



**City of Seattle**

**Department of Planning and Development**

Diane M. Sugimura, Director

---

**Swedish Cherry Hill Medical Center  
Scoping Document**

**June, 2013**

**Swedish Cherry Hill Medical Center Major Institution Master Plan  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Scoping Document**

On February 27, 2013, the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) issued a Notice of Application, Determination of Significance, and Scoping Notice concerning Swedish Cherry Hill's application for Council Land Use Action to adopt a new major institution master plan for Swedish Cherry Hill Medical Center. A rezone is required for expansion of the major institution overlay (MIO) boundary and modifications to MIO height limits. The proposal includes two future street vacations.

To ensure the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is concise and addresses the significant environmental issues, the Lead Agency (City of Seattle, DPD), invited comment on the Determination of Significance from the public, interest groups, affected Tribes and government agencies. The comment period ended on April 4, 2013. A Scoping meeting was held on March 21, 2013.

After review of the written comments received during the Notice of Application and Scoping, oral and written comment received at the Scoping meeting, and, written comment received from the Citizen Advisory Committee, the following **elements** of the environment have been identified as probable significant adverse impacts and shall be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (at a minimum, the issues identified under each element shall be addressed):

**1. Construction Impacts**

- Erosion Control (short term impacts from clearing and grading)
- Air quality (short term impacts, truck idling, clearing and grading)
- Storm water runoff (quality, quantity)
- Noise (short term impacts from site preparation, demolition and construction activity)
- Sidewalk/street closures
- Pedestrian circulation
- Truck Trip Traffic (earth, demolition, construction materials)
- Transportation (haul routes, street closures)
- Staging areas
- Increased parking demand (construction worker vehicles)
- Transit (bus stop/layover locations)

## 2. Impacts of Operation

### Air Quality

- Auto emissions from increased vehicular traffic
- Greenhouse gas emissions (City goal for carbon neutrality and worksheet)

### Water Quality

- Storm drainage runoff and surface water flows (long-term impacts)
- Ground water flow

### Height, Bulk and Scale

- Transition (between MIO heights and MIO boundary edges)
- Topography (between MIO and boundary edges)
- Large development sites (bulk, scale, and potential for creation of wind tunnels)
- Comprehensive Plan (Section B, Land Use Element of Comp Plan)
- Modified development standards

### Historic Preservation

- Historic structures on campus
- Historic structures in Squire Park

### Housing

- Reduction in housing supply (single family homes along 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and multi-family north and south of the existing campus)

### Land Use

- Comprehensive Plan
  - Section B of the Land Use Element Goals and applicable policies under Education and Employability and Health in the Human Development Element
  - Section C of the Land Use Element Goals, Location Specific Land Use Policies, C-2 Major Institution Goals and Policies
  - Neighborhood Plan(s)
- Street Vacation Policies
- Compatibility with surrounding uses
- Neighborhood connectivity and cohesion
- Street level uses
- Hospital versus office use
- MIO criteria
- Rezone criteria
- Modified development standards
- Decentralization options

### **Light and Glare**

- Lighting (interior, exterior, streetscape)
- Reflective surface (MIO boundary edges)
- Modified development standards

### **Noise and Environmental Health**

- Noise generators (mechanical, operational, ambulances)
- Handling and disposal of medical waste

### **Parking (to be included in the Transportation Element)**

- Parking Demand and supply (overflow)
- Transportation Management Program
- Modified development standards (minimum and maximum parking spaces)

### **Public Services and Facilities**

- Excessive demands on “public services” (water supply, sewers, storm drains, solid waste disposal facilities, and streets and services such as transit, solid waste collection, and police and fire protection)
- Impacts of parks, civic and other open spaces

### **Shadows on Open Space**

- Impacts to surrounding area (MIO boundary edges, public rights-of-way, proposed public open spaces)
- Modified development standards

### **Traffic and Transportation**

- Increased traffic volumes
- Traffic operations, including intersection LOS
- Effects of proposed street vacations on parking and circulation
- Transportation Management Program (including effectiveness of existing TMP)
- LOS at parking entrances/exits
- Pedestrian and bicycle impacts
- Pedestrian Circulation
- Pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular safety and accident levels
- Loading and movement of goods
- Transit service and access
- Neighborhood parking supply and enforcement
- Cumulative transportation impacts with other First Hill Major Institutions (Seattle University, Swedish First Hill, Harborview, and Virginia Mason)
- Consistency with City’s Transportation Plans
  - Transportation Strategic Plan
  - Transit Plan

- Pedestrian Plan
- Bicycle Plan

The EIS must analyze probable adverse environmental impacts that are significant. As permitted under SMC 25.05.402 discussion of nonsignificant impacts may be included and shall be brief and limited to summarizing impacts or noting why more study of the impact is not warranted. The following elements are not considered to have probable significant adverse environmental impacts: Earth/Geology (operational impacts), and Energy (usage of electrical and other forms of energy).

The EIS must discuss the proposal and reasonable alternative including the “no-action” alternative. A reasonable alternative must include actions that could feasible attain or approximate a proposal’s objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation.

The applicant has stated their objective for the Major Institution Master Plan is to construct an additional 2 million GSF, for a total of approximately 3.2 million GSF, over the next 30 to 50 years.

The applicant identified the following six (6) alternatives:

**Alternative 1 - No Action Alternative** – (used for the purpose of comparing impacts). Swedish Cherry Hill will not expand gross square feet or its boundaries.

**Alternative 2 – Compressed Growth/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues**

- Maintain the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west, south and east
- Expand boundary to the north to add “Spencer Technologies” property (located on the northwest corner of Cherry Street/16<sup>th</sup> Avenue)
- Expand vertical capacity from MIO 37’, 65’, and 105’ to MIO 65’, 90’, 105’ and 200’
- Demolish and rebuild aging medical buildings
- Vacate 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues between E. Jefferson and E. Cherry Streets
- Add approximately 1.9 million GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 3.1 million GSF

**Alternative 3 – Decompressed Growth/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues**

- Maintain the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west
- Expand boundary to the north to add “Spencer Technologies” property (located on the northwest corner of Cherry Street/16<sup>th</sup> Avenue) and properties north of E. Cherry Street between 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenues
- Expand boundary to the east to add half-block along 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue located between E. Jefferson and E/ Cherry Streets

- Expand boundary to the south to add properties south of E. Jefferson Street between 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues
- Expand vertical capacity from MIO 37', 65', and 105' to MIO 37', 50', 65', 90', 105', 160' and 200'
- Demolish and rebuild aging medical buildings
- Vacate 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues between E. Jefferson and E. Cherry Streets
- Add approximately 2 million GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 3.2 million GSF

#### **Alternative 4 – Compressed Growth/No Street Vacations**

- Maintain the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west, south and east
- Expand boundary to the north to add “Spencer Technologies” property (located on the northwest corner of Cherry Street/16th Avenue) and DSHS property (located on the north side of Cherry Street between 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues)
- Expand vertical capacity from MIO 37', 65', and 105' to MIO 37', 65', 90', 105', 200 and 240'
- Demolish and rebuild aging medical buildings
- Construct a skybridge across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and across 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Add approximately 1.9 million GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 3.1 million GSF

#### **Alternative 5 –Compressed Growth/Emphasis West/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

- Maintain the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west, south and east
- Expand boundary to the north to add “Spencer Technologies” property (located on the northwest corner of Cherry Street/16th Avenue)
- Expand vertical capacity from MIO 37', 65', and 105' to MIO 65', 105', 160', and 200'
- Demolish and rebuild aging medical buildings
- Vacate 16th Avenue between E. Jefferson and E. Cherry Streets
- Construct a skybridge across 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Add approximately 2 million GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 3.2 million GSF

#### **Alternative 6 –Compressed Growth/Emphasis West/Reduced Height East/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

- Maintain the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west, south and east
- Expand boundary to the north to add “Spencer Technologies” property (located on the northwest corner of Cherry Street/16th Avenue)
- Expand vertical capacity from MIO 37', 65', and 105' to MIO 50', 65', 105', 160', 200', and 240'
- Demolish and rebuild aging medical buildings

- Vacate 16th Avenue between E. Jefferson and E. Cherry Streets
- Construct a skybridge across 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Add approximately 1.8 million GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 3 million GSF

Swedish Cherry Hill considered an additional alternative which would have maintained the existing MIOs and would not have included either street vacation, but found that the available building envelope would only provide them 2 million GSF. This would not meet their projected need of approximately 3.2 million GSF.

The alternative included:

- Maintaining the existing campus MIO boundaries on the west, south, east, and north
- Maintaining vertical capacity at existing MIO heights (MIO 37, 65', and 105')
- Demolishing and rebuilding aging medical buildings
- Adding approximately 800,000 GSF of building area, for a total of approximately 2 million GSF

This option is not advanced for analysis in the EIS.

**The Director has identified the following alternative to the discussed in the EIS:**

- Alternative 1 – No Action
- Alternative 2 – Compressed Growth/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues
- Alternative 3 – Decompressed Growth/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues
- Alternative 4 – Compressed Growth/No Street Vacations
- Alternative 5 – Compressed Growth/Emphasis West/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Alternative 6 - Compressed Growth/Emphasis West/Reduced Height East/Vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue