



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
 Maja 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*
 Andy Cosentino
*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*
 Cristina Van Valkenburgh
*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #24

January 15, 2015

Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Dean Patton	Dylan Glosecki	Katie Porter
Leon Garnett	James Schell	Patrick Angus
J Elliot Smith	Linda Carol	Maja Hadlock
Raleigh Watts		

Members and Alternates Absent

David Letrondo	Ashleigh Kilcup	Laurel Spelman
----------------	-----------------	----------------

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed. The agenda was approved without changes. Ms. Porter noted that the main purpose of tonight's meeting was to receive a briefing on the Draft Report of the Director of the City's Department of Planning and Development.

II. Presentation of the Draft Report of the Director of DPD

Stephanie Haines from the Department of Planning and Development was introduced to provide a brief presentation of the Draft Report of the Director of DPD. She briefly read the major recommendations. The full report is included in these minutes as attachment 1

Following Ms. Haines reading of the Directors Report recommendations, Katie Porter commented that many of the recommended conditions appeared acceptable, but that one of the major issues that remains is enforcement. The Director needs to identify more enforcement mechanisms in the event that Swedish is unable to meet the identified conditions. Ms. Haines responded that DPD does measure performance and the institution has to respond and show that they are making improvements. Dylan Glosecki asked if a Standing Advisory Committee will be active before the first developmental

proposal is brought forward. Steve Sheppard responded that the Standing Advisory Committee would be in place to review development proposals. After the City Council adopted the plan, the CAC is done. Existing CAC members will be asked if they wish to serve terms on the Standing Advisory Committee. After the City Council adopted the plan, the CAC is done.

Steve Sheppard also noted that the Committee presently differs in major ways from the Draft Director's Report. The Committee has recommended significantly lower heights and there has been a clear indication that setbacks will also be reduced. Therefore the Committee presently disagrees with the conclusion of the Director that the plan should be adopted with the heights proposed in Alternative 12 and setbacks. The Committee's position is currently between that of the neighbors and Swedish. He asked if that was the general consensus of the Committee that Alternative 12 needed further amendments related to heights and setbacks if it is to be adopted. There were no objections raised.

Mr. Glosecki recommend that possible language around design guidelines should have some teeth to it. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that the Standing Advisory Committee will act as a "design review board lite". They will review and comment on the design of individual buildings but will not have the same enforcement authority of a City Design Review Boards.

III. Public Comments

The floor was opened to public comments.

Comments from Troy Meyers: Mr. Meyers stated that he appreciated the efforts of Ms. Haines and he would like to see consideration of having an independent external auditor to look at the whether conditions are met as part of the annual design compliance report.

Comments from Vicky Schianterelli: Ms Schianterelli noted that other institutions use ratios closer to 60% patients and 40% employees when calculating the amount of parking provided. Here the ratio is 80% employees. This calls into questions how much of this campus is actually devoted to patient care. This campus should be oriented to patient care, not other uses.

Comments from Ken Torp: Mr. Torp commented that his relationship with Swedish is not always adversarial. What has been presented from DPD is from the dark side. There was nothing in the draft report about height, bulk, scale and it has been consistent testimonies from the neighbors about balancing the needs of the institution and the neighborhood. The CAC has the responsibility to respond and to comment to this report. He asked that the CAC stand up for the neighbors, for the Squire Park Community Council, for the SEIU, etc. He noted that his major issue is not the detailed mitigation but the bulk, height and scale. The CAC should not get lost in the details of the Traffic Management Plan and that this plan is still too big.

Comments from Jerry Matsui: Mr. Matsui agreed with Mr. Torp's comments. Two years has been devoted to discussing this issues, and the plan is now at the point where it should have started. Negotiations should have started with this proposal and then been negotiated won farther. We have wasted two years. This feels too familiar; promises are made and not kept and the neighborhood is not respected. The institution has not mitigated anything in the plan or reduced possible adverse impacts. The projected use of the campus is not focused on hospital use but medical office and related services.

Comments from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod stated that Ms. Haines's DPD presentation is unacceptable. This report lays the groundwork for appeal to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner and the City ensures that the process is authentic and meaningful, and not a sham. The recommendation presented from DPD does not reflect the CAC recommendations nor the neighborhoods. It is insulting. There appears to be no intention to balance the needs and vitality of the neighborhood.

DPD has gone toward the institution. It essentially grants the institution everything it wants and ignores both the neighborhood and CAC. The CAC should not to give up. The CAC's recommendations are independent and can stand alone. The Hearing Examiner should pay attention to the CAC. The DPD's recommendations are unresponsive. The CAC should declare the DPD report to be inadequate and unresponsive.

Comments from Xochitl Maykovich: Ms. Maykovich stated that she was with Washington Can and that she would focus on the results of the Squire Park Community Council meeting on this process. One of the discussion is about community benefits. Swedish has failed in this area regarding charity care. Swedish should do some racial and equity impact studies due to the expansion that concerns height, bulk, and scale. She mentioned that Swedish should meet their obligation to equally serve the community and consider their needs throughout this expansion process.

Comments from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson agreed with all of the previous comments. He agree that enforcement mechanisms are lacking. Swedish is going to get a pass. There is nothing written that states "you shall" or "you must". The CAC must put forth a strong recommendation to reflect what the neighborhood is saying all along. Also, he mentioned about hearing the sound of construction and demolition traffic, and is discouraged about how this will be the future of his neighborhood.

IV. Committee Discussions

Discussion then returned to the Committees initial reactions to the proposal. The discussion started with a discussion of process and timing.

Steve Sheppard directed members' attention to the matrix of the recommendations pulled from the Directors report (Attachment 2 to these notes). Prior to the next meeting members should look at each of the recommendations and suggest those areas where the proposed changes or comments to them. He suggested that members forward their initial comments to him and that he would consolidate them into a document to become the basis for the detailed discussion at the upcoming meeting on January 29th. A week later, the CAC will have to produce a letter to Ms. Haines about what their comments. Mr. Sheppard noted that there was agreement on height, bulk, and scale on the 18th Avenue half block. Various members commented that the timeline is very tight and that they did not feel that they had sufficient time to properly consider comments. Katie Porter agreed but noted that the timeline appears to be no longer flexible.

Mr. Sheppard stated that the CAC's response to the Draft Directors Report is Due March 5, but that this is not the CAC's final report. The Committee's final report is not just a critique of Ms. Haine's DPD report, but an independent report. It stands alone. The CAC will have to craft recommendations that are not dealt by Ms. Haines and will have an equal standing with both the City and the Institution's report. He asked members to forward their draft comments to him by the January 26th. The goal for the meeting on January 29th will be to identify all comments so that the CAC's letter can be completed on time. His job is to write up that report and support the CAC's positons in the most effective way possible. CAC members can put forward minority reports that will be attached as an appendix to the CAC's final report.

Patrick Angus asked when the final report goes to the Hearing Examiner, and how much weigh it would have before the Hearing Examiner. He also asked how the neighborhood can present their positons. Mr. Sheppard responded that the Hearing Examiner will conduct a public Hearing and that anyone can present to the Hearing Examiner. The neighborhood could make a coordinated presentation to the Hearing Examiner. CAC members that have minority reports can comes forward and speak. The Hearing Examiner takes the CAC's recommendations into account and the CAC final report is one of the three key documents before the Hearing Examiner. The CAC will have an opportunity to present their report to the Hearing Examiner at the hearing.

Dean Patton asked why the CAC prepares two documents (response to the Draft Director's Report and Committee Final Report). Mr. Sheppard responded that the Code requires both. The CAC has the opportunity to respond to the draft DPD report. Ms. Haines comes back and produce the final report and then the CAC will develop their reaction to her final report and its own positions.

Members asked how often the CAC's recommendation match those put forward by the Intuition. Mr. Sheppard responded that it varies. About 70% or more of the time and the CAC substantially agrees with the institution with minor changes. Others asked how often DPD's reports support the institution. Mr. Sheppard responded that it varies, but DPD is often, but not always, closer to the institution than the CAC.

Discussion then returned to General Comment.

Raleigh Watts asked whether the CAC can advocate increase transit capacity. The Director's report contained few recommendations related to increase transit in the area. Mr. Haines responded that the basis for the recommendations was drawn from the EIS and the work of Transpo Group and SDOT. She noted that there was additional transit tied to the Children's Hospital Master Plan including increased shuttle service. The CAC can look into adding shuttle services or determine what type of conditions that will provide funds for more transportation.

Mr. Watts stated that in his opinion the section in the plan and the Draft Director's Report dealing with transit are inadequate and do not include sufficient conditions addressing transit capacity. He will recommend in his comments that the CAC state this and that the Director's report be amended to include conditions related to this issue including both additional transit capacity more shuttle services from Swedish.

Ms. Porter noted that she remained concerned about tying achievement of benchmarks related to transportation improvements to development phases. Ms. Haines responded that this can be recommended in certain situation and on certain conditions. This is usually done in reviewing each development as it comes forward.

Mr. Watts stated that he was not satisfied with the treatment of the sky-bridge in the Director's report. Ms. Haines responded that this process does not approve the sky bridge. A separate process is required.

Several members asked for clarification on both reporting back to the Standing Advisory Committee and what enforcement is included. Ms. Haines responded that DPD is required to publish annual reports each year and that they are reviewed by the Standing Advisory Committee. The annual report summarizes the development done under the Master Plan. The annual report only sees TMP compliance and what has been developed. If the CAC wants to see either additional reporting or changes to the format then it could recommend such.

James Schell noted that the transportation sections identify major arterials that are evaluated but failed to include 23th Avenue and some others. He stated that he would raise this issue for the 29th meeting.

Raleigh Watts noted that the Draft Director's report call for a reduction of the SOV goals of 1% reduction every 2 years. This is too slow. Another section states that Swedish will be allowed a lesser goal if others institutions in the area fail to meet some general CTR goal. He objected. Swedish should to be leader rather than a follower. Ms. Haines mentioned that the CTR goal is set by SDOT and most of the businesses that has 20 or more employees do not have a TMP. SOV goals are based on available transportation and SDOT believes it is an acceptable service. There was additional discussion and members noted that this should be a major discussion at the 29th meeting and possibly in the Committee's Final Report.

Mr. Watts stated that he would like to move that:

DPD inadequately addresses increased transit ridership and that in order to accommodate a transit use increase, Swedish participation in funding for increase increased transit capacity is necessary.

Ms. Porter stated that stated that there was insufficient information to make this decision at this meeting and suggested that it be dealt with on the 29th. Members agreed.

Ms. Porter asked Mr. Cosentino for information from ITB that shows the proposed action items. Mr. Cosentino responded that he would provide that information to Mr. Glosecki.

V. Adjournment

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