from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw stated that the neighbors have been saying the same thing for two years. The meetings are depressing given the consistent proposals from Swedish that are inappropriate to this neighborhood. It is clearly inappropriate having this sized development proposed for this neighborhood.

Comments from Mary Pat Dileva: Ms. Dileva endorsed the previous comments and asked the CAC to listen to her. She said that this project is inappropriate for this community and needs to be rejected.

Comments from Janet Van Fleet : Ms. Van Fleet stated that doubling the size of campus has adverse impacts on parking, traffic and the surrounding lights. She echoed the complaints that the proposed plan is out of scale in this type of residential neighborhood. She also mentioned that it is CAC's responsibility to consider the needs of the hospital and not Sabey. The CAC should reject the MIMP.

Comments from Greg Harmon. Mr. Harmon pointed out that the CAC should not approve Alternative 12 as it stands. It severely impacts the neighborhood. The process is supposed to seek balance and this proposal does not achieve that balance. The institution and its development partner are receiving a great deal without providing mitigation or public benefit. The setbacks need a great deal of work. The setbacks need to provide better transition. Along 15 there should be an 80 foot setback above 65 feet with minimum 15 foot street level setbacks along the other campus perimeters. .

IV. Continued General Discussions

Ms. Porter reiterated that she will be attending the Squire Park Committee meeting. She encouraged other CAC members to do so. Dylan Glosecki asked staff to respond to two issues: 1) the ability of the CAC to address the issue of needs; and 2) whether the CAC may recommend denial of the plan in its entirety.

Mr. Sheppard responded that the code states that the CAC can discuss and comment on the needs of the institution etc. However, the Code also stated that need is not negotiable and cannot be the basis for delaying the CAC's recommendation etc. Essentially the Institution defines its need and while the CAC can review and comment on that, including questioning it. However ultimately the CAC's recommendation is based on achieving a balance. Swedish Medical Center presented its need to the CAC early in the process and the CAC commented. Ultimately, the CAC chose to base their recommendations on the appropriateness of the proposed development to the neighborhood determined that it would not be bound by needs calculations. He briefly went over the process at Children's and noted that they came to the same conclusion, as this CAC appears to be coming to. The CAC is doing nothing wrong.

With regards to rejecting the MIMP, Mr. Sheppard stated that the Hearing Examiner can do that and the CAC can recommend that the Hearing Examiner do so. The Hearing Examiner has the ability refer the Plan back to the Department of Planning and Development and/or CAC for further revisions etc.

Ms. Porter noted that she agreed with the comments that many of the recommendations appear weak in the EIS. Ms. Stephanie Haines responded that the EIS is a tool to inform decisions. DPD will produce a Director's report that will take information from the EIS and put it into enforceable language.

David Letrondo noted that he lives near Children's Hospital and that traffic is difficult there too. Traffic impacts from all development are increasing City-wide. Traffic volumes are going up everywhere. Safety concerns are widespread. Mr. Cosentino responded that the Integration Transportation Board (ITB) came up with different facets and believe that it will have an impact to resolve these issues.

Ms. Porter stated that DPD should not issue building permits unless certain thresholds are met. Ashleigh Kilcup agreed.

Andy Cosentino noted that the Integrated Transportation Board identified a variety of actions; not any one action will likely solve the congestions problem. Ashleigh Kilcup responded that the only thing that will work is to make it uncomfortable for people to use Single Occupancy Vehicles. Creating a discomfort will require some actions that people are uncomfortable advocating.

Dean Patton agreed that the traffic is getting worse and the height, bulk and scale is inappropriate. Unfortunately, Swedish's credibility is negatively affected by its poor track record for the past 20 years.

Elliott Smith asked the Transpo representative whether there is a specific growth level for development in this area that would be the trigger for intersections going to level of service F. Transpo staff responded that there is a calculation done for each intersection. The City has no defined threshold for when level of service justifies remedial actions. Instead, a wide range of factors weigh in on this. Trip generation calculations were based on staffing levels and are tied to the square footage. As each project is proposed, each will have to be reviewed separately. The remedial action that are recommended can be amended with each of these evaluations. This is done for each individual Master Use Permit. The function of each intersection is a result both of background growth and the addition of development at Swedish.

Discussion then turned to setbacks. Steve Sheppard reminded the CAC that this is an important issue and requires careful consideration. It is as important as height, bulk and scale. Kati Porter asked for information concerning how other CAC's have treated setbacks. Steve Sheppard replied with a few examples from other institutions. He noted that the other CAC's often looked at site lines and how both ground and upper level setbacks affected views from nearby.

Mr. John Jex noted that in prior conversations, the design has increased the landscape buffer along the rear of the 18th Avenue half-block to push the building back. There was a lot of conversation regarding the desirability for deeper setbacks. He also noted that in other locations the Committee expressed the desire to bring street level activity out to the sidewalk to create a more lively environment. Members agreed with the greater setbacks along the rear of the 18th Avenue half-block and noted that there was discussion about street activations including use of canopies etc. for some other locations.

Ms. Porter commented that it has been some time since the CAC had discussed setbacks. She recalled conversations that proposed upper-level setbacks on west block should be dramatic. This body needs to decide what acceptable setbacks are. The Committee determined that this issue would require considerable additional time and at least a full meeting devoted only to setbacks.

V. Adjournment

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