

RECEIVED BY  
2015 MAY 15 PM 12:41  
OFFICE OF  
HEARING EXAMINER

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER  
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE WASHINGTON

In the matter of the application of

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER  
CHERRY HILL

for approval of a Major Institution Master  
Plan for property located at 500 17<sup>th</sup>  
Avenue

In the matter of the appeals of:

WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ACTION  
NETWORK; 19<sup>TH</sup> AVE BLOCK WATCH;  
CHERRY HILL COMMUNITY COUNCIL;  
SQUIRE PARK COMMUNITY COUNCIL;  
PATRICK ANGUS, et al.; and  
CONCERNED NEIGHBORS OF SWEDISH  
CHERRY HILL

From a SEPA Decision by the Director,  
Department of Planning and Development

CF 311936

FILE NOS.

MUP-15-010 (W)  
MUP 15-011 (W)  
MUP 15-012(W)  
MUP 15-013(W)  
MUP 15-014(W)  
MUP 15-015(W)

DPD # 3012953

DECLARATION OF PEGGY S.  
CAHILL

I, PEGGY S. CAHILL, declare as follows:

1. I am a legal assistant for Bricklin & Newman, LLP. I am over the age of 21. I  
make this declaration based on my personal knowledge.

2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of a transcript I prepared of a portion of the pre-hearing conference held in this matter on April 27, 2015 from the recording of the conference I obtained from the Hearing Examiner's office.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 15<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2015, at Seattle, Washington.

Peggy S. Cahill  
PEGGY S. CAHILL

Washington CAN  
Pre-Hearing Conference  
April 27, 2015

Mr. Brogan: Yes, good morning, Ms. Examiner. With respect to the notice of appeal filed by Washington Community Action Network, simply one question related to clarification and perhaps Ms. Newman can help us in this regard. The statement of issues on appeal begin on page 3 of that document and continue on to page 4. There is a reference in subsection (d) on page 4 that simply notes that attached to the appeal as Attachment B is a letter that provides more "detail" about appellant's issues on review. It goes on to say that many of the issues raised are still relevant and applicable to the FEIS and the last sentence, the appellant will address those discrepancies at the hearing. I just perhaps wanted to clarify that whether or not the Community Action Network intends on adding additional issues to the issues identified in 4(a), (b), (c), and (d) or, in fact, is the intent that the information and discussions in the letter are simply solely related to the issues identified in 4(a) through (d)?

Ms. Newman: My intention was, or my understanding was that the letter addresses... the letter addresses both the MIMP and the DEIS and the second half of the letter that addresses the DEIS I believe raises the same issues that are stated in the appeal, essentially it provides more detail. To the extent that there is any disagreement on that I guess I would like to know if the applicant sees additional issues in my letter that were not raised in the appeal I would like to know what those are so I can clarify.

Mr. Brogan: Well, I think, perhaps a more efficient way of addressing it would be if Ms. Newman could agree that the issues identified in 4(a) through (d) are the scope of the issues in her appeal.

Ms. Newman: I wouldn't... since I included the letter with the appeal and the issues are very clearly stated in my letter, I wouldn't want to remove any of the issues in my letter. They are incorporated into the appeal so I don't think it's appropriate to ask that I...

Hearing Examiner: Okay. What we'll do is we will give you an opportunity to clarify the appeal by going through and actually picking out from your letter anything you see that should be in your appeal that is in the letter and not in the appeal now. So I'll consider them to be there, but what we need is having them further, more clearly identified. So we'll set a date for that.