

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

Department of Enterprise Services

1500 Jefferson Street – Room 2208

Olympia, Washington 98504

November 29, 2012

10:00 AM

Minutes

(Approved: April 4, 2013)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Gary Alexander
Dennis Haskell
Patrick McDonald (for Secretary of State)
Alex Rolluda

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Linda Parlette
Barbara Swift
Representative Sam Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT

Sally Alhadeff, CTS
Dave Arbaugh, NCCHPDA
Kim Buccarelli, DES
Martin Casey, DES
Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Shelley Sadie-Hill, DES
Bob Jacobs, Citizen
Nouk Leap, DES
Former CCDAC Member Paul Blanton (Telecon)

Allen Miller, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Dev. Assn.
Dave Peeler, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team
Vikki Poitra, DES
Bonnie Scheel, DES
Brad Shannon, The Olympian
Andy Stepelton, Leg Support Services
Joyce Turner, DES
Steve Valandra, DES
Jeff Whitehead, DES

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. A meeting quorum was not attained.

Approval of Agenda

Approval of the agenda was deferred.

Mr. Haskell reported the notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian*.

Public comments for any agenda items can be offered at the conclusion of each agenda topic.

CCDAC will review three items on the agenda for Actions: Approval of the May 24, 2012 Minutes, 2013 CCDAC Calendar, and the Chair and Vice-Chair Recommendations; and two items for Information: General Administration Building – Predesign Update, and the DES Facilities Report.

Approval of Minutes

May 24, 2012

Approval of minutes was deferred.

Acknowledgments

Director Joyce Turner recognized and acknowledged Paul Blanton with a Certificate of Appreciation. Mr. Blanton was appointed to the committee in February 2009. Mr. Blanton was very involved in the reviews of the Heritage Center and the Executive Office Building project, the Landscape Master Plan, and the ProArts predesign site review. Mr. Blanton's perspective and historical context along with his ability to balance design considerations were very much appreciated.

Director Turner presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Secretary of State Sam Reed. Patrick McDonald accepted the certificate on behalf of Secretary Reed. Secretary Reed has been a member of the committee since January 2001. Secretary Reed was involved in the Veterans Memorial Plaza, Heritage Park County Markers, rehabilitation of the Legislative Building following the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, redesign of East Plaza, Capitol Campus Master Plan, replacement of trees in Heritage Park, and site development of the Jefferson Building. Everyone appreciates Secretary Reed's involvement on the committee as well as his appreciation of the historical context of Capitol Campus.

Mr. Blanton thanked members of the committee for their support and assistance. He wished members good luck as they deal with the recovery of the economy and its impact on state government. He is retiring after 50 years of public service. He expressed appreciation for the time spent on the committee with his fellow members. Chair Haskell thanked Mr. Blanton for his work on the committee.

2013 CCDAC Calendar

Martin Casey, Enterprise Services Assistant Director, presented the proposed meeting calendar for 2013. He proposed moving forward on the February 7 meeting date and completing arrangements on the appointment of the incoming Secretary of State. He recommended deferral of approving the meeting schedule until the February meeting.

CCDAC Administration

Mr. Casey reported the authority for appointing design professionals to the committee as well as the Chair and the Vice Chair positions was shifted from the Governor's Office to the Director of Enterprise Services. Customarily, nominees from the committee are considered by the Director. Mr. Casey recommended extending the current Chair and Vice Chair appointments until the February meeting.

The Director is currently recruiting for a successor for Mr. Blanton's architect position. The department is recruiting through an HR website – NEOGOV™.com. The recruitment closes on November 30. Three applicants have applied.

General Administration Building

Thomas Henderson, Facilities Assistant Director, reported that through House Bill 1497, DES is required to prepare an update of all previous predesigns of the General Administration Building completed over the last 18 years. SRG Partnership's presentation will outline a range of options for the building. Updated information is necessary to determine current possibilities for the building. At this time, costs for any future action will not be presented but rather the update is a representative report of potential actions for a particular occupancy of the building. A full predesign is necessary to develop a cost estimate.

Representative Alexander arrived.

Chair Haskell recused himself from the discussion as an employee of SRG Partnership.

Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership, presented the final report on the GA Building. A team was established in early July of mechanical, electrical, structural, civil engineers, and others to re-evaluate systems and

historic features of the building. In early July, a one-day walk through was completed of the building. The team spent time with operations staff to gain a better understanding of the issues and a better sense of the building, operationally. The same team worked on the Heritage Center project and is familiar with the GA Building. A thorough predesign was completed in 1992 followed by another predesign in 2006 as part of the Heritage Center proposal.

By 1992, the building was approaching the end of its useful life. Twenty years later, the building is beyond its useful life. The amount of repairs necessary to maintain the building will be costly.

The proviso directed the team to consider what's required to maintain and operate the building. The challenge is what could be achieved with the least amount of money to upgrade the building to meet codes and maintain operational capabilities for the next 20 years. That entailed retaining some of the basic systems and maintaining them in an operational condition (mechanical and electrical systems). However, the building wouldn't equate to a modern building built today. Minimally, major interventions are necessary to the building, particularly structurally. Structurally, it was necessary to introduce sheer capacity because the building lacks the ability to withstand an earthquake. That involves the construction of numerous sheer walls throughout the building requiring the removal of existing walls. The team also discovered that any new HVAC and electrical distributions that might be required would also entail the removal of building infrastructure to complete the routings resulting in a major disruption to the building.

Environmentally, there is no insulation of any of the exterior walls or windows, which would require an upgrade of the exterior walls to conform to current energy codes.

Some savings could be achieved through low cost improvements using a square footage calculation because previous programmatic information is available on the different uses in the building. The proviso directed spending the least amount of money that cannot be recouped in income through rents. However, the team determined it's not possible to achieve that objective while ensuring the building is usable.

Mr. Forsyth reviewed potential improvement options:

1. Upgrade and retain as many systems as possible. The GA Building is 282,000 square feet in size. An upgrade would cost \$95 million or \$240 a square foot.
2. A full upgrade by gutting the building and upgrading to modern systems for a useable life of 50 years at a cost of \$132 million. However, the building still remains a "big box building" in terms of the distance of the exterior walls inhibiting natural light and ventilation impacting the overall quality of the building even though all systems have been upgraded.
3. This option installs a light well in the center of the building to increase the building's standards; however, it would reduce the amount of usable space but improve the building while retaining its historical character. This option costs approximately \$124 million. The cost is less because it entails less square feet but more cost per square foot than a complete gutting of the building because more exterior wall is created, which increases the cost of the building.
4. Demolish and replace the building. Based on the 1992 and 2006 studies, the difference between constructing a new building versus gutting it and rebuilding the building in 1992 was \$2 million. Today, a new building with the same character and standards of buildings with light wells and other features would cost \$161 million. The team also treated the upgrade and the building as an essential building because the State Patrol would be a tenant that requires immediate occupancy following an earthquake. The upgrade would be to a standard to enable the State Patrol to operate in the building.
5. The team also evaluated demolishing the building and resurfacing the area with grass. The cost for demolition is approximately \$8 million.

6. Another option is boarding up the building and delaying any action until the Legislature makes a determination for the future of the building.

The report includes detailed information for each of the options.

Representative Alexander asked whether an option of combining a new building with the new Heritage Center as one project could be considerably less than building two projects separately. Mr. Forsyth said the proviso indicated that a renovated or new building includes the Heritage Center. The costs assume the Heritage Center is a component of the building. The square footage costs calculated for buildout allowed for 50,000 square feet of library and 50,000 square feet for the Heritage Center.

Patrick McDonald asked about the current square footage of the Library/Archives Building without the office building on the top floor. He noted that although option 1 includes a major upgrade, the building life cycle is only 20 years. Additionally, options 2 and 3 include the original concrete and rebar flooring with sheer walls added. It appears the calculations were based on gross square feet as opposed to usable square feet. Mr. Forsyth affirmed that the calculations were based on gross square footage. Mr. McDonald commented that the sheer walls could entail lost space for offices and meeting rooms whereas the new building would afford large, open expanses. He's unsure whether that calculation could be included in the report to demonstrate how much space is wasted with structural improvements to the old building. Mr. Forsyth replied that when considering a net/gross relationship of a structure it tends to be 1% to 2% of the gross area of a building. Mechanical, electrical systems and circulation consume much of the space. It's unlikely net gross ratios would be considerably less in a renovated building than in a new building because both are dependent upon circulation. Mr. McDonald expressed interest for the report to identify usable space rather than gross space.

Mr. McDonald asked whether there was any consideration of the floor load the library requires for options 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Forsyth said the use of the existing building requires heavy loads to be located on the lower floors. Mr. McDonald asked whether the seismic work masks the exterior design of the building to achieve seismic standards. Mr. Forsyth said there should be no dramatic changes in the exterior design of the building to meet seismic standards. The team received much feedback for maintaining the historic character of the building. The report outlines what would be important during an historic review. The team believes that it can maintain those elements.

Mr. Forsyth said the report also recommends consideration of demolishing and replacing the building. It's the same conclusion as in the 2006 study. It would be a similar conclusion for the 1992 study, knowing the facts as they exist today. The building has exceeded its useful life and compromises will be necessary if the building is saved. Another recommendation in terms of retaining the historic preservation elements is pursuing the option with the light well because it creates a much better building.

Alex Rolluda asked whether the atrium space is full height. Mr. Forsyth said the team recommends a height above the auditorium because the auditorium and the entry are of historic significance. Mr. Rolluda asked about elements in the historical report that should be retained. Mr. Forsyth said the report categorizes historical elements to retain by high, medium, and low priority.

Representative Alexander said that although he's supportive of protecting heritage elements, it would be more important for the overall campus to have a building that projects the real heritage of the state rather than the timeframe of the 1950s. It's possible to design a building to display some historical significance rather than protecting the symbolism of the 1950s.

Mr. McDonald agreed and pointed out that the architect wrote in 1953 that the building would last 50 years. He asked whether new buildings have a projected lifespan of 100 years rather than 50 years. Mr. Forsyth replied that most buildings are anticipated to have a lifespan of 50 years. However, systems can fail and become outdated. It's important to establish and implement a maintenance schedule to address major system failures. The GA Building has encountered many system failures. By completing a major renovation of the Legislative Building, the lifespan was extended by another 50 to 75 years at a cost of \$100 million.

Mr. Rolluda asked whether the replacement option accounts for the removal of the mural. Mr. Forsyth affirmed the cost is included. There are also some other historical elements that can be retained and reused in a new building.

DES/Facilities Reports

Director Turner provided an update on DES activities.

Progress continues on consolidation efforts. DES was created over a year ago. In addition to consolidation tasks, DES assumed some significant statewide projects. One is a review of all central service rates. Recommendations were forwarded to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) on some rate revisions. The recommendation ensures rates are fair and provide greater efficiencies. The rate structure also supports statewide goals.

DES is also pursuing procurement reform by consolidating different operations from several agencies under one umbrella. There were many different systems in place, different rates, and different processes. Through procurement reform, it was possible to combine all operations under one umbrella to provide greater transparency to vendors, state agencies, and to the community on bid awards, contracts, and prices.

DES is implementing a risk-based approach to procurement reform by assessing an agency's history in procurement and granting a specific dollar threshold to those agencies with proven track records. Agencies that haven't been employing best practices in contracting will receive a higher risk rate and a lower dollar threshold.

DES also assumed some statewide enterprise IT projects. One project is time, leave, and attendance functions involving several agencies on a pilot basis (WSDOT and DOE) by building a system to interact with the Human Resource Management System for tracking time, leave, and attendance.

DES continues efforts on agency fleet consolidation. The 2012 legislative session included more requirements to evaluate all purchases of any passenger vehicle by any agency in the state. Subsequently, DES is assisting state agencies. A number of SUVs have been reduced. Approximately 49 SUVs have been exchanged. DES is working with the Department of Labor & Industries, which has reviewed its vehicle purchase plan to reduce SUV purchases by 17% in the future.

The department is also managing a number of Lean projects to include six various projects in different stages of implementation. Some savings were achieved in production services and printing of \$80,000, as well as improving efficiencies including better customer service and reduced turnaround time for projects.

DES is continuing to implement greater efficiencies and identify places where improvements can be achieved.

Tom Henderson provided an update of current projects and 2013-15 capital budget requests:

- Legislative Building Dome Cleaning Project – Cleaning from the top of the dome to the fourth floor was completed. DES is seeking funding in the next biennium for cleaning from the fourth floor to the plaza to complete the work.
- Capitol Lake Dredge Study – DES signed a contract for the Capitol Lake Dredge Study on November 2. The six-month study will conclude with a final report due June 17, 2013. The study provides a roadmap for permitting requirements necessary to initiate the process of a dredge of the lake. DES is seeking additional funds in the 2013-15 biennium to continue the permitting process of approximately \$300,000.
- Old IBM Demolition Project – Demolition is underway of the old IBM Building to remove asbestos and hazardous materials. On December 3, the Olympia Fire Department is planning some training exercises around the building prior to the final demolition of the building. The area will be restored to a grassy area.

Mr. McDonald complimented the department on the cleaning of the Legislative Building, which also included restoration repointing and repairing sections of the dome. As a resident of the South Capitol Neighborhood, he was able to view workers as they were cleaning the dome. Major work was completed on the dome to include repair to the sandstone. The workers spent much more time on one of the mini domes and it appears they were able to resolve some leak issues. He asked about the possibility of cleaning the granite around the base of the building along the esplanade. The granite is black and could be easily cleaned to eliminate the eyesore. Mr. Henderson offered to confer with staff on the possibility of cleaning the granite.

Mr. Henderson reviewed capital budget requests. DES submits a capital budget request covering the period from 2013 through 2023. He reviewed the budget request for the 2013-15 biennium. The list of projects total \$87.6 million. Many of the projects may look familiar with many unfunded projects carried forward for many years. The first commitment by the department is safety followed by preservation of existing facilities and utilities and sustainability. The top categories of projects include:

1. Emergency Repairs
2. Major Construction
3. Minor Works Preservation
4. Minor Program Projects
5. Engineering & Architectural Services

Major projects are listed as major preservation projects. OFM breaks those projects into two categories of preservation and program projects. Minor works projects are also categorized by preservation as well as program projects.

Approximately \$15.3 million is designated for safety projects with most categorized as critical to include repairs to the steam system on campus to repair valves. Underground utility repairs include water service, sewer, and other utility lines that need repairs on the campus. DES recently completed a major update of the electrical system to include adding new service around the GA Building and the Power House. The East Plaza continues to experience water infiltration problems in elevators, which is a safety issue for the public and employees. Another project is the fire protection system in the Natural Resources Building. The material used in the system has corroded over time creating leaks throughout the system. Pressure in the system must be maintained for operational capability. The system's lifespan has expired and should be replaced. As the system corrodes, the effectiveness of fire protection is also jeopardized.

Many of the preservation projects are for exterior repairs to monumental buildings as well as roof repairs to the Natural Resources Building that has created a number of leaks and infiltration through windows and the parapet. The first phase of the repair work has been completed on the parapet. However, many window repairs are pending completion.

Sustainability projects include the upgrade of equipment, such as replacing chillers and upgrades to HVAC components. It's important to make investments in those systems to prolong the lifespan.

The department's priorities are included within the budget submittal to the OFM. It includes a scoring process to ensure appropriate order of expenditures. Some alternative funding strategies are included as well. Those strategies include taking advantage of the least purchased program to construct energy efficient systems or investing in energy efficient systems and products to achieve longer a lifespan and energy savings.

Much of the capital program funding has been reallocated to the operating budget because of the economy. There is some optimism of potentially restoring some of the funds traditionally used for critical repairs across the campus. Funds designated as "289" pertain to the Thurston County Capital Surcharge, which is applied to all state-owned facilities in Thurston County. That source of funding could potentially be restored to fund some of the critical projects.

Representative Alexander asked about the possibility of the committee proceeding with a recommendation to replace the GA Building, and whether that action includes DES augmenting the current capital budget to include funds for the design phase for a new building.

Mr. Henderson pointed out that the capital budget request includes the Capitol Campus Perimeter Master Planning project. The master plan hasn't been updated since 2006 and doesn't include a recommendation to replace the GA Building. There are many other costly elements attributed to replacing a building that must be considered, such as the creation of alternative spaces for existing tenants. A planning process is necessary to review and update the master plan to include an examination of options that have not been included in the current plan. DES recommends moving forward with an update of the 2006 Master Plan to define options around Capitol Campus.

Representative Alexander suggested a more aggressive approach and is hopeful the CCDAC could convey a preference for moving forward to provide DES with some direction in the update of the master plan.

Chair Haskell agreed it's important to include the issue on the next meeting agenda. He encouraged members to attend to afford an opportunity to discuss a recommended action.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that the report by SRG Partnership provided some non-recommendations that also included the ProArts Building, which may or may not be considered part of the Capitol Campus. It speaks to planning within the capital budget and whether DES includes new buildings. If so, it would be important to include a new building. If not, the committee should ensure another vehicle, such as the Secretary of State's Office pursues future action related to the replacement of the GA Building.

Chair Haskell affirmed the item will be included on the next meeting agenda. He encouraged members to attend for the discussion.

Public Comment

Allen Miller, President, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association, acknowledged the service of Secretary Reed and his vision of ensuring the Wilder and White and the Olmsted plans moved forward. He asked the committee to convey the association's appreciation to Secretary Reed. Secretary Reed has also agreed to serve on the association's statewide advisory board and the working board, which will focus on Capitol Campus issues.

Mr. Miller invited the committee to a lunch at the Water Street Café to discuss pending improvements to north campus to include the enhancements to the Eastern Washington Butte, which was approved by the committee several years ago, and replacement of the old restroom.

Mr. McDonald commented that he has attended nearly every committee meeting on behalf of Secretary Reed over the last 12 years. It has been an honor and a pleasure to serve. He arrived with some knowledge about the campus and is leaving with much more knowledge about Capitol Campus and those people who dearly love the campus and who have worked very hard to preserve the campus for the community and future generations. There has been an amazing amount of work accomplished over the last 12 years. The new Secretary of State, Kim Wyman, is very interested in the campus. He looks forward to serving in any future capacity.

Chair Haskell thanked Mr. McDonald for his service and dedication over the last 12 years.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for February 7, 2013.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.