



MEMBERS

Julia Blum (Vice-Chair)
Justin Kliewer
Catherine Koehn
Claire Lane
Dave Letrondo (Chair)
Kevin Klauer
Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods
David West,
Swedish Cherry Hill
Carly Guillory,
Seattle Department of Construction &
Inspections

**Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

**Meeting Minutes
Meeting #6
May 9, 2018
Adopted June 13, 2018**

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill
500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC
Seattle, WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present

Julia Blum	Catherine Koehn	David Letrondo
Justin Kliewer	Claire Lane	Kevin Klauer

Staff and Others Present

Eileen DeArmon – Sabey	Ann Sutphin - SDOT
Carly Guillory - SDCI	David West – Swedish
Mark Melnyk – Swedish	Sherry Williams – Swedish
Maureen Sheehan - DON	

I. Opening and Introductions

Mr. David Letrondo opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

There were motions to adopt the November 28, 2017 and April 12, 2018 meeting minutes and both were seconded. The Committee voted, and the motions were adopted.

III. Meeting #5 Follow-ups

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion about Meeting #5 follow-ups.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan commented about a notice that was mailed to neighbors about a regular meeting schedule for the Committee on the second Wednesday of each month. The meeting location will be at James Tower. If a meeting is canceled community members without access to email are asked to provide her a phone number so she can contact them.

The meeting materials were sent one week in advance and are posted at the [City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods](#) website. There is a comprehensive library of documents related to the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP. Ms. Lane asked that a meeting cancellation note be listed on the website.

Ms. Sheehan added that the Advisory Committee asked to have input on the agenda and this happened for this meeting and going forward.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the purpose and role of an Advisory Committee as stated the Seattle Municipal Code: to continue to advise the Institution and the City about the implementation of the Master Plan.

The SAC membership is comprised of seven committee members with one alternate. The role of the alternate is to attend every meeting and can vote when a regular committee member is absent. The committee also has one non-management representative from the institution, who currently is Kevin Klauer.

All regular committee members have one vote and the alternate member will fill the spot in place of an absent regular committee member. The committee needs to have a total of four members to have a quorum, and the goal of the committee is to have a consensus, and the committee will continue to vote until a consensus is reached.

Mr. David West provided an update about the pedestrian closure and it was put on hold due to the concerns that was presented at the last meeting. He noted that he would like to continue the discussion about the security challenges at a different time. There will be times were the connector needs to close due to. There should be signs posted in now to inform the public of maintenance that will be happening this weekend and if there is none then the work will be postponed or delayed. The closure is not an all-day event.

Mr. West introduced Ms. Sherry Williams to talk about the communication plan. Ms. Williams is the Community Engagement Director for Swedish Cherry Hill. She and Ms. Sheehan discussed a communication plan that is in the works to identify communication opportunities. These elements include having a phone list where Ms. Sheehan can call and notify about meeting cancellations, updated listserv and email addresses, public posting boards to use to communicate internal postings such as agendas, construction plans, and project timelines and contact information for Swedish Cherry Hill, Sabey, and DON.

Swedish Cherry Hill is creating a new MIMP website that will be available to the public and a link will be available to the DON website. She commented that if the Committee has any other recommendations or communication opportunities to share them so Swedish can review and activate them. She was also informed that Sabey is considering having external signs that provide the same information Swedish has if the public are unable to get into the building.

A comment was made if any of the materials from the old Swedish website will still be available, and Ms. Williams noted that outdated information will be replaced with a new and updated information.

A comment was made if non-technical mailers will be available to a larger community and Ms. Williams mentioned that she has not discussed it with their Marketing and Communications team. They must determine the viability, cost and amount of information that needs to be sent. She mentioned that a formal communication plan document will be available at the next meeting or at the next opportunity when the information will be sent out to the public.

Mr. Letrondo suggested to have the website links and the location of the posting boards in the meeting minutes.

Ms. Sheehan informed the Committee that the meeting minutes are being recorded.

Ms. Lane expressed appreciation about the postcards and the standing meeting dates information. She asked if it is possible to use City resources to communicate these notices in a different language other than English. She commented about advertising the notices to the neighbors that do not come to the campus. She suggests having a robust conversation about community engagement strategy that is beyond the bare minimum at the next meeting. She inquired if the contact information is used to add to the email list for those who signed in.

Ms. Sheehan commented that if the public indicate that they would like to be informed about program updates, that their information is added into the listserv. She added that it will be beneficial to build on existing networks and have Swedish, Sabey and DON partner with them. Ms. Williams noted that they could add the Swedish link to the Squire Park Community Council website or Facebook page to have the connection. Ms. Lane mentioned that Squire Park also published a paper flyer and it will be helpful if the information and standing notices be added to that for those community members who does not go to the Internet regularly. She also suggested an update in the sign-in sheet instead of receiving information about project updates but also meeting notices.

Mr. Letrondo asked about the minimum requirement for announcing meeting notices, and Ms. Sheehan noted that for the advisory committee the City is only required to widely notice the first meeting, for example postcards are sent within 600 ft. of the institution. Any construction impacts are outlined by SDCl and described in a Construction Management Plan (CMP).

Groundwater

Several documents were supplied to the Committee regarding groundwater as requested.

Mr. Letrondo asked if there is an underground stream below and the response was it was described perched water and more technical details are summarized in the report.

Perched water is not water being supplied from below and not a stream running through, but water coming from above such as rain and it hits certain layers that slows the absorption from the ground below. It is still infiltrating at a slower pace. It is not an aquifer or stream.

Ms. Lane commented that a geotechnical evaluation is required under the MIMP before issuance of any MUP. She read through the report and it only explains the evaluation based on best practices. She asked what will happen if something different is uncovered during the drilling process and how do the impacted neighbors get notified, mitigated, and communicated.

Ms. Eileen DeArmon explained that there will be an engineer onsite to monitor and adjust the plan, and it will depend on the severity of the impact to the neighborhood on when to notify them.

Ms. Sheehan added that the CMO is the document that this Committee will see that summarizes any actions taken if something unexpected happens.

Ms. Lane asked what happens if construction began and changes happen to the ground floor that creates flooding in areas that they were not supposed to have flooding. Ms. DeArmon answered that a hydrogeologist will be the best person to explain the conditions. As the project gets closer, there will be more information available that could improve and mitigate specific scenarios.

Other Updates:

There will be underground utility work that is happening along 18th Avenue. The scope of the work is to have power and communications buried underground. The permit is under review by SDOT and trailers will be delivered to the site once a firm date is set.

The roof of the Jefferson Tower will be replaced, and the target start date is May 21st, and may require six weeks to complete. There will be no potential impact to the surrounding neighborhood since the work will be done inside the campus.

Sabey has responded to a few corrections that was received from the City regarding the Cherry Street Residential Project. Demolition depends on when the MUP is issued, which could be as early as June. The building permit corrections have been submitted to the City. A permit is expected in late July or August. For clarification, Ms. Sheehan informed the Committee that there was a question about the other work Sabey does around the neighborhood outside the MIO and unrelated to the MIMP, and the Cherry Street project is one of them. As a courtesy, Sabey wanted to share this information.

IV. Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Survey Results/Methodology

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion on the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) survey results and methodology.

Ms. Ann Sutphin introduced herself. She works for SDOT in the Transit and Mobility Division and she oversees the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program, which CTR is one of the key programs. CTR is a state law that came about in 1991 and was incorporated into the WAClear Air Act. The law affects large employers with over 100 or more employees that are scheduled to arrive at work between 6 am and 9 am and requires employers to have a commute program.

SDOT staff provide program guidance, direction, and contracts with Commute Seattle who provides direct assistance to employers to help meet their requirements. A fundamental requirement for these employers is to demonstrate how they are meeting their trip reduction (or SOV) performance goals. Employers must survey their employees every two years and the State provides the survey platform and processes the results, and SDOT reviews the results. They report every two years to demonstrate that they are making a good faith effort in achieving their goals.

Another local TDM program is the Transportation Management Programs (TMP's) that are required in the land use approval processes based on SEPA policy or code authority. A TMP identifies programs for building tenants that will be deployed to achieve the TMP goal set for the project. These programs may include: parking management strategies, ORCA passes, etc. There are 13 major institutions, and all of these have TMPs. The Council approves and sets TMP requirements for these major institutions.

Ms. Sutphin's role is to manage and oversee these programs. She noted that Ms. Emily Ehlers from SDOT attended the last meeting and provided a memo that addressed questions about the CTR and TMP requirements for this institution.

She commented that Swedish Cherry Hill has the most oversight of the TMP of any of the major institutions at this time. She mentioned that she is directly engaged with the Integration Transportation Board (ITB) that was formed in 2014 to provide on-going input on TMP implementation. Community concern about lack of achievement of a long-standing trip reduction performance goal was one reason this special advisory group was established.

She added that she is familiar with the Swedish Cherry Hill program and had direct experience with the survey in 2016. Previously, the tenants were surveying on different cycles and they all agreed to survey the full population of all tenants at the same time on May 2016. It was agreed that another survey of the full population be done in the fall of 2017. The survey methodology used for the survey is set by SDCI and SDOT. She worked with Mr. Gordon Clowers of SDCI who reviews all the major institution's annual reports. She and Mr. Clowers confirmed the CTR methodology. The process begins by identifying how many people are on the site, and Commute Seattle provides oversight to ensure the documentation is complete and the survey is conducted in a scheduled two-week window. The survey results were available in October and reviewed by city staff in November. The results showed that the campus met the 50% drive alone performance milestone and achieved a 47.9% drive alone rate. She noted that she did her due diligence and convened a meeting with SDCI and the staff who was working with the campus and reviewed the results independently and determined that Swedish Cherry Hill followed all the rules. A communication was sent to Swedish Cherry Hill representatives with that information.

She commented that the current rule is to have a 50% response rate and the campus achieved it. The campus adequately surveyed their population. There was a request to have all the survey reports be available and those were provided to the SAC. There were five separate reports that were generated because of the different populations and each employer received a 50% response rate.

She added that they also looked at the unadjusted aggregate results in another way and scaled to the total reported CTR employees at the site as reported in a pre-survey form. That scaled (or "adjusted") results were a 47.54% drive-alone rate.

The next survey will be in 2019. She continues to serve on the ITB and the next meeting will be in June. She recommends that a member of the SAC be on the ITB to help in the communication and understanding of the transportation programming.

A question was asked if someone does not respond to the survey does it count as an SOV? Ms. Sutphin mentioned that a 50% overall response rate is required for CTR. The state in the past wanted to have a full census-like of response and they had a 70% threshold goal. On paper and policy, a 50% response rate is a fail and had to be surveyed. But in the past, they wanted them to reach 70%. If they do not reach 70%, the state would "fill" the remaining data as SOV. In practice, the state has not actually added that "fill" to the data. In 2013, the state clarified that their policy was not using the fill, but they maintained a goal of a 70% response rate. For the May 2016, Swedish had a 70% response rate and we had asked to keep the surveys open to get the 70% response rate. In 2016, WSDOT decided to drop the 70% response rate goal altogether since it was creating confusion. This was implemented in the fall 2017 CTR survey cycle for all Seattle sites and all sites were simply required to achieve a 50% response rate.

She noted that Mr. Bob Cooper did his due diligence and found on the WSDOT website an out of date state surveying guideline which was presented to the Committee. She contacted WSDOT staff informing of the outdated guideline on the website. WSDOT has since removed the old guideline. For Swedish Cherry Hill's TMP, by the Council's 2016 decision, and SDCI and SDOT were given the authority to set the methodology.

Mr. Bob Cooper responded that the information he provided to the Committee was what published in the WSDOT website. He argued that survey should have followed what was published rather than what was adopted which was not fully implemented, and the controlling regulation should be the information on the website at the time of the survey.

Ms. Lane asked about how the decision was made to consolidate all tenants to conduct the survey at the same schedule. Mr. Mark Melnyk commented about the CTR and TMP. He noted that Swedish Cherry Hill has a TMP with CTR employers, and the normal schedule is to survey the two different programs in opposite years. The TMP is surveyed on an even year, and every CTR employer is on an odd year. The result is data for two separate years blended together. Based on feedback from the public, a decision was made to have everyone conduct a survey on the same year to have consistent data. It meant going back and do the survey the following year that is why you have two different cycles.

Ms. Lane asked if the survey was done in 2016, why it was done again on 2017 instead of 2018, and Mr. Melnyk commented was the agreement to go back into the regular schedule and the 2017 survey was an extra effort to get every tenant in the same cycle.

Ms. Sutphin added that SDOT is proud of its CTR program specifically in collecting and analyzing the data.

Ms. Lane questioned the survey done in 2017 since it came with incentives. She also noted that in the April meeting minutes, it stated that the SOV rate was 47% instead of 47.9% as mentioned in tonight's meeting.

There was a motion to amend the April minutes to reflect the SOV rate change as was discussed, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion passed.

Ms. Lane asked about the decision to change the survey cycle in the odd years. Ms. Sutphin noted that they decided to be in the City's survey cycle and Mr. Melnyk added that the CTR population is surveyed on the odd years. He also noted that the discussion about survey cycle schedule was presented in the June 2017 minutes.

A question was asked about dropping the response rate to 50% from 70%. Ms. Sutphin commented that when the state dropped the rule, the analysis was that they did not see any data quality issues and it required a tremendous amount of energy and work to survey to a 70% rate. As an observer, she noted that the Cherry Hill campus pushed very hard to get the response rate to 70%, but because of competing activities at the campus, and possible survey fatigue among the population achieving the 70% rate was difficult and a challenge for them.

A comment was made about the quality of the data between the 50% and 70% response rate. Ms. Sutphin noted that they follow the state program rules and believes that a 50% response rate for a survey is a good data point. She also added that the state formally removed the recommended response rate of 70% in 2016. Additionally, there is a Director's Rule for SDCI and SDOT for TMPs that was adopted in 2016 that the response rate is 50% for TMPs.

Ms. Sheehan commented that there were concerns from the Committee from the last meeting about this issue and meeting the goal enables Swedish to move forward with a MUP. She recommends that if there are still outstanding issues and concerns that Ms. Sutphin cannot answer, the Committee draft a letter to SDCI that will be reviewed by SDCI during the MUP application.

Ms. Lane commented that it is not just this issue, but because of the long history of Swedish/Providence not meeting the goal. She asked about the mode splits and the dramatic changes among the tenants and the outstanding issues that makes the SOV rates go down.

Mr. Melnyk commented that changing the behavior of a small population like Northwest Kidney and Sabey are easier than a large population. A robust outreach and engagement plan makes a tremendous impact. He also noted that there is a period of transition among the tenants affected the population. An outreach program, awareness, education, and the ability to engage the population to the innovative programs allow for a meaningful conversation that leads to habit and behavior changes.

Ms. Lane commented her appreciation for all the work was done since this is a huge issue in the neighborhood. She asked about what the actual survey process looks like with the lower threshold. Mr. Melnyk responded that a communication plan is implemented for a large population and getting the word out about a week or two in advance before the survey. An email is sent to all population and follow-up meetings with managers and departments. Managers are reminded to have their employees complete the survey and this is done in a three-

week duration instead of a normal two-week schedule. The challenges include having all the Swedish campuses do the survey at the same time, other surveys happening around campus including employee engagement, Department of Health, etc. and carving some time for employees that are not stationed in cubicles to do the survey.

The TMP survey methodology for major institutions is defined by the Council's decision. All major institutions must have a TMP and the Council defines its performance goals and those performance goals vary for each major institution.

V. Public Comments

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in voice recording (.mp3) form)

Comments from Mary McLaughlin: Ms. McLaughlin commented about the ground water. She read the report from Shannon Wilson recommending that they would continue to consult with the design team during the construction. She mentioned that the report also states that things could change as construction happens and would like to know what level of oversight there will be in terms of the design and the construction, so it will not adversely impact the neighborhood.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper commented that the Committee should carefully monitor the groundwater issue. He noted his appreciation to the Committee for facing the audience, so he can observe the interaction among members. He would like for the Committee to be more informed about the Open Public Meetings Act because of the notice requirements about an open public meeting. He would like to see that the doors remain open during the meeting since it was locked previously. He also commented about a required element of the TMP that he has not seen in the report and this is about an analysis of employees that do not use transit must have access to transit.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen shared her appreciation for having the meetings on a regular schedule and improved communication. She received the postcard notice and was surprised that it was only in English. She noted that this is a good opportunity for Swedish and Sabey to be good neighbors and expand and go beyond the minimum standards. She inquired about the Jefferson Tower roof replacement on May 21st and she would not have known about this if she did not attend tonight's meeting. She asked about the hours of construction and if neighbors be notified. She also noticed that she did not see a sign regarding the closure of the 17th Ave corridor breezeway due to a repair this weekend and was disturbed by this.

Comments from Vicky Schianterelli: Ms. Schianterelli commented that her property gets flooded every time it rains, and these issues have been raised to the City several times. The City continues to participate in collusion with the major institution in doing things that are not honorable to the neighbors. She added her concern about privacy issues and a design discussion about transparent fences along the 18th Avenue property line. She is offended by this and has been petitioning Swedish and Sabey about this issue. She commented about the groundwater issue especially the surface aquifers. She sent information and testimonies from engineers that a maintenance plan should be issued before any landscaping is done on the fence line.

Comments from Jerry Matsui: Mr. Matsui commented that he would like to see more information from the consultant that SDOT uses to examine and formulate the TMP survey. He added that he would like to see a copy of the contract from the consultant. The groundwater and the house that he has lived in for 72 years has had constant flooding when it rains heavily. He noted that Swedish/Sabey/Providence need to mitigate this important and critical issue and a rain garden solution will not work.

VI. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Committee deliberation.

Mr. Justin Kliewer commented that it was good to bring up the groundwater discussion but that it is months ahead of the actual design and mitigating any problems. He noted that this Committee, Sabey or the architects does not have any answers, but it is good that was brought up, so everyone can be aware.

Ms. Lane commented that she appreciates having the neighbors raising this water issue and noted that having this awareness early on will engage the architects and the design team to think forward.

Ms. Sheehan echoed Mr. Kliewer's comment about the water issue at this time and she noted that she is working with the design team along with Swedish and Sabey on a schedule and what to expect in terms of a timeline. She also had a discussion with the Chair and Vice-chair to look at the Master Plan and what the Committee is looking for and comparing it to be shared at the June meeting.

A comment was made about the groundwater issues and how it will continue to come up due to the concerns of the neighbors. She suggests having the architects prepare to speak directly about the issue, so the community is clear on how they would address these issues upfront instead of having ongoing presentations and meetings. She also suggested addressing the privacy issues.

Ms. Sheehan noted that it will be an iterative process and she will highlight what the Committee would want to see, and she will convey it to them.

A comment was made about the hours of construction for the roof replacement. Sabey mentioned that the roof project will follow the noise ordinance and agreed to do the work between 8 am and 5 pm. They are sensitive to the neighbors and tenants and the work will be done during the weekdays and has not scheduled any weekends. The duration of the project is about six weeks, depending on the weather conditions.

A comment was made regarding the TMP analysis that was brought up by Mr. Cooper in his public comments and if Swedish can provide that information. Mr. Melnyk commented that he will look at the available data and provide what was being asked to the SAC once it becomes available.

Ms. Lane commented that she is a long-time bus user and her observation was there are fewer options in the neighborhood than there used to be. There will be no capacity in the neighborhood to meet the demand and she would like to continue and encourage the ITB to push Metro for more options and expansion.

A question was asked about truck traffic entering and leaving the construction area for the roof. Sabey commented that there will be dumpster trucks transporting the rocks and they will be parked at the campus drive lane. There will be beeping noise for safety and alert the pedestrians that are walking in the traffic flow.

Mr. Kliewer commented that to manage expectations of the Committee and the public at the next meeting it is important for the Committee and the public to understand the difference between the MIMP, MUP, and the building permit. He noted that it is important to talk about the groundwater issue, it is also important to know what the Committee's responsibilities is to review or control this issue. He added that privacy issue is an important aspect that this Committee can contribute into. Ms. Sheehan responded that she will work with SDCl.

Ms. Lane commented that even though the Committee has no official say or decision making regarding the groundwater issue, it is important to give feedback and comment for the decision makers to watch for. She added that there are elements in the MIMP about managing storm water.

Ms. Sheehan commented that she can provide clarification about the MUP, MIMP and the building permit and the role of this Committee.

Ms. Lane suggested a review of the conditions of the Master Plan at the upcoming meetings to determine what has been done and what needs to happen. She would like to see a comprehensive and consolidated document that summarizes the work.

Ms. Lane commented about a comment made by Mr. Matsui regarding a transportation consultant and her understanding was the City has a contract with Commute Seattle to do work with the CTR program and the transportation plans. Ms. Sutphin noted that they contract Commute Seattle to help with employer assistance for the CTR program and they extended their contract to help provide TMP program support to property managers for collecting reports, notifying about the survey requirements, and making sure that everyone is on track. Commute Seattle is not a consultant, doing transportation analysis or review for the major institution conditions. SDOT does the transportation review and analysis of Major Institution requirements including TMP's in partnership with SDCl.

Commute Seattle helps fill the survey for all Swedish campuses except for UW. Mr. Melnyk added that Commute Seattle is involved in the opening and closing of the survey. They are not directly involved in the data collection communication, and outreach.

A comment was made about the Sabey memo and the information about upcoming construction and would like to see more frequent communication so that the community is aware of what is happening in their neighborhood.

A comment was made about having the need to think creatively regarding communication and engaging the community even more about the process. She noted being aware of the existing channels and to continue use and explore other mediums and opportunities to better connect with the community.

Ms. Sheehan noted that there are two avenues of communication to the community. One is the advisory committee meetings where she can share with other community councils and the other is the construction communication plan. She mentioned that if there are any other outlets available to share this information with Ms. Williams. The job of the City is to facilitate these meetings and the get information to the Committee to deliberate. The institution will be responsible to manage the construction communication.

A suggestion was made for future meetings is to have a separate signup sheet for public comments. Mr. Kliewer suggested to announce making public comments for those individuals who did not sign up at the start of the meeting as a standard practice.

Ms. Sheehan informed the Committee that at the next meeting, the design team will do a detailed presentation about the design and the requirements the Committee will be looking at.

Mr. Letrondo added if a civil engineer can be invited to discuss about best practices on how to manage the storm drainage and the code requirements.

IX. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

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