



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  
 Majo 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*

**DRAFT Meeting Notes**

**Meeting #20**

**October 16, 2014**

Swedish Medical Center  
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus  
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

**Members and Alternates Present**

Dean Patton	Dylan Glosecki	Lara Branigan
Leon Garnett	James Schell	J Elliot Smith
Laurel Spelman	Linda Carol	Patrick Angus
Raleigh Watts	Dave Letrondo	

**Members and Alternates Absent**

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	
Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT	

*(See sign-in sheet)*

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed.

**II. SMC Presentations – Preliminary Final MIMP**

SMC Staff briefly went over the Preliminary Final Master Plan. It was noted that the Preliminary Draft Master Plan presented Alternative 11 very much as outlined previously. The major changes from Alternative 10 related to a reduction of heights on both the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half Block and the West Block.

Heights on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block have been reduced to 37 feet south of the 15 foot height break in the center of the area and in a step-down pattern from 50 feet to 45 feet and then to 37 feet north towards Cherry Street. On the West Blok height has been reduced from 200 feet to 150 feet by extending a portion of the higher 150 foot area over a portion of the garage along Cherry Street. A height of 65 feet is also extended over all of the north third of that block.

**III. DPD Presentation – Preliminary Final EIS**

Stephanie Haines from Department of Planning and Development (DPD) provided a brief update on the final EIS. Ms. Haines noted that the

Preliminary Final EIS includes the new alternative 11, environmental impacts, and shadow impact studies as it relates to new heights. Comments received by the City during the 45 day comment period will be located in the back document including responses and oral comments made in the public hearing.

Ms. Haines noted that an edit line is included so readers can see where the changes were made from the original document. The City anticipates providing notice of availability of the FEIS in early December. Concerning related to the adequacy of the EIS will be made following publication of the final and any appeal hearing held simultaneously with the Hearing Examiner proceedings concerning the plan.

#### **IV. Transportation Update**

Ms. Haines introduced Mr. Mike Rimoin from the Transpo Group to provide an update on the work that was done in the transportation section between the draft and final EIS.

Mr. Rimoin provided highlights and updates. The two main areas that were discussed were: 1) Loading dock/vehicular access and locations; and 2) sensitivity analysis around mode splits on campus.. Information on the loading dock, is included in the FEIS. Mr. Rimoin noted that there have been questions concerning the location of future loading docks and a number of loading “bursts” (times when a more intense level of deliveries) occur. At this point, the EIS has had some difficulty identifying specific numbers and the actual uses are not known at this this point, but it will be included in the FEIS.

Concerning mode splits for the campus, the DEIS assumed that 50% of all vehicles arriving on campus would be Single Occupant Vehicles. In response to the enhanced TMP a reduction to 38% for SOV use was analyzed. The result of this would be a reduction of 165 in the number of vehicles arriving on campus. This would have a positive impact on some nearby intersections. This information too is now in the FEIS. Mr. Rimoin then presented graphics showing those changes made between the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The drawings identified all of the loading and parking zone locations. Ms. Porter noted that there are three entrances shown to and from 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Regarding the Transportation Management Plan, Mr. Rimoin highlighted two issues: 1) mitigation for traffic – reducing demand and 2) possible physical improvements. He noted that the key physical improvements were the traffic signals at 6<sup>th</sup> and Cherry, and 14<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson. These improvements are still included in the proposal that is evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. A loading dock management plan will also be developed by SDOT and DPD and included in the analysis and final plan.

Reducing SOV use and thus reduce demand of parking and reducing street congestion remains a priority. Key elements of the program include: 1) establishment of the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB) to identify long-term strategies and actions; 2) better integrating the activities of the various employers on campus; 3) establishing and operating a shuttle including remote shuttle parking; 4) tightening parking policies and enforcement; and 5) providing incentives for employees to live closer to their work in order promote walking and bicycle use..

Mr. Glosecki asked if the shuttle would be available for neighbors. Mr. Cosentino responded that Swedish Medical Center would be open to that concept during the first 90 days, and would then evaluate use to determine if there was sufficient capacity to see this continued. Ms. Porter noted that the focus of the data in the Environmental Impact Statement was traffic volumes and level of service. She asked that there be more attention given to accident history. Mr. Rimoin noted that they are in the process of looking at this but have not identified specific locations where accident history appears to drive or justify specific improvements.

Laurel Spelman stated that she had looked carefully at the Children’s Transportation Management Plan. The Children’s final Transportation management Plan establish a short term goal of 38%

Single Occupancy Vehicle use and long term goal of 30%. The goal for the Swedish Medical Center's First Hill Campus is 44%. Why is the Cherry Hill Goal higher than at these other institutions? . Ms. Spelman also noted that she had often heard that stop lights are not installed until after a major accident or death has occurred. She suggested that the program be forward looking rather than wait until a major accident occurs.

Mr. Rimoin responded that Swedish has their own set of parameters based on their culture that determines their SOV goal. The City does not pick the parameters.

Ms. Porter asked what happens if Swedish does not meet their goal. Ms. Van Vankelburgh from the Seattle Department of Transportation responded if the goals are not met, or there is insufficient progress being made towards meeting goals, first the Department of Planning and Development, and the Seattle Department of Transportation work together to identify additional action that must be taken to move towards meeting the goal. Ultimately if the goal is not met or no progress identified, is the institution is subject to a violation. She noted that this can be a monetary penalty. Ms. Porter mentioned that Swedish has not been in compliance for many years. Ms. Van Vankelburgh responded that the Seattle Department of Transportation is working very diligently with Swedish to rectify this. Ms. Porter suggested that other enforcement measures be considered such as delaying permits etc. Ms. Haines noted that when DPD makes recommendation the goal is established in consultation with SDOT. The EIS is based on meeting that 50% goal.

After brief further discussion concerning the need to seriously consider safety more broadly in developing various traffic improvements the Committee asked Mr. Cosentino to add safety considerations and goals to the ITB.

#### **IV. Public Comments**

Ms. Porter urged the public to focus on the Master Plan issues and not necessarily on labor practices, wages and benefits and the quality of care and services that Swedish provides.

**Comments from Troy Meyers:** Mr. Meyers stated that at the last CAC meeting, he requested a copy of Option 11. That this request was not honored. It's clear that if you look at the Land Use Code, it is impossible provide proper transitions to the neighborhood. The differential between the heights on the Campus and the neighborhood are just too great. There was a lot of discussion about the heights at the last meeting but little about bulk and scale. The current alternative does not resolving the concerns of the neighborhood. This neighborhood is not an urban village and there is an inadequate transportation and infrastructure in place to support this kind of development.

**Comments from Joy Jacobsen:** Ms. Jacobsen noted that the Land Use Code is all about transitions. The current proposal does not have appropriate transitions. 160 feet is normally considered "high Rise". She encouraged the CAC members to be bold on setbacks and consider further reducing bulk and height to comply with the Land Use Code.

**Comments from Aleta Van Patten:** Ms. Patten noted that she began commuting along 15<sup>th</sup> and Jackson Street, made the trip eight times and about 25% of the time, cars were coming out and pulled in front of her and almost hit them. Several years ago, Ms. Van Patten's husband had an accident on 18<sup>th</sup>, the accident was never reported because they did not have insurance. Safety concerns are very real. Extra traffic lights will not solve the problem. If there is DOT Management Plan for this campus it is not being enforced. She asked for more information on this. Would future enforcement be any more effective that past enforcement.

**Comments from Vicki Schianterelli:** Ms. Schianterelli noted she has asthma and her concerns regarding traffic and transportation was not just safety but with the increase in the volume of cars, trucks, and buses stalled for a period and the air pollution that would be produced. She would like to live in her house long-term but now has concerns about the increase in traffic and pollution being

projected. That may force her to live outside the city. She noted that she has seen several accidents at 19<sup>th</sup> and Cherry and 19<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson. The studies included in the Environmental Impact Statement are not accurate and appear to dramatically undercount these accidents. She noted that she is very worried about the pedestrians.

**Comments from Jerry Matsui:** Mr. Matsui noted that the TMP is inadequate and incompetent. Swedish has not achieved its SOV rate goal in 25 years. He is very skeptical that Swedish will ever achieve its current or future goals. He noted that Ms. Porter brought the issue about safety. He agreed with that concern. Mr. Matsui noted that he lives on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Cars routinely speed along this two-block section. He noted that school buses also use that street. Neighbors have demanded a that traffic light signal be installed; but apparently the only way the City will do so is after enough serious accidents happen, SDOT should remove all the parking and that traffic engineers need to get out of their desk and go out on the field and look at the reality.

**Comments from Ken Torp:** Mr. Torp noted that he has a letter to the DON, DPD and CAC that relates to height on 15<sup>th</sup> street and the low rise residential neighborhood. Swedish should be required to comply with the 1994 Major Institution overlay that specify the maximum height of 65 ft. Seattle University has done that on the other side of the street and he see no reason to grant Swedish more height that Seattle University. Transportation impacts are driven in large part by the maximum projected square feet of new development. This drives level of service, parking demand, etc. The currently proposed 2.75 million square feet cannot be reasonably accommodated in this low-rise residential neighborhood. He suggested reduction of total square footage to a level that can accommodated in the neighborhood.

**Comments from Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod noted that thus far the CAC has been discussing height and has not talked more about bulk or scale. Scale is pulling back and taking a holistic view of the entire thing that make sense. 37 feet on 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue is preferable to the proposed 45 feet. The current proposed bulks do not provide an adequate transition to the neighborhood. The building volumes should be broken up into smaller volumes and one continuous building in the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half-block should be avoided. The current proposal for the 15 Avenue block is not appropriate. Retaining a building on 15<sup>th</sup> that is 150 feet in height is moving in a wrong direction. Having a representative from Seattle University as a voting member of CAC is a conflict of interest. Finally, she noted that the ITB is all well and good and should have at least a representative from the union in the board, otherwise, their plan will be difficult to achieve.

**Comments from Cynthia Andrews** Ms. Andrews noted that she used to be on the CAC at the very beginning of this process. She stated that she appreciated the need to discuss height, bulk and scale, but there are other issues that should be addressed concerning services for the community and especially to our aging population. She noted that as an aging advocate, the facility is serving them and she does not want to lose sight of the value of those services.

**Comments from Marlin Rainwater** Ms. Rainwater noted that the presentation talked about increase in supply which meant capacity of the streets and making cars move more efficiently, but she noted that there are other big components to make the streets work and this is support for additional transit. She mentioned that Children's invested and paid for additional transit for their facility. She strongly urged to consider contributing to the transit capacity. She also noted that the whole TMP is geared towards accommodating a whole lot of people, but need to think about safety capacity for people who walk, bike, arrive in transit, people with walkers, wheelchairs because these will increase.

**Comment from Jack Hansen** Mr. Hansen stated that he was encouraged that the CAC members appear to be raising serious concerns. All of these concerns come down to one fundamental problem - expansion of this size is inconsistent to the character of the neighborhood and overstresses its infrastructure. He noted that he has experience with needs forecasting and that

the information contained in Appendix G of the plan is insufficient and does not adequately document a need for the level of new development proposed. More information on this issue is needed. He encouraged the CAC to recommend a complete rejection of the current MIMP and send it back Swedish for a total re-do.

**Comment from Lori Lucky:** Ms. Lucky stated that she was glad to bring out safety and traffic flow. She noted that in the last five years, she has been commuting down from Providence and looking at the loading dock has been a serious problem. She mentioned that on the diagram that was presented that there will be three loading docks in the new building. 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue already feels dangerous. She is very concern now and the future about large trucks that will be parked on the middle of the street that will be in one lane where they could not see pedestrians, bicycles and cars on the street.

**Comment from Greg Harmon:** Mr. Harmon stated that the total square feet of development needs to come down and that a more acceptable transition to the neighborhood needs to be developed and emphasized. Mr. Harmon felt that adding more care trips to the neighborhood does not feel safe and that the neighborhood is not an urban village.

## V. Committee Discussions

Ms. Porter opened the floor to discussion of heights. She noted that only about a half hour remains and that it might not be possible to reach agreement on the height issue. There are three proposals before the Committee: 1) Alternative 11 from the Plan, 2) A neighborhood proposal dated October 16, 2014 and 3) a compromise proposal that is in the middle from Dylan. Ms. Porter stated that ideally the Committee would take votes based on geography, 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue block, etc. Mr. Sheppard suggested that votes taken tonight be considered preliminary and are not final until the Committee votes on its recommendations for its final report.

Mr. Patton stated that he felt that it might still be premature to vote tonight and would prefer that information concerning issues raised at this meeting be available prior to moving to votes. Ms. Porter responded that she shares the issue about wanting more information about safety, but emphasized that there has been so much discussion about the heights that CAC will not get through to other topics unless the Committee can proceed.

Mr. Andy Cosentino noted that the ordinance Swedish derives its mission by looking out 30 years from now, that Swedish has decreased its square footage from 3.1 to 2.75. That is the minimal amount of space that can sustain support Swedish's mission over the next 30 years. Lowering height further will have significant impact to the sustainability of the campus.

Discussion then turned to the proposals as laid out below.



Glyan Glosecki Proposal

Neighborhood Proposal

Alternative 11

Mr. Glosecki noted that his proposal would retain 37 feet on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block with the central block pretty much the same as in alternative 11 and that for the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue block the

maximum height both along 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> should be lowered to a uniform 125 feet. In this block it might be possible to extend the higher area farther over the parking garage. This is shown in the alternative.

Mr. Glosecki also noted that he had met with several neighbors to go over their positions. He emphasized that this was not a formal neighborhood proposal. In this alternative the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half block is a uniform 37 feet, the central Block unchanged from its present heights under the current plan, with a similar treatment in the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue block as shown in his alternative. There was little consensus for this 125 with many advocating a lower height.

Ms. Porter noted that in the neighborhood proposal there is no change from the present plan with the possible exception of slightly higher height in the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue block.

Mr. Letrondo commented that he sees a lot of progress and compromise being made trying to meet the needs of the square footage and meet the needs of the neighborhood even though there has been comments about Swedish not cooperating and not being a good neighbor.

Mr. Sheppard mentioned that a quorum is present to begin to vote on the alternatives presented.

Ms. Porter suggested that there be some preliminary votes. Ms. Porter suggested that the first votes be whether the CAC could endorse the proposal as outlined in Alternative 11. She asked how this should be stated. After brief discussion it was moved by Raleigh Watts that

*The CAC approve the heights for the area bounded by 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue S Cherry Street and S. Jefferson street as proposed by Swedish Medical Center in its alternative 11.*

The motion was seconded.

There was a discussion of the possibility voting on each of the four proposals. It proved very difficult to determine the full range of possible alternatives and after some efforts in this direction, it was ultimately determined that the CAC would start with a vote concerning acceptance of the SMC proposal.

The roll called on the previous motion. The vote are as follows:

Dean Patton – No  
James Schell – No  
Elliot Smith – No  
Raleigh Watts – Yes  
Lara Branigan – Yes  
Dave Letrondo – Yes  
Linda Carrol – Yes  
Dylan Glosecki – No  
Laurel Spelman – No  
Katie Porter – No

The vote was 6 no; and 4 yes, a quorum being present but the majority of those present having voted in the negative, the motion failed

It was moved by Dave Letrondo that:

*The CAC approve the heights for the area bounded by 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue S Cherry Street and S. Jefferson street (Central Block) as proposed by Swedish Medical Center in its alternative 11.*

The motion was seconded. The roll call votes are as follows:

Dean Patton - No  
James Schell - No  
Elliot Smith - No  
Raleigh Watts - No  
Lara Branigan - Yes  
Dave Letrondo - Yes  
Linda Carrol - Yes  
Dylan Glosecki - No  
Laurel Spelman - No  
Katie Porter - Yes

The vote was 6 no; and 4 yes, a quorum being present but the majority of those present having voted in the negative, the motion failed

It was moved by Dave Letrondo that:

*The CAC approve the heights for the area bounded by 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the alley immediately to the East (18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half Block) (as proposed by Swedish Medical Center in its alternative 11.*

The motion was seconded. The roll call votes are as follows:

Dean Patton - No  
James Schell - No  
Elliot Smith - Yes  
Raleigh Watts - Yes  
Lara Branigan - No  
Dave Letrondo - Yes  
Linda Carrol - Yes  
Dylan Glosecki - No  
Laurel Spelman - No  
Katie Porter - Yes

The vote was 5 no; and 5 yes, a quorum being present but a tie vote having occurred, the motion failed.

With this vote the CAC essentially rejected the heights shown in alternative 12. Ms. Porter emphasized by continuing to discuss about height, the CAC is missing important things to discuss such as safety. She urged the CAC to proceed on with other issues. Ms. Porter stated that Alternative 11 does not work and would like to see something that does work.

## **VI. Adjournment**

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