

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACHIEVING ACCESSIBILITY
AT THE UC DAVIS COOPERATIVE COMMUNITIES

UCD Cooperative Advisory Board
(Megan Bell, Christopher Congleton, Jay Erker, Teal Miller, and Ben Pearl)
12/6/2010

[Acknowledgments](#)

[Executive Summary](#)

[Background: Urgency of Meeting ADA Requirements](#)

[Program Definitions and ADA](#)

[Program Elements](#)

[Experiential learning](#)

[Collective decision-making and action](#)

[Critical self-reflection](#)

[Maintenance and development of facilities](#)

[Maintenance of garden space](#)

[Sustainable practices](#)

[Achieving Accessibility in Programming](#)

[Revised Scope of Structural Changes to Achieve Accessibility](#)

[Transition Plan](#)

[Provisional Plan](#)

[Implementation: Collaborative Planning](#)

[References](#)

[APPENDIX I: Domes Mission Statement and Tri-Coop Vision Statement](#)

NOTE APPENDIX II and III are separate files

1. **Acknowledgments**

This document represents many hours of work and collaboration of campus staff, students, and the Advisory Board. We would especially like to thank the following people for their contributions to the content of this document:

Faculty and Staff

Fred Wood Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

Janet Gong Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs (Retired)

Emily Galindo Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs and Director, Student Housing

Ramona Hernandez Associate Director, Student Housing

Faye Perata Coordinator for Group and Apartment Living, Student Housing

Branden Petitt Associate Director, Student Housing

Michael Sheehan, Associate Director, Student Housing

Chuck Huneke Assistant Director, Student Housing

Doug Ryen Assistant Director of Facilities Contracts & Auxiliary Services, Student Housing

Frank Loge Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering

Ryan Galt Professor, Human and Community Development

Mark van Horn Director, Student Farm
Mike Sweeney Associate Campus Counsel, Offices of the Chancellor and Provost
Wendi Delmendo Compliance Director, Offices of the Chancellor and Provost
Clayton Halliday Assistant Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Management
Chris Adamson Design Architect, Design and Construction Management
Allen Doyle Principal Planner, Administrative and Resource Management

Students and Alumni

Aaron King
Allissa Kendall
Ashley Smith
Brennan Bird
Bretta Anne Balamuth
Bryan Jungers
Byron Hoy
Charles Parker
Daniel Turvey
Danielle Pedersen
Darach Miller
Derek Downey
Dr. Damian Parr
Eizabeth Ernst
Elizabeth Fitzgerald
Greg Robinson
Ilan Cohen
Isabell Call
Jamie Hall
Janaki Jagannath
Jessy Beckett
Kara Fleshman
Kurt Vaughn
Marguerite Wilson
Michelle Yates
Molly Reagh
Renata Langis
Roxanne Sarraille
Sara Kosoff
Shea McWhorter
Sonia Ferrandiz
Stephanie Anderson
Tom Denton
Veronica Pardo
William Goss
and many more...

Executive Summary

This document contains the UC Davis Cooperative Advisory Board's recommendations

for programmatic accessibility at the Tri-Cooperatives and Domes communities as required by the Memorandum Of Understanding between Student Affairs, Student Housing (SH), and residents of the Cooperative Housing programs. These recommendations ensure that the cooperative living programs become accessible to any student without diminishing the opportunity for participation or compromising key program elements. In fact, in following these recommendations, underlying educational program elements are enacted through the renovation process itself. The plans also provide for continuing residency for both cooperative communities on campus, the Domes and the Tri-Cooperatives, during the development of the Sustainable Research Area and the widely anticipated Domes 2.0 development process.

It is recommended that the Domes can reasonably rely primarily upon a provisional plan through the development of Domes 2.0, although a Domes *Transition Plan* has been drafted and is available upon request should ADA staff deem it necessary. The Tri-Cooperatives are considered one program in this document and wish to make one of the three houses ADA compliant for a disabled student resident. Both communities recognize the value of and wish to develop more universal accessibility to the majority, if not all of, the facilities in the long term.

This document provides a proposed draft *Transition Plan* and *Provisional Plan* crafted through collaboration and the shared understandings created between SH Staff, Risk Management Staff (RM), and Students. The *Transition Plan* identifies how the Tri-Coop program will be made accessible in three phases: the first commencing Winter Quarter '11, the second commencing Spring '11 and continuing as necessary to completion, and the third further into the future as funding availability and/or necessity dictate. The proposed *Provisional Plan* alternately provides a more immediate response strategy by both Student Communities, SH, and RM to accommodate the accessibility needs of a particular student should they wish to live in one of the communities before the Tri-Coop *Transition Plan* is completed or before Domes 2.0 is operational. Decisions about the long-term planning process for these communities strongly impact not only the continuance and realization of necessary program elements but also significantly affects the implementation of ADA solutions. It is hoped that through further collaboration with all parties in the short-term, ADA solutions will be implemented in anticipation of and alignment with the long-term planning process.

Background: Urgency of Meeting ADA Requirements

“With the exception of the Cooperative housing program (Domes and Tri-Coops), Student Housing has done an excellent job of ensuring that all of its programs are accessible to students with disabilities.

To my knowledge, the Cooperative housing program is the only program that is inaccessible and without a plan to achieve accessibility.” (Sweeney to Galindo ADA Regs and Recs 10/13/10)

Before and since this communication, Students and the Cooperative Advisory Board (CAB) have worked closely with staff and faculty to formalize the cooperative living programs. Historically, the flexibility of the programmatic definition has allowed students in both communities to unofficially define and redefine the programs over time as participants change. Identifying those aspects of the programs which have remained constant over the lifetime of the programs has generated a set of immediate goals necessary to achieve ADA accessibility. Furthermore, students and staff have collaborated on formulating a long-term plan to enrich the accessibility of the programs

beyond the minimum ADA compliance.

Though the Domes and the Tri-Coops are considered separate programs with distinct structural offerings for students, they have important programmatic overlap. It is our understanding that all parties involved agree that the Tri-Coop program requires structural changes to the facilities to achieve accessibility, and that a *transition plan* must be developed by December 20th which includes:

- Identification of the physical obstacles in the facilities;
- Methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;
- The schedule for achieving accessibility;
- The identity of the person responsible for implementing the plan

Building on the work of Chris Adamson and his Campus Access Review (CAR), which was requested by Ramona Hernandez and Michael Sheehan and completed at the end of June 2010 without student input, the program elements of the two communities are discussed below. These program elements dictate the scope of the necessary structural changes to the facilities to achieve accessibility. Adamson's CAR study forms the basis for cost estimates in these proposed Plans. Adamson's study, which makes use of Student Housing's website descriptions of the communities as of June 2010, did not clearly represent the programmatic elements that have evolved to be common to both programs through their nearly 40 year history. Through the ongoing collaborative process of the CAB, students, and staff during the last 5 months, these program elements have come to be better understood and are formalized below for the purposes of the anticipated December 20th Transition Plan and to guide future development processes. Even so, extreme care should be taken to ensure that the definition of the program remains within the purview of the collective reflexive decision-making of current residents, which is explained in more detail below.

Program Definitions and ADA

The Tri-Cooperative Program and the Domes Program, as implied by the Tri-Cooperatives' constitution and the Domes lease agreement, and confirmed by current residents, requires participation in decision making as well as helping maintain one's living quarters and the gardens. While the separate membership selection processes of the Domes and the Tri-Cooperatives provides distinction between the two communities, they share common program elements: experiential learning, collective decision-making, and critical self-reflection. These foundational elements have resulted in additional program elements: *maintenance and development of facilities, organic food production and consumption*, and additional *sustainable practices* (please refer to APPENDIX I: Domes Mission Statement and Tri-Coop Vision Statement). We provide the following recommendations based on our current understanding of these programmatic elements common to both communities that have evolved through their historical development to their state at the present time.

Program Elements

Experiential learning

Experiential learning refers to a cyclical learning process of goal setting, experimenting and observing, reviewing, and planning action. This type of learning comes from a long tradition of constructivist and transformative pedagogies (Dewey, 1938; Freire, 1970; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Piaget, 1970), in which a convergent body of research acknowledges

and prioritizes the active role of learners in experiencing and constructing their own educational endeavors. Hands-on activity is recognized by educational scholars as the most effective way to meet the demonstrated needs of learners as active participants in their own learning. This foundational educational mission of the program underlies the implementation of other program elements, including collective decision-making, the maintenance and development of facilities, and food production and consumption. Experiential learning in this program is based on social deliberation, recognized by educational scholars and practitioners as an activity central to participation in a democratic society (Dewey, 1938; Greenberg, 1992), and has been central to the Domes and Tri-Cooperative programs from their inception.

Collective decision-making and action

Collective ownership of the decision-making process to define and pursue the educational/residential program is key to the cooperative living program. This ensures that as the program evolves, it reflects the contemporary concerns of students; yet most fundamentally, it serves as a powerful educational experience. The programmatic definition should therefore provide current students sufficient latitude in the direction and engagement of the missions of the two entities.

Critical self-reflection

Critical self-reflection refers to a subjective process of self-consciousness inquiry about assumptions and presuppositions, particularly about oneself (Mezirow, 1990) and the community as a whole (Bourdieu, 1992).

Residents practice critical self-reflection whenever they:

- seek to learn how and why their presuppositions have come to constrain the way they perceive, understand, and feel about the world;
- reformulate these assumptions to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable and integrative perspective; and
- make decisions or otherwise act on these new understandings (Mezirow, 1990).

The following program elements are outcomes of implementation of the program elements. This does not diminish from their importance as part of the program common to the two communities.

Maintenance and development of facilities

Resident maintenance and development of their homes and sustainable lifestyle-related structures provides a unique opportunity to enact experiential learning. The mandate for student maintenance of the facilities is written into the leases of the both communities: specifically, the agreement to help maintain one's living quarters. Resident participation in maintenance activities provides a unique educational experience that cannot be obtained through classroom learning. Development is evidenced structurally by the yurt project, the greenhouse project, the SRA Solar Energy Demonstration System, but has also included many non-structural projects developed by or with residents throughout the communities' history, such as Project Compost, the Davis Bike Collective, and many years of student directed course offerings on sustainability and student on the property.

Maintenance of garden space

As with the maintenance of facilities, organic gardening is a central component of the living and learning experience of both communities. Many residents of these programs have historically majored in agriculturally-based fields; the experience of organic, sustainable gardening in one's home space provides the necessary hands-on experience that complements the learning these students obtain in the classroom. The value of the

gardening experience is not limited to just the education of students of agriculture, however. Analogous to the importance of resident participation in building maintenance activities, garden maintenance provides an additional, and irreplaceable, experience of hands-on learning that cannot be replicated in the classroom.

Sustainable practices

Both communities have a strong commitment to sustainability, based on a social constructivist position in which sustainability is seen as a contested concept, where problem definitions are open to interpretation in the light of critical self-reflection. Sustainable practices find expression in the self-maintenance and gardening elements, but many others. Examples of the types of activities and practices that would make up this element under a formalized educational program are: using locally sourced food and other resources, bicycling and bicycle repair, recycling, reuse, application of Green technologies such as grey-water systems and solar technology, and a general reduction of waste produced and resource and energy consumption by the residents.

Achieving Accessibility in Programming

The most straightforward changes would require accessibility changes to paths between an ADA residence, the Southside gardening space, the paved pedestrian path on the north side to access parking, and the collective meeting space of the yurt. Efforts would have to be made on a more case by case basis so that differently abled students are able to participate in helping maintain their quarters. Gardening space must be made available with raised beds to accommodate all residents' participation in garden maintenance. Garden paths should meet ADA width and surface requirements. Certain facilities, such as compost and recycling bins, may require redesign and/or relocation to accessible paths.

Revised Scope of Structural Changes to Achieve Accessibility

In our ongoing discussions with Mike Sweeney, Wendi Delmendo, Chris Adamson, and Housing staff, it became clear to all parties that the revised program definitions reduce the scope of requirements needed to provide access to the programs as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). With the revised programmatic definitions listed above, in conjunction with the itemized lists in Adamson's CAR report and the components identified by Wendi Delmendo in her 6/16/10 Memo to AVC Galindo, a number of changes can be eliminated due to the improved understanding of program elements. Most of these scope changes are the result of a revised understanding that the necessary elements of the program do not include full structural accessibility of all residences and all parts of the property. Instead, a minimum satisfactory level of access to programs and residence can be met by making accessible at least one bedroom, a full bathroom, a kitchen, a laundry facility, securing accessible parking, a common space for socializing and participation in self governance of the community, and a garden space for participation in garden maintenance. This entails the development of a uniform application process at the Tri-Coops to clarify that it is a single program. As a single program, only one of the buildings would need to be accessible as a residence.

Transition Plan

Outlined below is a *Three Phase Transition Plan* to address concerns defined by UCD Risk Management staff. At the Tri-Coop, modifying physical structures, based on programmatic definitions, to meet basic accessible housing needs should be completed as soon as fiscally possible. This includes making at least one bedroom, a full bathroom, a kitchen, and a laundry facility accessible. Having a common space accessible for

socializing and participation in governance of the community is programmatically central. Additionally, garden space will be made accessible with raised beds to accommodate all residents' participation in garden maintenance. Existing accessible parking facilities exist within 400 feet of the Tri-Coop facilities, and there is ample room immediately adjacent to the east side of the property for ADA accessible development. TAPS has indicated that they are likely to share expenses of developing accessible parking.

Given the present planning process underway for development of "Domes 2.0", it seems feasible that the a Provisional Plan for the existing structures will be satisfactory in the short-term, as is the case in many redevelopment processes on campus, such as the King Hall and Hart Hall renovations.

While there exist several methods to achieve these changes at the Tri-Coops, student and community involvement foster the experiential and collaborative educational process and the emphasis on student learning and responsibility that is essential to these programs. We therefore strongly recommend that ways be found to support and include, wherever possible, student and community volunteer participation in the achievement of desired ends.

Methods and Timeline

Phase One: Design

1. Structural Project Design (target: winter 2011)
 - a. collaborative discussion between staff, faculty, and students on strategies to complete work
 - b. campus staff must review and approve designs before Phase Two can occur
2. Programmatic Changes
 - a. Uniform application process for Tri-Cooperative program
 - i. Step 1: single paper application (target: winter 2011)
 - ii. Step 2: comparable decision making priorities (target: fall 2011)
 - iii. Step 3: single student/alumni group overseeing application process (target: winter 2012)
 - b. Singular website (target: winter 2011)

Phase Two: immediate Accessibility

3. Critical components to the accessibility of either of the Cooperative Living Programs at UC Davis (target: fall 2011-2012)
 - a. One Bedroom
 - b. One Bathroom
 - c. One Kitchen
 - d. One Meeting space/common space
 - e. One Garden
 - f. Laundry
 - g. Parking
 - h. Necessary paths of travel between locations listed above

Phase Three: Improved Accessibility

4. Secondary components (target: fall 2012-2014)
 - a. Chickens
 - b. Visitability to other houses/domes
 - c. Additional garden spaces

- d. Necessary paths of travel between locations
- 5. Enhanced accessibility exceeding ADA requirements (target 2040 with ongoing work)
 - a. Additional bedrooms
 - b. Additional bathrooms
 - c. Additional Garden space
 - d. Additional common space
 - e. Timeframe depends largely on funding
 - f. 30 years represents loan repayment option

Cost Estimates

We have identified wherever possible items that reduce cost, but we are certain that with more integrated and in-depth discussion, further cost-cutting measures can be found. Economy of time and materials is essential to creating a functional plan which the programs can afford; this is reflected in the revised budget we have provided for the Tri-Coops (see Appendix II). Cost reductions come in three categories: clarification of project scope, economy of materials and methods, and potential for community labor.

- **Project Scope** has been clarified above.
- **Economy of Materials and Methods** is also self explanatory, but runs counter to several of the assumptions in the original project budget, which makes use of standard calculations for the gut remodel of each component, i.e. tearing out stairs completely vs. working with existing stairs, tearing out the bathroom rather than making adjustments, etc. Similarly, efforts should be made to use renewable resources (i.e. wood vs. metal for railings) which will in several instances not only save material cost, but additionally make those portions of the project possible via community labor.
- **Community Labor** is the final component in the adjusted project budget. The enthusiasm and loyalty within the cooperative community, including current residents and the Alumni of over 40 years of cooperative housing on campus, is a striking feature of the Cooperative Housing Program. The benefit of community labor is multifaceted, as it simultaneously addresses portions of the project scope, while providing vital programmatic educational opportunities, and strengthening the multi-generational community surrounding these programs.

The overall revised cost estimates for the Tri-Coops are on the order of \$160,000 and \$25,000 for the Domes (if they are subject to a Transition Plan; see Appendix III for itemized cost estimates for the Domes ADA renovation). Overall cost reductions in relation to the cost estimates originally provided by Student Housing are on the order of \$600,000, with 75% of cost reduction due to scope reductions, 21% from labor savings due to community participation, and 4% from economizing on materials and methods.

Table 1 Cost Savings Broken out by Category

Savings			
Scope	Labor	Economy	Total
\$447,734	\$124,199	\$25,295	\$597,228

Additionally, costs have been spread over time into phases, which will spread the cost and capacity burdens of the renovation:

- **Phase One:** Design (completion target: spring 2011) should involve little cost;
- **Phase Two:** Building Immediate Accessibility (completion target: fall 2011-2012) estimated at around \$70k;

- **Phase Three:** Building Improved Accessibility (completion target: fall 2012-20) estimated at \$75k.

Table 2 Phased Costs

Phased Costs	Percent	Costs
Phase 2 Hard Costs	48.37%	\$50,822.14
Phase 3 Hard Costs	51.63%	\$54,250.40
Phase 2 Total Costs		\$70,784.72
Phase 3 Total Costs		\$75,559.58

Provisional Plan

Provisional plan guidelines are relatively the same for both programs. If a student with a disability applies to live in Tri-Cooperative housing before adequate implementation of the Transition Plan or at the Domes before completion of Domes 2.0, an immediate consultation should be scheduled with Wendi Delmendo to develop a provisional plan that allows this student access to the respective housing program. Further, the community can begin discussion with the applicant to explore potential student-initiated change which assists in creating the requirements for accessibility. Specifically, students can work immediately to insure that all meetings occur in an accessible space, community garden events are focused on accessible space, and community potlucks also occur in an accessible space. TAPS has indicated that they are able to provide temporary accessible parking at relatively low shared costs should the need arise.

Implementation: Collaborative Planning

While this plan does not eliminate liability it has been suggested by both Mike Sweeney and Wendy Delmendo that the strategies outlined in this plan make great strides in mitigating liability. It is also recognized that the program can be discontinued to mitigate liability as a last resort in the worst case scenario. We look forward to discussion in reconciling our timeline and budget estimates with staff and faculty up to and beyond the December 20th deadline, to create linkages between our long term planning process and short-term goals, to continue our growing level of communication, collaboration, and creation of outcomes satisfactory to all parties.

Although oversight of the ADA process may change, we recognize that this is unlikely before December 20th. Given this, we strongly and unequivocally recommend Doug Ryen as the most appropriate choice within SH staff. Doug Ryen has expansive knowledge and experience with the programs for nearly two decades, both serving as SH liaison to both programs and also managing repairs and major renovation projects of the program facilities.

Overall, the Advisory Board recommends that the ADA plan be implemented as expeditiously as possible, to serve disabled students in the most integrated setting appropriate, and to implement the plan itself through the enactment of the program to enable the educational mission of this living/learning environment in its own development and change.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Invitation to a reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Greenberg, D. (1992) Democracy must be experienced to be learned. In Greenberg, D., *Education in America: A view from Sudbury Valley*. Framingham, MA: Sudbury Valley School Press.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mezirow, J. and Associates (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. New York: Orion Press.

APPENDIX I: Domes Mission Statement and Tri-Coop Vision Statement

Domes Mission Statement

As members of the Domes Community, we choose to promote and exemplify a lifestyle that incorporates the following:

- living practices including organic agriculture and permaculture, low-impact construction, energy efficiency, alternative forms of waste management and the general reduction of our ecological footprint, which allow us to meet our needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs.
- interdependence on levels ranging from emotional to economic.
- understanding of differences and conflict resolution through the consensus process.
- To encourage creativity, inspiration, initiative, personal growth and diversity.
- To structure our place and our community as an accessible educational resource for each other, the University of California at Davis, and the greater community of the world.

http://daviswiki.org/the_domes#head-734033b43a75aeda2af023b5f29c536ae40594a

Tri-Coop Vision Statement

These cooperatives exist as an alternative to typical student housing in Davis. They are a place for students to live and interact in an ecologically conscious, communal environment. They also provide an affordable alternative to off-campus housing. The Co-ops offer opportunities to learn more about low impact living, eating low on the food chain, fostering diversity, fostering communication, gardening, cooking, and being inclusive. Students take an active responsibility in maintaining the houses and the grounds. Students are expected to actively participate in the community and in the decision making process. Residents also carry the spirit of community beyond the cooperatives and into the community at large. This community strives to set a good example for other cooperatives in the area and for the university as a whole.

http://www.housing.ucdavis.edu/_host/tricoop/statement.htm