



# Minutes #15

(Adopted April 10, 2019)

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

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17<sup>th</sup> Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

### **Members and Alternate Present:**

Kevin Klauer	Catherine Koehn	Greg Swinton	James Welcher
Justin Kliewer	Claire Lane	Amanda Twiss	Lisa Fitzhugh (Alternate)

### **Staff and Other Present:**

Maureen Sheehan – DON	Sherry Williams – Swedish	Mike Hanson - Sabey
Sara Zora – SDOT	Mike Denney – Swedish	Kevin Zhang - Ellumus

---

### **1. Opening and Introductions**

Ms. Maureen Sheehan opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed

### **2. Housekeeping**

A motion was made to adopt the February 13, 2019 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

### **18<sup>th</sup> Ave Building Update:**

Mr. Mike Hanson of Sabey Corp. mentioned that he is in the process of responding to the committee's recommendations and collaborating with the City with its MUP application. Mr. Hanson noted that his understanding is the MUP and permit applications run in parallel until there is a ruling by the City. The City will make a determination and inform Sabey about any required modifications.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee asked at the last meeting to see the comment letters that came in response to the SEPA review, and the letter was sent out to the Committee today.

### **Campus Activity Update:**

Mr. Hanson mentioned that there is no current campus activity update. He noted the demolition of the Spencer Building at 16<sup>th</sup> and Cherry and the project is going along well. It was previously a Medical Technology building and the plan is to develop an apartment building. One of the main drivers is to help reduce the SOV goal at Swedish Cherry Hill by providing a complex that is close at the campus for employees or staff to live and walk to work instead of using their cars. Ms. Lane commented that she thought that the

building will be short-term housing for nurses or doctors that are travelling, and Mr. Hanson mentioned that it will be permanent housing.

Ms. Sheehan clarified that the building Mr. Hanson mentioned is outside the Major Institution Overlay (MIO.) A question was asked if it will be affordable housing, and Mr. Hanson mentioned that it will be market housing.

#### **Integrated Transportation Board (ITB) Update:**

Mr. Kevin Klauer is the Committee representative at the ITB that meets every other month with the goal of discussing transportation issues and concerns to the campus and to better understand how people get to work in order to achieve the MIMP SOV goal. Currently, the ITB is fulfilling its requirements before the start of the of the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Building. The ITB is also looking at updating its charter to make it more relevant and incorporating its role as it relates to this Committee.

The ITB is reviewing the Directional Capacity Analysis to identify all the employees on the Swedish Cherry Hill campus and if there are any improvements to increase transit ridership and better modes of transportation to the campus besides SOV. Mr. Mike Denney of Swedish also sits at the ITB and commented about the complexity of the analysis. He noted that once the analysis is done, they will present the results to the Committee. This capacity analysis is not only reviewing bus transportation but also other modes including improving the shuttle services, van share and car pooling as part of the discussion.

#### **Context and schedule:**

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee schedule was sent out last month and the only addition was for the Committee to discuss the overall process and reflect on any lessons learned from the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Building project and identify any best practices, organization, and prioritization for the upcoming projects.

### **3. Campus Overview**

Ms. Sheehan introduced Mr. Denney to present a campus overview. This was a request from the last meeting for the new Committee members about Swedish's overall goal and mission and any upcoming projects in the pipeline.

Mr. Denney shared the Swedish vision is health for a better world and this what drives Swedish in their decisions, missions and values for patients, staff, employees and people in the neighborhood and community.

Ms. Sherry Williams shared that as a non-profit organization, they are required to provide community benefit and every year Swedish identifies the five key areas where it provides community benefits including: community services, educational and financial assistance, clinical and social services, and free services such as Medicaid. As of 2017, Swedish spent almost \$200 million in community benefits. For 2018, the community benefit dollars have been identified and will share the information at the next meeting when it becomes available to the public.

Mr. Denney briefly explained the business planning process around quality, treating patients, investments, building buildings that is critical to the success and mission of Swedish.

Mr. Denney shared a brief history of the Cherry Hill campus. James Tower is the first hospital in Seattle and was founded by the Sisters of Charity. The campus became part of the Swedish system and became affiliated with Providence. Being affiliated with Providence allows Swedish the opportunity to leverage shared services and have a better cost-effective model as part of a larger system across a larger geographic area. It was not a merger or acquisition by Providence. Swedish has an independent board and operates as an autonomous region within the Providence system. There are processes that Swedish does as part of Providence, but the independent board also decides to do things differently under the affiliation agreement. The board looks at the interest of Swedish first and if there are any opportunities to leverage any resources to make Swedish better, the board will look at Providence.

Mr. Denney noted that when Swedish updated its business plan, it began by understanding the changes in real estate to better support the mission of Swedish. Swedish focused on understanding their partnership with other providers so it could add hospitals and clinics to the network that serve the whole population of the region and not just downtown Seattle.

Real estate should not drive its business plan. When Swedish is doing the Master Plan, it is not only what Swedish is going to do at each campus or community but planning for the relocation and changes of different functions in the community.

A question was asked about how the hotel fits in the overall vision of Swedish. Mr. Denney shared how challenging it is for families and patients to go to the hospital and look for affordable accommodations. This is a concern for Swedish, and as part of its mission to take care of the patients and their family that would allow them to find accommodations and close to the hospital. Ms. Sheehan added that in the Master Plan, it identifies different uses of the property and one of them is identified for hotel use.

Mr. Justin Kliewer asked if Swedish has identified any buildings in the development process, and Mr. Denney mentioned ongoing projects at the First Hill campus that are critical to the long-term success of Swedish. Swedish needs to complete the First Hill campus and then begin to plan a business development plan for the next 15 to 20 years at each campus.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that Master Plan has different phases, and each identified phases of development may happen at the discretion of Swedish.

#### **4. SAC Process Overview/Reflection**

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion on SAC process overview.

She noted that at the end of the last meeting and discussing with Mr. Kliewer, there was a need to orient the new Committee members and discuss the Committees concerns and possible solutions. She will work closely with the Committee Chair and Vice-Chair on the agenda and making sure that the needs of both Swedish and the Committee are met.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will be going on maternity leave soon and she will communicate the process to her replacement while on leave.

Mr. Kliewer mentioned areas that the Committee could work on as lessons learned from the past project. He suggested that the Committee should be more communicative to the Design Team and setting

expectations about agenda items and presentations to help them prepare and answer questions from the Committee. He added that the Committee should be more engaged with the Design Team.

Ms. Lane commented about the process the Committee reviewed and analyzed the Design guidelines, and it was a huge component of the MIMP. It was challenging for her because the Committee did not have a tool to guide the discussion as the Committee go over the list of guidelines.

A comment was made about looking at one of the requirements and to clearly understand the process.

Ms. Lane commented about not getting answers from the Design Team about the questions the Committee raised, and it was challenging to assess the scope of the project if the information is unavailable. Ms. Sheehan commented that there should be a point to have a closure on a specific issue if it was not addressed and document that issue in the report.

A suggestion was made about creating a spreadsheet tool to identify and capture action items. Ms. Lane added about having a process on how to delegate tasks among Committee members and provide a report back. She mentioned about having the Committee members access to a Google Doc for sharing information.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee about the open public meeting law and discourage any collaboration and discussion among members that is not in public. Ms. Catherine Koehn suggested that having a 3-person peer review is appropriate to review and collaborate about project information and share their findings with the Committee at a public meeting.

Mr. Kliewer commented about how the final letter went through different iteration and there should be a time where the Committee decides not to make any more changes and document any disagreements.

Ms. Liza Fitzhugh asked if the City pays careful attention to the recommendation of this Committee, and Mr. Kliewer mentioned that the City pays attention to the recommendation especially during the permitting period.

Mr. Kliewer commented about the issues for the new hotel project around health walk, pocket park and transit improvements. Ms. Sara Zora of SDOT to explain the role of SDOT in the permitting and application process.

Ms. Zora mentioned that, and Ms. Carly Guillory met with the hotel group to identify the campus requirements and suggest developing a strategy and timeframe for the project. there are different items in the MIMP regarding traffic improvements, signals, street improvement projects, etc. SDOT works with SDCI about these issues and will continue to attend any meetings if the Committee requested.

Ms. Lane mentioned that the MIMP requires a campus-wide dock management plan, and it was a challenge for the Committee for the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue building because it was difficult to determine if the project is meeting the right guidelines. She asked how the Committee will evaluate the application if they do not know the sequencing of the project and its application.

Mr. Denney shared that Sabey Corp. developed a dock management plan to their extent and the rest of the work falls under Swedish. He added that part of the challenge was understanding the additional items Swedish needs to add for clarity to capture the changes. This is where Swedish looks to Providence about

guidance and there is no final decision has been made regarding to the plan. He added to expect to add more details in the upcoming meetings.

Ms. Lane commented that it will be helpful for the Committee to have an outstanding list of overarching items other than the building design that Swedish needs to do.

## **5. Sanctuary Hotel at Cherry Hill – 1522 Jefferson St**

Ms. Sheehan introduced Mr. Kevin Zhang of Ellumus to present an update to the Sanctuary Hotel at Cherry Hill project. She mentioned that Mr. Zhang and his team presented at the last meeting and tonight's presentation incorporates feedback they heard from the Committee in February.

Mr. Zhang mentioned the Committees feedback in February were around design improvements and hotel operation and management. He added that he met with Ms. Sheehan and Mr. Denney to collaborate on the comments and questions from the Committee and noted that there are outstanding items that are in the process of being addressed.

Mr. Zhang showed a diagram of the site design improvements including refining the drop off area, including pavement that is integrated with the landscape strip, along with a vertical vegetation screen and secured bike parking rack. He showed the site design along the street corner with a vertical landscape wall along the sidewalk, and an outdoor deck covered by street level canopy.

He showed the site circulation analysis around the hotel including public, hotel guests, and vehicular circulation. He noted that they will provide a vehicle circulation traffic information and analysis at the next presentation.

Mr. Zhang also provided a diagram of the proposed floor plans for the hotel. The hotel will have six levels with a maximum occupancy of 42.

Mr. Zhang also showed a diagram of some of the architectural design improvements that addresses the blank façade.

One of the landscape design improvements include a roof garden space for private and public activities as well as lighting improvements with minimum lighting around the perimeter to reduce any light pollution.

The hotel owner will hire a third-party hotel management team to operate the hotel following Swedish standards. The hotel will primarily serve Swedish patients and their families with a discount rate and be open to the public depending on availability.

The café will not be a full-scale restaurant. It will offer food and drink options for Swedish patients and their families.

Ms. Sheehan asked the Committee to look at the presentation and identify any issues and concerns and share them at the next meeting and identify any action items.

## **6. Public Comment**

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion 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 Mary Pat DeLiva:** Ms. DeLiva commented her concerns about the affordability of the hotel for low-income visitors and patients and seniors. She commented about that the time when Swedish recommended accommodation for patients and visitors on places to stay, and these places were too expensive. She also commented about having vertical gardens and hopes that it will work at the hotel because she has not seen this work around her area.

## **7. Committee Deliberation**

Mr. Kliewer opened the discussion on committee deliberation.

The new Committee members thanked the Swedish staff, Ms. Sheehan and the Committee for supporting and educating them about the whole process and acknowledged Mr. Zhang and his Design Team for responding to their feedback and comments and their time spent in preparing the updated presentation.

## **8. Chair & Vice-Chair Nomination)**

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for chair and vice-chair nomination.

The role and responsibilities of the chair person is to collaborate with Ms. Sheehan and Swedish staff about the upcoming agenda and discussion items and running the meeting. The vice-chairperson will serve as a back-up when the chairperson is unavailable. Other responsibilities of a chairperson is to ensure that all Committee members' voices are being heard and being respectful to one another.

The Committee voted Mr. Kliewer as the chairperson and Ms. Lane as the vice-chairperson. Ms. Sheehan noted that she will work with Mr. Kliewer and Ms. Lane on the April meeting agenda.

## **9. Meeting #15 Agenda & Adjournment**

Mr. Denney suggested to schedule a pre-meeting with the chair and vice-chair along with Ms. Sheehan two-weeks before the Committee meeting to discuss and collaborate about the agenda items that will be relevant at the Committee meeting.

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