



Minutes #9

(Adopted March 11, 2019)

Swedish Medical Center First Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, November 7, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center First Hill Campus

747 Broadway – B-Level Room #1

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Douglas Holtom	Heather Skeehan	Brian Parker
Ted Klainer	Carl Tully	
Molly Linden	Susan Zeman	

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan – DON	Sherry Williams – Swedish
Mike Denney – Swedish	

1. Opening and Introductions

Mr. Carl Tully opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

Ms. Maureen Sheehan shared that there will be an election for co-chairs of this Committee. Mr. Doug Holtom and Mr. Carl Tully both nominated themselves to serve as co-chairs for the Committee. The Committee voted, and Mr. Holtom and Mr. Tully were elected as the Committee's co-chairs.

A motion was made to adopt the August 8, 2017 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Review Annual Report

Mr. Holtom opened the discussion to review the annual report.

Mr. Mike Denney, chief real estate officer for Swedish highlighted the TMP (Transportation Management Plan), compliance conditions, development activities under the Master Plan and leasing and construction activities outside the MIO (Major Institutions Overlay) within 2,500 ft.

Mr. Tully commented that it would be interesting to hear about the status of the street car as well as transportation issues and challenges that Swedish is facing due to density growth in the area how Swedish is addressing them. Mr. Denney commented that Swedish has several transportation programs for both Cherry Hill and First Hill campuses. These programs include subsidies for van share, ride share, and car pools. The focus is to reduce the SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) traffic and all the transportation programs

has been successful. Swedish continues to have conversations about the street car and its impacts to traffic such as maneuvering the street cars without blocking traffic along Madison and Broadway. They are looking at making the parking garage accessible, easier, and faster for vehicles getting into Broad St.

Mr. Denney provided an update on the development and existing planning for the NW Tower and Block 95. Ms. Sherry Williams mentioned the community benefits, that they have been working with FHIA (First Hill Improvement Association) for the First Hill Park. Swedish has allocated \$500,000 for the project. Swedish has reimbursed FHIA for the design cost and supported each other on the design process of the park. Swedish is closely monitoring its community benefits responsibilities.

Mr. Holtom noted that Swedish provided the funds for the First Hill Park and the redesign is complete. It is now doing a fundraising for the public art piece and will begin construction by the end of this year.

A comment was made if there was a significant increase in use of the street car when it was opened and presumably an improvement in the SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) and CTR (Commute Trip Reduction) data. Mr. Denney commented that he will find out the data.

Mr. Tully asked if there are any data that relates to achieving the SOV targets, and Mr. Denney mentioned that he can get more details about the data. He added that they provided the data to SDOT and WSDOT validates the data.

Ms. Susan Zeman commented that she is interested to see the transportation data between the previous campaigns. She mentioned that one of the key complaints she heard from her colleagues was that they would like to see more reimbursement on the ORCA card.

Ms. Williams commented that in the last two years compared caregivers commute programs that promotes alternative modes of transportation for caregivers that provided opportunities for rideshare, cycling, offering van pools and a parking app in the smartphones, as well as improving commute information in the website to provide more connections. She mentioned that she will provide the data to show the program and highlight the improvements.

Mr. Denney commented that what Swedish First Hill did last year was to hire a concierge position in the parking office so employees and staff could call and assist in their modes of transportation, trip planning to help them which buses are available and convenient for them to utilize or any rideshare and carpool information. He added that he will provide the data and statistics showing the use.

A question was asked about bike infrastructures and showers available at campus for staff and employees. Ms. Williams noted that they have done some improvements and reorganizing of the facilities and she will provide more information about the current locations. Mr. Denney added that they are working on it as part of the project to get ready for the tower build, shifting different areas around campus. He mentioned that they are figuring out where to install staff showers by the bicycle storage area.

Ms. Zeman commented that based on her conversations with her colleagues and her own experience that the number one reason preventing riding bicycles to work is the lack of shower facilities and bicyclists could not find them. Mr. Denney mentioned that he will investigate it and he also added that he is working with the Cherry Hill campus on shower locations.

Mr. Denny noted that the biggest challenge for Swedish is space. He noted that there are not enough locations to move clinics in a cost-effective way, but he commented that he is willing to look at the shower location issue for employees and staff who ride the bicycle to work. Mr. Tully commented that this is a point of concern and it was interesting to hear from an employee's point of view and he would like to know about how Swedish can mitigate this shower location and ORCA reimbursement concerns, and how does Swedish gather input to provide useful information to decision makers.

Mr. Denney commented that Swedish is currently having internal conversations on how to improve and rework the transportation programs for staff and employees including ORAC reimbursements, etc. Ms. Williams added that they are working with a bike repair company as a benefit to staff and employees where they could bring their bicycles and do general bike repairs and service during the summer months in each of the campus and be subsidized for a certain amount.

Ms. Zeman asked about the status of Projects B and E in the annual report and Ms. Nancy Rogers referred to Project E (Block 95) and Project B (NW Tower). The NW Tower remains on hold.

Ms. Rogers mentioned that the MUP has been submitted and gone through several reviews before it was put on hold. The approvals that were obtained earlier were the City Council approval for alley vacation on Block 95 and term permit for the skybridge, and a conceptual approval for below grade tunnel. They notified the City to take off the hold on Block 95 and will do a resubmittal of the application to respond to the most recent corrections from the architecture team. The reason for moving the MUP forward because the building is a safety hazard.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee has reviewed and commented on these projects to SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections) during the MUP review. There will be no Committee comments going forward, only status updates.

Mr. Denney mentioned that there are no significant changes in the MUP. The reason for the delay is Swedish is reviewing the projects carefully in order to keep pace with the current trends in the health care industry. Swedish is looking at how to make these projects more efficient to meet the needs of the campus and making sure that it is done right. Swedish has identified the function of the building, but there are no specific details on what the different floors would look like. Swedish decided to hold off until the planning on the tower is finished.

Mr. Tully asked if there is a timeline for the review. He added if there is a process in place in managing through review and approval process, and Ms. Rogers explained that part of the MUP process is for additional environmental reviews, and the City will be doing an addendum to the EIS and to the MIMP to accommodate and address the impacts on the new project at Block 95.

Mr. Denney suggested to have a process 101 discussion, so the new Committee members can understand the MUP submittal process and updates to the project.

A comment was made that knowing what is happening around the area would be helpful for neighbors to receive an updated project status. He added that there were 15 mature trees that were removed along Cherry and Boren and he does not know if these was related to the project. Mr. Denney responded that he does not know if the trees that were taken down will be replaced since there is a landscape plan already in place.

Mr. Tully commented as a good point of communication to provide and set expectations, and outreach to the community so the neighbors would know what is happening or what is being taken away.

Mr. Ted Klainer asked if the public benefits needs to start before the project moves forward, and Mr. Denney mentioned that there is a sequence of events and the investment for the NW Tower is tied to capital projects for improvements and not an operating expense. He added that if Swedish gets its approval, it would take a year or so before the actual demolition of the building will start.

Ms. Zeman mentioned that she is a patient care giver and talked about the importance of a nature scenery particularly trees for healing and asked if there are any building design plans to have an outdoor garden space for patients for the new tower. Mr. Denney commented that part of the redesign and the design concept for the tower will include a cutout that faces north to decrease the amount of natural light and a green roof.

Mr. Tully commented that it would be a good idea to do a review of the design concept of the projects for the new Committee members at the next meeting to address the questions about open space, landscaping etc.

Mr. Klainer commented about the construction activities across First Hill and requiring construction workers park on the streets rather than occupy the visitor and patient garages and he asked if Swedish has any plans to address these issues. Mr. Denney mentioned that any information about construction and where to park are outlined in the CMP (Construction Management Plan).

4. Public Comments

Mr. Tully opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

5. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Tully opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

Mr. Tully recapped the discussion and follow up at the next meeting including an update on the TMP, a request to understand the taking down of the mature trees and what will be the next steps and how to address the tree plantings. In addition, the Committee would like to get a briefing on how open space, landscaping, green space is being proposed and approved and how will Swedish will implement the desire to integrate a patient care space.

The Committee would also like to see a detailed update on the EIS plans, requirements, and timelines and how the project will address it. He also added about the bicycle infrastructure and shower locations and having a clear understanding about what facilities are available to address the needs of staff and employees.

Mr. Denney added that Swedish will provide data on the SOV rate compared to last year and a better update on the street cars. Mr. Klainer added about an update on the funding for the First Hill Mile. Ms. Zeman also added an update on the pedestrian safety as condition by the City Council. Ms. Sheehan commented that any pedestrian safety operations can be addressed by SDOT.

Swedish has its own transportation engineer that has been updating the EIS, but not sure if a crosswalk analysis was done along the oxygen farm and Boren St.

Ms. Sheehan suggested at the next meeting to have a map available, so the Committee members could see the different intersections or pedestrian walkways that needs to be addressed.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned the survey about how the Major Institution Master Plan process is going and what she heard is having a meeting once a year is insufficient to receive new updates and information from the institution. She recommends, with the Committee's support, to reconvene in the next six months and go through process and update on what had been decided at the previous meetings.

Mr. Denney agreed, and added that Swedish will have a more definite plans regarding the project including budget and approvals will also be able to provide what is happening in 2019 schedule including building demolition, etc.

6. Adjournment and scheduling next meeting

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will coordinate with Swedish to identify the next meeting date.

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