



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

Ashleigh Kilcup

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Committee Alternates

James Schell

Dean Patton

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*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #33

April 2, 2015,

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 Cherry Hill Auditorium

Members and Alternates Present

Patrick Angus	Dylan Glosecki	Leon Garnett
Linda Carrol	Maja Hadlock	David Letrondo
J Elliot Smith	Dean Patton	

Members and Alternates Absent

Katie Porter	Ashleigh Kilcup	Laurel Spelman
James Schell	Raleigh Watts	

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephany Haines
---------------------	-----------------

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Steve Sheppard. He noted that this is the 33rd and last, meeting of the Committee. He noted that this is intended to be a short meeting mainly to review the list of recommendations to assure that they are correct. No changes can be made. The Committee will take closing public comments and then adjourn.

Mr. Sheppard briefly went over the upcoming schedule leasing the hearing examiner Hearing. Members were reminded that they can submit minority reports. These are not reviewed by the full Committee and will need to be in prior to publication of the final Report. That is anticipated by the end of the month and members will be informed a couple of days prior to those minority reports being needed in final form. The Hearing Examiner hearing is the week of July 13th. There was considerable discussion of the conduct of the Hearing Examiner's hearing, including its length.

The meeting was turned over to Dylan Glosecki as vice chair. Past meeting notes were approved without substantive changes. Cleanup of typos was authorized to occur during final report editing as needed.

II. Brief Review of Committee Recommendations

The Committee was provided with a listing of its final recommendations. After brief review the Committee was polled by show of hands concerning whether the listed recommendations were accurate. The vote was unanimous and the final list of recommendations was approved without substantive changes.

III. Public Comments

Comments of Greg Harmon – Mr. Harmon thanked the Committee for its long service. Non-the-less this proposal should be rejected in total. The proposal is not an adequate compromise between positions.

Comment of Troy Meyers – Mr. Myers provided the Committee with a copy of his appeal and other information.

Comments of Abil Bradshaw – Ms. Bradshaw noted that this was her last opportunity to present her positions. She noted that she often appears angry at these meetings, but is not typically an angry person. This proposal is the cause of this anger. She stated that there needed to be more discussion of issues other than height bulk and scale. Particularly, underground garages should not be included in the 18th Avenue half-block. She noted that others in her block have the same position.

Comments of Cindy Thelen – Ms. Thelen asked for more information of the Hearing Examiner Hearing. A brief re-iteration of information presented earlier occurred.

Comments of Jerry Matsui – Mr. Matsui noted that he had lived in the neighborhood since 1946. He expressed dissatisfaction with the conduct of the Committee. He noted that members knew what their roles were but have not discharged this duty in terms of mitigating the impacts of this institution. He faulted both the Committee and the City Agencies. Too many were pre-disposed to favor the institution and ignored the neighborhood. He noted that the City has race and social justice goals and expressed the position that this was not taken into account for this proposal. There needed to be more neighbors from the 19th Avenue area and who were more aligned with the neighborhood positions.

Comments of Vicky Schianterelli – Ms. Schianterelli noted that this is one of the few CAC's that has been unable to reach a consensus with its neighbors and the institution. This is also the only institution in the City where the majority of the land within the MIO is not owned by the institution the majority of land in the MIO is owned by Sabey. Fifty seven percent of this campus is owned by Sabey. The intent of the Code was to allow owners of land within an MIO to remain. It was never anticipated that the institution would sell-off their land with the increased development authority under the Major Institutions Code. But this is what occurred here. The Code needs to be changes.

IV. Closing Comments

Mr. Sheppard noted that with the close of this meeting all formal Committee meetings will have been completed. Technically members' terms continue until the day that the Mayor Signs the legislations adopting the new Plan, following which terms expires. A follow-on Standing Advisory Committee will then be formed. Members will be asked if they wish to be considered for appointment to terms on that Committee.

He noted that the majority report is not a consensus, but only that all recommendations in it are accurately recorded and received a majority of members' votes for each. By approving the report members are not necessarily endorsing every recommendation since obviously not every member voted for every recommendation. Some were unanimous and others received bare majorities. This is also why minority reports are allowed.

Steve Sheppard stated that this has been a difficult process. Neighbors have often emotionally stated that this is an inappropriate level of development. Some believe that neither side listened to each other. This is not necessarily the case. If you look at the proposal compared to the original proposals, it is significantly reduced. The CAC currently sits in the middle between the institution and neighborhood positions. Neither side appears totally pleased with the CAC's positions. Perhaps this was inevitable given the high stakes involved for all parties. All parties have acted honorable, and

some times in the passion of the moment this has seemed to get lost. He thanked all members and neighborhood commenters for their diligent participation.

Dean Patton asked how many of these processes Mr. Sheppard had conducted. And why this one seemed so much more contentious. Mr. Sheppard responded that he had conducted at least twenty such master plan processes. When the process was established, it grew from conflicts over the spread of institutions into surrounding neighborhood, buying up land and growing horizontally. The Code tried to ameliorate this by allowing greater heights, bulks and scales than otherwise allowed in exchange for constraints of horizontal expansions. When the Code was developed it was clear that there were different typed of institution and different surrounding neighborhood. Some intuitions were both high-rise and located in medium to high rise neighborhoods. Others were more suburban and located in low-rise neighborhoods. As a result there was a wide range of heights identified in the Code.

Swedish Cherry Hill (Providence at the time) always presented a conundrum. It was more First Hill scale but located far east of that mid to high rise neighborhood. In a low-density neighborhood. By 1995 this conflict was becoming very clear. The two competing goals of promoting quality health care and protecting low-density neighborhoods was in stark conflict here. The neighbors appeared to see this proposal as a tipping point jeopardizing the continued health of this neighborhood as low-density.

V Final Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee the meeting was adjourned. No follow on meetings were scheduled.