

Meeting Minutes #16

(Adopted June 18, 2025)

Seattle University Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC)

Tuesday, April 22, 2025

6:00 to 8:00pm

(Transcriber's Note: The notes 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 video recording and available upon request.)

In-person Location:

Seattle University
Advancement and Alumni Building — Stuart T. Rolfe Community Room
824 12th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

Virtual Option: via Webex

Committee Members Present:

John Feit, Chair
James Kirkpatrick
Wolf Saar
Manette Stamm
Mark Stoner (virtual)
Wes Wheless
Bill Zosel

Seattle University Staff:

Lara Branigan
Nathan Gregory

City of Seattle Staff:

Sarah Sodt, Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Donna Hartmann-Miller, Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Dipti Garg, Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Carly Guillory, Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI) (virtual)
Gordon Clowers, Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI) (virtual)
Ellie Smith, Department of Transportation (SDOT) (virtual)

Opening & Introductions

- Dipti Garg opened the meeting at 6:04pm.
- Agenda reviewed; housekeeping items; IAC Roles & Responsibilities; Public Comments procedure; brief introductions

- Meeting handed over to Chair John Feit

Agenda item review

- Chair John Feit confirms number of people planning to testify
- Museum Project
 - Concern about project acknowledged
 - Presentation by Seattle University; Q&A; public comments; IAC deliberation

Minutes adoption

- November 20, 2024)
- Call for corrections or clarifications: none

John Feit would like to vote for adoption of minutes; second by James Kirkpatrick

Minutes adopted (11:24)

Project: Art Museum Proposal

Presentation (by Lara Branigan, SU)

- Early in design process
 - Normally present three times to IAC during schematic design
- Will cover what doing until date; possible function(s) of building; initial site plan setting; concept design; next steps
- Academic Vision shared: collaborative/meeting/connecting for students, faculty, community, K-12,
- Project goals: multi-use; flexible; able to adapt to new teaching methods; more open hours; all ages; sustainable/LEED; support dialogues between people & pieces of art; gathering & collaboration site; support context/experiences/action
- Architect and Contractor selected, but not under contract
 - Planned: Olson Kundig, Sellen
 - Team of consultants working on this
- Site survey/investigation: For hazard materials (none); Geotechnical boring (soil, ground water table)
- Tours of other museum facilities to help determine functions and best-practices
- Fundraising campaign needed to raise money for the building
- Building programming
 - Review of collections: 14th Century to Modern; NW indigenous art; permanent collection
 - Storage and care needs
 - Hosting touring exhibits require adequate humidity and temperature control needed
 - Pop-up capabilities need free, open wall space to accommodate
 - Visual art becoming more prominent as video art is increasing
 - Performance Art needs a gathering space to view as well as perform
 - Teaching spaces and studios
 - Storage collection
 - Visible collection needs instead of a black box where no-one can see
 - Student Gallery
 - K-12 space

- Public spaces: Coffee shop, maybe a restaurant; lecture space; offices; receiving; facilities to support events and catering needs
- Initial Site Plan Studies done twice in last ten years (both chose this location)
 - Holds the corner well and announces entry (make the entry feel like the entry)
 - Provides a good key hole view of interior
 - More street activating
 - Can be open more hours and available to the public
 - Shading of chapel is avoided as the design for the chapel
 - Green space next to chapel always planned
- Concept Design
 - Exterior colors, storm water retention & cleaning planning, landscaping, function of galleries, L-shape pretty much decided on
 - 20% Schematic Plans
 - Overhang provided gathering and rain protection
 - Touches ground at two points to provide street level activities
 - Basement plan reviewed: receiving, offices
 - Top floor; mostly open gallery with moveable walls for adaptability; two closed galleries; art storage with object study option
- Schedule
 - Schematic into July
 - Design development until Jan 2026
 - Construction documents into July 2026
 - Construction starting in July 2026 (after FIFA)
 - Construction ending in March 2028
 - Very long move-in period for collection to be moved in by Fall 2028
- Next steps
 - Floor plans, parking, stormwater, landscaping, amenities around site
 - Return to IAC in late May with full MIMP review

Committee Q&A

Bill Zosel: In the 20-year Master Plan, where will the other development needs be built?

Lara Branigan: That site is still intact; this doesn't go near it.

Bill Zosel: Parking lot vs grassy area shown in drawing . . . ?

Lara Branigan: Will need more money to lid parking lot and to achieve the aspirational view shown; maybe some day in the future.

Wolf Saar: How did you come to the decision to replace the Lee Center and talk about where the function is going?

Lara Branigan: Intention to keep it, but merger changed the game; this allows to take the corner for a more proper entry

Wes Wheless: Other locations considered?

Lara Branigan: Have studied over the years (parking lots, other buildings); this space kept coming up.

Wolf Saar: Parking impact studies? What is envisioned with this?

Lara Branigan: Not really affecting parking; grounds trailer and mechanic shop will be relocated; count should equal out. Nathan Gregory: Museum has specific additional number of spaces based on square footage; need updated numbers of current student population; know more with actual footage numbers.

John Feit: Height massing concerns re: chapel and Master Plan – why is chapel shading such an issue now when it was not a problem before.

Lara Branigan: Hard to predict what will be important in twenty years. Height has been studied in other campus Master Plan.

John Feit: Shared functions between Lee and new museum — any thoughts to blend the two to retain Lee and the art museum add value that currently exists in the Lee Center.

Lara Branigan: Doesn't offer the flexibility SU is looking for

John Feit: Was suggesting to leave the theater space as it is and have the museum work around it and offer everything SU might need — it seems the auditorium functionality has a value, even to the museum.

Lara Branigan: Theater department is moving to Cornish Campus; don't want to cobble something else.

Wolf Saar: Would like to understand how a more powerful entry will function. Why a covered space, is it really a festival space, need to understand the urban design space needs.

Lara Branigan: Concerns are being discussed — provides a keyhole view of the chapel, a long-term desire. All the opportunities this might offer are being discussed, how to do everything is being discussed.

John Feit: Do you have a magical relationship with SDCI in regards to breaking ground with this timeline?

Lara Branigan: This is a goal plan.

Bill Zosel: Emphasize what John Feit says, while museum is wonderful, taking away a theater – important to students and the community –there is a strong statement about being a leader in sustainability in the Master Plan – tossing away a perfectly usable building is not sustainable.

Lara Branigan: Plan has been altered. Do take sustainability seriously; building has served well for a hundred plus years, preserving below structure. Trying to keep what we can as working on sustainable goals, feel like could achieve LEED Gold

Public Comment

Theresa Earenfight

Ellen Sollod

Alex Erickson

Isabelle Cowlson

Rafe Ryan

Lily Cibene-Ingram

Eiryn Kilroy

Isa Martinez

Jarrett Magdaleno

Dominick Cody Kramer (maybe Dominique?)*

Jane Nichols

Brett Forbik*

Ariel Olson*

Manny Cawaling

Sandy Ha

Saffron Connors

Robin Wheeler

*Not identifiable on sign-in sheet

Committee Deliberation

John Feit, Wolf Saar, and Wes Wheless: want to see the deliberation and decision due-diligence process and (notwithstanding the shading and entry issues) would like to understand why this location. Other considerations? What level of student/faculty input was included? Necessary to see the study

Bill Zosel: need to see site selection study; does it include what is important to students and people who work there. IAC can make sure this is consistent with master plan. Does removing the theater affect 12th Ave activity? Did not approve ideal greens view presented without knowing when it might be realized.

James Kirkpatrick: impressed with information gained from public; more aware of emotional impact of this project. Will take time to study. Wants to know more of the First Hill area across from this location.

Manette Stamm: doesn't want to cause resentment to the museum space or put blame on Cornish, but Cornish doesn't appear to have the resources needed to support the theater program. Shuttling is an issue. There is a need to engage students.

Mark Stoner; dislike seeing newly renovated buildings torn down and doesn't see the LEED Gold status as a good reason to get rid of a perfectly good building.

John Feit points out the Lee Center is not identified to be demolished in the Master Plan; not just the loss of a nice building, but the loss to the University community. If preserving was considered, how long would it be for certain aspects (parking and views) of the rendering to be achieved. Also wants to better understand how the site was chosen. Take into account the view to the chapel and shadow issues and still recognize the importance of Lee.

ACTION (1:39:37): Bill Zosel moves, due to committee consensus, to vote for the Chair to write and send a letter to the SDCI and the University expressing the process the IAC would like to see in terms of evidence and process. More due diligence is needed to help IAC understand the decision and how this is consistent with sustainability and the goals of the Master Plan. Wolf Saar seconds.

Lara Branigan notes showing this process is the intent of the next meeting

Adjournment

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting, it was seconded. The Committee voted and the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.