

University of Washington Tacoma Oral History: Founding Stories

Narrator: Dan Grimm
Date: 7/20/2018
Interviewed by: Justin Wadland
Place: Tacoma, Washington

Justin Wadland 0:01

This is Justin Wadland, and I'm interviewing Dan Grimm for the *University of Washington Tacoma Oral History Project: Founding Stories*. We are at the Tacoma Public Library Northwest Room on July 20, 2018. And, briefly, actually, I have a list of questions here. But I was wondering if first you could just introduce yourself and say what your position is now.

Dan Grimm 0:28

Dan Grimm. My current position is I'm the Deputy Executive and Chief Operating Officer for Pierce County. I work for Bruce Danmeyer, who is the elected County Executive. And I've been doing that since he was elected a year and a half ago.

Justin Wadland 0:43

So what were the origins of the idea of a public university in downtown Tacoma, and what was your role in that process?

Dan Grimm 0:59

Origins are really demographic and historic in nature. And it's one of the issues that tends to be forgotten or, or overlooked. The physical structure that we have of higher education in the state of Washington is based on demographics from more than 100 years ago. And as a result of changes in population concentrations and overall population growth, the significant portions of the population centers have been separated from the physical locations of facilities. The classic example of that is, more than a hundred years ago, we had three normal schools, Eastern, Central, and Western, so named obviously because they were extensively equidistant from regions that had comparable populations. And obviously, that's simply no longer the case. So you have one normal school turned into a state college and university in Bellingham, in the population area that is, what, four times greater than what you had in either of the other two. And one of the areas that was most adversely affected by these changes in demographics was, and still is, South Puget Sound, specifically Pierce County. So the origin is not so much political in the sense of individuals taking leadership roles, but the fact that the state had changed, and it was necessary to align the provision of the services with the people physically who needed those services. We had huge disparities in participation rates. Not true only here in Pierce County. Southwest Washington was probably initially in the forefront of that disparity that was the greatest, especially because they were just across the river from Portland State University and a population center that was fairly robustly served by higher education services. In fact, the model for the first foray we had into trying to solve this problem was in Southwest Washington, where we set up reciprocity agreements, where students who want to attend community colleges in Oregon didn't have as many opportunities in the Portland metropolitan area. We, on

the other hand, had Clark Community College and Lower Columbia Community College that had significant capacity greater than they did, but they had Portland State University, and we didn't. So we ... now, congressman Denny Heck, who was in a state legislature from the 17th Legislative District in Vancouver and Clark County, propose that we enter into a reciprocity agreement, and we did. We authorized it. And that was an example of—actually the beachhead—of recognizing the need to bring services to where the people were, and the people were not where the services have been put.

And that's really the genesis, because I went to work for the House Higher Education Committee in 1973. And one of the first things I learned was, where we had the colleges, it wasn't where we had the people who needed the colleges. So the people who lived near those colleges in Spokane or Cheney or Pullman, or in Bellingham, their participation rates were rather robust. But in other areas, it was much less so. Ironically, one of those areas is King County, because the only institution at the time that had an enrollment lid, that had been imposed since really the '60s, was in the single area where the highest concentrations of people and the greatest growth occurred, the University of Washington.

So that was, that's really the underlying source of the genesis of why something needed to be done. Then it was simply the case—I don't want to say simply—but it was a matter of people being in the right place at the right time with the right commitments, who could in fact affect that and change that policy notwithstanding significant opposition at the time, and difficult. I don't want to portray it as simple. Let me just go ahead and do it. There were a lot of challenges. But the reason we were successful at it is that no one in the legislature, and no one in the other institutions of higher education—many of whom, if not all of whom, opposed the idea of a branch campus here in Tacoma—had trouble overcoming the argument that there were no disparities in educational opportunities, because there were. Charles Williams never could get over that—if he was a professor at the University of Washington, say, well, we don't need this. But he never could say, "Gee-whiz, you do have equal opportunities in Pierce County." Because we didn't. And so legislators would, who, who were sympathetic to not doing anything about this, nonetheless recognized that was a difficult argument to make. It didn't look as good in print as it might in a back room.

Justin Wadland 6:07

And so you had ... you were in the legislature when you became aware of this as an issue?

Dan Grimm 6:13

No, I was on the staff.

Justin Wadland 6:14

Okay.

Dan Grimm 6:15

University of Washington Tacoma Oral History: Founding Stories

I was on the Higher Education Committee staff in 1973. I worked there for about a year and a half. Then I became the director of the policy office in the House, representing the nonpartisan policy office, but I was still very involved in higher education matters. When I was elected in 1976, in 1977, I became the Vice Chairman of the Higher Education Committee, and then two years later, the Chairman of the Committee. And two years after that I was in the minority, and I was the Caucus Chairman, still very involved in higher education matters. And then I was Ways and Means Chairman, when we really took this initiative.

Justin Wadland 6:53

Great. Getting back to that question of the origins of the university. When you were beginning to think about this disparity and the response to it, what was your idea about that response? Did you have a particular vision of that? Or was it that—

Dan Grimm 7:16

We needed to create another university.

Justin Wadland 7:19

Another university.

Dan Grimm 7:20

At least one, probably two.

That was not ... Hardly anybody comes up with a new idea. But my concept for it was really shaped by the, now the provost at the University of Washington, whose name at the moment I cannot recall. I will over time. I asked him what it would take for the University of Washington to be a truly world-class university at an even higher level than it's currently recognized as being. And he said, "Simple. You need to create a San Francisco State University because it would relieve the University of Washington of its regional enrollment obligations. So, Berkeley thrives as one of the premier institutions in the world because it has nearby other regional colleges and universities that local populations can attend. So the thought crossed my mind: well, you would apply that to the disparity of educational opportunities as well. So I became an advocate of, at that time, building another university in what I called, at the time, "the Crescent," stretching from Everett, to the east side of Lake Washington down to Tacoma. As a Pierce County legislator, I would have been happy doing that in Tacoma. But I recognized that as public policy, the issue wasn't Tacoma. It was that Crescent. And if you could do that, and at the time, I also advocated that it'd be something in the Seattle area. I was an advocate at the time of, of expanding Seattle Central Community College and making it a four-year school. The reason that never, I never pushed that was that there just wasn't the capacity for physical expansion. I don't know. If we did, it would be exponentially more expensive than doing it somewhere in that, in the Crescent, which, to be fair, was where the greatest population growth was at the time. Keep in mind, this was at a time when Seattle's school population ... even its population wasn't growing very fast for a combination of reasons.

Justin Wadland 9:29

So you were in the legislature when there was a lot of funding that went through that was for Tacoma and sort of that ultimately led to the revitalization of downtown. And I'm wondering how University of Washington Tacoma fit into that larger effort, if at all, sort of what the relationship might have been to, say, Union Station and the Washington State History Museum.

Dan Grimm 10:00

Well, they were all of a kind, which was to improve the quality of opportunities and improve the infrastructure in Tacoma. And it started frankly with Pantages Theater, which very few people realize. Jim Salatino was a former state legislator from the 27th Legislative District, North Tacoma. When we had a tie in the legislature, we anticipated that very little would get done because you'd have to cross the aisle to get a vote. So you tend to not get much done, and your expectations are fairly low. He nonetheless came to other legislators, his colleagues such as me, new legislators, in 1979 and said, "Well, if I can get the votes elsewhere, if I can get the votes in the Senate, to actually get funding for the Pantages Theater," which needed to be redone, remodeled, and they were having trouble raising the money. He said, "If I can put this together, will you guys all support it?" We all said yes because we didn't think there was any possibility of that happening. What he did is he put together the votes with Republicans. And as a result, we were able to get the money for the remodeling of the Pantages Theater. It was at least a few million dollars. It was a lot of money. And people who go to the Yakima Performing Arts Center or the Olympia Performing Arts Center or Pantages, have Jim Salatino to thank for that project. And he established the model, the template, for doing the same thing in the future.

That then became ever more evident because two women wanted to redo and save Union Station. Linda Bowman and Kathryn Van Wagenen. There may have been others in leadership positions, but they were the two who spoke with me. And we came up with, I think it was the initial few million dollars to stabilize the dome. They were afraid that it was going to collapse. And I think we redid the dome. And then after that, Norm Dicks was able to get the money to restore it completely as a federal courthouse, which is an unfortunate, but I understand unavoidable, use or justification for the use of the facility. My perspective was always it should be a building of hum, not hush. It's a building of hush, but at least the building was restored and saved. So we have the silhouette. And that's better than what we were faced with, which was, it was going to fall down. It didn't need to be demolished. It's literally going to collapse.

And then the same was true for the History Museum. As Ways and Means Chairman, the ... I can't remember his name now either. This is where an oral history isn't as good as somebody who writes it. Ah, the story. He was the chairman of the Washington State Historical Society. And the Historical Society Museum, which is in North Tacoma—was in North Tacoma—was in shambles. The roof was leaking. It was terrible, and they needed like three or four million dollars to just make it usable. And I said, "Well, why do we keep spending money, good money, on a bad facility? Why don't we build a new facility?" And he was very concerned that by pushing for a new facility, new museum downtown, that he wouldn't get that, the Society wouldn't get that

and wouldn't get the money to restore the facility—it was up in North Tacoma. And I said, "Well, sometimes you've got to take a risk." And he was willing to take the risk, without whose support I never would have been successful in securing funding. And we pushed through the funding, with the support of the Pierce County delegation, for the construction of the History Museum next to the Union Station. And then the next step was doing the same thing for the University of Washington or a campus. A branch campus, at the time not anticipated to be the University of Washington, because the University of Washington didn't like the idea. I'm not sure they still do. In fact, I'm pretty sure they don't. If it went away in the morning, they'd go, "Oh, that's terrible."

Justin Wadland 14:41

Getting back to the Pierce County delegation and the support that you had to marshal for these different public works projects in Tacoma, was there resistance to these projects? And then how did you work with that, and what were the ...?

Dan Grimm 15:02

For Pantages and the courthouse—the Union Station and for the Museum—I don't remember any local opposition. The only opposition locally was to the University of Washington, to the branch campus here. And that was a pretty strong opposition from certain quarters. But not among the legislative delegation that I recall.

Justin Wadland 15:32

Who were the representatives that you were working with in that delegation?

Dan Grimm 15:40

Brian Ebersole, closely. Ruth Fisher, George Walk, Wayne Ehlers, Mark Gaspard, Ted Bottiger, Lorraine Wojahn. Pretty much the entire delegation. We had the good fortune of, by default more than design, getting a number of people elected from Pierce County to the legislature, both the House and the Senate, who were able to demonstrate skills and commitment to getting work done, that allowed us to be appointed to and/or elected positions internally of significance. Speakers of the House, chairmen of Ways and Means committees, transportation committees, leadership positions throughout the two chambers. And so we were able to acquire levers of control and confidence that, when we advocated a project or a proposal, that it was in fact well thought out, there was a justification, and when you combine with pinch points of power, it was quite effective.

Two of the people who were the most influential were the chairs of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, Ruth Fisher and George Walk, because those are pork committees. And when somebody came in to ask Ruth Fisher for consideration for a fifth lane somewhere or an overpass or this little project, she had behind her desk large photographs of Pierce County projects, be they the Union Station or the museum or the University of Washington. So you didn't have to be a brain to be sitting in front of her asking her for special dispensation and consideration and looking right behind her at something she was very interested in doing. And

University of Washington Tacoma Oral History: Founding Stories

there were occasions when they actually figured out that, "Gee, that seems like a really interesting project that is worthy of support."

But the same was true for majority leaders and for speakers, for Ways and Means chairmen, who had control and pinch points for the consideration of legislation. But what's really crucial is that never did we collectively introduce anything that was not prudent and appropriate. And so there was underpinning it all was, these were good ideas. Now, one could argue about, "Well, should the museum be built in Tacoma as opposed to Seattle or Fife, or Olympia?" Those are legitimate arguments. The fact that it had been here in Tacoma made it difficult to justify moving it. The fact that Pierce County was underserved by higher education made it difficult to argue that it should go someplace else or that it shouldn't exist. The fact that we were able to get it faster was probably as a result of the positions that we were in at the time.

Justin Wadland 19:08

So while you were serving in the Washington State House of Representatives, you had important positions that influenced the legislative process, specifically around the University of Washington Tacoma. And it sounds like that one, this University of Washington Tacoma project, really kind of came at the end of these other significant projects that had already come through. Can you tell us what happened through that process? What were the major challenges or obstacles you encountered? And how did you respond to them?

Dan Grimm 19:41

Major obstacles. Go through the list ... One, opposition from the, basically, every place else in the state—newspaper publishers and editorials, reporters, and higher education leaders, university presidents, who argued, and if you do much research on newspaper articles and editorials at the time, almost all panned the idea of opening a new university when we needed more money right here in River City, wherever their location was, so they saw it as a threat to access to limited available dollars. So we had to overcome that because they would all exert pressure on their friendly local legislators and say, "Oh, no, don't do this. This could hurt us." We had trouble attracting interest even from any of them back in the late '70s, tried to get Central Washington University to offer undergraduate four-year degrees in Pierce County. And they wanted to do that but only if we gave them in today's dollars, probably 15,000 dollars per FTE. I don't know what the numbers are now, but I got to be fairly close. Fifteen thousand dollars per FTE. But they only wanted to spend three thousand dollars per FTE. They didn't want to provide any of the ancillary services, and they wanted to be able to hire contract faculty, not permanent faculty. So, we went, "What's the deal for our kids as it's just a source of revenue for you?" And they were like, "Well, you're the one who wants it, so you have to pay up." So we told Central we would take a pass, and we also tried to get Washington State University, but at the time, the president of the university was Glenn Terrell, and he didn't like the idea of branch campuses. I had numerous conversations with him over the years. We were always friends, but I told him, "Glenn, I think you're wrong." He said there needs to be a campus in a remote area where everyone, in fact, needs to come there from somewhere else and form a college. A collegial

University of Washington Tacoma Oral History: Founding Stories

environment where you're away from the hubbub of the rest of the world. Well, if one can afford that, wonderful, but given the limited resources, we needed to make sure that the services we provided were actually accessible to the people who needed those services. And so I could never get him interested in doing it. He was antagonistic to it. We still have public disputes about that.

That changed when Glenn retired. And the person who succeeded him came from the Pennsylvania State University system, which is a branch campus system. It's what it is—a bunch of branch campuses. And he knew that that was the future. And as soon as he came here, when I first saw that he had been hired, I went, "The world just changed." And very few people recognized that because he was just another university president, but I knew that it was a sea change from Glenn to Sam.

And so there was an interest in trying to get Sam to come here. And he had early on—this is where the years meld together for me. We started programs in Clark County that the WSU served and in the Tri-Cities. And coincidentally the publisher of the Tri-City Herald at the time was Kelso Gillenwater, who subsequently moved to Tacoma and took over the Tacoma News Tribune and was a strong advocate. And Sam, and I can't remember exactly how quickly things moved in those locations. There clearly was a commitment to doing whatever could be done.

And so there was the prospect for me of being able to get Sam interested in coming here. Well, the one thing that is really crucial to getting University of Washington here, not necessarily a branch campus or a campus here, but making sure that was the University of Washington, was when someone—and I don't know the history. My guess is it was Kelso Gillenwater. But it could have been Rod Hagenbuch. It could have been the fellow who was the Economic Development Director for Pierce County or chamber, and I can't ... Ryan Petty? It could have been Liz Heath. And to this day, I don't know the origin. But somebody said, "Well, let's get Sam Smith here to take a tour of potential sites for a branch campus of Washington State University." And it is my contention that the University of Washington Tacoma should have a very large photograph on the wall of the administration building, the president's office, and the caption is: "the birth of the University of Washington Tacoma." And it will be a photograph or a depiction of Sam Smith with one foot on the rail of a helicopter. Because when he got into that helicopter and took that tour, Bob Edie, who was the Government Relations Director for Bill Gerberding at the University of Washington at the time and Tacoma resident and former staff director for the Senate Ways and Means Committee, I know him well. He called Bill Gerberding. And he has told me this—he lives in California now, I believe—that he called Bill Gerberding from his home here and said, "Bill, I know people have talked about getting the University of Washington here, and the Faculty Senate hates the idea, opposes the idea. And if you support it, they will be angry and pose a problem for you. But you have an existential crisis on your hands. If WSU sets up a branch campus in Pierce County, politically, they will surround you, because the next thing they will do is they're going to Snohomish County, and your political base will be constrained. And he will eat you alive politically in Olympia!" Bob Edie knew exactly what he was talking about. And Bill Gerberding ate it. He knew as soon as Bob Edie said, "Sam Smith took a helicopter ride looking

for locations for a branch campus. And he's a branch campus man from Pennsylvania State University. This will happen. And it's either going to be you or him." And from that day, Bill Gerberding had to take on the Faculty Senate and say, "I realized, Charles, that you don't like this, and this is what's going to happen." He was faced with a fait accompli, or the least offensive alternative at the time.

So, I never had that thought. Why? I don't know. And as soon as somebody told me that's what happened. I went—I forget. I saw a movie one time where somebody went, "Damn! Why didn't I think of that?" Because it was the key! It was so obvious. It was in your hand, and I just didn't think of it. But bless whoever it was—Kelso or somebody said, "Well, isn't it rather obvious?" Take the air out of tires, you pull the truck back out from the underpass. No problem. And that's really a critical moment in history about the creation of the University of Washington.

Justin Wadland 27:20

So just trying to piece together this event. One, I'm wondering, is there a photograph of this event?

Dan Grimm 27:28

No, there isn't. But it would have to be staged, or as I said, depicted. But I think it would be wonderful if we could get Sam. And I'd make a modest contribution if that's what it took to secure the, rent the helicopter to get him to do that, because he's still in sufficient physical condition to do that. The fact that he's older now than he was at the time will be inconsequential 300 years from now, because the university will be old, and the fact that he's old in that photograph is going to be meaningless, but it still should be done.

Justin Wadland 27:58

And then, when did you first hear about this and its effect on the University of Washington president? And so, I'm wondering about you—

Dan Grimm 28:06

Same day. I mean it was—BOOM! This was, it's ... yes. It was just that. It was lightning, without the intention of being lightning, because the University of Washington was opposed. The assumption was that they would be opposed, but we needed to proceed with something.

Justin Wadland 28:29

And what's your sense of the motivation for inviting Sam Smith? Was it legitimately to—

Dan Grimm 28:37

I think it was to legitimately appeal to him and attract him to build and operate a branch campus here. I don't think, I'm not aware of ... I don't remember anyone and I'm not aware of anyone ever saying or contending that it was with that intention of forcing the hand of Bill Gerberding. My guess is, it's because the people who are doing it were just thinking in a linear manner, and it would have taken someone like me to go ... in politics. "Well, of course. This is what will

happen." Now, keep in mind, that didn't solve our problem, because the University of Washington was a reluctant bride and still is. And that's why we created the ... I made reference to it ... the South Sound Higher Education Council. We had to put into place political leadership in the city and the county, who would fight the University of Washington along the way until we were established and probably forever.

Justin Wadland 29:46

Yeah, I know we have our list of questions, but I think sometimes it's probably better to just kind of explore some of these issues as you bring them up. When you ... I would like to talk more about the South Sound Higher Education Council. But first, thinking through the process that you went through to establish the University of Washington Tacoma campus, what were the major sort of sticking points for the university in Seattle in terms of its resistance to the idea?

Dan Grimm 30:22

Competition for money, dollars, that it would be a drain. That the premise is, it's a zero-sum game, that there will be two billion dollars available for higher education, of that 780 million dollars—using arbitrary numbers—will be available for the University of Washington, and WSU will get 500 million, and you just go down the line. And in reality, actually, over time, it's a pattern that holds true. Because I changed some of that, and as soon as I was gone, it change back. And the reason for that is that I wanted to ... we have lower-division, upper-division allocations. What I wanted to do is to base it on competing peer institutions. So I wanted to fund the University of Washington, compared to its peers, Michigan, Berkeley, etc. Fund WSU to its peers, Purdue or whomever. And that wouldn't be as rich. It would be a different rate, ratio of funding, and then the same step down. But we don't do that. Every student in lower division in this state gets exactly the same number of dollars. It's every other student in lower division. And so I was able to do that for a year two. And as soon as I left, it's gone. While I was there, I could intimidate. As soon as I walked out the door, it's like, "Get rid of that." And they did. And there were others who were advocates of it. I mean, Joe Taller, who was a budget director for Spelman, he was a strong advocate of differential rates of support. So, but the University of Washington saw that, and all of them do still, my guess is, see this as a zero-sum game, that if in fact there's two billion dollars available, the legislature is not going to magically say, "Adjust it for inflation. Gee-whiz, we're just going to add another hundred million dollars for a new institution." But in fact, it'd still be just two billion dollars. And that money is going to come out of one or more or everybody, probably everybody. And so we won't be able to add this position or we won't be able to spend the money on this or that. We will lose. And if it's a zero-sum game, the answer is, Well, yes. But our argument was, well, one, even if it's a zero-sum game, it needs to be a fair zero-sum game. And two, it doesn't necessarily need to be a zero-sum game. Whether or not it has, I'll let somebody else assess over the years

Justin Wadland 33:02

Were there other challenges that you encountered? I think we're talking about the University of Washington and its resistance. What were some of the other obstacles, maybe locally?

Dan Grimm 33:13

Local opposition from community colleges and the existing four-year colleges, private colleges. Again, zero-sum game. If Charles goes to the University of Washington Tacoma, whoops! One less student for Tacoma Community College, Fort Steilacoom, what at the time was Fort Steilacoom Community College, PLU, UPS. They were very strongly opposed and did everything they could to stop it. And even when it became obvious they weren't going to be able to stop it, Tacoma Community College fought valiantly and unsuccessfully, way beyond reason, to have the University of Washington Tacoma located at Tacoma Community College. They want to in essence go from being a two-year college to a four-year college. I said no.

A lot of people were involved in that. But from the very beginning, Brian and I had decided that—and we had the support from the delegation that—if anybody at a local level or at the state level, because you make reference to the Higher Education Coordinating Council, whatever its iteration was at the time, that they might move it someplace other than here. And we'd said that if they do that, then we will put a proviso in the budget says money is not available unless it's right there. So Chuck Collins was a strong advocate of doing that, locating it there, so as Bill Philip, and so they were able to overcome that opposition. I never really got involved in that because Brian and I had already made the decision, had the support of the delegation that: you can go ahead and talk all you want, but this is where it's going.

Justin Wadland 35:03

And that was in Tacoma, right downtown?

Dan Grimm 35:06

Right there, right where it is.

Justin Wadland 35:08

And you said that that decision was made?

Dan Grimm 35:11

That decision was made before people started talking about it. Well, seriously talking about it, we just said, "We'll just be quiet and see what happens." But Chuck Collins and others knew that in the worst case scenario, this was what was going to happen anyway. We didn't mind that, actually, because it diminished the prospect of speculation.

Justin Wadland 35:34

So, yeah, if you read the news articles, it seems like it was still ... they were looking at different options.

Dan Grimm 35:44

They were looking at all the options.

Justin Wadland 35:46

But that was partly because there were all these competing interests, and it was a matter of continuing to offer people opportunities to sort of weigh in on that, or? Yeah, I saw a very interesting poll that was done by the News Tribune, I think, where they ... had gotten down to four locations. I can't remember the specific date. And it was TCC, Fife, somewhere in Hilltop, and then the downtown location. And the majority of people who voted in this TNT poll wanted it either at TCC or Fife. I think it was like ... and then there was a very small sliver for the downtown and then for the Hilltop, which I thought was very interesting. But it sounds like there was no—

Dan Grimm 36:42

No, it was not going to happen. And if it was going to happen, first place it was going to go if it couldn't go here, it was going to go to the boonies corner in Puyallup. But I didn't advocate that because it should be here. It's the cultural center. It's population center, transportation center. It's where you have the greatest concentration of students, who suffered the greatest disparity of educational opportunities. It belongs here. And that in fact was one of the factors that made it difficult for, for instance, legislators from Seattle to argue the point. Because if it was going to go out in Puyallup, it's just clearly pork for the 25th legislative district. And if it was going to go, you know, to Fort Steilacoom or Tacoma Community College, it was clearly based on an imperative other than policy. But being it was going to go right there, it's hard for them to argue that that wasn't logical, regardless of politics, and regardless of the fact that people knew that I was under a lot of pressure to put it out in Puyallup. Political ... the folks who were voting for me or against me didn't care about Tacoma. I wasn't representing Tacoma, nor did Ken Madsen or Phyllis Erickson way out in the second legislative district in rural Pierce County. But they all said, "No, it will go where it needs to go. Right there." And there were people in Seattle who went, "You know, if they've got the guts to say no to their local constituents, and if in fact, this makes sense because of all the reasons they've given. It makes it harder to oppose." And it did.

People can look at this as pork. That's great, fine. I don't mind doing pork deals, frankly, if they're justifiable. This was justifiable. And the proof is in the fact that it's expanded, and now it's not ... I don't think it's a political argument much anymore. But it didn't happen easily, and I don't think it will ... expansion. I remember Kelso Gillenwater after we were here. When I say, we, the campus was in place, the legislative, this was after I was out of the legislatures, they put money in a capital budget for a new building on campus. And, but it went to the UW, and they wanted to divert it. And Kelso Gillenwater published in the Tacoma News Tribune, and I don't know who else was in on the phone call, I wouldn't be surprised if Bill Philip was one of them, hooked up by phone with the president of the University of Washington, and were persuasive in having him change his mind. I think if you talk to Brian, he may be able to use the words that he heard from Kelso. Kelso was very earthy.

Justin Wadland 39:46

He told me that story over the phone, and I'll be asking him about it next week.

Yeah, there's a lot there. I'm just ... oh, yeah. I had a question. Going back to the location of the university and placing it downtown, and it's had such a significant impact on revitalizing—

Dan Grimm 40:11

That's 'cause things were terrible down there. If you start off bad enough, everything's good. So we knew it was terrible. I don't know, you guys—

Justin Wadland 40:19

Yeah, I've seen photos of what it was like.

Dan Grimm 40:22

You weren't here.

Justin Wadland 40:22

I wasn't here but I've heard—

Dan Grimm 40:24

Fifty years ago, the Union Station was just a wreck. There was nothing. It was a railyard where the museum is now. And across the street were just dilapidated and vacant warehouses and brick buildings that were worth, I mean, as an entry to a city, it was discouraging, which was another factor that we had going for us as a political delegation. Boy, if any city in the state deserve to be revitalized with some support from the state or the federal government, it had to be Tacoma. And the major projects that Tacoma had undertaken for the last, the previous so many years was parking garages. The joke was, it's hard to get Tacoma to do anything other than what they do well, and that's parking garages. I remember Ken Madsen told me that. And he was right. Because some of our problem was in fact getting the city to establish a mindset of: We can do this. It's not often easy, not always easy, to get people, even if they like the goal of it, but that seems like a lot of work. And we can climb the mountain. We can, we've got the tools. "Yeah, but it's really high." Understand, Charles, it is high. And that's what I went through with the president of the Society of the Historical Society. He was like, "You're saying you're willing to fight for 10 times the money and an entire new building?" Sometimes you got to go for it. We made it. And of course he was ... McClelland, John McClelland, publisher of Longview Daily News and an author about while he was fascinated with the Wobblies.

Justin Wadland 42:15

So when did the idea of placing the university downtown really take shape? Because it sounds like there, you know, you. I'm just trying to get—

Dan Grimm 42:26

For me, at the very beginning. At the very earliest stages. It would have been in the '70s. When exactly, I can't tell you, but mid-, late '70s, that it had to go downtown. I made the same argument about the Bothell campus. It's in the wrong place. I worked with Dan McDonald and others, trying to persuade them that it should go in Everett for the same reason that Tacoma is where it is. And it's not just in Tacoma, it's there. That's where it needs to be. And I remember Dan McDonald, who was the chairman at the time of the Senate Ways and Means Committee, and he said, "I just don't have the political capacity to make that happen." Circumstances kind of got beyond him. And that happens. And so I was more than happy to support the other branch campus because, again, I go back to somewhere in this Crescent. It's just that when you sat and looked somewhere in that Crescent, it needs to go to three places, four places: in Seattle itself, if you could get it done, Bellevue, Everett, Tacoma. And Tacoma was secure. I thought it should be in Everett, but who was I to tell the locals up there where to put it? I just said, "Wait, you're making a mistake. Left to my own devices. I wouldn't allow you to do that. But I've got skin in the game so I'm going to protect my own first. And if you guys want to put it in the wrong place, then maybe history would prove that you were pressured." So there it goes. There it is.

Justin Wadland 44:12

So while the planning was happening for the University of Washington Tacoma, there were these two organizations that—one was the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, sort of the HEC Board, which sort of developed reports and sort of created this vision, policy statement for creating branch campuses across the state. And then there also was this local South Sound Higher Education Council in Tacoma, which was, as you've already mentioned, a local advocate for the university.

Dan Grimm 44:49

Political protection. What Kelso did: get on the phone and say, "No, you're not gonna do that. We'll blister you."

Justin Wadland 45:00

So could you talk about these two different groups and sort of what—

Dan Grimm 45:04

One is purely political; the other was purely political.

Justin Wadland 45:09

Could you expand on that a little bit in terms of what—

Dan Grimm 45:11

One was an institutionalized political organization. That's the Higher Education Coordinating Council that went through numerous name changes. But it was a political group appointed by the governor and not limited to a specific geographic location. But very political. Chuck Collins was a master. He would be ... if you're going to do an extensive assessment of the history, he would be somebody to talk to. He'd been CEO, couple of companies or something. He's still

alive, and I think he still lives in Mercer Island. Great guy, loved him. And he was willing to say and do things that challenged the status quo. Was kind of a latter day Eddie Carlson, who was the former CEO of United Airlines. And you guys were young, so you don't know here was a CEO. And you think of CEOs as don't offend anybody, because he was on the Washington ... was it WPPSS, Washington Public Power Supply System. And I went to a couple of meetings where he toasted the staff. I mean, toasted staff. Chuck Collins was willing to look people in the face, especially in the higher education community, which historically always controlled, and I think they still do control, the current iteration of the higher education court, any council. They weren't accustomed to that. They had always controlled it. And Chuck Collins was not of a mind to allow that to happen. And I believe he was appointed by John Spellman. But he was a good guy. And he was strong. And given the whole of the information, he would move in the right direction, even if it was politically unpopular, and he had to stare down the University of Washington president. He was excellent. There are people who serve in appointed positions who are excellent, and he was one of them. And to be fair, so is Bill Chance. Who was ... if he wasn't the executive director at the time, he was one of the senior people at the Higher Education Coordinating Council. He's still alive. Living in Olympia, I believe. I haven't seen him for years. I haven't seen Chuck Collins for 30 years either.

Justin Wadland 47:51

So Chance was on the Higher Education Coordinating Board?

Dan Grimm 47:55
Staff.

Justin Wadland 47:56

He was on the staff.

Dan Grimm 47:58
Collins was an appointee. He was the chairman.

Justin Wadland 48:01

There was the Chance Report, which I heard was part of the South Sound Higher Education Council. There are these two documents that I came across as sort of references that that were essentially making the case in a public document for a University of Washington Tacoma, essentially. And you had, one document was released by the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and I'm blanking on the name of the, it was a University of Washington professor who wrote that report. The Kerr Report. Yeah. Donna Kerr.

Dan Grimm 48:44
Yes. And she's still alive. And she was ... right. She was very smart.

Justin Wadland 48:50

And then, in that one, that particular report documented a lot of the needs that you spoke to earlier and in this interview. And then there also was this Chance Report that I, was referenced in this somewhere that I came across ... and it was produced by the South Sound Higher Education Council. And so was there an overlap there with Bill Chance and that reporter?

Dan Grimm 49:22

My guess is there's more than coincidence. I remembered, is it Kerr or Kare? ... I remember Donna Kerr. But that, that's I could be wrong. I remember that ... I remember that report. But my memory is that that came sufficiently late, that all it did was affirm decisions that we had already made. That may have refined the tactics and/or the approach, which is necessary and much appreciated, and if it affirmed the fundamental premise, wonderful. But that wasn't news to us. We were already comfortable. And I say we—Brian Ebersole and Mark Gaspard and others. We were already comfortable with fundamentals. It's not as though we were bereft of the ability to read. It's not as though we were bereft of the ability to figure out that there was a disparity in educational opportunities. That information was all available. These reports simply would be confirmation of that fact. Or those facts. And I didn't know that Bill Chance had done any work specifically for the South Sound Higher Education Council. Great. And I'm, I haven't seen him for many years, but we were old friends because we worked together on higher education stuff back in the '70s. So I think once the movement began to take shape, that there were a number of people who became involved for whatever combination of reasons, and they all tended to come to the same reasonable conclusions. I say that without having any memory of what Bill Chance brought. My only memory is of Chuck Collins affirming the fact that it needed to be branch campuses, and the first one ought to be right there in Tacoma. And a lot of people didn't like that—at the other college universities, all of whom felt as though they should control the Higher Education Coordinating Council. And if you want to confirm that, just call up somebody who served on the, on the staff at the Higher Education Coordinating Council or whatever it's called now. They'll tell you, "Yes, nothing happens here without the consent of the university presidents." By consent, unanimous consent. So, there's a reason why you don't know much about the Higher Education Coordinating Council and it's because it doesn't do much.

Justin Wadland 52:15

So this, you've mentioned that the South Sound Higher Education Council was also political. And now talk to me about how it operated and what it's sort of what levers was it pulling?

Dan Grimm 52:35

Well, that will be a better question for Brian. When we realized that this was going to happen and realize that University of Washington was not a willing bride, willing participant, that making it successful after it was first established was going to be before it got pushed back in the ocean, we needed to institutionalize a base of support in Tacoma, Pierce County. And that to do that, we would need an advisory committee made up of, comprising, community leaders, Democrats, Republicans, business, labor, whatever, who would politically be willing and eager

to challenge the University of Washington, be a catalyst for support locally. The idea was if you could get these—whoever they were—10, 15, 20 community leaders together, and if they said, "Gee, everybody who's an elected official here has to fight hard to make sure the University of Washington does this, this, and this, and doesn't do that, that, and that. That was going to be the only way to institutionalize it because obviously what they were going to do, left to their own devices, is that they would hire the chancellor, and the chancellor would be an employee of the president. So, "Gee, Charles, we're not going to be able to give you the extra faculty people because we got problems here on campus." And, and Charles would go, "Well, I wish that weren't the case. But I have a choice between a job and advocacy." And while specific Charles might have been willing to fight it, economics tend to apply to the vast majority of people over time. And if you're going to kill your career, not sure that specific budget fight on that building or that 50,000 dollars or 500,000 dollars is going to be where you decide to die.

And so we knew there had to be people who were willing to fight for the cause, who were not controlled by the University of Washington. And so I believe I was the one. This is one of those places where ... if Brian tells you he was the one who thought of it, okay, he was the one. But whichever one of us said it, the other one went, immediately, "Yes, we need to do that." And I remember thinking up a few names. But for the most part, I left that to Brian. And he was eager to do that. And so the actual operation and the appointment of a number of people, I probably knew who they were, and didn't have any problem with them, but I was more concerned about getting it set up and making sure that the people on it were good people. So I wanted to know who they were, but it was rather obvious they had to be from a fairly small group of people. It had to be the 10 or, it had to have at least six or eight of the Bill Phillips's and others, who, if they snarled, people would go, "Ooh, I don't want him snarling at me."

Justin Wadland 55:40

Now was this body charged by a larger body, or was it just an independent group?

Dan Grimm 55:48

Just came into being.

Justin Wadland 55:51

Got it.

Dan Grimm 55:52

Hand to the Lord. Fingertip to fingertip. Who was there to paint that? They just existed. We talked about that. There was no ... We didn't pass anything in the legislature. We just, they just self existed.

Justin Wadland 56:11

Citizens Committee, I guess is a way to describe it.

Dan Grimm 56:15

Again, I didn't really care whether it had any legal authority. It didn't need any legal authority. It had political authority. That was the idea. The idea was to set up so we have political authority.

Justin Wadland 56:30

What was your sense of the public perception of it? We've talked about the community leaders, government leaders, the university. What were you hearing from your constituents about this project because it sounds like—

Dan Grimm 56:46

Other than those who had a special interest, I don't remember anything in particular.

Justin Wadland 56:54

Would you say that there was support or not in ... or just a lack of awareness?

Dan Grimm 57:00

My guess is if you did a poll, they would say, "College good. Education good." But if you stop talking about it, they probably wouldn't become upset. It's long term decision. There was nothing immediate happening. People tend to get the most excited about what's pending today, tomorrow, the next, you know, the next paycheck. And this was all going to be years in the making. And so I don't think you tend to animate the general electorate based on my children that are now in grade school may be able to go there. You haven't shown it to me. I don't see the ivy on the walls. I mean, so, what's this teacher gonna look like? I mean, is he gonna be a crazy or something? I don't know. Is it gonna be another Evergreen? So, I never, I don't recall much in the way of ... I think they would have been, when asked, they would say, sure, good. But other than those who had a vested interest in the outcome, one way or another, I don't remember much.

Justin Wadland 58:13

I'm going to skip over some questions because you've kind of answered some of them, especially about ... And let's see.

We've talked a bit about establishing it in the historic warehouse district. And I think, actually, it might be worth just visiting that topic a little bit more. Because one piece of that history that I found particularly interesting was that—particularly, I learned this from talking to Michael Sullivan about this sort of initial siting of the university—in the initial plan didn't include the historic warehouses and the warehouse district. And at the same time that all this was happening, the city had done a grant funded survey of the warehouse district and was looking at some sort of repurposing of those historic warehouse buildings. I'm just wondering how aware you were of these different proposals for the downtown location. And to what extent you were involved in any of those discussions?

Dan Grimm 59:31

Totally unaware. Totally uninvolved.

Justin Wadland 59:35

Okay. That's, I mean, I'm not going to ask you about anything you weren't ... things that you weren't involved in. So.

Dan Grimm 59:40

To my memory, that doesn't mean people might not have said things to me to say, "Gee-whiz. Justin is working on this. Did you know that?" I may very well have, but they never rose to the level of significance to me that they were a factor in any decision that we were making, and it's not part of my memory. Keep in mind, I have forgotten a great deal.

Justin Wadland 1:00:01

No problem.

Dan Grimm 1:00:02

And there's also a lot I never knew. So if somebody says something that contradicts that I say, they may very well be right.

Justin Wadland 1:00:13

And so your term in the legislature ended in—

Dan Grimm 1:00:17

January of 1989. And then Brian took over. He was the, I think, the Speaker after I left.

Justin Wadland 1:00:27

And so you left the legislature before the university campus actually opened. And then you became the state treasurer in what year?

Dan Grimm 1:00:38

Eighty-nine. I was elected in '88. I went from the floor of the house to the treasurer's office that same day.

Justin Wadland 1:00:45

I see. Now, you are a treasure at a really important time in the university's history because, you know, the university, as I understand, had been authorized, and then there's the, you know, the funding that would go toward establishing the university, and then the capital funds that would go toward a new campus. To what extent were you involved in some of the sort of tracking of that, the budget allocations and things of that nature? And, I understand, I have an article here in the '90s. There was a recession, and there were some concerns about funding and pulling the funding from the university in 1991. And so I just was wondering if you could talk a bit about that.

Dan Grimm 1:01:33

Very little. I was aware of the issues. I would have conversations with Brian and others, but they were hallway conversations for the most part. I use that as ... for the conversations that I had. Sometimes I'm sure they were sit-down conversations. Sometimes they may have been several minutes. Sometimes they might have been passing remark: "Watch out for this." But as treasurer, my role was as a financial officer, not as a policy maker. So my interest notwithstanding, I was ... I sold the bonds. I managed the assets. It's an administrative position. I had no policy control or influence. Personal influence, perhaps, but not as an elected official. It's really an administrative position. I don't want to diminish the significance of it when it comes to management of assets—what is today probably about 100 billion dollars under management with a very broad portfolio, but it's when it came to selling paper, bonds to build the buildings. All we did, or I did, and the Finance Committee, which comprise the governor and the lieutenant governor, was to find the best time to sell the bonds that had the best interest rates and the best deals possible to make money available in large chunks. We would sell a billion and a half dollars worth of bonds. And we would have all kinds of facilities in there. It was just whatever was ready to go. So I really wasn't a factor. You have several questions here at the end.

Justin Wadland 1:03:25

That's okay. We can skip those. And to what extent were you involved with the university after you left the legislature?

Dan Grimm 1:03:35

University of Washington people generally didn't like me.

Justin Wadland 1:03:40

The Seattle campus, you mean?

Dan Grimm 1:03:41

Oh, yeah. Tacoma campus was so nascent that there was no history. But I had a history with the University of Washington and higher education generally. And it was not an amicable relationship. They didn't like me. They still don't.

Ask, suggest to someone, "Dan Grimm, we talked to him. He seems like he'd be really good to be on a staff or an administrator or teacher, something at UW." See how far that goes up the chain. There's a memo somewhere. And that's okay.

Justin Wadland 1:04:22

Obviously, I haven't received that memo because we're sitting here talking to you.

Dan Grimm 1:04:27

Well, but your duty's a little bit different. But in terms of getting a job, every one's ... in fact, I think David Zeeck at one time told Brian, "Gee, I think Dan would be a good candidate to be a chancellor at the UW here in Tacoma," because of my familiarity, background, stuff like that. I've

been an administrator, a manager, and stuff. And Brian told me, and I said, "What did you say?" He said, "Well, I laughed." He told David ... because David didn't have any of that history, but I had been, notwithstanding the fact that I think of myself as being an advocate, trying to get better funding, and like the differential funding that I talked about earlier, Bill Gerberding opposed that. So, and he admitted to me later that was a big mistake, but he did that because all the other universities and colleges said, "We have to be a team. And if you start being, thinking of yourself as being taller than us, we will all dislike you. And collectively, we will make your life more difficult than any benefit you will derive from agreeing with and supporting Dan Grimm's proposal." So he didn't support it, and I was often belligerent and antagonistic of our college universities and their financial practices.

Justin Wadland 1:05:51

Well, I think that's a good lead into a question that I'd like to ask everybody toward the end of the interview, and that is: How do you perceive the evolution of the campus over time? And has UW Tacoma stayed true to what you hoped it would become?

Dan Grimm 1:06:09

Well, yes, because all that I'd hoped it would become is an opportunity. It's your job to make that opportunity of significance. It's on my job. I might get happy, or I might be mad. But my task was to make sure that money was available for you to do that or for someone to do that. And apparently, given enrollment, over the past 20 years or whatever it is, 25 years now or something, that aspiration, that imperative has been fulfilled. Doesn't mean it can't do more and can't do better. It should. And it doesn't mean that I agree with everything that has been done or is being done. I was a vehement opponent of allowing students to get more than 90 credits at a community college. And I don't know what the status of that is now, but one of the concessions that I was forced to accept and didn't like it was that Tacoma Community College would go along with what was being done if they could get students to able to, in essence, have three years worth of credits at TCC. It's a bunch of crap, never should have been allowed. I don't know if it's still allowed. Bad idea. Terrible idea.

So, but I can write letters to the editor. With time, my hope is that will resolve itself favorably for the students because either Tacoma Community College can in fact do that, and, and you only need the University of Washington to what, be a finishing school? What the premise is that community colleges are good at delivering the first two years, and that you need a four-year university to do the last two years. And if what Charles Williams offers is no different to Tacoma Community College from in a three- or four-year program at the University of Washington Tacoma, why am I paying him more?

So I still pay attention. And I can still get angry and distressed at decisions that are being made. But fundamentally, there are more opportunities for more kids than there were. And I don't know about the disparities today, my guess is, there are still large disparities, but my guess is they're less severe than they were 40 years ago. So, I have fulfilled what I consider to be my mission.

Justin Wadland 1:09:01

What is your opinion about this, the funding for higher education in the state, since you had, I mean, you had this sort of very intimate perspective in the '80s. And you've been paying attention to it over the past two decades since, and I'm just curious what your perspective would be on that.

Dan Grimm 1:09:22

On overall funding?

I can't ... I'm not comfortable with the specific dollar amount for saying that the current dollar amount is more or less than it should be. I do believe that our colleges and universities are managed by consensus rather than with a management plan that would be more appropriate for students. We don't really have a higher education system or plan.

It's, it's a complex issue that involves meritocracy, efficient uses of resources, recognizing that universities are training facilities as well as they're educational facilities. I get angry, for instance, at the fact that we have communications departments that are huge. And yet the number of students who graduate with degrees in communications and the number of them going into any kind of a program within five years that has anything to do with what they've learned in communications. A liberal arts will have a liberal arts background. I think that's wonderful for people, but colleges do both, even our universities. And much of it is in fact training. And not just engineers. But in fact, like communications, we spend millions and millions of dollars for kids to go through communications programs. And really what they are is less rigorous liberal arts programs. And it doesn't do the kids any favor, and it doesn't do taxpayers any favor.

But a lot of people are so committed to the piece of paper as a proxy for attainment that it is difficult to persuade them to do otherwise or to accept otherwise or to fight for a different approach. I'm just concerned four-year college degrees have lost a lot of significance. There is just too much evidence indicating that a whole lot of kids graduate from college would not much more, if anything, know in the way of, of cognitive skills or knowledge base or reasoning skills than they had when they got out of high school. And to be fair, high school diplomas don't mean much anymore. Everyone gets all excited about increasing the graduation rate. I can get you a graduation rate of 100 percent today. You just have to write their names in, sign it on a piece of paper. It's right out of the Wizard of Oz. And, and there is a financial incentive for doing that. That's why, for instance, Tacoma Community College and others fight for expansions of opportunities, because every, every student is what I refer to as this ski lift ticket. The student enrolls and they tear that off and give it to the state and get 15,000 dollars. So they have an institutional imperative to spend little and get a lot. Why do you think they don't have as much ... everybody gets concerned about engineering programs, software programs. We're not producing enough. Okay. I'm sure you're right. We're not. Why aren't they doing more? Well we don't have the money. What do you mean, you don't have the money? They have the money. They just don't have the money to do everything they want and more of that. Well, I agree. Now, the question is you have X amount of money, what are the priorities that are both economic and

educational? Doesn't mean you don't have both. It just means that you may not have as many spaces that people become accustomed to. And Bill Gerberding, he admitted that after he left office. In fact, when he lost the opportunity to be the chancellor at the University of California, then and only then did he advocate the closure of, shutting down the number of degree granting programs. I think Slavic dance was one of them. Is that a, Slavic dance, a great thing? Yes. The question is can you afford it, relative to what other objects of expenditure are a higher priority? How many nuclear physicists do we need? Do we need everybody to be able to, whenever they choose, take a peek at a PhD. Oof, a very expensive proposition we've undertaken. There're a lot more PhDs than we have job opportunities. But as a result, a lot of fairly low PhDs, fairly lowly paid. Have you ever been to Burger King or anything in Olympia? Fast food restaurant? Go sometime and ask the nice young man or the young woman behind the counter what they do when they're not working here. You won't have to go very often or ask very often, and many times, "I'm a student at Evergreen," or, "I just graduated from Evergreen." You know. Wow. Unfortunately, you could just ask the same question of, "When did you graduate? Was it just in spring?" "Well, two years ago." Or four years ago. More often than you think. And every dollar that's spent there is not spent someplace else.

So, yes, there's a lot of opportunity for reform in our higher education system. But is there a political imperative for it? I don't sense that. I fought that battle for many, many years.

Justin Wadland 1:15:28

And within this context, I think I'll just sort of close with this last question. Based on what you know about UW Tacoma and its history and as somebody who lives in the city and has an awareness of the issues of higher education from a political perspective, what do you see as the likely future direction of the campus?

Dan Grimm 1:15:53

In terms of educationally, or? Well, I would suggest it will continue to develop. I think it will, it should expand up the hill and continue to offer additional programs. And it should take over full upper division responsibility. Tacoma Community College and others should not be allowed to have to give more credits than the 90 or whatever it is. I just think it over time will become in Tacoma what University of Washington is in Seattle. My great nephew is one of them. I don't know if you ... they used to do posters of students at UW Tacoma. One of them on a bus was of my great nephew who took environmental sciences as training program. What I would call a liberal arts program. It's okay. I don't have a problem with that. He makes good money, has a great job. I've got a couple great, great grandchildren out of the deal, or great nephews out of the deal. And so it's wonderful. That's what it should do. I don't have a problem with training programs from a liberal arts background, and that's fine. We just need to be better managers of the resources. And right now, all of our university professors ... if all of our university presidents, before they can become president, have to go through a lint licking process of agreeing to everyone's demands. So by the time they get to the president's office, they've already said they would never do anything to upset anyone in the higher education community. And as a result, there's nothing they can do. They're stymied.

I saw all these newspaper editorials, going, "Oh, we need to have everyone involved in the hiring of Justin or whoever is the president." Well, the price of that is that Justin is unable to do anything. And if Justin is just looking for the opportunity to move on and then become a university president, some of them, you know, eventually become the chancellor of the University of California. He'll go along with that; he's responding to incentives. Understand that doesn't mean it shouldn't change. Anything else? Other questions?

Justin Wadland 1:18:26

If there is anything that you feel that you wanted to add?

Dan Grimm 1:18:31

A whole lot of people were key. One of them was Bill Philip. Locally.

Justin Wadland 1:18:44

Yeah, that's, I guess ... Can you just talk a bit about what his role was just to kind of—

Dan Grimm 1:18:52

He's a community leader, who is very direct, very blunt, and is willing to take a long-term perspective. And he has enough brains and guts to just be direct and blunt. He was wonderful to work with. And he had money, and he gave money. I think he built, contributed millions of dollars or whatever, to projects there, and he was a catalyst for others. If he's the chairman of a group that you want to do something, it probably will get done. Or he wouldn't sign on. If he does sign on, it will happen. That doesn't mean he's the only one, but he was instrumental in this. I mean, he was the one who had the guts to tell people at Tacoma Community College, "No, I don't think that makes sense." So he was, he was tremendous. I can't call him a friend personally, because it's not like we had that much contact but a friend politically and insofar as public policy is concerned. I liked him a lot. Still do.

Justin Wadland 1:20:01

Yeah. And actually, that just reminds me of one other thing just to kind of ask you about is that, I mean, you've talked about the political value of the South Sound Higher Education Council. It seems that once the university was formed, that many of the members of that committee then became the Advisory Committee for the campus. And, and I have an article here where it's titled, "UW Tacoma Campus Gets Advisors," published in 1991. And it really talks about a lot of the issues that you've kind of highlighted in that, in the sense that this group would influence the direction of campus, so.

Dan Grimm 1:20:55

A lot of people have done a lot of good work, and I, once I left the legislature, I was pretty much out of the control position, and that didn't bother a whole lot of people.

Justin Wadland 1:21:16

Okay. Well, thank you very much for talking to us, and I'm just going to stop the recording right there.