



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*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #19

September 30, 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	Dave Letrondo
Leon Garnett	Laurel Spellman	Lara Branigan
Laurel Spelman	James Schell	J Elliot Smith
Raleigh Watts	Linda Carol	Patrick Angus

Members and Alternates Absent

Katie Porter

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Marcia Peterson, SMC	
Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT	

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Dylan Glosecki opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed. Steve Sheppard noted that members had meeting notes through meeting 17 and urged them to review those carefully.

Mr. Sheppard stated that the process going forward would be more formal. Members will be required to sign attendance sheets to establish quorum and voting eligibility. The Committee will soon establish formal positions for the final report. All votes on these positions will be by polling of members and individual positions recorded in the meeting notes. Mr. Glosecki asked the members to review the minutes and send any mark ups to Steve to avoid taking meeting time for typographical changes. The meeting notes will be approve at the next meeting.

II. SMC Presentations

Mr. Glosecki introduced Mr. Andy Cosentino. Mr. Cosentino stated that before diving into the TMP review, he would like to have Mr. John Jex to do a brief update regarding the final preliminary MIMP.

Preliminary Final Major Institutions Master Plan

Mr. Jex used the 3-D model to illustrate reduced heights on 15th, 16th and 18th Avenues that would be incorporated into Alternative 11. Changes illustrated included reduced heights in the West block. Mr. Jex also noted that design guidelines, would be incorporated into the plan as its Appendix H as recommended by the City and implemented by other institutions. The final plan will also include identification of neighborhood amenities, landscape area, open space, day care center, wellness center on 15th, a landscape buffer between 18th and 19th Avenues, linkage to 17th Avenue through the campus north south, linkage east to west on 15th to 18th through the campus, and the new TMP.

There was a brief discussion concerning how heights are conditioned down from the standard MIO heights in the Land Use Code. Members asked how conditioning might work for the West Block between 15th and 16th Avenues. Mr. Jex stated that a block is identified as MIO 160 but it is not the intent to build 160 feet high on that block. Instead it would be conditioned down. The current proposal would likely see heights no greater than 150 ft. along 15th Avenue and 125 ft. at the midpoint on 16th Avenue.

Mr. Sheppard informed the Committee that Children's, Virginia Mason and Seattle University used a similar method to condition down. The City Council then adopted those reductions as "Council Conditions".

Revised TMP Discussion

Mike Rimoin, from Commute Seattle and vice chair of the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB) was introduced to discuss the work of the Board. Mr. Rimoin provided a status update.

The current TMP goal is 50% maximum single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use. The last survey indicated that SOV use was currently at 56%. The ITB is working through different groups around the campus through a number of policy shifts, education outreach activities in order to develop strategies to reach the TMP goal. Current efforts include: 1) educational outreach, 2) communication about existing amenities, 3) transportation fairs, and 4) workshops and seminars on how to use the current transportation technology, bicycle 101, vanpools, bus pass, and ORCA sign ins.

The biggest challenge for the ITB is arranging that all stakeholders sit down and talk about the issues.

Mr. Rimoin listed the ITB priorities as follows: 1) develop a unified set of policies on parking; 2) assure TMP compliance; 3) incorporate anticipated transportation changes into plans; 4) engendering cultural shifts within SMC staff to further TMP goals.

The ITB has met a number of times. Work groups were formed and prepared: 1) draft parking enforcement plans, 2) a neighborhood parking call-in line and website, 3) draft vendor parking policies and 4) outlines of a "live close to work program" The ITB also discussed expanding shuttle operations as a critical element.

Mr. Cosentino reported that about \$1.3 million has been spent on shuttles, in response to the reduction of services done by Metro. The first trial route is from Westlake Park and other routes including connections to the International District station and Colman Dock. It will initially be a 13 hour service. SMC advocates changes to the current RPZ to compliment increased parking enforcement by SMC. He noted that SMC is concerned that enforcing parking prohibitions on its staff would have little affect if those spaces are taken by employees from Harborview or SU students etc. Therefore SMC advocates amending the RPZ to allow resident parking only with no two hour general parking allowed from 7:00-11:00. Such a change will require approval from neighbors.

Mr. Cosentino agreed that when the West Tower is occupied, it will generate traffic congestions. This will likely require expansion of outlying parking and further increased in the proposed shuttles. Other employers in the area will take a similar approach. SMC will also explore leased spaces at local churches. Mr. Glosecki stated that he would like to see the 44% goal reduced much further. Steve Sheppard stated that the current 50% goal is in line with other major institutions.

The shuttle expansion, bus stops and crosswalks are consistent with the First Hill neighborhood CTR goals set by SDOT. It will take a comprehensive multi modal plans to successfully address these issues. Swedish will be very aggressive in pursuing improvement.

Mr. Rimoin stated that aggressive actions will be needed to get down to 50% SOV goal and ultimately to the desired 44% CTR SOV goal identified in the plan.

IV. General Committee Discussion – Questions and Comments

The discussion was then opened by Mr. Glosecki for Committee comments.

Revised TMP Discussion

Mr. Glosecki note that he was on the ITC and that under the current proposal employees caught parking in the neighborhood would get a warnings and increasing discipline up to and including termination of employment. For vendors, the 1st strike is a warning, 2nd strike loss of the right to come on campus for 30 days and a 3rd strike will loss of the right to come on campus for 1 year.

Members asked if there was any current evidence that Harborview staff and other groups come to the neighborhood to park. Mr. Cosentino responded negatively but stated that once a void is created SMC assumes that such could be the case.

Members asked how many added employees would be on campus once the West Tower occupied. Mr. Jex responded that in Appendix G of the Draft Plan , the forecast is 277 by 2040.

Members noted that some vendors provide validated parking in the garages to their users but that SMC does not. Providing validation (free parking) might go a long way towards reducing patient parking in the neighborhood. Members also asked if patient would have access to the shuttles. Mr. Cosentino responded that shuttles are open to patients and employees. Patients will be informed of this.

Mr. Glosecki noted that two decades of failure to meet goals has resulted in zero credibility on parking issues in the neighborhood. This presents a major challenge to Swedish. Enforcement policies must be strict and neighbors clearly see that SMC has changed its practices. This will take some time and effort. Mr. Cosentino agreed and noted that Swedish takes this challenge very seriously. This will be a five year commitment and the enforcement policies will begin to kick off on January 2015.

Laurel Spellman asked if the policies being developed applied to the First Hill campus as well. Mr. Cosentino responded that it will be only at Cherry Hill. Dylan Glosecki stated that he wanted to see the SOV use goal retched down over time,

Steve Sheppard stated that the current 50% goal is in line with some other major institutions.

Alternative 11 General Committee Discussions

Mr. Glosecki stated that on Alternative 11, the that maximum heights on the 18th Avenue half block should be 37 feet, not 45 or 50 feet. Mr. Cosentino responded that it is worth exploring with different elevations and a thought process, transferring the square footage and smoothing out the building and leveling the area.

There was a brief discussion of concerns over privacy from the proposed roof gardens on the 18th Avenue half block. Mr. Jex reviewed the designs of those features highlighting efforts made to address those concerns. He noted that the design includes landscape edge to the roof deck to keep the visitors back from the edge thus reducing their ability to look down onto adjacent yards and homes.

Members noted that the most effective way to reduce traffic impacts would be to limit the amount of new development. Various members noted that the heights and bulks still appeared out of scale to the neighborhood. Mr. Glosecki asked what an appropriate height is. Various members responded that 105

feet would be appropriate, preserves the neighborhood, without dwarfing surrounding uses. Mr. Cosentino responded that the SAC had taken a preliminary vote on its degree of comfort with 160 feet for the Hospital building in Central block. The institution has spent a great deal of time and money developing this direction.

Dave Letrondo observed that there has been change. The institution started out at 240 foot towers in Alternative four and has now come down 90 feet in the Central block. Others noted that looking at the model and heights in alternative 11, they were happy to see that it is now moving in the right direction. Both sides needs to come together towards cooperation and concessions in order to come into an alignment.

Mr. Cosentino stated that 18 months ago SMC had identified a need for 3.1 million sq. ft. of development. The current alternative can provide only 2.75 million sq. ft. If the CAC recommends restricting height and bulk farther, then by default that will further reduce achievable development below projected needs.

IV. Public Comments

Comments from Robert Schwartz: Mr. Schwartz stated that he was the Associate Vice President of Facilities for the Seattle University. Seattle University staff met with Swedish Medical Center staff last week and reviewed the model of the current directions. The current proposal appears to address the major concerns that Seattle University raised previously such as building heights, setbacks, massing and articulation, circulation and connectivity and street activation. There has been significant progress on most issued. Building Height: Seattle University was not supportive of the original 200 foot proposal along 16th Avenue. With the significant reduction in building height along this street to an average of about 138 feet, with the greater articulation and setbacks along 15th Avenue, Seattle University's previous concerns about having a massive building looming over the Seattle University Campus are being addressed. There has been significant progress in the direction of building setbacks along 18th which he find is appropriate and is supportive of. There has been significant concessions regarding massing and articulation and believes that it is appropriate in those areas. Mr. Schwartz would like to see more circulation and activity along 15th and agree that the corner is a challenging street. Overall, Mr. Schwartz stated that Swedish and Sabey made significant movement and encouraged the CAC members to review these proposals favorably and move forward with appropriate conditions.

Comments from Julie Popper: Ms. Popper noted that she represents the SEIU Healthcare 1199 northwest. This organizations is the union for nurses and healthcare workers at all Swedish campuses. She referenced her support of the physician's positions that were submitted to the director stating that this is not First Hill and this is not downtown and it does not have the infrastructure of First Hill or downtown to support these transportation proposals. Combining shuttle service to the two campuses is unrealistic. The Swedish shuttle is full. Shift workers do not get off work on time. The shuttle should be a 24/7, around the clock operation. Solutions to the parking and transportation problems should not demonize employees. The only solution is to provide a quality transit infrastructure, walkable street car options.

Comments from Xachitl Maykovich: Ms. Maykovich stated that she was from the Washington Community Action Network. The impact of traffic to low income communities and colored people are way too great. She stated that the scale of development needs to be addressed to mitigate traffic impacts and that SMC should sit down with the neighbors to come up with real agreements to address their concerns.

Comments from Jack Hansen: Mr. Hansen stated that he was a very skeptical that SMC's proposed TMP efforts would be followed through on. Some innovation is being presented. However, he noted that they had stated that \$300,000 a year a year was allocated to this effort. Given the scope of the problem this is insufficient and not a real commitment. The real issue is the massive expansion to the neighborhood. This is a single-family area with two lane streets. He reminded the CAC that the message from the community has remained consistent since the very beginning that the scope and scale of this project is inappropriate

to this neighborhood. He encouraged the CAC to reject the proposed MIMP and send it back to the drawing board and start over. The neighborhood has seen little significant improvement.

Comments from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that at its current 105 ft., development is already too big and too tall for this neighborhood. Greater heights should not be allowed.

Comments from Joy Jacobsen: Ms. Jacobsen stated that this proposal is out of scale and should come down. While there has been progress, the current proposal it is not there yet.

Comments from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw stated that she believed that any apparent progress was an illusion. The first proposal about the complete destruction of every house on the west side of 19th and having an enormous building to be built on the north side of Cherry brought the neighborhood in tears. She stated that most people sitting in the room understood clearly that alternative 1 is false and pretended that Swedish were all in negotiations and that the only individuals being compromised in this room are the neighbors.

Comments from Troy Myers: Mr. Myers stated that he agreed with the statements made by neighbors and has been consistent that this campus is not First Hill. This neighborhood is not an urban village and does not have the same amount of transit service. The suggestion of having a neighborhood watch and a RPZ amendment sounds good, but he questioned shifting the burden to the neighborhood. The burden should not be on the neighbors. While the live close to work option seem interesting, it is unclear how it might affect employees who no longer work at Swedish, and how will they be subsidized. He noted that Sabey is a vendor and asked if the vendor policies, or SMC policies would apply to them. There will be significant construction that will impact the livability on the neighborhood and having trucks and construction vehicles idling at 7:00 am for a long period of time is detrimental to the people's health and the streets.

Editor's Note: Mr. Cooper had previously formally requested five minutes time to present a neighborhood survey. This request was granted.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper stated at, and after, the last meeting, members of the Committee were given a survey by Swedish about what they thought about the 3-D model that was presented. The same questions were given to the neighbors who were also asked questions about the health walk, definition of pedestrian scales and provided rating scales.

Fifty four persons responded all from this zip code (98122). Most lived very near the hospital. The same rating system was used. The overwhelming majority had attended the CAC meetings. The neighbors do not appear to care greatly about the amenities and are either neutral or not interested. The Bulk, height, scale and traffic impacts were their major concerns. Respondents were asked state whether they saw progress towards reaching an acceptable bulk, height and scale. Neighbors responded that they saw little or no progress. Mr. Cooper stated that there will be tremendous traffic that will be generated from these proposals and the Committee should consider what the neighbors want and the neighbors do not care about the amenities because of the little or no progress that was being is being made to reach any compromise. Neighb9rs are consistent in their opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Glosecki asked how the neighbors were sought out. Mr. Copper responded through organizing, collecting email addresses, and the comments were solicited on Facebook, and some neighbors identified themselves and some did not. Mr. Cooper stated that he will provided a copy of the survey results to the Committee, and stressed that it is not quite the racial balance of the neighborhood.

Laurel Spellman expressed surprise that the neighbors did not care about amenities and especially the proposed daycare. Mr. Glosecki echoed this comment. Mr. Cooper stated that he was very enthusiastic about having daycare 20 years ago, but it did not come to pass. Mr. Cooper would like to see, when it will be built, certain things are not allowed to happen unless certain goals are met.

Comments from Merlin Rainwater: Ms. Rainwater noted that she is an activist with Seattle Greenways and as such is very interested in an active and effective transportation program. These Transportation efforts should not be limited to meeting the demands of the community, but it should be part of the mission of the institutions. Swedish is a healthcare organization and it should embrace the goal of active transportation and should be an integral part of the institution. She stated that she believes that more patients than one might expect arrive by means other than the private car. She hopes that Swedish encourages transit users in the same way that Swedish encourages their employees using the parking garage and should embrace transit reimbursements for employees. The increase in shuttle services for patients and staff is nice but it does not benefit the rest of the community. She noted that Children's contributes to funding metro routes and suggested that SMC do likewise. Swedish should put more money into transportation improvements that could benefit everybody in the community.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen stated that she supports the comments made by her neighbors and mentioned the mistrust that exist between the institution and the neighborhood. This mistrust was reinforced when Alternative 11 was not presented to the public. She stated that she does not want a public rooftop and a garage behind her house that would invade her privacy. She is not excited about the daycare center and she kept saying over and over in these meetings for over a year and a half that the height, bulk, scale, and density are out of scale and far too large.

Comments from Vicki Schiantarelli: Ms. Schiantarelli noted that Sabey has purchased two remaining homeowners out along 18 Avenue and paid 1.5 million apiece. This was a \$3 million dollar investment. It is zoned single family and under the underlying code, a 25 ft. minimum rear-yard setback is required. However the institution initially proposed less, thus the proposed 25 foot setback is not all that impressive. In relationship to what was spent simply purchasing two properties, the transportation investment is not really significant. She showed viewpoint pictures that shows the building and foundation and how the ground level would look different at a 2nd story bedroom window and the only view will be the sky and nothing else. She stated that the amenities are offensive and are not mitigation for this level of development.

Comments from Greg Harmon: Mr. Harmon noted that the proposal started with 3.1 million square feet with that level of development maintained for alternatives 1 through 9. Now in Alternative 10 and 11 total square footage has been 2.7 million square feet. This is not enough of a reduction. He stated that it does not have enough infrastructure space here. The proposed TMP actions are an improvement compared to 20 years of doing nothing. It is difficult to integrate the plan and that the TMP goals needs to have more teeth

Comment from Lori Lucky: Ms. Lucky stated that she agreed with her neighbors that was stated at this meeting. When the meeting started, Mr. Cosentino stated that he had heard neighbors' concerns regarding traffic impact. This is not the primary concern of neighborhoods. The overall bulk, height, and scale of the buildings are the primary concern. Traffic is a close second. Also, she stated about parking consequences and the termination of employees, and if there is hierarchy involved and will doctors be terminated or it only applies to nurses, CNA's, etc. She stated that she do not like this project and there is no compromise to this kind of project.

Comment form Sonya Richter: Ms. Richter stated that she agrees with her neighbors. She noted that Swedish staff routinely refers to this as a downtown campus. It is not. This is not a negotiation but a power play by a large institution that has money and a neighborhood that does not have money. She stated that this project is too big for this site and the whole transportation plan is difficult to find a solution. She noted that the entire process feels like a power-grab by Swedish.

Comment from unnamed person The commenter stated that this campus is not an urban village and does not have the infrastructure to handle the current plan. She noted that Swedish/Sabey complex should be located in an urban village that has an appropriate transportation such as Rapid Transit. This project puts

a lot of pressure to the neighborhood street that would bring gridlock and negatively affect the neighborhood. She encourages the CAC to reconsider the proposal.

Comment from Mary Pat Dileva : Ms. Dileva stated that the comments made by the representative from Seattle University is irrelevant because of its vested interest on the project. She stated that the message by the neighbors that have been attending these meetings for 18 months and all testimony has been consistent. The proposals are too large and neighbors care more about reducing the scope of the proposal than amenities. The simple solution is “do not build this project”. She noted that it has nothing to do with the hospital, but the gridlock it will bring to the neighborhood according to the DEIS. She stated that this is for-profit development. WE are not here to help Sabey.

Comment Linda Cabba: Ms. Cabba stated that she is employed at the campus and lives in the neighborhood. She agreed with her neighbors about their frustrations with the lack of movement with this development. She also questioned some of the features transportation plan as it relates to employees. Some employees’ start shift as early as 5:00 AM and cannot easily use either public transportation or the proposed shuttles.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Glosecki announced the conclusion of the public comments and asked the Committee if they have any further questions. Mr. Patton made a comment that the meeting should stay on schedule so it could end on time. Mr. Sheppard commented that he suggested extra time for public comments as a courtesy.

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