

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
General Administration Building
210 – 11th Avenue SW, Room 324
Olympia, Washington
September 17, 2009
10:00 AM**

Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell
Barbara Swift
Paul Blanton
Senator Karen Fraser
Patrick McDonald (for Sam Reed), Secretary of State
Alex Rolluda
Senator Dale Brandland
Representative Sam Hunt

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Richard DeBolt

OTHERS PRESENT

Albert, Jim DIS
Bixby, Laura, SRG Partnership
Bremer, Linda, GA
Carlsberg, Steve, OIC
Carstensen, Russ, SCNA
Casey, Martin, GA
Childs, Harvey, OFM
Cockrell, Nick, GA
Cowan, Diane, GA
Cox, Howard, GA
Donald, Craig, GA
Edens, Cindy, Wright Runstad & Company
Excell, Steve, SOS
Forsyth, Dennis, SRG
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia

Gordon, Patrick, ZGF
Hall, Steve, City of Olympia
Jackson, Carleen, SOS
Jennings, Marygrace, GA
Jones, Nathaniel, GA Koal, Penny, GA
LeRiche, Ed, Treasurer's Office
Lindgren, Cheri, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Noble, Ron, GA
Richey, Tim, SRG Partnership
Simpson, Dan, ZGF
Swannack, Zak, SSD
Van Gelder, Michael, GA
Williams, Pattie, GA
Zieve, SRG

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

Announcements and Introductions

Chair Haskell reported the meeting notice 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.

The Governor confirmed the appointments of Dennis Haskell as Chair and Barbara Swift as Vice Chair of the CCDAC.

Approval of Agenda

Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the agenda, as published. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes – May 21, 2009

Paul Blanton moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the minutes of, May 21, 2009 as presented. Motion carried.

Director's Report

Linda Bremer congratulated Mr. Haskell and Ms. Swift on their formal appointments as Chair and Vice Chair by Governor Gregoire.

Ms. Bremer updated members on current activities:

Committee Website - A website was created for the committee on GA's website. The website includes the mission of the committee, member biographies, and links to meeting agendas and minutes.

07-09 Capital Budget Update – GA completed several major and minor capital projects on Capitol Campus during the 2007-2009 biennium. Members were referred to a capital project list of major and minor projects. The most memorable work involved restoration to the World War I (Winged Victory) Memorial. Improvements to the Transportation Building included security upgrades, fire system upgrades, mechanical and electrical system upgrades, and freight elevator repairs.

Senator Fraser asked for a future briefing on the Regional Transportation Study.

Mr. McDonald asked about the status of the conservatory. Ms. Bremer said at this time there is no funding dedicated to the conservatory. The site is now classified as an Opportunity Site. During the next biennium's budget, it may be possible to include some funds.

Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) –The CLAMP Steering Committee recently completed an alternatives analysis of four alternatives for the management of Capitol Lake. Ms. Bremer reported she is reviewing and synthesizing all the information from the various studies, as well as any gaps in information for formation of a recommendation to the State Capitol Committee in early December. However, the lake is an element of the architectural design of the campus, and as such, the issue should be reviewed by the CCDAC to understand the alternatives. The committee received periodic updates over the years, but hasn't received the final recommendation and information within the alternatives analysis. She recommended the committee consider scheduling a review of the issue and referred members to additional information on the recommendation.

The committee's efforts began in 1997 with the intent to work with GA to manage the lake and work through the 10-Year Adaptive Management Plan the committee developed. As part of that effort, an Estuary Feasibility Study was completed. That management review process was initiated when GA attempted to obtain a dredging permit. At that time, many other agencies weighed in and expressed interest in becoming involved in the future direction of the lake. Any dredging of the lake will require permits and millions of dollars regardless of the management alternative.

The four management alternatives under consideration include:

- Status Quo – present conditions and management actions continue in the future
- Managed Lake – if a managed freshwater lake continues, include dredging
- Estuary – if the dam is removed, opening widened to 500 feet with tides reintroduced into the basin
- Dual-Basin Estuary – if tides are reintroduced, the north basin would be split to create a saltwater reflecting pool

The CLAMP Steering Committee's recommendation went beyond the four alternatives to include the estuary as well as the Deschutes River watershed and Budd Inlet for a system-wide approach. Ms. Bremer reported she is reviewing all applicable statutes that will be shared with the CCDAC regarding authorities for the lake. Each of the entities participating on the CLAMP has different opinions and there was no unanimous recommendation. She suggested members consider scheduling a workshop to review all the information.

Representative Hunt arrived at the meeting.

Chair Haskell suggested the best option might be including the matter on the November meeting agenda, which should afford sufficient time for members to review the materials.

Mr. Rolluda asked about the process for presenters to address questions the committee might have at that meeting. Chair Haskell recommended working directly with Mr. Casey.

Mr. Blanton asked whether any activities or work has been completed on the lake. Ms. Bremer said there has been no action. Essentially, there has been a stalemate. Mr. Casey pointed out that in addition to the lake/estuary analysis the steering committee identified a dozen more management objectives in the early analysis. A number of those objectives were achieved, such as restoring the Deschutes Parkway after the earthquake and progress on addressing noxious weeds and invasive species in the lake. There are a number of activities currently underway for maintenance of the lake. However, on the particular issue of long-term management of the lake, no major activities have occurred.

Mr. Blanton said his concern revolves around any potential work that has been done or is underway that might need to be considered in any future planning. It's important for the CCDAC to receive information. Ms. Bremer advised that the committee will receive all pertinent information.

Ms. Swift said the estuary alternative was presented to the committee multiple times as the study progressed. The CCDAC voiced interest and concerns at each one of those briefings with the understanding that the estuary alternative was one element of the historic design of the master plan in the original visioning of the campus. It's extremely important for the CCDAC to have an opportunity to review, comment, and act on something that will have a significant impact on the nature of that master planning vision. With the dome and landscaping, the lake is the next large piece of the master plan. It's essential for the committee to review and comment.

Chair Haskell referred to Norm Johnson's letter to Governor Gregoire about his feelings regarding the lake and its important historical context. He read the letter into the record, which opposes returning the lake to an estuary.

Mr. McDonald reported the Secretary of State has received many letters and correspondence both as a citizen of Olympia and as a member of the State Capitol Committee with many of the same sentiments. It's important that the issue is discussed especially in light of the conclusion by the CLAMP committee.

Senator Fraser said she's also received feedback from many citizens and it would be important for the committee to receive input from the public. She suggested utilizing the website as one option for conveying information to the public. Many organizations and individuals are concerned about the management of the lake. She referred to the CLAMP Steering Committee's recommendation and questioned the intent of the recommendation in terms of her difficulty in visualizing what the recommendation will eventually create.

Ms. Bremer acknowledged that one reason for additional time on the issue is because the CLAMP Steering Committee's recommendation goes beyond the committee's alternatives that were studied. The recommendation is based on the committee's work near the end of the process and appears to focus more on a system-wide view of the problem as opposed to just the lake. That's why more time is required to review the issues. The earliest a recommendation is submitted to the SCC is December.

Mr. Casey advised that there's a possibility that the SCC will not hold its October meeting. Staff is working on the committee's schedule and agenda items.

Representative Hunt asked about the timeline for a recommendation to the Legislature. Ms. Bremer advised that at this point there is no firm deadline for submitting a recommendation to the Legislature. However, the CLAMP Steering Committee believes there should be some kind of alignment on a system-wide solution as soon as possible. The CLAMP Steering Committee discussed a new governance structure outside of GA and members believe momentum should continue moving forward.

Ms. Swift suggested CCDAC members should receive some feedback and guidance from GA on what the CCDAC should receive above and beyond the materials already provided, such as understanding what the physical manifestation would be and the issue of the governance model. She said she doesn't believe it's important, given the role of the lake in the large organization of the master plan, for CCDAC or any other committees to lose the ability to advise on the management of the lake. Understanding what those governance changes might be is also important for the committee.

Mr. McDonald commented on the importance of such a major change regarding the management of the lake. For the sake of expediency, it might be wise to slow the process.

Senator Brandland asked about the cost implications of a decision, how that information will be shared, and at what point. Ms. Bremer replied that the costs will be included within the presentation the CCDAC receives. Much input has been received from individuals that there are some gaps in the cost analysis. The costs included in the material provided to the members range from \$200 million to \$450 million over a 50-year timeframe.

Steve Hall, Olympia City Manager, said he's spoken to Ms. Bremer and Senator Fraser about conducting more public participation on the state's eventual decision regarding the lake. On behalf of the Council, the City is willing to consider hosting a forum with the state to receive public feedback.

Chair Haskell advised members to direct all comments or questions to Mr. Casey prior to the November meeting to ensure comments are addressed during the presentation to the committee.

Members offered varying comments on the role of the CCDAC to provide public comment opportunities and other options for citizens to offer comments. Some options include the CCDAC's website or through blogging. Ms. Bremer advised members on the extent of public engagement that has occurred to this point involving many public forums, workshops, and through correspondence from letters, emails, and feedback during meetings. While acknowledging the importance of public comment, she suggested more opportunities at this point in the process for public outreach may be unnecessary. Ms. Swift agreed it may not be helpful to the committee in assessing information and rendering its recommendation for another public outreach effort. It would be unfortunate for the committee to lose sight of its primary objective.

Members agreed it's important not to diminish the importance of the public process but acknowledged the volume of public input received to date. Members agreed to include the issue on the November meeting agenda and, at that time, determine the need for additional public outreach and the appropriate mechanism. Committee questions should be directed to Mr. Casey prior to the November meeting.

Wheeler Project

Jim Albert, Deputy Director, Department of Information Services (DIS), introduced Cindy Edens, Director of Development, Wright Runstad. Mr. Albert updated members on the status of the Wheeler project.

Last May, the committee reviewed the site plan, architectural concepts, exterior elevation and materials, and landscaping concepts. A bond sale was successfully concluded in August resulting in financing for the project. Groundbreaking occurred on August 20 with Senator Fraser, Representative Hunt, Director Bremer, and others in attendance. Demolition on the site is underway with mass excavation in process. The goal is to secure a LEED point for recycling materials on site at 95%. As of last week, recycling is at 72%. The design and construction documents are completed.

The project includes 394,000 square feet of which 264,000 square feet is office space, 110,000 square feet is for the data center, and 24,000 square feet is the utility building to support building functions. DIS is working with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to identify tenants for approximately 80,000 square feet in the office building. The goal is identifying tenants by the end of this year.

Landscaping plans have not been finalized. Numerous mature trees on the site were removed and stored in the area along the slope near the freeway. The trees are doing well and appear to be very healthy. The landscaping plan was expanded based on feedback from the committee to include the property east of the site downslope of the main project. The team is working with Puget Sound Energy (PSE) because the utility needs access to its electrical substation located near the area.

Ms. Edens advised that PSE previously accessed the site by using the road that was utilized by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) located north of the substation. That access was lost with the placement of the utility building. The road was redesigned to meet PSE standards. After the new route of the road is determined, the landscaping plan will be completed.

Mr. Albert reported the SEPA appeal was settled in July. Subsequently, the focus is on improving communication with the South Capitol Neighborhood, which is part of the settlement agreement. DIS established an issues tracking system and the site is posted with signs with contact information to report concerns. The department received 15 calls from the neighborhood involving noise, dust, traffic, and other construction concerns that were immediately addressed. Additionally, a series of work sessions

were held related to construction activities on the site. Work sessions covered traffic, landscaping, and parking and transportation with the next session scheduled on the traffic roundabout.

Ms. Edens added that an advisory report is prepared each week on upcoming construction activities occurring during the week, which has also been helpful for residents in the neighborhood.

DIS is working with Woodland Trail Greenway Association on the project's plan to provide bicycle access to the triangular lot located north of the site. As part of SEPA mitigation, DIS is contributing to the design of the site. Mr. Albert distributed a copy of the conceptual design of the site. Ms. Edens said the project includes a requirement to build the connection to the existing bicycle head existing to the east as well as constructing a sidewalk along 14th Avenue. The sidewalk/bicycle trail ends at the roundabout. The team met with the bicycle association and many ideas were shared. The design team offered to prepare a conceptual design for utilizing the space to include a small parking area and access through the site, as well as landscaping. Bill Johnson prepared the illustration.

Mr. Albert reported the team and DIS are working on addressing all mitigation identified in the SEPA to include working with GA staff. The next steps are completing mass excavation of the site through the end of the year, utility work, and foundation work scheduled to begin in the fall.

Representative Hunt inquired about the location of the bike route from the point of the Olmsted border of the campus. Mr. Albert reported the existing trail terminates on Cherry Street. He outlined the location of the trail and connections to the existing trail, which is the Western-Chehalis Trail, a major regional trail network for non-motorized vehicles. Ms. Edens noted bike lanes along Jefferson are also included in the project.

Ms. Bremer referred to the conceptual design for the triangular piece of property and indicated the budget for the project does not include funds for constructing those improvements.

Mr. Albert and Ms. Edens responded to a series of questions from members. The entire site has been cleared including the childcare building. Bricks from the buildings were preserved with a plan for development of an art piece by an artist pertinent to the site. The value of tenant lease space is approximately \$40 a square foot based on requirements by the Legislature. A construction schedule has been developed and is posted on the Department's website. The number of onsite parking spaces is 350 in the existing parking structure. The Department is working with GA staff to identify parking spaces. Some surface parking is available on the west side of the building as well as some parking behind the building. An existing parking lot located on Opportunity Site #8 is also available with 38 parking stalls. A parking structure under the DIS site includes 300 parking spaces. Parking is programmed to accommodate 900 vehicles.

Mr. Albert shared that some of the primary concerns of the neighborhood involved increased traffic within the neighborhood as well as cut through traffic on 17th, 18th, and 19th. The Department is working with the City of Olympia and Parametrics to establish baselines on existing traffic. The SEPA mitigation settlement is based on variances of the established baseline and depending on the increase in traffic, the Department is obligated to install barriers at some intersections to force traffic to 14th or Maple Park to reduce neighborhood traffic. Some baseline work for traffic counts has been initiated by the City.

Ms. Edens reported residents expressed concerns during the beginning of the landscape work session, but after review gained a better understanding of the landscape plan and now support the landscape plan.

Mr. Albert reported DIS is working with GA to accommodate parking for the Dash shuttle. Currently, a parking lot is located between the Wheeler site and WSDOT Building. Staff is working to identify other nearby parking on an interim and a long-term basis to accommodate parking needs for the Dash shuttle. Ms. Bremer offered to provide the committee with additional information at its next meeting. Ms. Bremer recommended DIS and the team provide more graphics during the committee's ongoing updates. Mr. McDonald asked the team to provide a copy of the construction timeline.

Ms. Edens noted some contaminated soil was discovered, which has been properly removed. The project timeline spans two years. Wright Runstad is responsible for delivering the completed project by September 2011; otherwise the company will begin paying the lease. The team anticipates that by July 1, 2011 the office building will be occupied.

Members requested receiving an update during each meeting.

Chair Haskell recessed the meeting from 11:11 a.m. to 11:19 a.m. for a break.

ProArts Site Pre-design Review

Penny Koal, Project Manager, reported the design team is in the data collection mode for pre-design. At the November meeting, the team will present alternatives as well as a preferred alternative.

Within OFM and GA's six-year plan, an additional need for office space was identified near the campus core. In 2009, the legislative budget proviso included language for a pre-design for the site for development of a new office building. The proviso identified a number of potential tenants with many currently residing in the GA Building. Those tenants are best suited to a Tier III location as designated in the Master Plan. Both agencies are working to define the best mix of tenants for the building based on proviso language in the six-year plan. The GA Building may be part of a replacement project, such as the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building or modernized. In either case, tenants need to be relocated.

GA selected the firm of ZGF Architects, Seattle, to lead the design effort during a competitive selection process. Mr. Rolluda was a member of the selection panel. Patrick Gordon is the Project Manager, Dan Simpson is the Lead Designer, Chris Chatto, is the Sustainable Designer, and David Hudd is the Cost Estimator.

The site is located on the block bounded on the north and south by Union and 11th Streets, and east and west by Franklin and Washington. The state purchased the property in 2008. The property contains two existing buildings of a 1960s vintage 11,000 square foot Professional Arts medical building and a 50,000 square foot office building. Currently, one tenant is located within the ProArts Building. The highest and best use for the building includes demolishing the existing buildings and redeveloping the site with a major general office building. Additionally, there is an opportunity to enhance and improve Centennial Park and incorporate that work into the new development.

Patrick Gordon reported that optimizing the site was important instead of maximizing the use of the site because the charge includes assurance that the building is a highly efficient, high performance building as a general office building for tenants. That will involve working from the inside out on the project ensuring planning principles for development of work spaces and floorplates meet the goals. Sustainability goals include features influencing the form and the size of the building. The pre-design study is underway with a target completion date by the end of the year. Design of the project will occur during 2010 with construction beginning in early 2011 and occupancy in 2013.

Dan Simpson reviewed key project drivers. The goal is obtaining LEED silver certification at a minimum with the intent of achieving a higher LEED certification. Sustainable design involves natural resource conservation and environmental stewardship as well as human performance of comfort, health, and productivity. In addition to meeting LEED, the team's objective is meeting the 2030 Challenge achieving an energy consumption profile at 40%. There are a number of different approaches that can be integrated within the building design to meet the energy challenge.

Senator Fraser asked whether the energy consumption goal includes transportation and parking. Mr. Simpson indicated those factors are not included in the measurements applied to the project. He indicated he'll follow-up with other staff to determine whether a precedent is available for incorporating those factors into the model. Typically, the consumption factor is factored only within the building environment to other buildings. Mr. Gordon added that it does impact LEED certification.

Mr. Simpson described the challenges of programmatic flexibility in the absence of a specific tenant and a specific program. The goal is to pursue flexibility based on state standards and guidelines for offices as well as reviewing other comparable projects throughout the state system. The goal is optimizing the dimensional footprint for energy, internal performance, and efficiency based on state standards for offices. For workplace functionality, the objective is designing a highly efficient and functional building.

Representative Hunt asked whether today's assumptions for technology include wireless technology. Mr. Simpson affirmed that is the trend. However, technology needs haven't been addressed at this point. Many clients believe that the investment is worthwhile. The decision about the system will include opportunities for the ability to renovate the system in the future.

The team has been asked to review a values-based foundation for design consisting of value driven (cost effective) and values based (reflects sound, enduring state values) functional design sensitive to context, honors statehood/democratic ideas, is of dignity, quality, and durability, open and accessible, and of timeless design with a sense of presence.

Some of the initial observations pertain to the orientation of the site relative to climate and sun with east/west proportions of the site offering daylighting opportunities. The site location is on the east campus with a strong relationship to 11th Avenue and the City's streetscape. Enhancing pedestrian connections for tenants within the building to and from Capitol Campus and other facilities will be important as well as access to Centennial Park located to the north. An early consideration involved the Dan Evans tree as an icon along with the capitol dome and the potential to engage visually with those landmarks as design is pursued. Another goal is optimizing the site development potential. The footprint of the site is approximately 150 feet by 250 feet equating to a 35,500 square-foot footprint. Opportunities will be examined for enlivening and enhancing daylight experiences. The likely range of square footage will equate to approximately 100,000 to 175,000 square feet. Zoning code limits the height of the building to 75 feet.

Without a tenant for working through programming requirements, the team has sufficient information for a smart-shell design for a flexible, durable, versatile, and maintainable building with fixed infrastructure components to provide flexibility and optimization of environmental amenities for tenants to enjoy while adaptable for changing tenant programs.

Mr. Simpson reviewed concepts of a 3-D model of a five-story building. The team is working with the state and City to identify the appropriate parking ratio for the building. Site zoning includes parking

standards. It's anticipated that one to two levels of parking below the building will be included. Mr. Gordon added that to accommodate parking needs, a below level parking structure will be necessary.

Senator Fraser suggested that within the big picture scheme, the state needs to expend more to determine ways for people to access sites rather than building expensive parking garages. There isn't sufficient space or money to maintain the current pattern of building structures. Ms. Koal said the transportation study will be used as the team considers parking needs. Ms. Bremer acknowledged the goals but cautioned that until personal habits and patterns change, the neighborhood's concerns is that there will be insufficient parking and overflow parking will occur in the neighborhood.

Mr. Simpson reviewed several design concepts to take advantage of daylighting for different spaces within the building. Entrances will likely be included on both the street side and the park side with most internal spaces located on the park side. Mr. Gordon encouraged feedback because of the proximity of the park and potential design opportunities that could be considered. The goal is to embrace an integrated design process as opposed to dividing the property lines.

Mr. McDonald recommended having the committee receive a copy of the site plan of the property.

Mr. Simpson reviewed several building design concepts.

Mr. McDonald asked about the current square foot usage within the GA building excluding State Patrol tenants. Craig Donald replied that other agencies are utilizing approximately 200,000 gross square feet. Ms. Bremer said the new building according to the proviso language is intended to OFM and other smaller agencies for an approximate square footage of 140,000. Mr. Donald noted that with the inefficiency of the GA Building, it is possible to downsize within a new building. The current 200,000 square foot of space utilized in the GA Building would equate to approximately 160,000 to 170,000 square feet in a more new, efficient building.

Mr. McDonald noted the proviso also includes language directing that the pre-design will be developed with representatives from the CCDAC, Department of General Administration, and OFM. Mr. Koal advised that she is working with Harvey Childs and Amy McMahan. Because of the unknowns associated with the designated tenants in the building, the team is working with OFM on a parallel track with the design team on preferred tenants for the building. Prior to completion of the pre-design the two processes will be aligned.

Ms. Bremer said she believes the Department of GA as an organization is not included in those conversations at this point. Mr. McDonald said that based on his review of the organizational chart; there was no CCDAC or OFM representation. Ms. Koal indicated the organizational chart pertains to the project team. A steering committee will be established and will be involved. The CCDAC will receive regular updates.

Mr. McDonald commented that the site includes several homes that were demolished but basements were left intact creating safety concerns on the site. Ms. Koal affirmed that the site survey will address those types of issues.

Chair Haskell said in the past, the CCDAC prepared a Design Opportunity Report (DOR) for projects. This project has moved forward quickly during the summer, which hasn't afforded time for the CCDAC to complete a report. He suggested the committee should move forward and prepare a report. Members

should forward desired design criteria or other requirements to him for development of a draft report for the committee's review at the November meeting.

Ms. Koal requested the receipt of the report as soon as possible because of the compacted timeline. Chair Haskell asked members to submit comments within the next week for completion of a draft for finalization and forwarding to Director Bremer.

Senator Brandland commented on the square footage availability between the Wheeler and the ProArts projects and said it's assumed that discussions are occurring between the projects. Ms. Bremer acknowledged there are discussions underway involving next year's facilities planning. The Department is also looking at square footage for the State Patrol and GA.

Mr. Blanton stressed the importance of considering the Master Plan and the concept of a three-dimensional quality of the campus involving shade, shadow, light, and the public and how citizens might react. It's important for the design to be effective. He acknowledged the short timeline but noted the building will be an important element of the campus and it needs to be as right as possible given all the constraints and resources available. The design team has a large job to pull all those elements together in the timeframe provided. The CCDAC will be examining the project carefully. He advocated for as much landscaping and softness of the building as possible. It's important that once the design is determined, the building includes some interest and artistic quality. Building materials shouldn't promote flat surfaces and boring spaces. Mr. Gordon agreed and pointed to the presentation's point of distinction for optimizing the site as opposed to maximizing the site.

Mr. Rolluda agreed with the comments and expressed appreciation for attention to sustainability. It appears the team is considering natural opportunities for strategic, sustainability features by considering the park design as it extends toward the capitol and the dome along with manmade amenities, neighborhoods, and traffic patterns. Hopefully, the team during its fact-finding process will discover all those issues and present the information to the CCDAC.

Ms. Swift said it's essential that the processes involving the projects consider the campus and the growth of the campus within the next 50 years. The team's comment for designing from the inside out makes it essential for the team to consider the building as a physical, spatial extension of the campus that must address the Master Plan and the strength of the axes otherwise those features will be incrementally lost. There's an obligation to strengthen those. It's essential to consider the issue of public exterior space as well as interior space. She said she's always concerned when a project is presented addressing the building rather than addressing the campus as the whole. The concept studies involving the park makes a physical gesture to the campus with the remaining studies gesturing to the existing urban grid. She said she would like to see the campus focus prevail.

Chair Haskell agreed with Ms. Swift's comments. Ms. Swift's comments pertain to designing a building from the outside in by considering the shape and form of the building as part of the campus. Making the park as part of the building is essential. The L-shape design concept begins to look at the form of the building and contributes to the park as well as to the campus. He suggested the team also consider those factors when considering building materials.

Representative Hunt noted there is some unique architecture within the neighborhood. There is the sweeping DNR building along with the concrete massing of the old courthouse, the Association of Washington Cities, and the church. He said he assumes the team will consider all those elements as well.

Mr. Gordon acknowledged the challenges as well as thinking over the long-term.

Chair Haskell reported the DOR will be forwarded to the team by the end of October. The committee looks forward to receiving another presentation at its November meeting.

Mr. Casey commended the team for its diversity and with participation by woman-owned businesses.

Chair Haskell recessed the meeting from 12:02 p.m. to 12:30 p.m. for lunch.

HC-EOB Project Pre-design Review – Workshop

Chair Haskell recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Donald reported SRG will provide a site overview followed by a detailed discussion of each site to receive guidance from the committee on building design recommendations and criteria.

Mr. Donald reported that in 2007, the Legislature authorized the construction of a 200,000 square-foot Heritage Center (HC) and a 120,000 square-foot Executive Office Building (EOB) for construction on the current site of the GA Building. The project completed design development and was in the construction documents phase. However, economic conditions affected the financing of the project. The current budget authorizes a pre-design review to reduce the scope and the cost of the project to the level current financing can support. SRG Partnership, the design team selected to design the building, was retained to provide design guidance during the review process. Economic conditions did impact county auditor filing fees, a major source of revenue for the HC portion of the project. Additionally, there was approximately 28,500 square feet of unassigned space in the EOB. The Legislature directed the team to scale the projects recognizing current realities.

OFM recently completed an analysis of major revenues. Using those forecasts and lease rates, GA calculated a preliminary bond capacity. The Office of the State Treasurer is working on the final bond capacity amount, which is unavailable at this point. The team is working with OFM's Facilities Management Office to determine appropriate tenancy for the EOB. In the meantime, there is an agreement with OFM to analyze a range of office sizes from 80,000 square feet, 90,000 square feet, and 120,000 square feet. The sizes are approximate and are subject to specific programming as well as appropriate building size recommendations. A 120,000 square-foot EOB would require a bond capacity of \$78.9 million for a building completed in 2013. For completion in 2015, it would be \$80.4 million. For a 90,000 square foot building, bond capacity is \$59 million for 2013 and \$60.2 million in 2015. For an 80,000 square foot building, bond capacity would be \$42.5 million in 2013, and in 2015 it would be \$53.5 million.

For the HC, a 200,000 square-foot building would only be located on the GA Building site or another site that would require major demolition and likely wouldn't be completed in 2013. Bonding capacity would be \$120 million. For a 142,000 square-foot building that is in line with the square footage identified for the project by the Legislature proviso, bonding capacity would be \$116 million in 2013 and in 2015, \$126.5 million. The difference in cost pertains to 60,000 square feet of space within the 200,000 square-foot building not paying tenant lease. Reducing the building size reduces operations and maintenance costs which can be directly applied to bonds.

SRG Partnership developed an updated budget for the existing design, as well as breaking down design cost estimate into component parts. That allows realignment of various cost increments and the project

scope within the financing amount. Efforts will continue on studying and reviewing existing design on the GA Building site as the preferred alternative. However, based on the legislative proviso and economic uncertainty, alternate sites will be considered as possibilities.

The team is seeking the committee's guidance and sense of direction regarding design recommendations for a reduced building size at both the current site (GA Building) as well as preferred alternate sites. The team possesses the committee's DOR for the existing design on the GA Building site. It's likely the two buildings located on alternate sites will need to be split because of space limitations. Alternate sites not approved by the SCC will need to be authorized by the SCC for consideration.

Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership, introduced Rick Zieve, Laurie Bixby, and Tim Richey, SRG Partnership.

Mr. Forsyth reviewed several display boards of alternate building sites and existing Master Plan Opportunity Sites:

- Site 1 – Preferred site housing GA Building consisting of 120,000 square feet.
- Site 2 – Same site with reduced HC building utilizing the same site square footage
- Site 3 – 1063 site on the corner of Union/Columbia consisting of 53,000 square feet in a different configuration.
- Site 4 is the Archives Building site of approximately 31,000 square feet that could include a 91,000 square-foot EOB with expansion for the Archives within the basement. The site is not listed as an Opportunity Site within the Master Plan.
- Site 5/6 – Old IBM south/north sites. Both sites provide an opportunity for the EOB
- Site 7 – Visitor Center/Parking Lot is an ideal site for the HC consisting of 50,000 square feet.
- Site 8 – Pritchard Library was considered as a potential HC.
- Site 9 – Insurance Building
- Site 10 – Located in front and off center from GA Building. Site offers potential by changing roadway that could house EOB that has some advantages over other sites.

Mr. Forsyth reviewed preliminary schemes for each site.

Mr. McDonald referred to the area west of the Supreme Court and asked about the potential for consideration of that site. Mr. Forsyth said the team was discouraged from examining that site because of the displacement of parking and the potential for other buildings.

Senator Brandland asked about the option of the ProArts site. Mr. Forsyth said the EOB houses elected officials and support staff that should be located on the west campus. Ms. Bremer said there was some discussion during the steering committee. However, proviso language is clear about tenants for the ProArts Building.

Rick Zieve cautioned members that the schemes are not designs but are diagrams to provide a sense of footprint and height. After a preferred site is identified, a pre-design will be pursued. The height limit for all the sites is based on the height of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings of approximately 65 feet above adjacent grade.

Mr. Forsyth referred to Site 1. The big advantage for a combined building on the site is the site's size to accommodate a large-scale building. Because of the needs of the HC and storage requirements for the library and archives, the site allows for below grade construction while reducing the height of the building. The site works well for building space below grade and offers an ideal solution for a combined building.

Site 2 represents a reduced HC Building that would be on the same site as the EOB. A floor of the office space would be moved into the base of the EOB with three floors for the EOB. The character and look of the building would be similar to the original design. The dilemma is taking a building that is approximately 100,000 square feet less and trying to amortize site costs and demolition of the GA Building thereby increasing the cost per square foot to the point that it's not economically feasible. The pros associated with the site is the ability to place the buildings as generally conceived, however, affordability decreases significantly. If the mission is to construct two buildings cost effectively, the team discourages reducing the size of the buildings too much on the site.

Representative Hunt commented on the site as a potential to include top floor condos because of the views and as one way to support construction costs.

Mr. McDonald asked about the timeline associated with relocating GA tenants, as that was a timing issue within the original proposal. Mr. Forsyth said the 2013 construction of the ProArts Building would be the soonest followed by 2015 dependent upon the construction schedule.

Site 3 is the corner site shown with the HC and EOB. The site is short of perfect for a HC. However, more building can be accommodated than just the HC or the EOB, but the site is too small for both buildings. Additionally, the same problems exist as in Sites 1 and 2 in that tenants in the 1063 Building would need to be relocated as well as removal of 300 parking spaces in the garage. The site has similar issues as the previous two sites, and none of the advantages for building one contiguous building. The site is remote from the campus for elected officials along with the disadvantage of transitioning to the City. Occupancy wouldn't likely occur until 2015. The site is a gateway between Capitol Way and downtown Olympia providing an opportunity for improving the transition.

Ms. Swift suggested an option of adding another floor. Mr. Zieve said the magnitude of the building would be too great. It does provide an opportunity to create a nicer edge to downtown Olympia and the building design would be more urban in nature because of that transition. There are opportunities for open space and plazas to continue the spatial character of the campus.

Representative Hunt asked whether buildings on both sides of the site were considered. Mr. Forsyth said the site in its entirety was considered, but applying the site to a set of reduced-size buildings because of cost is the issue. Mr. Zieve said it's also important to consider a site with fewer encumbrances.

Site 4 is located east of the existing Archives Building and could accommodate an 80,000 to 90,000 square-foot office building proportioned in a similar scale as the Old Capitol Court Building. Some of the trees could be preserved and the site provides a direct link to the existing parking garage. The archives could be expanded below. However, it's not possible to house the entire HC. The site is an opportunity to satisfy EOB needs as well as provide for expansion of the archives. The other option is including parking levels that could eventually evolve into storage for archives in the future. Mr. Zieve said part of the strategy included reinvention of the roof of the existing building and converting it to a plaza to make it

more inviting for pedestrian traffic. Mr. Forsyth said one of the disadvantages is it's location across Capitol Way. Mr. Donald said the site is also restricted in terms of construction activities

Site 5 is located on the old IBM South site. The HC would be too large for the site. The site is the most removed site from the campus but does link well to parking and there is an opportunity to create a gateway to the south end of campus. An EOB could fit on the site. The disadvantage is demolition of an existing building with the same tenant issues associated with other sites. Additionally, the building would be located adjacent to the neighborhood. The disadvantages associated with the site outweigh any advantages. Mr. Zieve noted that the site located to the north is not classified as an Opportunity Site. The planning question is how much building should be considered for the site in terms of emphasizing the original Olmsted lawn. It's a question that will need to be considered at some point in the future when building does occur.

Site 6 is considered IBM North providing some of the same advantages as the south parcel but with fewer disadvantages and it provides for transitional height to the larger-scale building. The site is close to parking and is unencumbered. The site is appropriate to house the EOB, but not the HC. The building would be appropriate for the Insurance Commissioner because of its location on campus. The site includes some good-sized trees.

Ms. Swift said it's important when reviewing campus space to consider that space as encumbered as it serves some function, which is important. It's problematic to look at the use of buildings primarily as a way to frame the campus. She said she views the site and looks at the trees that were planted in the 1970s as beginning to have the desired impact. She suggested including those factors within the discussion on options. Mr. Forsyth said that with many of the sites, parking could be added for the building. At this point, the team is considering the proximity of parking with the understanding that parking will be required. Mr. Zieve agreed the landscape is as historical as the buildings.

Mr. McDonald commented that the parking garage could be expanded. Mr. Forsyth affirmed that with any of the sites, if it's decided that campus parking must be increased; all the sites have the opportunity to do so with underground parking structures. Mr. Zieve referred to the existing pedestrian bridge and the question of whether an elevated connection across Capitol Way should be maintained.

Site 7 involving the Visitors Center was studied by the Legislature as a potential site for expansion purposes for legislative building needs in conjunction with the site located west of the center. The team didn't consider the west site because of its proximity to the neighborhood. The site is 50,000 square feet and would enable storage areas for archives and library below grade. The location of the site is high visibility in terms of the nature of the HC as a welcoming front door to the campus and it features educational components on the State of Washington and the campus. The site is a great location for the HC. It has good proximity for visiting schoolchildren for tours. Working with the community on the right design would serve as an asset to the neighborhood with minimal impacts. The team believes the building requires a tunnel under Capitol Way for motorists to help avoid traffic in the neighborhood as well as developing a link to the garage and to the west campus for long-term development. The walkway could celebrate the HC with displays and good lighting creating a good access point for all users of the garage back to the west campus. Additionally, it would attract more visitors to use the garage. It also gives an additional advantage of balancing remaining archives in the Archives Building to serve those campus researchers by providing tunnel access.

Mr. Zieve said that by putting the HC on the site, the scheme includes a level below grade to house the collections. An office building would require daylight for all spaces requiring a larger scale building. The function of the HC enables storage of materials below grade to help reduce the building's mass and scale. There also would be sufficient room to pull the building back and include outdoor space and plazas providing a nice edge along Capitol Way.

Mr. Forsyth reviewed the location of possible bus drop locations.

Steve Excell commented on some of the problems encountered with removing archival materials and exposing materials during transfers to inclement weather. The alternative allows for leaving some of the collections behind because of the underground connection. Otherwise, it's very dysfunctional to have employees in two different places or keeping two different buildings open to the public.

Ms. Swift asked whether it's possible for a tunnel connection between Site 5 and the parking garage. Mr. Forsyth replied that it would be possible but would entail more construction. Mr. Donald noted that one advantage of the tunnel is extending the tunnel to the Legislative Building providing a new way for people to travel between the garage and the campus. Ms. Bremer pointed out the difficulty of securing adequate funds to maintain infrastructure. She noted the existing tunnel between the O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings needs maintenance.

Members discussed the need/requirement for locating elected officials on campus.

Site 8 is the site of the Pritchard Building. When the building was originally designed an expansion was also completed, which reduced the scale of the backside of the building to transition to the neighborhood. Because of the huge areas for stacking books, the construction of the building would occur to the east that would consume the additional square footage with two levels under grade providing 10,000 square feet less than the necessary 142,000 square feet. Additionally, there is no parking with a larger massed building adjacent to the neighborhood. The HC would not have visibility for visitors but would have a good connection to the Legislative Building. There are more disadvantages than advantages associated with the site. Locating the EOB on the site also has many limitations, as previously studied. The team doesn't believe this option is a strong possibility in moving forward.

Ms. Bremer commented that the House Capital Committee previously addressed using the Pritchard Building. Mr. Forsyth confirmed a study was completed on the Pritchard Building several years ago as well as a previous study that reinforced the building's limitations.

Ms. Swift referred to the team's comments regarding the location of the site with respect to the campus and how the site tends to be somewhat buried leading to less accessibility. She suggested that the issue of accessibility directly to a building for vehicles or buses is a flawed programmatic criterion because of other access options available to different sites. Mr. Forsyth said the issue relates to people who use the facility for research or visitors attending museum exhibits. It's public place where there is much public interaction with visitors coming and going. There may be alternative and easier routes to the building, but direct access is limited. Mr. Zieve added that over the years there have been many discussions on the highest and best use of the Pritchard Building, which is an ongoing question for both the committee and the Legislature. The building was designed as a state library that is now outdated and vacant. The goal is to find a way to utilize the building. From a big picture-planning point of view, the intent is to find the right use for the building.

Mr. McDonald said one challenge with the site is its location between the House and Senate Office Buildings and as the state begins looks at the future of the Newhouse Building and what to do with that site and surrounding sites the natural preference as well as indications of the Legislature's natural propensity is to move on to the site behind the two office buildings. As a future Legislature growth site, that will be a major factor. There was a plan to build an underground parking garage with a park above as well behind the Pritchard Building.

Site 9 is the Insurance Building whereby the Insurance Commissioner would move back into the building that would entail a building renovation. However, the existing tenants currently located in the building would need to be relocated. There may be some scenario where an EOB would be built on the campus with the tenants moved to the EOB and the Insurance Commissioner moved back to the Insurance Building.

Mr. Donald noted the Insurance Building would only house the Insurance Commissioner and not the Treasurer. The original scope and location of the EOB on the GA site is the preferred alternative by both the Insurance Commissioner and the Treasurer with the Insurance Building the second choice by the Insurance Commissioner. He said he spoke with facilities staff who indicated it would be difficult to find housing for both the Governor's staff and OFM staff that is close to the Legislative Building.

An unidentified member of the audience referred to Site 7 and asked if there was a reason for not extending the site to the location of the existing Press Houses across Columbia. Mr. Forsyth said an extensive study was undertaken by the Legislature to examine expansion space of its offices on that site and because of that the team did not consider that option.

Site 10 is the conservatory site or Opportunity Site #2 within the Master Plan. The building would essentially be an extrusion of the Insurance Building located on the north side of the rose garden and placed over the current roadway. It's very close to the Legislative Building and considered a prime site. It would have to be sensibly designed given the nature of classic surrounding buildings. The site would entail relocating the road and it provides a prominent walking area and great views for the EOB. The site could contain an 80,000 to 90,000 square-foot building. Because of the grade of the site, the building could be five stories rather than a four-story building.

Mr. Zieve referred to long-range Master Plan issues and said it's generally agreed that the conservatory and maintenance are located in the wrong area that eventually will be relocated.

Mr. Forsyth said one of the disadvantages of the site is the lack of parking. It may be possible to include parking under the building to accommodate up to 600 parking spaces.

Senator Fraser acknowledged the team's good work on the options. There appears to be an underlying assumption that the campus is essentially a parking lot accommodated by buildings. Parking appears to be a big underlying assumption otherwise the option is not workable. She suggested as the future of the campus is considered, it's important to consider transportation and not just parking. Another assumption that applied to several of the smaller sites appeared to suggest that the first priority of the HC was for storage of archives. The team may want to revisit that assumption, readdress the first priority as visitors, and consider other options for the storage of documents.

Mr. Forsyth said Site 4 included a reduction in archival space. Currently, the only documents housed in the HC are those documents accessed most by researchers. Mr. Donald said if the current Archives

Building is retained and the documents are located at another location, it reduces bond capacity. It's considered as a revenue source for paying off the bonds. If the archives are not fully moved, but retained in the existing building, that revenue can't be considered. Senator Fraser offered that some additional archives could be considered as a separate project.

Mr. Excell commented that employees within the Secretary of State's Office are not paying market value for parking and are basically receiving subsidized rate compared to what a person would pay for monthly parking in downtown Olympia. A concept is paying employees the market rate for not driving to work by utilizing transit and providing free parking spaces to people who carpool. Drive alone would have to pay the full rate. He said his agency is willing to survey department employees and consider creative alternatives to obtain the right mix of parking.

Mr. Rolluda asked for information on the priority of goals the team used in evaluating the different sites for the HC and the EOB. Mr. Forsyth said for the EOB, the basic premise was that elected officials would be located on the west campus. The Master Plan includes language supporting that intent. The HC's goal is for providing an educational and public use building involving delivery of public service, community vitality, and historic preservation. The HC is an important building that is the center of the campus for visitors. Where it's located, how it's accessed, and how it's used have always been a high priority, which is why some sites drop out relative to those goals.

Mr. Zieve said the intent over the last several years is placing both buildings as close to the Legislative Building as possible. The issue is complex in trying to figure where to build on campus. However, both those buildings should be close to the Legislature Building because of the goal to keep elected officials close.

Nick Cockrell, Facilities Division, GA, commented on Site 10 for the EOB and Site 3 for the HC. The GA Building, according to master planning, is an extension of Union Avenue as the transportation/visitor location drop-off. What might be of interest to the committee is the concept of a larger project and tying together the availability of parking, multi-modal options, and transit over the long-term providing linkage of the GA Building on the north side of the campus to the community and Union Avenue while focusing southerly toward the Legislature Building to avoid adding transportation impacts on 14th Avenue.

Russ Carstensen, South Capitol Neighborhood (SCNA), read a letter from the South Capitol Neighborhood Association on the neighborhood's experience with the Wheeler project and concerns with the future HC/EOB project. Currently, there are approximately 100 lost Dash visitor stalls that haven't been replaced. The neighborhood doesn't know how increased traffic will affect the neighborhood. The neighborhood immediately adjacent to the Visitors Center that is of consideration as a possible site for the HC, is already experiencing continued and documented erosion caused by the pressures of traffic, parking demand, and the proliferation of houses vacant most of the year that are used primarily to conduct business. A new development adjacent to this part of the neighborhood could be "the straw that broke the camels back" for the historic and residential quality of this part of the neighborhood. Over the last several weeks, the neighborhood has watched this concept progress from a possibility to more of a probability. The SCNA Board of Directors is convening a review on what the proposed site impact may be on the neighborhood. At this point the association has not defined the concerns, but as the focus is formed on this particular site, the association will address those concerns.

Ms. Swift said it appears Sites 1 and 2 are important in terms of efficiency and function and it's extremely important in terms of the campus. From a spatial perspective, they are important in building out the

campus. She said she would look at a combination of Sites 3 and 7 as addressing that issue. She urged the team for sites to have mature trees or trees growing toward maturity. That would remove Site 6 from consideration. Equally, trees used in a significant for example on Site 4, provide for an important spatial structure on the campus. Site 10 has premiums associated with the site because of the type of building it would need to be as well as having to bear the burden of significant site improvements to a level of quality, and it would require quality materials and detail, as well as within an historic framework.

Mr. Rolluda said he's intrigued by Site 10. He asked if the team considered Site 10 for the HC as opposed to the EOB. Mr. Forsyth said one dilemma with the HC is the amount of traffic it would generate in that part of campus. Mr. Zieve said placement too close to the capitol group, all types of pressures occur. AT this time, the team believed that if placed that close, it needs to be a building of the scale and height and massing of the Insurance Building otherwise it will not work. Mr. Forsyth said the HC is a lively site. Site 10 needs to replicate the Insurance Building. The site is appropriate for the EOB and the HC would suffer because of the required design for that particular site.

Mr. Rolluda said Sites 6 and 7 are also good solutions as well as good gateways from the south onto the campus. The practicality of the parking issue is also important. The practicality of parking for Site 4 is acceptable, as well as retaining mature trees.

Mr. Blanton said he's somewhat confused but acknowledged the consultant's have been studying the issue for many years. There are many alternatives with each one having resources and constraints. He asked for the consultant's proposal in the way of a preferred solution to the problem. Mr. Forsyth said the options are still open. The process is at the point where if the committee recommends another direction, the team is willing to study that option. The intent is to obtain the committee's ideas and thoughts. However, after examining all the issues along with the desires of the Secretary of State, Treasurer, and the Insurance Commissioner, the first choice is the original concept. However, as the sites have been examined, the HC has gravitated towards the Visitors Center site (7) because of its prominence and its location on campus and visitor traffic. The original site would work, but downsizing the building would increase costs substantially. The same applies to the 1063 site as it is somewhat removed from the center of campus.

Mr. Excell said his office had many internal discussions about location. Any placement across Capitol Way would be a deterrent to the visitor experience and to schoolchildren and teachers. The other issue pertains to the out-of-town visitor who is not familiar with the campus. Site 7 is the optimal site for a visitor not familiar with the campus. Another advantage of Site 7 is the demolition costs, which is not included in the budget. Site 7 is a good gateway for visitors and is beneficial for the department in terms of costs. Site 3 has some transition issues and its distance is another drawback. Site 7 in terms of access is equal in terms of the original plan and easier to find. Site 7 is also affordable in terms of cost.

Mr. Forsyth said Site 7, in terms of cost for an HC, meets the budget constraints. The team could pursue Site 7 as a preferred alternative if there is a consensus.

Mr. Zieve said the team can work on the design to meet the concerns of the neighborhood.

Mr. Forsyth referred to the EOB. The team believes the projects should be separated because of the lack of any one site for a joint project that is affordable. SRG believes there are up to three sites deserving more study prior to determining which ones are preferable. They include Sites 4, 6, and 10.

Senator Fraser said it's better to consider building on the north side rather than the south side. She referred to the prior study for Site 7, which is fraught with problems as well as following the study of the Pritchard Building, which also has problems. In terms of community vitality and downtown, it is better to place the functions on the north side of campus rather than on the south side next to historic neighborhoods. She favored more study on Sites 2, 3, 4, and 10. She agreed Mr. Cockrell's suggestion of creating a transportation hub is a creative idea.

Representative Hunt agreed with Senator Fraser's comments.

Mr. McDonald said to meet the new budget realities and still provide the heritage of having the State Library, Archives, and Museum placed in a prominent and easily accessible space on the campus, which is conducive to the public, meets the principles of the standards for public use and access, Site 7 is the most logical alternative. Because of the cost constraints, building a tunnel across to the parking garage would enable accessibility to the archives and to the public.

Mr. McDonald referred to his concerns for constructing any building on Site 10 because of the Law Enforcement Memorial and suggested consideration of Opportunity Sites 3 and 4 as potential sites for buildings. He agreed the Pritchard Building should be removed from consideration.

Members agreed to remove Site 8 (Pritchard Building) and Site 10 from further consideration.

Members agreed for the team to study Opportunity Sites 3 and 4. Ms. Swift recommended the team obtain a copy of the most recent Master Plan. Mr. Donald referred to the parking issues associated with the sites. Ms. Swift suggested the issue of parking in the realm of decision-making for a 50-100 year decision is difficult to factor at this point.

Ms. Swift said the committee asserted some additional principles about easy access, maximizing connections to existing facilities, such as parking below grade, view blockage in the Master Plan framework, separating HC and EOB, and historic neighborhood impacts.

Mr. Forsyth referred to comments regarding the desire to move toward north locations and recommended having an opportunity to meet with the neighborhood to discuss options.

Mr. Forsyth and the committee discussed sites to retain for further study. It was determined to eliminate Sites 5, 6, 8, and 10 from consideration, retain Site 7, and consider ProArts site in terms of tenancy.

Representative Hunt referred to the possibility of including condominiums on the top floor of a new building as a possibility.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 2:32 p.m.