

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
General Administration Building  
210 – 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, Room 324  
Olympia, Washington  
September 18, 2008  
10:00 AM**

**Approved Minutes**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Fred King  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Ron Tan  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Carleen Jackson (For Secretary of State)  
Dennis Haskell  
Barbara Swift  
Representative Richard DeBolt

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Senator Dale Brandland

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Bremer, Linda, GA	Hensel, Grant, GA
Case, Sharon, GA	Jennings, Marygrace, GA
Childs, Harvey, OFM	Koal, Penny, GA
Donald, Craig, GA	Shosbree, Bob, SRG Partnership
Evans, Tom, GA	Springer, Lillian, GA
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia	Valencia, Rachel, GA
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Zieve, Rick, SRG Partnership
Gray, Donovan, DAHP/GA	

Chair King called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Announcements and Introductions**

Chair King reported the notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian*. Public comments will be accepted after completion of each agenda item. Other public comments will be accepted at the end of all agenda items.

**Approval of Agenda**

**Dennis Haskell moved, seconded by Representative DeBolt, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.**

**Approval of Minutes – August 6, 2008**

**Ron Tan moved, seconded by Representative Hunt, to approve the minutes of August 6, 2008, as presented. Motion carried.**

**Director's Report**

Department of General Administration (GA) Director Linda Bremer updated the committee on recent activities:

**Expiration of Member Terms** – The appointment terms of Fred King and Ron Tan expire on October 10, 2008. Mr. King has served two terms beginning in 2001 and Mr. Tan has served three terms beginning in 1998. GA has begun a recruitment process and established a deadline of September 30, 2008 for applications. The Governor allows time extensions until replacement members are appointed. Both Mr. King and Mr. Tan have agreed to serve until replacements have been appointed.

Ms. Bremer reported a reception and recognition event will be held for Mr. King and Mr. Tan.

**City Building Height on the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Isthmus** – The Olympia City Council held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 16, 2008 at the Washington Center for the Performing Arts. Several hundred people attended with approximately 100 people testifying. Another opportunity to testify is on Sunday, September 23, 2008 for those who did not testify at the first meeting. Public comments focused on four areas:

1. Accept the developer's proposal as submitted.
2. Accept the Olympia Planning Commission's compromise proposal.
3. Deny the proposal and retain the existing zoning.
4. Deny the proposal and study the possibility of turning most of the isthmus into a park.

The City of Olympia is accepting written comments until 5:00 p.m. on September 23, 2008.

Chair King noted that the committee's previous letter was addressed to the Planning Commission. He inquired about sending a separate and perhaps modified letter to the City Council. Ms. Bremer advised that staff can draft a response letter during the break for the committee's review.

Mr. Tom Evans reviewed some of the elements of the previous letter that no longer apply. Staff will create an updated draft for the committee's review later in the meeting. Members agreed another letter should be forwarded to the City Council.

**Wheeler Site Redevelopment** – In response to the direction by the Governor, the Wheeler project is under redesign and scaled back to more closely match the budget authorized by the Legislature. The redesign will not include the second office building and will only include the state data center and an office building for Department of Information Services (DIS). It's anticipated DIS will submit a budget to the Legislature for consideration during the 2009 session.

Representative DeBolt asked whether space will be allocated for the second building in anticipation of future growth needs. Ms. Bremer said GA has not reviewed the design from DIS and is unsure of there is space allocated in the future. She said she will contact DIS and share the request as well as schedule an update on the project at the committee's next meeting.

Chair King asked whether there is a belief that the design-build public works method failed the [Wheeler project] process. Ms. Bremer said she's unsure whether there is one element to blame, but that it's likely a combination of several factors, such as the short timeframe, extensive stakeholder work, child care issues, and the traffic roundabout.

**West Campus Regenerative Landscape Planning – Landscape Master Plan Progress**

GA Facility Planner and Cultural Resources Manager Marygrace Jennings provided some background information and a summary of progress on regenerative landscape planning for the west campus.

In 2001, GA completed an inventory and documentation of existing conditions of the west campus, which was compiled into a report completed by Susan Black and Associates working with Artifacts Consulting. The report created some policy advances and more thoughts about the historic grounds of the Capitol Campus. In 2007, GA went back with the CCDAC's support and feedback and completed a site analysis and evaluation of the design integrity of the Olmsted Plan, and tried to identify the character and features that remain on the campus.

In 2007, the committee adopted a goal statement stating:

“The goal of this rejuvenation effort is a West Capitol Campus landscape that respects the design principles of the original Olmsted Plan. This effort will honor characteristic features and concepts of the historic design while acknowledging the dynamic and increasingly urban context of the historic capital grounds.”

With the committee's approval, GA moved forward and focused on an area that was identified in most need of remediation for landscaping involving the perimeter around the Justice of Temple. For the most part, the existing landscape did not reflect the original intent of the Olmsted design. GA undertook a detailed planning effort with Susan Black and Associates, who designed a perimeter planting plan for the Temple of Justice based on the original Olmsted Plan design and plant selections. The plan was implemented last August.

During the committee's review, members indicated a preference of not taking a piecemeal approach to the Capitol Campus landscape. The committee indicated a desire to see an overarching base master plan for the landscape of the west campus, as well as a tree plan.

Concurrently, Artifacts Consulting was doing additional work for GA on research at the Olmsted archives in Massachusetts and at the Library of Congress for the properties at the Northern State Hospital, which are owned by the Department of General Administration. During the course of the research, additional information was discovered on the Olmsted Plan for Capitol Campus. Staff determined it was prudent to delay design planning until staff and the consultants had time to review the documentation. Artifacts Consulting was commissioned to copy and organize all of the documentation, and to compile it in a report for the State. They were also asked to provide some analysis, with particular focus on newly discovered information or findings..

GA moved forward in mid-August and issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for landscape architecture or architectural firms to create a Landscape Master Plan for the west Capitol Campus. A second deliverable will be a detailed Tree Plan for the historic grounds. Responses to the RFP were due on September 17, 2008. An interview panel will convene next week to select the firm. The Landscape Master Plan is due in February, and the Tree Plan is due in March 2009. The firm will review the Olmsted documentation and will work with GA on meeting the goal statement adopted by the CCDAC in the Landscape Master Plan to be developed for the west Capitol Campus.

Ms. Jennings reported the most important thing about the research conducted by Artifacts Consulting of the Olmsted documentation is that the historic information now available generates a total value that is far greater than its individual parts and the expanded understanding leads to a vastly increased sense of the historic value of the west capitol grounds. The state now has much more to draw from, and the potential to do a greater measure of restoration than originally envisioned.

Ms. Jennings affirmed that Ms. Swift is representing the committee on the interview panel.

Michael Sullivan, Artifacts Consulting, introduced Spencer Howard, Artifacts Consulting. Mr. Sullivan provided a presentation on the firm's work involving the Olmsted collection.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the elder Frederick Law Olmsted's role in the creation of landscape architecture discipline worldwide and his prominence in the development of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 and the birth of the city-beautiful movement. Most of the principles used in city planning come out of the innovations from the Columbian Exposition. Since the skyscraper in the modern city is to a large degree an American invention and going back to the roots of that invention, Frederick Law Olmsted is one of the key figures.

The Olmsted's early work involved the layout of the design of the Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition on the site of the University of Washington that laid the underpinnings and the main site planning for the University of Washington in Seattle. On the heels of the project, the Olmsteds were commissioned by the State of Washington to design Northern State Hospital in Sedro Woolly consisting of a 1,000-acre site involving an institution and agriculture landscape. It's one of the only Olmsted projects that incorporated the master planning of both an institution and an agriculture landscape. From there, the Olmsteds were approached to work on the state capitol grounds in Olympia.

In 1911, the Olmsteds were invited to look at the site of the state capitol. In March 1991, John Charles Olmsted visited the site consisting of a foundation and some ruins. By May of that year, a competition was launched and in August, Wilder and White was selected to do the work. However, the Olmsteds were looking at master planning of the site. In December 1911, the Olmsteds and Wilder and White met in New York in what turned out to be the first act in a dramatic saga between the two firms. The first act in the clash of the titans occurred over some very different fundamental principles in the layout of the Capitol Campus. The debate was over the siting of the buildings surrounding the Legislative Building, most notably the Temple of Justice. The Olmsteds strongly advocated for locating the Temple of Justice to the south of the Legislative Building and having the Legislative Building open out onto the view to the north. Wilder and White felt equally strongly that the Temple of Justice must be located on the north side and that a composition of buildings needed to encircle the Legislative Building. In the end, the Olmsteds lost the battle and in January, the company's contract was severed. The Olmsteds came back and addressed the Capital Commission but failed to sway the decision.

In 1927, the landscape of the Capitol Campus had completely changed. The Temple of Justice and the Insurance Building are completed and the Legislative Building is nearing completion. The Olmsteds are contacted to interact with the Wilder and White group, but this time with a clear charge to lay out the entire landscape of the Capitol Campus. This results in the beautiful drawing of the Olmsted Plan for the Capitol Campus.

The work begins with grading and site modification. Development occurs of the grounds and plantings, paths, sidewalks, roads, view corridors, fixtures, furniture, monuments, and the way the light and night plays on the buildings and the landscape. The thorough and profound overlay of the Capitol Campus dealing with views, aesthetics, and the symbolic overlay is highly intellectual and an important set of ideas that underpinned all of Olmsteds' decisions.

Mr. Sullivan displayed the first version of the Olmsted Plan for the campus developed in 1927.

Mr. Sullivan reported that by the end of 1928 and into 1929, Wilder and White's commission is completed. Some problems are beginning to arise in the Temple of Justice and in the Insurance Building, such as leaks, floor settling, and the state is ready to sever its contract with Wilder and White. In the end, the final touches are left to the Olmsted Brothers. Just as the great depression is approaching, the Olmsted Brothers receive the last commission and have an opportunity to complete the groundwork. That becomes the end of their role.

Mr. Sullivan said the archives include over 1,000 pages of correspondence, with some involving incredibly dense thinking about the campus and some theoretical and some very confrontational debates back and forth. Reading the letters and the thoughtful exchanges was a wonderful experience--especially before the advent of mindless e-mail--where every letter was thought out by highly invested people at the top of their craft as architects and landscape architects in absolutely bitter combat over critical questions. The way it is dealt with in the exchange of letters is an amazing body of correspondence. All of the correspondence is supported by sketches, drawings, and photographs. The collection includes beautiful photographs from the Olmsted Brothers.

Mr. Sullivan said the team tried to distill all the information down at the prompting of GA and what could be pulled out and provided to the CCDAC. A voluminous reference piece was developed that will be available for future designers. There are many unrealized ideas and dreams. The summary includes things that came to the top and were important to the Olmsteds. In essence, the Olmsteds advocated that in all decisions relating to the campus, architecture should not be dealt with in an isolated sense and that the composition of the campus should be continually viewed as an integrated whole, but not an integrated whole that comes to an abrupt framed edge as viewed in the Olmsted Plan, but a better understanding of how the Olmsteds saw the campus within a real-life environment that considers many factors other than the property lines of the campus. It's an oversimplification to say Wilder and White were pulling the other way. However, one important key thing is that Wilder and White did tend to focus on the architectural composition, the buildings, and the position of the buildings, leaving the landscape and the greater site and environmental issues as a secondary concern. The Olmsteds argued that in particular, the connection to the west and to the southwest needs to be featured in a spectacular natural environment and that they realized that to understand the Northwest, you need only to look up and out to view it.

The Olmsteds also saw a critical connection between the campus and the City of Olympia – the immediate neighborhoods and the City that was in the near distance. Advocating for that one great artifact of the Olmsted Plan, is the diagonal that runs from the Winged Victory that was originally intended to go down and connect with Sylvester Park. It is a long, linear visual connector that runs between the campus and the City. Standing in downtown Olympia in Sylvester Park, there would be a straight view corridor diagonal to the dome, providing a visual connection.

There is also a very distinct spatial hierarchy about the way the spaces on Capitol Campus and elsewhere were connected to the capitol consisting of a sequence of larger areas that are more defined when nearing the government buildings. Moving closer to government, the space is more refined and after reaching the Legislative building there appears to be more order and resolution, which symbolizes the democratic process.

There was great tension with Wilder and White over the dome. Wilder and White argued that the dome was proportionate to scale when viewed as an architectural composition consisting of several buildings, and that the elongated verticality of the dome doesn't work in terms of real proportion on just the

Legislative Building. It is designed to fit the proportion of the entire composition of the buildings around it. That was Wilder and White's view. However, the Olmsteds saw the dome as a focal point and icon for the state capital that was connected not just to the architectural composition, but also to the environment around it. The best way to consider who was right is to consider how the dome is viewed today when driving on I-5 or from Olympia.

Mr. Sullivan said there is also wonderful discussion on open spaces, rooms, and chambers and how they work around the Capitol Campus, which is connected very much to topography. In the early grading plans for the Capitol Campus, the grading used teams of horses and early mechanical equipment to sculpt the entire campus. Chambers were not created just with rows of plantings and trees, but were actually created by changing grades and levels. The sunken garden is the most intact part of the Olmsted scheme. Much of the grading has been erased. The feathered edge of the Olmsted Plan can be viewed when departing the Legislative Building on the south side and approaching the O'Brien Building.

The Olmsteds also had a sense of the importance of monuments. The Olmsteds laid out the circles from which radiate the diagonals that are used to connect, but they were very much aware of plans for the Winged Victory Monument to World War I soldiers -- it was 1927 and only 10 years after the end of World War I -- and they had a model of it. . The Olmsteds spent an immense amount of time designing the circle and considering the way the monument would be presented.

Mr. Sullivan said he is unsure whether the state has been true to the importance the Olmsteds placed on locating monuments as decisions were made about the placement of monuments on the campus, especially when viewing the studied thoughtfulness and the layers of consideration that the Olmsteds undertook in locating monuments within meaningful places and meaningful connections. He advised of the importance of reviewing the values and the considerations that were identified.

Mr. Sullivan said the Olmsted Plan also laid out a foundation of plantings of annuals and perennials around key buildings, which was never completed. Most of the existing landscape has been accrued over time and along other lines and through other purposes.

The report includes an elaborate planting schedule using the Olmsted catalog. An illustrated catalog was prepared of all identified plantings, annotations, and directions from the Olmsted Plan. It's designed to be a companion piece to the catalog of existing plantings on the campus. A similar effort was undertaken for the Tree Plan based on Olmsteds big tree scheme for the campus.

Mr. Sullivan said all of the photographs were reproduced from the Olmsted Library at Brookline Massachusetts and the Library of Congress, and were referenced and put in chronological order and are stored at the State Archives.

Mr. Sullivan displayed a series of photos of the evolution of the campus from the 1940s through the 1960s in the Olmsted Plan.

Senator Fraser asked who won the battle of the dome. Mr. Sullivan said in one sense both sides believed they were victorious because the dome as designed by Wilder and White was constructed as planned. However, from the standpoint of how it's viewed today, the arguments made by the Olmsteds are proving to be more accurate. Essentially, Wilder and White's influence on the landscape was generally to set up a direct photo opportunity and a favorable camera angle on the entire building composition. The Olmsteds tended to look at creating spaces that had value onto themselves, so that all the places on campus had a

variety of different viewpoints. A good example was the Olmsteds' belief of the importance of people standing with their backs to the Legislative Building looking to the north. They wanted to see the experience of the state capitol as spilling into the natural world, the City, and the mountains in the distance, whereas with Wilder and White their idea was to build steps all the way up the bluff and have everything focused on how the capitol was viewed from the outside looking in.

Ms. Swift commented that the report needs to be provided to anyone who works on the campus, regardless of their discipline. She noted the importance of having access to the information with respect to the development of the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project. The report supports arguments for work that needs to happen.

Ms. Bremer said one of the biggest factors in terms of the information is how to implement the information. The goal is to determine a way to operationalize the decision-making. GA will be working on that goal. She acknowledged Ms. Jennings' commitment in pursuing the project.

Ms. Jennings referred to the goal statement and indicated she is not recommending any changes to the existing statement. Staff will continue working on the development of the Landscape Master Plan

Ms. Swift suggested staff should pursue opportunities for publicizing the information and seeking national recognition for work completed on the material. It's important to have the information available in terms of development of campuses. She suggested pursuing some press coverage.

Representative Hunt referred to former homes and buildings on the campus near the Legislative Building and asked whether there is any historical documentation on the owners of the homes and history associated with the buildings. Ms. Jennings indicated there is some information available on the buildings. Mr. Howard reported one building located at the corner was a testing laboratory for the Highway Department. Ms. Jennings said there is historical detail available of the residential structures located on the O'Brien Building site.

Chair King expressed thanks to staff and Artifacts Consulting for the work completed. Mr. Tan said he appreciated the perspectives from looking both at the campus and looking away from the campus. Chair King noted that there is a battle underway within the City of Olympia relative to what is viewed from the campus. The perspective provided by the Olmsteds should be provided with more consideration and importance in the current debate underway in the community. The discussion on Olmsteds' consideration in terms of placement of monuments is another important piece of information. He agreed that the placement of recent memorials and monuments on the campus have not followed the principles of the Olmsted Plan. Currently, there is a set of guidelines for the placement of monuments and memorials that was developed without the benefit of the Olmsted information. He suggested at some point, reconsidering the document to determine if there are elements of the Olmsted Plan and principles that should be incorporated. Ms. Jennings said GA is scheduled to amend the Administrative Code with a goal to have it completed by the end of the biennium. She suggested discussing the issue at a later date.

#### **Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Progress Review**

Craig Donald, Project Director, updated the committee on the status of Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project.

*CCDAC Regular Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
September 18, 2008 Page 8 of 15*

Mr. Donald reported the first Steering Committee meeting was held on September 16, 2008, which included a presentation by the Arts Commission for the one-half percent art program. Due to an error in scheduling, Ms. Swift and Chair King were unable to attend. CDs of the presentation are available.

The project budget includes a half percent for art. The Arts Commission process includes selection of an artist who designs the art in conjunction with the design team for incorporation into the project. Currently, staff is initiating a process to begin interfacing the project processes with the Arts Commission process.

Ms. Bremer asked whether any of the art funds are available for existing art. Mr. Donald said the funds are only for new art.

Representative DeBolt referred to the art budget and indicated that he believes the intent of the Legislature was not to limit art funds just for new art. Penny Koal replied that the mosaic in the GA lobby is the property of GA and not the Arts Commission, which complicates the matter. The purpose of the half-percent art fund is to introduce new art into the public arts collection. Mr. Haskell asked whether the funds can be used for the purchase of existing art. Ms. Koal said existing art can be purchased as long as it is within the public art Commission's collection. Mr. Haskell inquired about the possibility of the Commission purchasing the art from GA. Ms. Bremer said staff will revisit the issue.

Chair King asked whether the discussion involves applying part of the one percent for art to the mosaic or the mosaic will be lost. Ms. Bremer and Mr. Donald affirmed the mosaic will be preserved. Chair King asked whether the current plan is to integrate the mosaic artwork into the new project. Mr. Donald said there is intent to integrate the artwork. However, the intent is to have the artist work with the design professionals to ensure an integrated process. Chair King suggested pursuing both options – new art work using the half-percent and the existing artwork. Mr. Donald acknowledged both statements. He agreed that the intent of the demolition funds is to remove historical artifacts from the GA Building. As part of that process, some form of preservation activity will be undertaken. The mosaic is the most prominent piece within the GA Building. However, he said he is unable to comment on the Art Commission's goals for the half percent for art.

Senator Fraser said she believed there was an assumption that the mosaic would be preserved and placed within the new building. Mr. Donald replied that the assumption is not what staff is operating under at this point. He said is not precluding the option, as the design of the building has not been completed.

Discussion ensued on the assumptions pertaining to the placement of the mosaic and the purpose of the half- percent art fund.

Ms. Swift said she is always concerned when the focus is tied to the half-percent fund, which misses the point of the policy and principal objective of the arts as an expression of the culture. The building is of extraordinary importance that should be looking both to the past and to the future. As the effort moves forward on how to engage the Arts Commission, their mandated obligations as an agency of the state probably reflects that broad range of concern and ought to be the basis used to respond to the way in which they are engaged or the creation of work is engaged in the development of the building. It should not be a fiscal question; it should be the bigger question first. She urged the committee to consider whether the mosaic or other art should be brought into the collection of what is within the building.



*CCDAC Regular Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
September 18, 2008 Page 9 of 15*

Chair King said the conversation pertains to two issues. One involves the preservation of the mosaic. The second element is where it will be placed. The options include placing it in the new building, in storage, or in the next office building replacement. He suggested the committee would be appalled at the thought of losing the mosaic but also acknowledged that there is some flexibility in the placement of the art.

Mr. Tan supported the comment and noted that the arts bring out the gentleness in humans and basically when humans learn to create, they cease to destroy.

Representative Hunt asked SRG representative Rick Zieve whether staff has explored ideas of using the mosaic within the project. Mr. Zieve said it's an ongoing process and that the design team is considering all options.

Mr. Donald reported the Washington State Historical Society has indicated some interest in the mosaic. The society believes it fits well with its permanent display in Tacoma.

Mr. Donald said he was unaware that the committee had weighed in on the placement of the mosaic in the new building. Senator Fraser said it was more of an assumption rather than a specific discussion. The discussions focused on preserving the art and if preserved, it would be designed within the new building.

Ms. Jackson asked for clarification on whether there is clear direction for placement of the mosaic in the new building or whether it's just an assumption because it changes things tremendously as the design team is working to determine walls for art and places for donor recognition and other pieces of art or items for enhancing the storytelling of the building. It's critical to understand whether there is specific direction.

Chair King asked the committee to render a decision on whether the mosaic must be saved and whether its placement is not necessarily within the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building. Ms. Jennings offered additional information to assist the committee. In the last several years, staff has been working on an approach of considering all artwork on Capitol Campus as a collection and to begin developing disciplines that treat it as a collection for assessment, inventory, and conservation. The mosaic is a piece of the State Capitol collection. She suggested from a policy standpoint, that efforts should be pursued to keep the piece as near as possible to its original placement as intended by the artist.

Mr. Haskell said he doesn't necessarily disagree with the comments but suggested that the placement shouldn't necessarily be within a new building on the site. Ms. Jennings agreed and said parameters need to be developed. The artwork should be retained on Capitol Campus within a state building. Having it visible and accessible to the public is the highest priority. It's important to be clear on the priorities as options are assessed.

Ms. Jackson agreed with Mr. Haskell's statement in that as decisions are made, the question is how the art fits within the context of the new building and ensuring it fits together. She said she's not opposed to having the art placed within the building, but the story of the building in terms of the state's heritage and existing space needs to be considered before committing placement of the mosaic.

Mr. Donald advised that the team will revisit the issue with the committee before any decisions are made.

Discussion ensued about the direction from the committee regarding the placement of the mosaic artwork.

**Dennis Haskell moved, seconded by Barbara Swift, that at all cost, the mosaic will be preserved and that a suitable location will be found for the artwork preferably within the Olympia area and that one of the potential locations is the new Heritage Center/Executive Office Building and that the logic and feasibility of that placement should be studied with a follow up report to the committee. Motion carried.**

Chair King inquired about the possible relocation of the [Callahan] mural located in the Pritchard Building associated with the Washington history collection of books. Ms. Jennings said moving the mural would be very risky and it would be displacing a piece of art that was designed and installed for a specific space. The Pritchard Building continues to be in flux and it's unknown what the program will be for the building in the future. There have been some efforts to provide the room for conferences and meetings. She said she hopes GA can re-create a public use for the space that will give the art an audience that it deserves.

Mr. Donald said the project budget has been reconciled between Davis Langdon, the SRG Cost Estimator and M.A. Mortensen, the GC/CM. The estimates pertained to the design and construction costs and excluded costs related to project management and permits. A reconciled total project budget for the Heritage Center is \$140,894,000 and a total project cost for the Executive Office Building is \$79,954,000.

Mr. Donald responded to questions about the difference between the Wheeler project design-build process and the GC/CM process used for the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project. He noted the GC/CM process is different from the design-build process. There are reasons that design-build would, at times, be selected over a GC/CM method. The main reason for the Wheeler project was the tight time-frame for construction. The Wheeler project entails the use of a developer to select an architect and contractor to design and build the project. The environmental issues, the resulting required mitigation, the tight building site, and the complexity of the program all contributed to the Wheeler project being delayed.

Mr. Donald referred to the final schematic design drawings for the HC/EOB and noted that the team is now in the final design development process and work continues on the structural, mechanical, electrical, and engineering activities within the design development process along with finetuning the program within the building. After that work is completed, a new set of design development drawings will be prepared and presented to the committee at its November meeting. If major changes occur in the design prior to the November meeting, a special meeting will be scheduled for the committee's review. Currently, the entryway of the building is under discussion. There is concern that the entryway is not as prominent and doesn't address some of the original vision.

An arborist has been selected and is scheduled to begin working with the project team. The focused Environmental Statement will be published by the end of the month, followed by a public meeting and a 30-day comment period.

*Representative DeBolt left the meeting*

#### **GA's 07-09 Capital Program – Progress Report**

Tom Evans, State Capitol Facilities Planning Manager, reviewed GA's 2007-09 Capital Program. The program includes 10 major projects from the 2007 regular appropriation and 4 additional projects from

the 2008 supplemental appropriation totaling over \$100,000,000. Most of the projects are repair and preservation projects.

Chair King questioned the issues associated with the World War II Veterans Memorial. Ms. Jennings indicated that some of the issues surrounding the repair work on the memorial concern improper maintenance of the memorial. Another problem is proper drainage and cracking at the base. Some of the infill on the lettering of the memorial is missing. GA hired a consultant to provide a study on the problems and issues. Ms. Bremer noted that even with proper maintenance the memorial would have deteriorated over time. The study will also look at infrastructure requirements for the memorial. The study is anticipated to be completed in a month.

Mr. Evans reported GA has submitted the capital program for the next biennium and will present the information to the committee at a future meeting.

### **Lunch Break**

Chair King recessed the meeting from 11:46 a.m. to 12:33 p.m. for lunch.

### **Letter to Olympia City Council Regarding Isthmus Building Height**

Mr. Evans presented a draft letter from the Committee to the City Council.

Representative Hunt suggested the letter should be addressed to Olympia Mayor Doug Mah and the City Council with a copy to the City Manager. A list of the committee members should be included at the bottom of the letter. He suggested revising the last paragraph to appropriately address the concerns to the City Council.

Senator Fraser agreed and recommended including some information about the Olmsted Plan and the importance of the plan to the Capitol Campus. Part of the concept of the Olmsted Brothers was for people to experience the capitol through the natural world, the City, and the mountains. The height proposal will interfere with views to the mountains. The letter should include information on the pride people feel and that the capitol is a national example of excellence. The vista is part of the historic context of the campus.

Chair King indicated there was discussion during lunch on whether the committee opposes heights any higher than 35 feet or whether some height between 35 feet and 90 feet is acceptable and would not seriously damage views from the campus.

Senator Fraser advocated against providing specific design ideas and that the committee's response should focus on the major concerns involving the views. In addition to the height, there is the space issue between the buildings. She cited the example of Vancouver, B.C, which has many high buildings. However, there is adequate spacing and open space between buildings.

Discussion ensued on the proponent's website and the illustrations of the view corridors based on the proposal's building heights.

Senator Fraser suggested including within the letter the committee's interest in actively working with the City on how the two can better coordinate planning and design to meet both City and state goals. The state has many tools at its disposal, such as unoccupied properties and leased buildings.

*Representative Hunt left the meeting.*

Discussion was deferred on the letter until staff can develop a draft based on the committee's feedback.

**CCDAC Handbook - Review**

Chair King reported the review of CCDAC's Handbook is included on the agenda for several reasons. One is at the request by Senator Fraser to review the handbook. Chair King invited feedback from members.

Mr. Haskell suggested improving the organization and the graphics within the handbook to improve readability.

Senator Fraser said she has no suggested revisions but questioned whether the committee is actually undertaking the actions as prescribed in the handbook. There are many points in the handbook and the committee might want to select those that should be emphasized. Planning at the end of the year for the next year should be pursued. Given all the community dialogue on land use by the state, commercial, and residential uses, she suggested creating a process for a more comprehensive and active process, as well as considering satellite campuses and transportation issues. GA recently prepared a list of underutilized state properties, which include many in the downtown area. She suggested discussing with the City how to modify state policy on how the properties could be better utilized, such as sold, swapped, or leased, which could be a potential work item in 2009.

Senator Fraser referred to the provision in the handbook that speaks to the CCDAC formally providing advice to the State Capitol Committee (SCC). She indicated she's unsure if previous communications have been structured formally.

Chair King said approximately a year ago, the committee discussed the possibility of having the Chair or Vice Chair attend SCC meetings. Ms. Swift attended several meetings but the practice was inadvertently stopped. He suggested enacting the practice through a discussion on how the communication should occur.

Senator Fraser said she's unsure whether the committee has participated in post-construction evaluation review. She suggested the committee might want to consider exploring that policy in greater detail.

Chair King commented that he's suspicious that part of the failure of the Wheeler project was due in part because it was not managed by the Department of General Administration, but by a department with virtually no experience with building development and construction.

Ms. Swift provided input on the handbook. Enabling legislation indicates CCDAC is an advisory group to review programs, planning, design, and landscaping of state capitol facilities. It doesn't matter if the facilities are leased or owned. All facilities fall under the umbrella and there is an expressed obligation of the committee to look at all facilities in terms of the goals, objections, and principles.

Ms. Swift recommended that with the attrition of personnel and committee members, historical perspectives can be lost. It's important for the CCDAC to have the handbook as a tool to guide its advice to GA and the SCC. The process of review is an important review process for the committee to undertake annually.

Mr. Tan agreed with the previous comments.

Ms. Bremer agreed with the recommendation that formality is important and should be implemented. She cited the laundry list of projects submitted in the budget to the Office of Financial Management without the benefit of the CCDAC's review. She asked the committee to consider the next step of reviewing the capital budget at its next meeting or during a workshop.

Ms. Bremer reported staff will be reviewing progress on the master plan. She suggested including the master plan's table of contents within the handbook. GA has also asked OFM and the team working with OFM to discuss the facilities planning effort to engage the CCDAC in the front-end of the process.

Chair King commented on the number of leased facilities by the state. Members agreed the [CCDAC enabling] legislation doesn't address how facilities are reviewed when funded differently. Mr. Evans said staff follows the principle that any facility, leased or owned, that is initiated by the state should be reviewed by the CCDAC. Chair King said the legislation is unclear.

Discussion ensued on the rules for solicitations for leased facilities and how developer negotiations are handled. Ms. Bremer said she's invited OFM to attend the next meeting.

Senator Fraser suggested having staff work with legal counsel to develop legislative language for updating the law governing the CCDAC as well as Representative Hunt's suggestion to include a representative from the City of Olympia as a member of the CCDAC. Chair King commented that he's troubled with Representative Hunt's suggestion, as he doesn't want the CCDAC to become bogged down in local politics. Senator Fraser agreed it makes sense to update the law and begin working on legislative language to submit to the CCDAC for review.

Mr. Evans referred to the first paragraph on page 7 of the handbook referring to CCDAC's review process and suggested including some of the ideas discussed surrounding leased facilities and projects managed by other agencies.

Discussion followed on the interpretation of the provision pertaining to the section on Standards Review. Chair King said the provision's intent is to have approved standards that are adhered to throughout the three campuses. If that is not occurring, part of the CCDAC's work program in 2009 should include a review of the provision.

Mr. Haskell offered to provide a marked up copy of his suggested changes electronically.

*Ms. Swift left the meeting.*

Senator Fraser said the list of items to be reviewed by the CCDAC should include Capitol Campus transportation and parking.

Mr. Evans reported he will provide an updated draft of the handbook in advance of the committee's November 20, 2008 meeting. Ms. Bremer advised that staff will contact its legal counsel for drafting legislative language to update the RCW.

**Master Plan Amendment – Progress Update on Guidelines and Standards**

*CCDAC Regular Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
September 18, 2008 Page 14 of 15*

Mr. Evans reported the Master Plan's organization includes principles followed by the policies which implement the principles. Those two levels of the four-tier structure are included within the pages of the master plan document. Tiers 3 and 4 involving guidelines and standards are not included in the master plan. They provide quantitative, qualitative, and /or comparative dimension to the policies. Those tiers will be in various formats.

Mr. Evans reviewed the Master Plan Guidelines Completion Plan for completion of the third tier of the master plan. All of the 31 policies beginning with Policy 1.1 through Policy 7.3 including the guidelines/issues mentioned in the policies are listed on the schedule. The schedule begins in September 2008 through the end of the biennium, June 2009, and the first month of the next biennium. The plan includes an estimate on completion of a particular guideline or standard.

Mr. Evans reviewed the guidelines/standards that will be reviewed by the committee:

- 1.1a Guidelines on the design and placement of public entrances and lobbies.
- 1.2a Guidelines on allowable public activities on capitol grounds and parks
- 1.2b Guidelines on the placement on the placement of memorials, commemorative, and artwork has been completed. Mr. Evans referred to the completion of the Handbook on Commemorative and Art Works on State Capitol Grounds, which will be reviewed and updated with assistance from the CCDAC.
- 4.1.f Landscape Rejuvenation
- 5.1a Guidelines on developing and protecting campus open space
- 5.2a Guidelines for aesthetic and architectural considerations
- 5.3a Guidelines for off-campus architecture
- 5.4a Guidelines for incorporating universal access concepts
- 5.5a Guidelines for the review and placement of commemoratives and art (to be combined with 1.2b)

Ms. Bremer requested the committee's support and recommendations on priorities with respect to the guidelines and standards because of resource limitations. There appears to be some duplication that staff should review.

Mr. Haskell advised that he'll review the information as well as the master plan prior to offering comments.

Senator Fraser suggested including 3.1a, guidelines on evaluation of preferred leasing areas and 3.2a, guidelines on Commute Trip Reduction and campus parking, which should be coordinated with 6.3a unless it pertains only to utilities and not transportation.

Ms. Bremer said the team is looking at sustainability opportunities for a green campus initiative, which may involve review of the energy guideline. She asked members to provide feedback on the guidelines the team should begin working on first.

Ms. Bremer advised members they will receive a copy of the draft capital budget submitted to OFM.

Members reviewed and approved the draft letter to the Olympia City Council.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair King adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services