



April 20, 2023

To: Andrew Davis, Chief Real Estate Officer
Camila Terceros, Swedish Parking & Commuting Manager

From: Gordon Clowers, Seattle Dept. of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)
Sarah Spicer, Seattle Dept. of Transportation
Ellie Smith, Seattle Dept. of Transportation

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for submitting an Annual Report for Swedish Cherry Hill after a long gap in reporting. We look forward to continuing our relationship. The reports are a useful record of the institution's progress as it continues to grow and change. We ask that going forward, Swedish make every effort to restore a regular rhythm of timely and responsive annual reporting to comply with the City requirements for Major Institutions. Other Major Institutions have continued to meet their obligations over the past few years despite the pandemic.

We have reviewed your report and find it to be responsive on many topics, but with a need for corrections and additional information to make it satisfactory. We have the following comments and questions.

SDCI

1. The single-occupant vehicle (SOV) percentage performance rates you cite on pages 4, 14, and 21 are not correct, and likely reflect only the performance of the SMC subset of the institution. Evidence of this is that your table on page 22 provides the possibly accurate calculation as 47.0%. Please review these past findings, and ensure the new survey results are correctly calculated as well. We look forward to seeing your edits regarding the old survey and the new survey numbers in the revised report version you will send. SDOT will be in further communication with you on these topics.
2. Page 4. Correct an apparent typo "187th Avenue" to, I assume, 18th Avenue.
3. Page 5. I agree that Swedish should make every effort to hold a public meeting in 2023 to discuss progress made so far in the Major Institution Master Plan, with appropriate publicity in advance of the meeting.
4. Gordon echoes SDOT's transportation related comments and interests in follow-up clarifications and discussions on certain topics and getting requested information, as noted below.



SDOT

Please see the following SDOT comments, for more discussion going forward, and your attention to making revisions and re-submitting this annual report. They are grouped from the most important to least urgent to address.

Overall comments to improve accuracy and relevance of report:

5. **Update the report with recent commute survey data.** SDOT appreciates Swedish Cherry Hill's efforts to successfully administer the 2022 Commute Trip Reduction Survey. We note that this annual report does not reflect the inclusion of the 2022 Commute Trip Reduction Survey data. As such, it does not fully identify opportunities, challenges, and future pathways for improved performance based on insights gained from this recent data. Please revise the annual report upon receipt of final survey results, and provide discussion in the "Anticipated Transportation Activities for 2023" section to reflect survey insights.
6. **Ensure thorough descriptions of activities during reporting period.** We have not received an annual report since 2018, so this report covers the reporting period 2019-2022. As such, we expect you to provide a reasonably detailed summary of development and transportation-related activities during this longer period of time. This may be best placed on page 21 of your report. We see that many descriptions of activities mostly duplicate the content from the 2018 report. Please provide more detail on the activities that specifically happened from 2019-2022, including ways in which activities shifted during the COVID-19 pandemic and related disruptions. Please also double check that each condition requirement is addressed, even if no progress was specifically made in the time period (this applies especially to Table 5.3 in the TMP conditions section).
7. **Update references to SOV goals/targets.** Please ensure the MIMP Plan's referenced SOV goal throughout is accurate. Based on the MIMP, the goal *started* with 50% in 2016, and anticipated a 2% reduction every 2 years, until reaching a 32% SOV rate by 2034. This would mean the 2022 SOV goal is 44%.
8. **Update references to SOV performance.** Please also revise the SOV performance referenced in this document, since there is a discrepancy. It appears the reported performance of past years does not reflect campus wide results, but rather only the results from Swedish Medical Center. Campus-wide results need to include the following:
 - e-82636 (SMC)
 - e-81892 (SMG)
 - e-82100 (NWK)
 - e-85696 (LabCorp)
 - e-81540 (Sabey)

Here are the performance numbers we have for the Cherry Hill campus (blending all e-codes listed above):

Campus-wide	2014	2016	2017	2019
Drive-Alone	57.5%	56.7%	47.9%	47.0%

9. **Include a high-level timeline of campus development activities, in alignment with Phased plans in MIMP.** It would be helpful to provide an overview of general status of the campus development at the time of report submission, particularly as it relates to the conditions outlined in the MIMP approval. This might also be best placed around page 21 of the report. Please provide a timeline of past key submittals, City reviews and approvals. This way, the big-picture of development under the MIMP doesn't need to be pieced together by reading condition by condition responses. Because this is a document for public consumption, it is important to demystify this information as much as possible.

MIMP Conditions

10. Page 5: Condition 3. Please update the SOV goal to reflect the downward trend of 2% every two years. The 2017 goal should have been 49%, and the 2019 goal should be 47%
11. Page 6: Condition 8. This is the same entry as in 2018, in which it was indicated they are "open to exploring different bikeshare partnership options." How has Swedish Cherry Hill explored bikeshare partnerships in the last few years? Please provide more detail here.
12. Page 6: Condition 9. Who is SOTO? Is it referring to a City signal and traffic operations group? Was there ever a formal acknowledgement by the City or in the master plan approval proceedings that a signal would not be needed there ever at 16th and Cherry?
13. Page 10: Condition 24. This condition speaks to the inclusion of Jefferson Street transit street improvements between 15th and 17th Avenues with very specific commitments (real time info signs, covered waiting areas, pedestrian scale lighting, expanding boarding area, additional benches, and landscaping). The response only indicates that impacts from 18th Avenue are being addressed, but not this specific separate requirement. What plans does Swedish Cherry Hill have to meet this condition?

TMP Conditions

14. Page 23: Applies to all of Table 5.3. Make sure each item included in the description is addressed in the 2022 update column, even if it wasn't specifically tackled. We need a more thorough inventory so we understand the full scope of activities that occurred over the past few years.
15. Page 23: Applies to all of Table 5.3. Please double check that this table reflects updates from Table 5.6 from the 2018 report, which indicates upcoming activities. Identify if they have been accomplished or not.
16. Page 23: Please provide a clear description of what "Caregiver commute" is and which employers have access to it. Are there program metrics to be shared to help us understand the use/uptake of the program?

17. Page 23: Please provide some level of discussion of the changes and challenges the Swedish Cherry Hill institution experienced from 2019-2022? It feels especially important to speak about the travel impacts from COVID.
18. Page 23: We point out an apparent need for Swedish to reinstate a 100% transit pass subsidy if the institution as a whole is not meeting commuting goals across all tenants. We will expect to coordinate further with you on this topic to reach a resolution about next steps.
19. Page 27/28: Intercampus Commute program – have you been able to identify if this program is effectively improving commutes? In other words, does this service allow for people to make their commute mostly by non-driving modes, knowing that this service is available upon their arrival for use during the day? How many people have taken advantage of this?
20. Page 27/28: What data or factors are you using to decide if it's safe to re-start the shuttle? Given the COVID emergency declaration has expired, it seems like an appropriate time to ask about this topic. For employees that relied on using the shuttle to complement their transit journeys, how have their commutes changed?
21. Page 28: Provide specific discussion of each requirement, and edit the response to indicate that the annual reports were not submitted on schedule for the 2019-2022 timeframe.
22. Page 35: Please include Ellie Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, as the SDOT representative.
23. Page 33: For the first item in this look ahead for topics of work in 2023, please edit the first sentence to say, “*In 2023, Swedish will actively engage with transit service providers...*”

Additional comments for consideration

MIMP Conditions

24. Page 6: Condition 7. Has the bicycle parking provided been maintained per City Council conditions? Has the demand for these facilities changed during the last few years? Regarding 18th Ave bike parking: will the bike parking for the new development meet the design elements listed?
25. Page 8: Condition 13. The status item indicates there is no planned pocket park, but the MIMP indicates there is a commitment to a pocket park at 18th & Cherry as a part of Phase A development.

TMP Conditions

26. Page 7: Condition 12. Please specify how the institution has interacted with the Central Ridge Neighborhood Greenway project. <https://www.seattle.gov/transportation/projects-and-programs/programs/greenways-program/central-ridge>
27. Page 24: It is good to see the upcoming use of LifTango to improve carpool matching.

28. Page 24: We would be curious to understand participation in car/vanpool numbers, and the plan for pricing structures/performance plan given the shift in incentive during this recent period. Will there be a time when you go back to what was outlined in the TMP?
29. Page 24: Please provide status updates on bicycle topics not addressed in your last column. Specifically:
 - a. Bike lockers – first come, first served – what is the demand for this? The TMP suggests making it available to "all employees" - is there enough provided at this time?
 - b. What is the signage for bike parking locations?
 - c. How is pedestrian and bike safety promoted?
 - d. Bike racks added to shuttle vehicles?
30. Page 25: Please provide specificity as to how bike share is promoted, and what exploration of partnerships have occurred in the last few years.
31. Page 25: Provide more details as to what the "bike spot" was.
32. Page 29: Have there been any updates or adjustments made in the last few years to the transit screens in your facilities?
33. Page 30: If Zipcars are used extensively, are there enough provided? How do you know? Similar to the Intercampus commute program question, does the flexibility of the Zipcars allow more folks to make their primary commute via transit?
34. Page 30: Please give a brief update about any recent changes since 2019 related to the topics of wayfinding for cyclists and pedestrians, the implementation of the vendor parking policy, and any further work on the residential pilot program.
35. Page 32: Please indicate what year the parking inventory and utilization rate is documented for. What can you say about changes since 2019 in the parking inventory and the parking utilization rate?

Thank you for considering and responding to these comments. For coordination with SDOT, please e-mail Sarah Spicer and Ellie Smith (@seattle.gov).

Sincerely,

<signed>

Gordon Clowers

<signed>

Sarah Spicer

cc: Carly Guillory, SDCI
Nelson Pesigan, DON
Dipti Garg, DON
Tina Tufts, Sabey Corp.