



MEMBERS

Julia Blum (Vice-Chair)
Justin Kliewer
Catherine Koehn
Claire Lane
Dave Letrondo (Chair)
Kevin Klauer
Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods
David West,
Swedish Cherry Hill
Carly Guillory,
Seattle Department of Construction &
Inspections

**Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting #5

April 12, 2018

Adopted May 9, 2018

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill
500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC
Seattle, WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present

Julia Blum	Justin Kliewer	Catherine Koehn
Kevin Klauer	Claire Lane	David Letrondo

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	Carly Guillory	Mikel Hansen
Emily Ehlers	David West	Brad Hinthorne
Daria Supp		

I. Opening and Introductions

Mr. David Letrondo opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

Ms. Claire Lane commented that there were discussion items including significant questions and comments regarding transportation that are not mentioned in the minutes. Mr. Letrondo suggested postponing the adoption of the November 28, 2017 meeting minutes until the next meeting.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that she cannot share email addresses to members of the of the Committee without their consent. She reminded that this group is a City of Seattle Advisory Committee, therefore all discussion and decision making must happen in an open public meeting.

Ms. Lane commented that it would be beneficial to have the presentation be submitted to the Committee a week in advance as stated in the bylaw so that she and the Committee can come and prepared at the meeting. Ms. Sheehan added that her goal is to provide information and presentation materials to the Committee one week in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Julia Blum commented that it would be helpful for the Committee if they are prepared with questions and a full understanding about the agenda items. She noted that having email addresses will be beneficial if the documentations is not sent in advance of the meeting.

A suggestion was made to have standing meetings in the near term and have any agenda items roll over at the next meeting since there are several topics and issues that need to be addressed.

A request was made for a training on basic land use code and zoning for all Committee members.

A comment was made about any actions if they do not comply with the bylaws. Ms. Sheehan noted through corrections can be identified by complaint in order to be addressed. She added that any oversights will be addressed.

Ms. Lane commented about setting the agenda and transparency. She suggested they have a conversation about what the process looks like for transparency and engagement. Ms. Sheehan commented that she takes direction from Swedish regarding the agenda items and input from the Committee. Ms. Lane commented that agenda items set by the Committee chair, Swedish and Sabey should be communicated back to the entire Committee for review to prioritize the topics at the next meeting. Mr. Justin Kliewer commented that it is also important to identify the order of precedence within the MIMP, so the Committee is prepared to discuss at the meetings.

Ms. Lane also requested all future meetings be held in this conference room.

III. 2017 MIMP Annual Report

Mr. Letrondo introduced Mr. David West, Chief Operating Officer of Swedish Cherry Hill to provide an update on the 2017 MIMP Annual Report.

Mr. West highlighted the conditions on the MIMP regarding the concept Streetscape Design for 18th Avenue and the Wayfinding Plan. The concept Streetscape Design for 18th Avenue and the Wayfinding Plan were submitted to the City for review and comment and that design work was shared at the last meeting.

Ms. Lane asked if the comments made by the City comes back to the Committee. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that it does not come back, but it is available to the public and she will share the information to the Committee.

Ms. Sheehan noted that the thirteen Major Institutions are required to produce an annual report. There are four areas that the major institutions report on and these are: conditions established by the City Council, development happening outside the MIO within 2,500 ft. of the institution, construction development under the Master Plan, and the conditions of the TMP.

Ms. Lane commented that it will be useful for the Committee and the neighbors to know any constructions or development outside the MIO that is not owned by Swedish as an act of a good neighbor. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the chair of the Committee along with Swedish and Sabey will have a discussion on how to move forward and present the information as transparent as possible.

Ms. Lane mentioned that a neighbor brought to her attention that the annual report should be distributed within four weeks when it was published in February and she wants clarification if this was followed. She also added that there were questions about transportation and not knowing that the annual report is coming, if these questions and issues has been addressed.

Ms. Sheehan noted that there is a Director's Rule which states that all Major Institutions must submit their annual report by February 1st. Having the February submission date by the Director's Rule is no longer practical and there is work being done to update the process. All Major Institutions are on an annual schedule for predictability. Swedish Cherry Hill is to submit their Annual Report every April.

Ms. Lane asked what the Committees responsibility is for the annual report is. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the annual report is a disclosure document and provides the work that the Major Institutions has done with regards to the MIMP. The annual report is shared among the City departments. She noted that SDCI, SDOT and DON review the annual reports for accuracy and completeness. The City can request additional information and clarification from the Major Institutions.

Ms. Lane suggested having an agenda item to look through the annual report and if there are any questions or comments that the neighbors or the Committee may have, to submit to Ms. Sheehan. Ms. Sheehan noted that comments, clarifications and questions about the report can be sent to her but does not guarantee a direct or timely response until the next annual report.

Mr. Kevin Klauer inquired if the annual report be considered as a draft. Ms. Sheehan noted the report the committee received over email and in hard copy is the version they should comment on. She noted that typically the

City would review the report and ask the institution to respond to comments and question before sharing with the SAC, however in this case she felt it prudent to share now.

Mr. Letrondo suggested to send any questions about the annual report to Ms. Sheehan and will compile them and have answers at the next meeting. He also suggested to have an open email exchange among the Committee members. Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that it is okay to have an open email exchange if there are no decisions being made.

Ms. Koehn questioned if a statement of “ongoing compliance” is sufficient to meet the requirement of the Annual Report.

IV. Transportation Update

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion on the transportation update.

Ms. Emily Ehlers of SDOT commented that she anticipates more questions about the transportation at the next meeting once the Committee reviews the annual report. The purpose of the TMP is to outline the Major Institution’s strategies and programs to reduce its impacts on the transportation network.

A MUP for development may not be issued for Swedish Cherry Hill until they reach a 50% SOV rate or lower. The goal is to reduce the SOV rate every 2 years by 2% with a target of 32% SOV rate by 2034. The SOV rate is measured every 2 years with the Commuter Survey, measuring transportation choices by employees who work at the campus. The survey instrument used is operated by the WA State Commuter Trip Reduction (CTR) survey for all Major Institutions and the methodology has not changed.

In 2014 the Integration Transportation Board (ITB), a multi stakeholder committee, was established to advise on the TMP. The ITB meets quarterly and is composed of campus employers, parking operators, commute service providers, community representatives, SDCI, SDOT, and King County Transit.

SDCI and SDOT both independently reviewed the survey results and determined that Swedish Cherry Hill is meeting their current SOV goal. The Fall 2017 survey results showed a 47% SOV rate.

She added that the next ITB meeting will be on June and the next CTR survey will be done Fall 2019.

Mr. Justin Kliewer commented that if SDOT and SDCI determined that Swedish Cherry Hill met its 50% SOV goal, are they required to maintain that goal before a MUP is issued, and what happens if the campus does not meet the goal in the Fall 2019 survey.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that Swedish Cherry Hill must reduce the SOV rate every 2 years by 2% with a target of 32% SOV rate by 2034. It will be an ongoing program.

Ms. Catherine Koehn asked what will happen if the 2019 survey results do not meet the goal. Ms. Carly Guillory of SDCI mentioned that there are several conditions within the Master Plan that address the TMP requirements and SOV rates. The SOV rates are checked every two years and every time a MUP is submitted, SDCI looks at the SOV rate. If substantial progress is not being made, as determined by the results are different, SDCI and SDOT, SDCI may take a range of actions including denying the permit.

Ms. Ehlers added that the MUP is the first permit that is issued by SDCI before construction may begin.

Ms. Lane asked why Swedish Cherry Hill did a CTR survey in 2014, 2016, and 2017 and did not follow the biannual survey schedule. She added that if the baseline was the 2016 survey, why it was done again in 2017. Ms. Ehlers assumed that Swedish maybe anticipating new developments and they would like to know where they were at.

Tina Tufts, Sabey Senior Property Manager, shared that it was done because Swedish Cherry Hill and all the Sabey and LabCorps tenants were not previously on the same survey schedule and this change was intentional and approved through the City to align the campus.

Ms. Lane commented that the underlying state legislation for transportation talks about a 70% survey return rate. Swedish Cherry Hill achieved the return rate but did not meet the SOV goal in 2016. At the last meeting, Swedish met the SOV rate but did not achieve the return rate. She noted that under a negotiated process rule, Swedish

needs to meet certain requirements to make the 70% return rate valid and the neighbors did not get this information or any kind of negotiated approval.

Mr. Kliewer added that he would like to know what the requirements were that SDCI, SDOT, and Swedish signed off on regarding the 70% return rate goal. Ms. Sheehan noted that the question will be added to the agenda at the next meeting for clarification.

Ms. Lane commented that the neighbors sent emails and questions to the City and noted that a staff from SDOT answers all these questions. She asked if it is possible to have these questions that were submitted by the neighbors and the City's responses be shared to this Committee. Ms. Sheehan explained that those documents were requested under a Public Disclosure Request (PDR) and the requestor paid for hardcopies of these documents. She can share the requests, but not the response materials. Ms. Sheehan commented that all comments on the MUP are publicly available through the SDCI portal and she will provide the link to the portal.

Ms. Lane emphasized that knowing the validity of the survey numbers is a critical issue because this would lead to having Sabey proceed with the development plans. She added that she strongly opposes any development plans moving forward without information about how the survey results and response rate were gathered and conducted. She applauded the work that Swedish has done regarding their transportation programs to reduce their SOV rate, but reminded the committee that in the past, Swedish Cherry Hill never met its goal. She added that she would like this information presented by SDOT or Swedish at the next meeting. She also added that she would also like to see more information from the City about its process. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will ask the City to provide the methodology used to accept the survey return rate.

A comment was made about transparency and how can this Committee resolve the issue moving forward. Ms. Sheehan noted that she would like the Committee to have a better understanding about how and why this process happened. She added that this Committee provides is advisory and it is important to ask for clarity to build trust with the institution and with the City. She also mentioned that even though the City is the decisionmaker, the neighbors are being impacted and she wants the neighbors to understand the process as well.

Ms. Lane asked if there are development plans that are happening that this Committee could request to be put on hold until all the questions and issues are addressed about the TMP. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that this Committee is the starting point for any building permits issued. SDCI will look at the MUP and will ask for the Advisory Committee's review.

A question was about permitting for the utility work along 18th Avenue. The project is to take all the utilities overhead and put them underground.

Ms. Koehn asked if this type of information should have been communicated. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that this type of work is a maintenance issue and not a building permit. Ms. Ehlers added that there are a variety of conditions under the MIMP impacting the right-of-way, including streetscape concept plans and neighborhood greenway along 18th Avenue, etc. This work is going through the SDOT review process in order to satisfy Master Plan conditions.

Ms. Sheehan noted that it will be beneficial for this Committee and the neighborhood to be informed on what is happening even though it is maintenance work and not a huge construction project. Any big construction projects will have a Construction Management Plan (CMP) that details a communication plan. Swedish and Sabey would like input from the Committee on how to best communicate the plan to the neighborhood.

Ms. Koehn suggested Swedish or Sabey communicate all small projects to the neighborhood as good neighbor policy.

Ms. Lane added that it will be beneficial for the neighborhood to know the work that is currently underway is street improvements and maintenance, not big infrastructure development. She suggested to the Committee to gather all the feedback and comments from the neighborhood and compile them for the Committee to review in advance of the next meeting.

Ms. Koehn asked if there is any clarification from Swedish on why they were not able to comply on the condition of discouraging neighborhood parking. Mr. West committed to following up with Mark Melnyk.

V. 17th Avenue Pedestrian Connector

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion about the 17th Avenue pedestrian connector.

Mr. West summarized there were complaints about signage outside the entrance limiting use to employees only. He noted that there have been physical assaults happening around community hospitals, not particularly on the Swedish Cherry Hill campus. At the hospital, there have been issues with people taking food from the cafeteria and employees being threatened. Safety and security are his for Swedish, staff and patients were the objective for the decision to close the 17th Ave pedestrian connector, and that was the reason for the decision to put the signage.

The moment the concern was brought to his attention, he immediately put a hold to understand what the concerns were. After understanding and reviewing the commitment that the organization made to the City through the Skybridge permit renewal, the signs were taken down and the closure will not move forward.

He noted that inside the door entrance, there is a slippery walkway and his construction team would like to replace the flooring and close this entrance for 24 hours. He decided not to move forward until he first talked to this Committee to better understand and ask feedback on how to communicate and articulate this information. He would also like to partner with the Committee and gather thoughts and ideas on how to better secure the area and take care of the employees and staff. He understands that the commitment is a walkway through.

Ms. Lane added that the pedestrian walkway that goes from Cherry to Jefferson is part of the MIMP and it was there because as part of the agreement, it provided opportunity for neighbors for the north and south passage without walking four blocks.

Ms. Guillory mentioned that while the MIMP references the circulation, the requirement for the circulation opportunity is a product of a skybridge over 16th Avenue. It is a term permit that is facilitated by SDOT and approved by the City Council. As part of the public benefit package was the circulation around Cherry and Jefferson. It is not a requirement of the MIMP, but a requirement of the skybridge term permit approval.

Mr. Kliewer asked how the Committee would want to address the issue of a short-term closure due to maintenance. Mr. Letrondo commented that whatever the Committee decides will become a good foundation for future communication.

Ms. Sheehan suggested taking further outside this advisory committee by creating a sign-up or mailing as part of the Construction Management Plan or having a posting notice in advance. She referenced Sellen's CMP for Swedish First Hill. Mr. West asked the Committee if they are comfortable having a temporary sign in place in advance of maintenance work and have a longer-term communication plan discussion in place for the future.

Ms. Koehn commented to have an agenda item at the next meeting to discuss what is an appropriate communication process going forward. Ms. Sheehan noted on bringing the discussion in conjunction with the Construction Management Plan that will be put in place. Mr. Letrondo asked Ms. Sheehan for a copy of Sellen's CMP be available for reference.

Ms. Lane also added that she will be interested on what other major institutions are doing to address these safety, security issues.

Ms. Sheehan commented about the condition of the skybridge. If this is how Swedish would like to proceed it would need to be documented and receive City Council approval.

Ms. Koehn commented about any compliance violation and how it is documented. Mr. West introduced Mike Denney, the Chief Real Estate Officer for Swedish and he will be partnering on these issues.

VI. 18th Avenue Building Plans

Mr. Brad Hinthorne, architect from Perkins + Will, presented a high-level overview of the proposed 18th Avenue building plans. The project they will be presenting is Phase A site as identified in the MIMP. He described the development standards that were outlined in the MIMP including landscape, community amenities, streetscape plans, as well as the building entry and exit points. He reminded the Committee that tonight's presentation summarizes where the project is in the preliminary development as it relates to height, bulk, scale, and the relationship of the buildings.

Ms. Daria Supp showed a diagram of the site on 18th and noted the requirements and compliance within the MIMP as well as constraints to the site. She also showed how the building modulation, curb cuts, connection to campus, etc. as required by the MIMP.

She showed the plaza area which will be 90 ft. across that will separate the north and south buildings. The area will serve vehicles and pedestrians. She emphasized the importance of a landscape buffer with trees as screens that will provide a pleasant experience for the users inside the building as well.

Ms. Koehn asked about the Health Walk as shown in one of the diagram and Ms. Supp mentioned that there is no health walk and the diagram will be updated. The Health Walk was removed from the final MIMP, but this image was not updated.

Ms. Lane asked how high-level conceptual plan was being presented, and Mr. Hinthorne noted that the building height, scale, and the plaza area are identified, but the specific details about the use and design will be introduced and presented at the next meeting.

A question was raised if the plaza counts as open space for the MIMP. Ms. Supp noted that under this design, the plaza was not called out specifically.

A question was raised about what point the 37 ft. height was measured since the height was an important negotiated issue and the constraint of having a huge grade difference on the site. Ms. Supp noted that it was measured using the City process for measuring height for the buildings using the average grade for the site.

A question was raised if the building parking is definite since it is close to the neighbors. Mr. Hinthorne mentioned that the location entry of the parking is fixed based on the topography of the site and the MIMP and it is logistically simpler and safer for the garage to be at the back of the building. He added that they have plans to mitigate issues such as sound, headlights, etc. using trees, screens.

Ms. Lane commented that many of her neighbors were asking about the purpose of the buildings. Mr. West noted that Swedish does not yet know what the building use will be other than medical use related to the hospital.

VII. Public comments

Mr. Letrondo opened the floor for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments 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 voice recording (.mp3) form)

Comments from Andrew Sullivan: Mr. Sullivan, who lives on 19th Avenue, commented about the existing parking lot on 18th Avenue and if there are any plans for the current parking situation once construction begins. He added that he likes the idea of having speed humps added along the greenway that travels to 18th and 19th Avenue. He commented about the dressed security guards that were coming in and out of the 553 19th Avenue property that is owned by 17th and James LLC and governed by Sabey Corporation. Since the property is outside the MIO boundary, he would like to know if this can be addressed by Sabey.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper, who lives on 16th Avenue, commented that the Committee should have received his comments in writing and many of his comments were addressed at tonight's meeting. He emphasized on the TMP compliance point and it was difficult for him to understand the process that went through to comply with the options from WSDOT as to how to count the SOV. He commented about the timeline and all the things that must happen before permits are issued, because there were elements that were listed and detailed in the MIMP that has not been addressed. He also added some may have difficulty accessing the meeting room because it is card key access only after 6:30 pm and this violates the Open Meetings Act if the public are unable to access and be at this meeting.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen lives on 19th Avenue since 1991 and commented her concerns on why the discussion about the Committee's process is being addressed at this time since this is the Committee's fifth meeting. She added that she was confused on how the Committee was formed and how the recruiting process went since there was no neighbor representative from 19th Avenue. She added that communication with the neighbors is a big issue. Emails are not reliable and if the City is working through a social justice lens, it is important to

accommodate and reach out to neighbors that do not have access to email. She thanked the Committee for taking a closer look at the TMP issues and she addressed her concern about the landscape buffer and its use. She does not want to see people camping in the landscape buffer and be another tent city and she would like the issue to be addressed.

Comments from Mary McLaughlin: Ms. McLaughlin lives on 19th Avenue and commented that she was actively involved in the MIMP process as well as the previous one. She addressed her concern about not being notified about this meeting. She noted that she signed up through the City, but she did not receive any notification about this meeting. She heard about this meeting through her neighbor. She asked that this issue be resolved.

Comment from Abil Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw commented and inquired if there will be windows on the east side of the building to address her concerns about people looking at her house and the neighbors.

A response was made that there will be windows and added that the design team will do whatever they can to provide safety and privacy issue to the nearby neighbors.

Comment from Danielle Sullivan: Ms. Sullivan commented that the big issue that was discussed was about the SOV compliance rate and asked if there is an opportunity if someone from the neighborhood or a neutral party be designated to observe on how the SOV rate was gathered.

VIII. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Committee deliberation.

Ms. Lane commented that she appreciates the Committee taking the time to engage into a conversation on how to improve the process. She suggested focusing on community outreach and communication among the neighbors be ongoing agenda item. She added that she appreciates the comment about nearby residents that are not getting any email or information about this meeting, and asked Ms. Sheehan look at past records to address this concern.

Ms. Sheehan commented to send her their correct email addresses and she will add them to the current listserv database.

IX. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

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