Appendix I
Minority Report of Dr. Sharon Sutton

In response to your request of 18 March 2013 for an e-mail signature that would indicate my general approval of the Final Report of the Virginia Mason Major Institutions Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (VMMC CAC), I must remind you that during the final meeting, when the Chair took a vote among the six persons in attendance, I did not approve this report. Having misnamed my vote that night (the Chair had offered no choices other than "approve"), I confirmed in two follow-up e-mails that I voted to abstain from approval. Herein I would like to clarify that I am unable to allow you to scan my signature into the report indicating my general approval: simply put, I abstain from approving or disapproving the report.

The reasons for this vote relate to my strong objections to the cover letter and three sections of the report—"Recommendation to Adopt the Final Plan," "MIO Boundaries," and "Housing Replacement"—which are all interrelated.

Cover Letter

This letter states that:

> *Virginia Mason identified a need for 3 million gross square feet of development—more than doubling its current authorized maximum size. The Committee struggled with this issue as it drives heights, setbacks, and boundary expansion impacts to the neighborhood. However as the Seattle Municipal code specifically states . . . that while the CAC receives information from the institution on need and may discuss it, [need] is not subject to negotiation . . . the CAC ultimately chose to focus on ways to mitigate the impacts of this amount of new development.*

In short, City regulations put the CAC in a one-down relationship to VM, distorting its participation by requiring a token rubber stamp for VM's expansion plan. Not only did I struggle with the reality of how to insert such a huge amount of square footage into the First Hill neighborhood, I was outraged at being dis-empowered by City regulations that, at the same time, mandate citizen participation. Because I cannot be complicit in such tokenism, I cannot approve the CAC's decision to focus upon mitigation rather than upon a meaningful exploration of what would be right for the neighborhood.

Recommendation to Adopt the Final Plan

This section states that "the resulting MIMP represents a consensus choice of what would have *the least negative effect* upon the surrounding community, given VM's stated need for 3 million square feet at full build out [emphasis added]." Again I am outraged at being backed into a corner by City regulations that forced the CAC to choose among the least negative alternatives—to spend 28 meetings and many hours at home figuring out how to put lipstick on an elephant. Most depressing, I did not realize until the very last meeting that *none*

of the bulk of this development was negotiable; to paraphrase Tina Turner, the CAC's mandate was: "you can have it here or you can have it there, but you gonna have it." Because I can not be complicit in such tokenism, I cannot approve the CAC's decision to choose among negative alternatives.

MIO Boundaries

This section states that:

> *Virginia Mason and the CAC evaluated alternatives with and without this boundary expansion. Review of these two alternatives showed that Virginia Mason needed this space to allow a logical and systematic replacement of its aging central Hospital and that it would allow significant reductions in height and bulk across the campus [emphasis added].*

While the CAC (and I) agreed that the proposed expansion of the MIO Boundaries does allow a logical and systematic replacement of the hospital, I would also note that it leaves an unspecified hole in the center of the overlay for some unknown future development. However, it was the significant reduction in the height and bulk of the required square footage that seemed to drive the CAC's acceptance of the expanded boundaries, as it viewed the urban designers' modeling of various masses. Again the CAC was forced by City regulations to choose among negatives, and I can not be complicit in such tokenism.

Housing Replacement

This section is my true objection to the substance of the report and not just the underlying premise of its creation. Recommendation #7 requires the housing that will be demolished as a result of VM's expanded MIO boundaries to be comparable in size, number of units, and quality of construction. Optionally VM can choose to make it minimally comparable in cost by creating just 10 percent of the units (or 7 units) affordable at 80 percent of median income. Recommendation #8 encourages a higher voluntary option of 25 percent of units (or 15 units) affordable at the same income. These recommendations are totally unacceptable to me as is VM's explanation that a private developer would not have to replace any of the units; this is not a private development but one consuming public funds. Then, as the letter from the Seattle Displacement Coalition pointed out, the real living, breathing people residing in the housing that will be demolished do not make 80 percent of median income but rather 50 percent or less. All of those people (or their surrogates)—who occupy not just 7-15 units but all 62 units—need comparable replacement housing i.e., 62 units affordable at 50 percent or less of median income. Yet the report reads that when the CAC asked about the issue of comparability:

> *The CAC was advised that the City has been struggling with this issue and that no current consensus exists because of the definition of comparable housing.*

This is a totally unacceptable justification for eliminating low-income housing and

for displacing the residents, who were not dealt with as real living, breathing people, but rather as numbers in a table. Again referring to the Seattle Displacement Coalition letter:

> *No attempt was made to assess demographics of these residents living at the Chasselton, including and especially their incomes. Nor did the document accurately identify rental rates in the building and their relationship to average rents and market rates in the neighborhood or city.*

In short, the City's policy of not allowing a CAC to question the size of a proposed expansion forced the VMMC CAC to focus upon mitigation of a huge development in the First Hill neighborhood, which in turn forced it to sacrifice a block currently occupied by low-rise affordable housing. In Seattle's developing future, that block would likely be occupied by the high-rise housing that is sorely needed to balance the presence of four large and expanding institutions in this area. Further constraining the CAC in doing the right thing for the First Hill neighborhood is the City's unwillingness to use a dictionary definition of "comparable" i.e., equal to in all respects, in requiring replacement housing.

While I agree with the CAC's thoughtful recommendations that seek to mitigate the effect of this huge project, except for its recommendations on housing replacement, I vehemently object to being a token rubber stamp for the proposed VM expansion. Thus I abstain from voting to approve the report.