



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 125/24

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall, Room L2-80

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, June 5, 2024 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang, Vice-Chair

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod, Chair

Lawrence Norman

Katie Randall

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

060524.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Britta Johnson supported the nomination of INS. As a tenant of the building, she said the building provides affordable arts and culture space. She said people are impacted by learning about the history of the building.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported nomination of the INS building and said it was a favorite of his. He noted the architectural character, the pedestrian scale of the building. He said the entire Terminal Sales Building is designated, not just the façade. He said the building is a significant example of Collegiate Gothic style with its terracotta ornament; it is not just a façade or a bump on a tower.

060524.2 MEETING MINUTES

May 1, 2024

MM/SC/DB/MI

8:0:1

Minutes approved. Ms. Caton abstained.

060524.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060524.31 University of Washington Anderson Hall

3715 W. Stevens Way NE

Proposed removal of two trees

Carin Carlson, Henneberry Eddy provided context of the site and identified two trees proposed for removal. The trees are too close to the building resulting in negative impacts to the building. The arborist said it would be detrimental to both trees to prune them. The accessible route to the building goes under one of the trees, the fallen Beech nuts are a maintenance and ADA issue. Responding to clarifying questions, she said two new trees will be planted.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed removal of two trees at University of Washington Anderson Hall, 3715 W Stevens Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation, LPB 484/22.
 - a. The two mature trees were planted too close to the building creating challenges for the historic building and the ability to safely maintain it.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. There appear to be no reasonable alternatives.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/DB/TC

8:0:1

Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

060524.32

Good Shepherd Center
4649 Sunnyside Avenue N
Proposed planting of new tree

Megan Stanek, Historic Seattle explained that last year the Monkey Puzzle tree was removed. She proposed to replace it with a tree that honors its uniqueness. She explained community outreach and the selected Ginkgo Biloba as a replacement. She said it is more columnar than the Monkey Puzzle and has fan shape leaves that are vibrant green in the spring and hello in the fall. She said the tree provides an interesting winter form when bare. She said the bad smell associated with the Ginkgo tree is attributable to the male tree, a female tree is specified here. The tree will be placed as close as possible to but not on top of where the Monkey Puzzle tree was located.

Mr. Macleod supported the application.

Ms. Wasserman said the choice was reasonable.

Ms. Caton said the Ginkgo choice is appropriate.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed tree at the Good Shepherd Center, 4649 Sunnyside Avenue N, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 111882.
 - a. The proposed tree is in proximity to the previous one and will be of a similar scale at maturity. It does not appear to have an adverse impact on views of the main building.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. No alternatives were provided as they did not seem necessary, and none were requested by the Board.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/KR/DB
9:0:0
Motion carried.

060524.33

Georgetown Steam Plant

6605 13th Avenue S

Retroactive proposal to demolish south balcony and stair

Julianna Ross, Seattle City Light apologized for the retroactive Certificate of Approval. She said the stairs were original to the plant. She said there was no special care to the plant until 40 years ago. She said a Certificate of Approval application was submitted in 2013 for repairs, but it was not funded so the work was not done. The stairs were identified as a priority in 2014 when there was more public access to the site although the stairs and doors were not used. The stairs were removed in 2018 when a grant was to remove the harmful coatings on the exterior concrete. She said their internal communications fell through the cracks. She said the stairs had deteriorated further while being left outside on the ground. She said at the same time a community development authority has been set up and has ideas to run the facility as a museum and cultural center with the intent to bring it up to code. She said they will likely be coming back in the future with new egress plans. She said lessons were learned and she said it is hard to imagine it could happen again.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said ARC said all information gained from the material should be recorded before leaving the site. She said the staff report includes that requirement.

Ms. Wasserman said she was very bothered by the removal and that it is against policy. She said it was disturbing. The stairs needed demolition but not like this. She said to be more careful and to make sure to watch closely, that all details are recorded. She said it is sad it happened but that she would support the application.

Ms. Randall said deterioration is difficult, but it is not a free pass for making a change. She said she supported the application in this special circumstance.

Mr. Macleod asked Ms. Doherty what would happen if the board denied this application.

Ms. Doherty said it is hard to remedy, but the board could ask to have the stair put back, which would require some repair, but that Ms. Ross reported that she thinks it is beyond rehabilitation. She said the board could ask for reconstruction but because it would not meet code there might be some permitting hurdles related to that. She said that in 2019 the board approved a Certificate of Approval application to maintain and reinforce parts of the balcony, recreate the parts that were missing, address the code issues with some alterations, and then build a new stair run that met the code and the board approve that. But as Ms. Ross said, there was an internal miscommunication that happened during the coating removal project about what was meant to be a temporary removal. She said the board's intent was to maintain parts of it, but according to Ms. Ross that is no longer possible.

Mr. Macleod said it is always concerning to have a retroactive application. He noted Ms. Ross said this event has inspired a change in the chain of custody going forward.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said the purpose behind having all the information documented beyond just photos is that in case the group that is doing the restoration and rehabilitation of the building wants to put in some sort of stair that refers back to the original historic stair, they'll have all the information necessary.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board retroactively approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for demolition of the south balcony and stair at the Georgetown Steam Plant, 6605 13th Avenue S, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 111884.
 - a. Demolition of the balcony and stair affect the integrity of the south façade. But the Board recognizes that due to unfortunate circumstances the balcony and stair will not be reinstalled.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. The owner believes the balcony and stair cannot be rehabilitated.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
4. This approval is made with the condition that the property owner fully document all of the existing components of the historic balcony and stair and submit this information to the Landmarks Preservation program coordinator for their acknowledgement, before removing any of the building pieces from the site. This information shall include existing photographs and notations to record the materials, profiles, and dimensions. This may also be supplemented by historic photographs and/or drawings to explain the original layout and any additional details that may be available.

MM/SC/BP/KR

8:0:1

Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself.

060524.34

Terminal Sales Annex

1931 2nd Avenue

Proposed redevelopment

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill provided an overview of the project.

Ellen Mirro, Studio TJP explained the review for final Certificate of Approval and said the signage, lighting and mural will be reviewed under a separate Certificate of Approval.

Colby Perrine, Kengo Kuma & Associates explained the evolution of the design to the present. He reported that each setback has been calibrated to the Terminal Sales Annex (TSA) building and neighboring building and program. He said the building sits at an iconic intersection with the Moore Theater and the Josephinum. He said the parti-wall location will embed into the current layout with the TSA expressing itself throughout the space and mural extending to interior space. He said the façade of the new building will take a back seat. He said the setbacks allow the TSA to breathe. He noted the punched openings in the alley elevation align to interior program. He said the entry is still usable and will have a glass door. He said key program elements will be concentrated in the TSA. He said the interior activation will be visible at night.

He said the roof will be a unique experience and allow people to be up close to the terracotta parapet. He said floor levels of the new structure will align with the TSA with TSA floor levels retained. He said upper floor levels will be the closest to being aligned. He said from street level, entry will be a step up or down. He said the marble steps, marble stairs to the second story create a problem for the entry and will be removed.

Jason Lamb, Ankrom Moisan said there has been a lengthy research history on the site. He said they have the original construction drawings, structural summaries and the Artifacts window survey which is still up to date. He said per the survey recommendations they will clean, repair, replace and remove non-original items. He said window operations will be changed to meet current code including window hardware, swing limiters and on low sill windows they will apply a safety protection film. He said Pioneer Masonry did a test section to remove some of the paint and sealer and it came out well. He said should any issues come up during the construction process all the terracotta that needs to be replaced will be matched with custom terracotta and any stone that requires additional anchorage will be attached with helical anchors to reinforce the stone attachment to the façade.

Mr. Lamb said on the ground level there are two main entrances on 2nd Avenue with the main TSA entrance incorporated as a main hotel entry. The restaurant entry will be further south. He noted the ballroom on the second floor is double height. He said the main residential entry is close to the alley. He went over program by floor. He said the project will adopt typical downtown residential tower lighting. He said it is subtle and won't affect the TSA and will be a limited feature lighting to reduce the light pollution. He said the ground level corner plaza will be a public space with deep set landscape that will retain the plane of the TSA.

Mr. Perrine provided an overview of project materials. He said the vertical elements will be differentiated from the TSA and constructed of folded metal panels that almost mimic the pilasters on the TSA. He said the terracotta is being restored but any replacement would be in-kind with terracotta. He said the party walls will be consistent but differentiated from the TSA. He said material will wrap around the side that will just be panelized walls.

Mr. Lamb went over the technical details of façade bracing. He said the windows will be carefully removed and catalogued either for storage or the start of the rehabilitation of the frames and glass. He said the engineering has been completed for the façade bracing. He said the bracing is going to span into the right of way and is composed of eight major piles. The terracotta will be protected from the steel engagement and the bracing effect will go through the removed windows in order to hold the façade together. He said the back of the daylight basement windows will be changed out for a light box effect that will reflect the activities of the lobby. He said they will retain the entry as a main focal point with solid wood door with glass lights. He noted the sixth-floor level terrace railing is pushed back and secondary to the stone and cap details of the party walls.

Ms. Mirro explained that art curation for the murals and signage will happen in the future under a separate Certificate of Approval application.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said there aren't a lot of changes from what had been seen at ARC. She said this project has been reviewed many times. Items called out by ARC and addressed by design team included floor levels and too many punched openings in party walls. She said the design team did a good job of recapping what they went over with ARC.

Ms. Wasserman concurred and said she has watched this project since the early versions that were not nearly this nice. She said she was happy the windows were carefully looked at, but she wished more of the lovely old being was being preserved. She said the alignment of the tower with adjacent buildings is not as jarring as some of the others are.

Ms. Randall asked for clarification on the entry stairs.

Mr. Lamb noted the transitional difference between floors because of the existing condition of the building. He noted the initial stairs followed by the second flight of stairs to the first floor. He said the whole staircase will be removed.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if there would be muntins on the windows.

Ms. Mirro said the glass will be replaced to conform to the original design of the building and will have muntins. She said windows will be a custom reproduction that will match historic windows.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about the statues that used to be in the niches.

Ms. Sodt asked for clarification that the proposal is to restore the existing historic windows and then replace the non-historic windows.

Ms. Mirro said it will be a custom reproduction to match the historic windows.

Ms. Clawson appreciated it was on the record. She said she didn't know where the statues went.

Ms. Mirro said there was no intent to replace the statues and noted there is no adequate documentation to do that responsibly.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the replication of the existing windows would include true divided light windows.

Ms. Mirro said they would and that the only difference would be the thin double glazing. She said very careful measurements were taken.

Mr. Lamb said the pedestals on which the statues set will be retained.

Ms. Caton asked if any of the interior was designated and noted the substantial changes proposed.

Ms. Mirro said only the exterior of the TSA was designated and she noted her firm did the nomination report. She said a couple salvage companies went through to identify items they will take to their re-use businesses.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked what protective measures would be taken to protect façade materials during bracing with steel members.

Mr. Lamb said protection boards and padding would be used.

Garo Pehlivanian, CPL said the façade would be supported and terracotta would be avoided. He said there is concrete backing behind it with steel inside of it and the terracotta elements would be probably covered with protection board.

Roger Peterson, Pioneer Masonry said it would be some sort of protection board, foam, and something in between layers to protect so the metal won't ever touch the terracotta.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if the concrete wall is existing.

Mr. Lamb said it is.

Mr. Macleod appreciated that the historic footprint of the building would be reflected within the volume of the new building. He asked if that is still part of the proposal.

Mr. Lamb said it is and explained that along with the retention of the full front façade they would retain the mass of the TSA coming through the new structure.

Mr. Macleod said was curious about the transparency on the 2nd Avenue side and if it is possible to read that volume within the larger tower.

Balazs Bogнар, Kengo Kuma & Associates said they are working on expressing the volume as well as the sense of the building coming through as well as the tower, reflectivity of the sky, the atmosphere at night.

Ms. Wasserman said she wished more of the historic building would be preserved but recognized it wasn't practical. She said she watched the evolution of the design through different owners, partners, projects, goals. She said the design team has been responsive to the things the board has asked, like including more of a sense of the TSA when you come into the lobby. She said it is better than most of the glass sort of buildings reviewed by it is a huge project. She said she is happy to see it get this far, and she would support it.

Ms. Randall said by going through ARC so many times many alternatives have been seen. She said where it has landed shows much respect for the TSA, the façade, form, party wall. She said it is a sensitive way to build a tower above an existing historic building and preserves as much of the form of the original building exterior as possible.

Mr. Norman concurred and said he appreciated the presentation and how the team was able to preserve and get what it needed out of the building space. He said they did a great job.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and thorough summary of work of the feedback and design changes that have evolved over the years. She said this development maintains the historic value of the landmarked building and sets the new structure back. She appreciated how the historic building is featured even though it is just a façade. She supported the project.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the diligence of the architectural team and all the work that has gone into making this work.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he was on board with the proposal. He appreciated the presentation and said the project has evolved nicely responded to ARC. He noted the details on the TSA and said transitions have been handled elegantly. He said the roof terraces were handled well. He said it looks like some fluid applied flashing stuck out over the terracotta and he hoped a resolution isn't adding a lot of flashing around the windows surround system. He said that would change the perception of the window and the window opening.

Ms. Caton said she doesn't typically like the idea of sticking a giant building on top of a beautiful little historic gem but that the design team has worked hard to integrate the two and it is probably one of the more successful versions that she has seen in what is possible. She appreciated the effort and revisions that have been made and the willingness of the design team to take advice from the board. She said she was inclined to support.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said she appreciated that the approach to the historic building does extend through the entire site. She said it could have easily felt like you just

sliced off the front of the building and then everything else got demolished. She said there has been a lot of effort in response to what was said at ARC to make it feel like there is a solid building that still exists within the new building. She said that is important because we don't want to just see these buildings as just 2-D elements that are applied. She said this building has avoided that trap. She said she appreciated the work to make sure this doesn't feel like it is an actual building and not just something applied to a new building. She said there is a lot of development pressure to maximize square footage, but the setbacks have helped to let the building stand on its own.

Mr. Macleod said he has strong reservations about adding towers to historic buildings. He appreciated the 3-D engagement of the historic building volume and footprint. He said the concept is worth supporting. He said what is critical in a property like this is not necessarily the tower itself but how it interfaces with the street and the historic property, and this is a good concept that he could support.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for new construction, partial demolition and rehabilitation at the Terminal Sales Annex, 1931 Second Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 122981.
 - a. While the proposal includes partial demolition, a substantial portion of the first bay of the building is proposed to be retained, including the existing historic windows, therefore the primary elevation and view of the building will remain.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.
 - a. The owners have shown many alternatives to and received feedback from both the Board and the Architectural Review Committee, and the proposal has evolved to what is presented today.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/MI/DB
9:0:0
Motion carried.

060524.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

060524.41 Seattle Center Playhouse and Exhibition Hall
201 and 301 Mercer Street

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for an extension to September 4, 2024. She said the building is multi-tenanted and negotiations are ongoing.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Seattle Center Playhouse and Exhibition Hall to September 4, 2024.

MM/SC/DB/TC

9:0:0

Motion carried.

060524.42

Seattle Times Block

1120 John Street

Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the next three properties – the Seattle Times Block, Baker-Linen Building, and Knights of Columbus are all requests for four-month extensions to October 2, 2024. She said the clients have a draft agreement.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill said the Baker-Linen Building is the most likely to come first.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Seattle Times Block, 1120 John Street, until October 2, 2024.

MM/SC/RC/DB

9:0:0

Motion carried.

060524.43

Baker-Linen Building

1101 E. Pike Street

Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of Baker-Linen Building, 1101 E. Pike Street until October 2, 2024.

MM/SC/KR/TC

9:0:0

Motion carried.

060524.44

Knights of Columbus

722 E. Union Street

Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Knights of Columbus building, 722 E. Union Street to October 2, 2024.

MM/SC/HW/TC
9:0:0
Motion carried.

060524.45 Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building
103 Pike Street
Request for extension

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill explained the request for a four-month extension. He said he is working with staff, and they are reviewing reasonable economic use process. He said they are working on responses to community comments and questions. He said hopefully there will be new incentives put into place to explore viable uses.

Mr. Macleod appreciated hearing about the process.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Hotel Elliott / Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street for four months.

MM/SC/RC/DB
9:0:0
Motion carried.

060524.5 **Nominations**

060524.51 U. S. Immigrant Station and Assay Office
815 Seattle Boulevard S

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle who was the applicant for the nomination said the building is historic and very significant in the Chinatown International District and it is located in the International Special Review District. It is a contributing building to the local historic district and is listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places. It has been on the register since 1979. She said having this added layer of recognition and designation as an individual landmark is appropriate for this building. She said the GSA, the federal government used to own this building and they surplused it. The current owners are private owners who have owned it since 2009 or so. They have been good stewards of the property. She thanked the owners for their stewardship and their idea to adaptively reuse the building and have it be artist studios. She said it has created a wonderful community of arts and culture space in the building. She said she realized that landmarking does not protect use and they were not seeking it to do so. She said she wanted to recognize that for the last 14 years Inscape has been significant as part of the story of the many layers of history and significance for this building.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular provided context of the building and site. He said the US Immigration State Immigrant Station and Assay Office also known as the INS Building is individually listed to the National Register of Historic Places. He said the front façade faces northeast. He said the building's front would be referred

to as the north façade for east of reference. He said the building's scale and massing contrast with the surrounding buildings making it an easily identifiable building within the neighborhood. The building's design and original use contribute to the distinct qualities of the neighborhood.

Mr. Howard said the property encompasses two tax parcels, both of which are associated with the historic use of the building. The entrance formerly used by detainees arriving at the facility is centrally located on the rear south façade. He said the building's design conveys a monumental government building character, features conveying this include the massing, front façade length, front entrance composition, front setback with landscaping rather than built out to the front property line. He noted the tall two-story window bays and the exterior materials, buff colored brick and terracotta cladding. Front architectural details include the engaged marble Corinthian capital columns and pilasters above the front entrance doors, decorative metal spandrel panels and a terracotta belt course with a Vitruvian scroll stylized wave pattern on blue background. He said steel sash multiple light windows provide daylighting and ventilation for the building. Most of the original security bars have been removed. He said a continuation of the same architectural detailing and materials continue on the east façade.

Mr. Howard said the building's placement and design situates outdoor spaces at the rear of the building overlooking industrial development where these spaces and their use would generally not be readily visible. He said this sets up a distinct and important contrast between the front and the rear of the building influencing both the identify and distinctive qualities of the building within the neighborhood. He said the site slopes steeply down to the south exposing the basement and the rear south façade. He indicated the difference in grade level between the front and rear in photographs.

He said the building features a central cross hipped roof flanked by flat roofs with parapets and with parapets at the ends. Red mission tile roofing clade the roof and there are shingles at the dormers and copper flashing at the terracotta cornice. He provided photos of the front main lobby and noted the stairwells at either end of the building and the central corridors as you move up each floor within the building. Centrally located on the north façade the main entrance opens to the large central lobby which connects to the elevators and east to west corridors. He said the central doorway opens to a small, enclosed vestibule. He said the floor layout on the first floor consists of a central east to west corridor with short double loaded north to south corridors at either end of the building. Restrooms and stairwells are at the outer east and west ends of each floor. Smaller offices extend along the perimeter walls with windows.

He said the former citizens swearing-in room east of the central lobby has been converted for theater use. US representative Jayapal is among the many who received their citizenship in this room. Half turned stairs provide access between the basement and the upper four floors. They are located at the east and west ends of the building. He said added smoke doors separate the stairwells from the corridors at each floor. The stairways consist of painted concrete carriages with marbled

treads, and metal balusters and newels. He noted the half space landings have terrazzo with a marble border. He said the walls are glazed hollow clay tile.

Mr. Howard said within the basement a yellow line extends throughout the central corridor; it marks the route that former detainees had to follow as part of the intake processing. The line and handprints remain as significant elements from the building's original use. He said there are two metal doors opening to the solitary confinement cells that remain at the west end of the corridor along with at least one associated concrete cell. He said that finishes on the second floor consist of glazed hollow clay tile walls at the east. He noted the east to west corridor with painted plaster walls at the east and west, north south corridors. He said the main central corridor that runs the length of the building has glazed hollow clay tile. He said the two shorter hallways at the ends of the building are painted plaster walls. The second-floor patios are located at the east and west exterior spaces that originally provided excise space for the detainees. He said detainees wrote their names or each other's names, places of origin and the dates using the roofing mastic on the bricks at each patio. These names and dates were handwritten by detainees themselves and represent a significant feature and historical record of their presence.

Mr. Howard said the finishes on the third floor consist of glazed hollow clay tile walls with glazed tile base at east to west corridor and the north to south corridors and the restrooms. He said some of the perimeter spaces retain the glazed hollow clay tile exterior wall finishes. He said the fourth floor contains the former Assay Office. He said the doorway to the office is glazed by service windows with small counters. A vault for storing the gold remains at the south end of the former office space. Alterations on the fourth floor painted all of the glazed hollow clay tile wall throughout.

Katie Pratt reported that the Immigration Station and Assay Office was built in 1931 to house two different offices of the federal government in Seattle. An immigration station to serve as the entry and exit point for immigrants arriving in Seattle and an assay office to analyze and process gold and silver bullion and foreign coin. She provided context of the building on the southwestern edge of the Chinatown International District (CID). The building was used by the federal government until 2004. The CID was primarily developed between 1907 and 1927 and although originally referred to as Chinatown and predominantly associated with Asian immigrants, the neighborhood became home to many different ethnic groups with sub communities formed within the neighborhood.

Ms. Pratt said the construction of the Immigration Station and Assay Office (INS) was completed in 1931. Plans for the building were prepared in 1929 for the building to house two different bureaucratic functions in one place, the immigrant station and the assay office. Prior to combining those two bureaucratic offices into one building, they each had their own building. Talk about the construction of a new immigration station began to circulate in Seattle news by 1926. In early 1928 news surfaced that the government planned to build the new immigration station on land previously purchased to house a new post office.

Ms. Pratt said that plans for the building included five stories with the assay office to occupy the upper floor were completed in October of 1929 and were drawn up in the office of the supervising architect James A. Wetmore of the Treasury department in Washington DC. A call for bids to construct the new immigration station went out in early December 1929. Evan Anderson, a builder and contractor based in Tacoma was awarded the construction contract along with Otis Elevator Company of Washington DC getting the later contract. Construction began in spring of 1930 and was supervised by construction engineer C. E. Swift of Washington DC. Swift was also charged with supervising other federal projects underway in Seattle including a new federal office building and the U. S. Marine Hospital.

She said the new immigration station and assay office building was much larger than previous buildings and required additional employees. The federal government advertised for new positions to help the building function which included elevator operators, engine men, assistant custodian, firemen, and an engineman helper at the new facility. The building was completed by fall of 1931 and was occupied starting on September 30, 1931.

She said the immigration station housed the US Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization serving as the entry and exit point for immigrants arriving in Seattle and providing detention facilities for detained immigrants. The immigration station operated out of this building from 1931 until it closed in 2004 upon its replacement by the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma. Due to a mistake in the wording of the congressional appropriation, the building was officially named the United States Immigrant Station and Assay Office. The building was designed to accommodate 250 immigrants with the kitchen, dormitories, laundry and open airport, as well as offices and workspace for 115 immigration employees.

Ms. Pratt said Luther Weiden served as the Immigration Commissioner during this transition. He was appointed as the US Immigration Commissioner in Seattle in 1921 and served until 1933 just after the organization moved into this building. After his tenure, the Bureau of Immigration was combined with the Bureau of Naturalization into a single agency in 1933. The Immigration and Naturalization Service are within the Department of Labor. In 1934, Marie Proctor was appointed US Immigration Commissioner in Seattle by the Secretary of Labor. She served in the position until June 1940 when the agency was reorganized by the Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) administration. Proctor was the first woman to hold the position on the west coast and the year that she left the job, INS was moved from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice. She said in 2003, INS as an organization was eliminated and replaced by three separate agencies: the US Citizenship and Immigration Services, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Patrol within the newly created Department of Homeland Security. She said soon after the Seattle Immigration Station was closed, and the facilities operations moved to the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma.

Ms. Pratt said the Assay Office housed the Seattle Office of the US Assay Commission within the Treasury Department which is responsible for analyzing and

processing gold and silver bullion and foreign coins. The Seattle office was established largely in response to the gold rush as Seattle miners returned from Alaska with gold. The Assay Office established the value of the bullion and purchased it from the miners. She said they operated in this building from 1931 until 1955. Seattle's Assay Office was first established in July 1898 and between that time and 1932 when they moved into the nominated property, \$334 million in gold had passed through the office, \$200 million of which came from Alaska, \$94 million from the Yukon Territory, \$25 million from British Columbia with the rest from mining ventures in Washington, Oregon and Idaho.

Ms. Pratt said Thomas G. Hathaway was the assayer in charge at the time of the move and the office relocated into the building in 1932, several months after the building was completed. Under the new administration of President Franklin Roosevelt a new Director of the US Assay Office in Seattle was appointed, George L. Swarva. During the Depression years the Assay Office saw an uptick in individuals bringing in gold scraps such as jewelry, watches and even teeth to see to the US Government but as the government needed at least an ounce to offer the buyback service, folks would go door to door buying up unwanted gold and taking it down to the Assay Office for inspection and purchase. Some individuals even discovered that the prospector sacks that they had kept were supposedly full of gold dust were actually just full of brass when they tried to turn them in for cash. The Assay Office was closed in 1955 in a government cost saving measure due to declining amounts of gold processed at the office. Swarva was still the assayer at the office at the time. The office closed in 1955.

Ms. Pratt said that after the federal government moved out of the INS building in 2004 the building remained vacant for a few years, and it was purchased by private investors in 2008 for 4.4 million. The building was reopened as Inscape in 2010. Inscape is an arts and cultural enclave that provides work and studio space to individuals and nonprofit organizations with a focus on arts and cultural use. She said the Wing Luke Museum installed panels that communicate the building's history and Wing Luke also has an oral history collection, "Voices of the Immigration Station" which was utilized in preparing this report.

She said that while the Immigration Station processed immigrants from everywhere, there was originally a significant focus on Chinese immigrants. The emphasis on manifest destiny led the country to prioritize economic development in the west in the 19th century. The discovery of gold in California and later Alaska stretched the west pool of white laborers. In need of more workers the US government negotiated treaties with China to allow for immigrant labor to meet the demand. However, as the west developed and the laboring class organized against exploitation, Chinese workers became the scapegoats for the conflict and were attached as enemies of the white working class. Debates were known as the Chinese question and they centered on the pros and cons of Chinese immigration. That question was formally answered through the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 which was then extended via the Gery Act and then made permanent in 1902. This act marked the first time Congress prohibited entry of a specific ethnic

group to the country and these acts guided immigration policy and thus the use of immigration stations like the subject property throughout the country.

Ms. Pratt said by the time the subject building was opened in 1931, the intense focus on the anti-Chinese immigration had somewhat lessened but Chinese individuals remained the primary detainees in the facility. Local coverage during the 1930s highlighted detainees from China, Eastern Europe and Canada as well as political detainees typically associated with communist activities. In the 1930s there was a concerted effort by the immigration service to crack down on the legal immigration of Japanese. This crackdown was an enforcement of the 1924 Immigration Act which excluded any immigrant ineligible for citizenship from entering the country. Japanese citizens had been previously exempted from this rule in an earlier immigrant act from 1917 but the 1924 act removed that provision. Immigration inspector Bila Egoan was head of the investigation division in Seattle during this time and led raids on Japanese merchant vessels suspected of smuggling Japanese immigrants either as extra crew or stowaways during the 1930s.

Ms. Pratt said after the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the FBI conducted sweeps in Seattle and other Pacific coast cities to round up Japanese men primarily who were then taken to the immigration station. Their personal effects were confiscated and stored at the station, and this included US citizens. It was confirmed that by December 10 – just a few days later – 124 Japanese individuals had been arrested along with 30 Germans and two Italians. She said that not all the Japanese detained were foreign born or immigrants. There were several prominent Seattle Japanese men detained including lawyers Thomas Masuda and Kenjo Ita, importer-exporter Yoshima Osawa and then Merchant at Charles Theo Takahashi. She said many who were detained were then sent for incarceration at Fort Missoula in Montana which was run as an alien detention center by the INS in the Department of Justice during WWII. She said as of March 19, 1942, there were 115 Japanese detainees at the immigration station. At that time, they were relocated to the King Street Station and transported by train to Fort Missoula for incarceration. None of the Japanese that were held at Fort Missoula were ever charged with acts of disloyalty despite being held as potential security risks and subjected to loyalty hearings for the duration of the war.

Ms. Pratt said two months after the United States entered WWII, FDR issued executive order 9066 that occurred on February 19, 1942. She said the implementation of this executive order had a profound impact on the west coast Japanese population through military orders and pre-described military zones, curfews, voluntary relocation, temporary assembly, and ultimately forced relocation and incarceration of all people of Japanese ancestry. As WWII ended, due to increase fears of the spread of communism the INS initiated deportation hearings against a number of Filipinos in the late 1940s and early 1950s alleging membership in the communist party. She said that four months into the Korean war, congress passed the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950, and this act required communist organizations to register with the justice department and allowed the President to authorize the arrest and detention of persons who might engage in espionage or sabotage to find out alleged communists. The immigration station's detention

facilities were closed in early 1950 for a period as a cost saving measure and detainees were then sent to King County jail or relocated to the immigration station in San Francisco.

The average number of detainees had dwindled to between 35 and 60 on average. In 1954 new INS policies to reduce detention of immigrants kept the long-term detention facilities at the immigration station closed. They continued to send any detainees for long term detention to the county jail and local newspaper coverage of the immigration station declined significantly after the end of WWII and deportation efforts related to the internal security act. Although the building's detention facilities were used less, it was still used for other immigration services including processing of immigration paperwork, immigration hearings, as well as citizenship tests and ceremonies. One of the next prime immigration legislations that was passed was in 1965 with the immigration and Nationality Act which repealed national origins quotas which had discriminated against non-European immigrants since the 1920s. It replaced that system with a preference system for immigrants with familial relationships with US citizens and residents as well as the skills of immigrants. This law increased the flow of immigrants to the US with a pronounced demographic shift. While the majority of immigrants to the US before 1965 were European, after 1965 more than half of immigrants arriving were from Latin America or in one quarter from Asia. At the same time that this new immigration legislation was passed, the US ended its Bracero program which was started in 1942 to recruit temporary agricultural workers from Mexico to fulfill the labor shortage during WWII. She said the limits on legal immigration and then civil unrest in Central America really sharply increased illegal immigration and thus there was substantial INS enforcement in years after the passing of the Immigration Nationality Act in the late 1960s.

The immigration station in Seattle bears physical marks of these policies handwritten by the detainees themselves. She said the walls of the second-floor courtyards are covered with the names of Latinx immigrants painted with asphalt and their places of origin. She said because this was the only space where they had access to the outdoors, tar on the ground of the courtyards would get soft in the heat from the sun and then they would use that softened tar to mark on the walls.

In the late 1970s proposals were made to relocate Seattle's INS office from the immigration station and turn the building over to the county or at least use the former detention facilities within the building as a work release facility. But there were objections from the International District community as well as INS staff, so those plans were ended in 1980. In 1987 staffing increased at the ISN building as well as other INS buildings around the country in anticipation of increased applications for permanent residence and naturalization following passage of the 1986 immigration reform and contract act. This act allowed undocumented immigrants who arrived in the US before 1982 to apply for lawful permanent residence and possibly naturalization. Rising numbers of detainees during the late 1980s and into the 1990s during which the immigration law changes and increased enforcement, increased the use of immigration stations detention facilities which became crowded. Single beds were turned into bunk beds and mattresses were

added to the floor. The holding area was so crowded that people often had to sleep on the floor. The handprints on the wall were outside of the processing room for detainees to be searched because they were brought into the basement to await processing, and the yellow line on the floor guided detainees as they walked. Detainees were held in cells on the second and third floors with a lunchroom and kitchen on the third floor. Additional immigration changed and continued to affect how the building was used. In 1996, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) reframed under documented immigration as a crime and led to fast-track deportations and mandatory detention for immigrants with convictions. The immigration station in Seattle resumed long term and even indefinite detention particularly when it detained individuals from countries that had no agreement with the US to take back citizens. Those detainees became known as 'lifers' and were often from Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, the former Soviet Union and Cuba.

In the 1990s the INS director at the immigration station collaborated with the Chong Wa Benevolent Association to improve services for new immigrants and the Chong Wa Immigrant Service was founded which helped with onsite fingerprinting and photos for identification. These services discontinued after increased security concerns in the early 2000s. Racial and ethnic sweeps of immigrants in the US occurred again following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks with INS and other federal agencies arresting and detaining hundreds of people from the Middle East and Arab countries. In 2003 the Department of Homeland Security was created, and INS was then replaced by three separate agencies: the US Citizenship and Immigration Services, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Customs and Border Patrol. In 2004, the immigration station was closed, and those services were relocated to the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma.

Ms. Pratt said the building was designed in the Mediterranean Revival Style and it reflects the distinctive characteristics of that style. The style was influenced by Italian architecture, and it shares quite a few attributes with Spanish Colonial Revival. The style frequently uses brick, stone and terracotta. It emerged in the early 20th Century and continued in popularity well into the 1930s. This style is typically more restrained with formal, often symmetrical composition and they usually have low pitched roofs that are clad with clay tiles and those are frequently hipped roofs. They have horizontal emphasis and often you will see arched doorways and windows. The INS building embodies the Mediterranean Revival Style with its grand and formal appearance and its use of symmetry, its low-pitched hip roof clad in clay tiles and its repeated use of arched windows and doorways. Mediterranean Revival was not a typical style used on monumental government buildings in Seattle and it is more frequently seen on residential buildings like apartment buildings and single-family residences as well as small civic buildings. She provided photos of civic buildings in Seattle with a similar style including Seattle Fire Station 23, West Seattle Library, Yesler Library and the Cooper School; all four are Seattle landmarks. She said the INS Building is much larger and formal and stands out as a unique example of the style in the city.

Ms. Pratt said the design for the INS building is credited to the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department's supervising architect, James A. Wetmore. It is unclear who actually designed the building because Wetmore was not an architect but a lawyer and a civil servant. He was a bureaucrat who oversaw the construction of over 2000 government buildings across the country during his career. Designs associated with his career are too numerous to mention here but a few projects in Washington that are associated with him included the Federal Office Building in Seattle, the Federal Office Building in Port Angeles, and a former Post Office in Aberdeen.

Evan Anderson was the contractor for the construction of the INS building. He was born in Norway and immigrated to the US in 1904; he established himself in Tacoma in 1906. By the 1920 US Census, his occupation was listed as a contractor and throughout his career, as a general contractor. He built numerous buildings throughout Washington and Oregon including many government buildings. He retired in 1942. Projects that are attributed to Anderson's work include an addition to Western State Hospital, a renovation of the Northern Pacific headquarters building in Tacoma as well as the remodeling of post offices in Wenatchee and Yakima.

Ms. Pratt said they believe the building meets designation standards A, C, D and F.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the presentation. He said it was important to hear the context and historic perspective of what happened in the community and in the country. He asked if there was interpretive information onsite.

Ms. Pratt said there are impressive interpretive panels throughout the building.

Ms. Woo said landmarking the building will add to this story and will update all other information such as the National Register, International Special Review District.

Ms. Chang asked if the concrete structure with its hollow clay tiles is considered an unreinforced masonry building (URM).

Martin Hoger, part of the ownership, said they did the remodel 13 years ago. The building was abandoned when they bought it. He said there was some limited structural that they did over the entryways but for the most part there was not a study done. It is a concrete building with brick infill. It is not a URM building. He said the building sits on pilings. He said the basement is a structural slab, concrete columns and floors, hollow clay tile and infill brick. He said the building has survived so many earthquakes and there are no cracks. There are 90 pilings in the ground. The site is on the edge of liquefaction zone, so it was over-built. The basement was occupied but the rest of the building sat empty for a couple years. He said they didn't do a full structural analysis so the improvements they made were voluntary. He said if seismic upgrades were required, it would be hard to do that and maintain the historic character.

Steve Kelly said he was one of the original buyers of the building from the GSA along with Martin Hoyer and Hoyer's brother, Rob, who has passed away. He said they brought in 17 other investors and purchased the building for 4.4 million dollars and put another six million into it to get it to a certain habitable state. He said they bought the building knowing it was on the federal registry and that was one of the reasons they wanted it. He said both of Hoyer's parents came through this building and it had enormous significance to them. He said it was well-pointed out by Ms. Pratt and Mr. Howard's fantastic presentation, but the building has enormous history and impact on our national immigration story but also for the local area. He said it is more important to the city than it is nationally. He said they have a duty to nominate this building and they tried to do that in 2009. The nomination was stopped because the current owner didn't hold the title to it at that time and the GSA didn't want city designation on a building before it was transferred to new ownership. He said they could make their 2009 nomination available to the board if desired. He said as owners of the building there was concern about the level of oversight needed to do repairs and necessary modifications that this process would incur. He said they think this process is going to come up with identical and efforts to protect the building as is now done by the state historic preservation office (SHPO) because they said the federal government required in their MOA with the state that there would be protections on the historic character of the building, and we bought into all those. The administration of that process is done through the SHPO and the SHPO then it has been deferred to by the GSA so that those things will be the federal character of the building will be protected. There are a lot of specifics to what we need to regard as important historical features, almost all the outside of the building is protected. The inside interior hallways, the entry, the glazed tile work in certain areas. There is the building that was mentioned in the presentation by Ms. Pratt but much of the holding facilities and those things that are equally important to us. We want that character to be preserved. We are going to preserve it. We hope that it doesn't require approve of the SHPO and this board whenever we need to do work and that maybe the two boards can work together, to have one defer to the other so there is just one approval process, the time required and the potential for confusion if there is a difference of opinion between the two. He said they wanted to capture this information in the nomination and ultimate designation which they doubt anyone would oppose the designation. He said they were the ones who created the art community and the space for the artists. He said they were the ones who welcomed the Wing Luke exhibit in the building and regard it to be important to the building. He said they respect the building's historic character and its nature and want to continue doing that. He said if they ever sell it, that buyer would be bound by everything they are talking about here and everything that the federal government has already imposed on the building. Those obligations run with the land and don't stop. He said they tried to sell it when the market was hot and didn't get an offer. He said it isn't for sale now but there will be a day that will happen. He said they didn't want anything to happen that would impose restrictions on the use of the building and what type of tenants that they can rent to.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the detailed presentation. She was amazed that so much of the history was visible. She supported the nomination.

Mr. Macleod asked how future work might be coordinated between the city and DAHP.

Ms. Sodt said there have been instances where the city has coordinated with DAHP for property that has been disposed of by the federal government like the Federal Reserve Bank where there are interior spaces that are designated and then interior spaces that are more highly regulated by DAHP. She said the city works regularly with DAHP and has a good relationship with them so she is optimistic it can be figured out. She said a site visit would be helpful and may help inform what may be designated if it moves in that direction.

Ms. Woo said that there is a graphics portion of the nomination where they included the preservation zones mapped out. She said that information could be pulled out and the language from the MOA could be added as well in text and graphic form.

Ms. Sodt said the nomination report including the graphics page is on the Current Nominations page on the Historic Preservation website.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis supported nomination and said that without having walked through the building including Zone 1 and 2.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination and suggested including everything and then refine that at the designation meeting.

Mr. Barnes supported nomination and said he concurred with Ms. Wasserman about inclusion of everything with refinement at the designation meeting.

Ms. Randall supported nomination, including everything with refinement at designation meeting. She said it is an unassuming building with an incredible history. She said it can convey its significance. She noted the names on the bricks.

Ms. Caton supported nomination with inclusion of everything.

Mr. Norman supported nomination with inclusion of everything.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported nomination with inclusion of everything.

Ms. Chang supported nomination with inclusion of everything. She appreciated the thorough report and noted the significant building history.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the public comments, each with distinctive story. He supported nomination with inclusion of everything.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the U.S. Immigration Station and Assay Office at 815 Seattle Boulevard South for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exterior

of the building; and the interior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 17, 2024; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/HW/DB

9:0:0

Motion carried.

060524.6

BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Doherty said the next meeting would be June 26, 2024, due to Juneteenth holiday on June 19, 2024.