



## CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Dennis Haskell, Alex Rolluda, Jonathan Taylor, Landscape Architect - Vacant*

*Secretary of State Kim Wyman*

*Senator Karen Fraser, Senator - Vacant Position*

*Representative Sam Hunt, Representative Gary Alexander*

Department of Enterprise Service  
1500 Jefferson Street - Room 2208  
Olympia, Washington 98504

### MINUTES

**DECEMBER 4, 2013**

*(Approved: February 20, 2014)*

---

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Don Skillman (for Secretary of State)  
Jonathan Taylor  
Representative Gary Alexander  
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair

#### MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator (vacant)  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Landscape Architect (vacant)

#### OTHERS PRESENT

Ruben Amamilo, Enterprise Services  
Don Becka, Enterprise Services  
Rick Browning, Enterprise Services  
Jim Erskine, Enterprise Services  
William Frare, Enterprise Services  
Stefanie Fuller, Enterprise Services  
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Tom Henderson, Enterprise Services  
Anthony Ifie, Enterprise Services  
Bob Jacobs, Olympia Capitol Park Foundation  
Marygrace Jennings, Enterprise Services  
Nouk Leap, Enterprise Services

Chris Liu, Enterprise Services  
Carrie Martin, Enterprise Services  
Jessi Massingale, Floyd | Snider  
Allen Miller, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association  
Lenore Miller, Enterprise Services  
Dave Peeler, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team  
Trina Regan, Enterprise Services  
Jarrett Sacks, Enterprise Services  
Bonnie Scheel, Enterprise Services  
Anny Sweeney, Enterprise Services  
Sasha Visconty, Axis Environmental  
Bob Wubbena, Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association

#### Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Chair 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.

**Approval of Agenda**

*Alex Rolluda moved, seconded by Representative Gary Alexander, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.*

CCDAC will review one item on the agenda for Action: Approval of the Minutes – *October 9, 2013*; three items for Information: Capitol Lake – *Status Update*, 1063 Block Replacement Office Building – *Status Update*, and the 2014 Agenda Items; and one item for Discussion: Capitol Campus Planning – *CCDAC Handbook and Committee, Assignments, Process*.

**Approval of Minutes**

*October 9, 2013*

*Representative Gary Alexander moved, seconded by Jonathan Taylor, to approve the minutes of October 9, 2013, as published. Motion carried.*

**Capitol Lake – Status Update**

Chair Haskell recognized Jessi Massingale with Floyd | Snider.

Ms. Massingale briefed members on the summary report of the Capitol Lake permitting analysis.

The scope of the 2011-2013 biennium appropriation was beginning the process of seeking necessary permits to dredge and spot dredge excess sediments as required under all proposed long-term management strategies. To ensure the possibility of an accurate and realistic permitting analysis, the effort included preparation of a conceptual-level maintenance dredge within the lake, which did not preclude any of the long-term alternatives previously evaluated. The scope included vetting the draft permitting analysis with local, state, and federal agency representatives.

The scope of work included the evaluation and feasibility of a maintenance dredge from a constructability aspect because of challenges with access and water levels, assess the impact of invasive animal and plant species (New Zealand mudsnails & Purple Loosestrife) on dredge disposal or reuse options, incorporate water quality conditions placing Capitol Lake on the Clean Water Act (CWA) 303(d) list, and identifying permitting agency expectations and lake regulatory history.

Capitol Lake was closed to swimming in 1985 because of poor water quality and coliform bacteria. In 1996, a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) called for a maintenance dredge of the middle basin sediment trap and the formation of the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee. The CLAMP Steering Committee evaluated whether future management of the lake should include converting the lake to a tidal estuary or continue to be managed as a lake. In 2009, the CLAMP Steering Committee issued a split recommendation on the long-term management strategy for the lake.

In 2009, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) closed the lake to all public uses because of the presence of the invasive mudsnail to prevent spreading mudsnails to other water bodies. In 2012, portions of Deschutes River/Capitol Lake/Budd Inlet failed to meet water quality standards and continued to be listed on the 303(d) list. In 2013, the Dredge Material Management Program determined that dredged materials from the lake were not suitable for open water disposal because of the presence of mudsnails and the risk it could pose to other water bodies.

The scope of work also included identifying technical data gaps during the design and planning process prior to any permit submittals for maintenance dredging. The team identified the need for an updated bathymetric survey as a key data gap. A portion of the proviso funded a bathymetric survey in 2013 to

---

identify areas of particular sedimentation within the basin, as well as understanding the water available for access or construction equipment. Other data gaps included sediment chemical water quality testing characterization to ensure accurate water quality parameters prior to design and permitting.

Ms. Massingale reviewed the depth contours of the 2013 bathymetric survey. Compared to the 2004 survey, an additional 300,000 cubic yards of sediment have entered the Capitol Lake basin. Approximately half of the additional sediments are located in the north basin along the main channel and the other half is located in the middle basin sediment trap and part of the southern basin. Based on the results of the bathymetric survey, a conceptual maintenance dredge scope was developed identifying two main areas to dredge - the main channel of the north basin and the sediment trap of the middle basin. The approximate volume of the two sites would be 100,000 cubic yards. The design feature at the conceptual level cannot preclude the dredge footprints of any of the long-term alternatives.

Ms. Massingale displayed and reviewed the permitting road map, which is included as an appendix in the Recommendations Report. The road map documents all processes for permits and approvals for dredging Capitol Lake under either a limited maintenance dredge or any dredge of any scale. The report identifies primary permitting processes necessary for maintenance dredging and contingency processes for long-term dredging alternatives. Ms. Massingale reviewed the 15 permitting and approval processes necessary for a dredge event:

- Federal National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106, Cultural and Historical Resources
- ESA Section 7 Consultation
- Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) enables joint application to consolidate and apply for multiple local, state, and federal permits
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review led by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to evaluate project impacts and benefits for preparation of an environmental assessment or an EIS
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review (DES has statutory authority to issue a threshold determination)
- National Pollutant Discharge Environmental System (NPDES)
- Aquatic Invasive Species Transport Letters of Approval required for transport of dredged sediment contaminated with invasive species
- Other Local Permits/Approval: Noise Variances resulting from construction
- Other Local Permits/Approvals: Railroad coordination adjacent to Marathon Park

The timeline for applying for required permits for a dredging event is anticipated after completion of conceptual design is 9 to 12 months. Application submittal, agency review, and issuance of permits require another 18 to 24 months. The entire process requires two to three years.

The estimated cost of securing permits is approximately \$125,000 to \$200,000.

There are several technical challenges associated with a maintenance dredge of Capitol Lake. Marathon Park could be a viable location for staging and launching dredge equipment. Because of shallow water depths and access issues, specific dredge equipment is required, which affect the timeline for dredging. The presence of New Zealand mudsnails limit the disposal and reuse options of dredge materials. Dredge materials transported outside of the Capitol Lake basin have only two viable options of either upland disposal to a landfill or possibly reused upland in dry areas. Both options could require treatment of the sediment to immobilize or kill mudsnails and potential monitoring around the transportation route to ensure no infestation has occurred by the mudsnail.

---

Under both the federal and state environmental review processes, any action must have a strong purpose and need statement, which presents a challenge. Preparing a purpose and need statement separate and independent of any long-term strategy is very difficult to achieve.

The draft permitting road map was vetted with agency representatives for feedback on expectations and concerns. They believe it would be difficult to secure maintenance dredging permits without an identified management strategy.

The cost benefit analysis reveals changed conditions. A prior long-term alternative cost analysis was completed in 2009 prior to identification by WDFW of the presence of mudsnails. Those costs did not include any restricted disposal option because of the invasive mudsnails, as well as additional handling and characterization work that would be needed. Subsequently, costs have increased. It's important to identify the long-term management option to achieve both cost savings and the environmental benefit. Any dredging operation around an alternative can be more cost effective and tailored to fit long-term goals. There are also public and political interests vested in the future of the lake, which speaks to the need to have an environmental review and permitting process that is defensible to identify a long-term alternative to avoid a risk of appeals or delays in the process.

Potential next steps include working with local government and other entities to implement the 2013-15 budget proviso to develop a long-term financing plan and equitable cost-share approach for the maintenance dredging costs. One potential next step is estimating the cost of an EIS process to enable an evaluation of the alternatives, impacts and benefits, and defensively identify a preferred alternative. As part of the EIS process, costs would be updated based on current conditions of the long-term alternatives, which could be shared between local governments and entities. The EIS would produce a preferred alternative and identify costs reflecting current conditions. At that point, the state would determine financing or cost-sharing options.

Chair Haskell asked what the dredging is meant to accomplish if no definitive long-term management decision has been rendered for the lake. Ms. Massingale replied that the 2009 CLAMP Steering Committee recommendation was a split vote with approximately two-thirds of the committee voting in favor of an estuary alternative and one-third preferring a managed lake and dredge alternative. The budget proviso focuses only on the maintenance dredge. The regulatory challenge is preparing a purpose and need statement for a maintenance dredge without having any long-term management alternative identified. Additionally, the desire for not precluding any of the alternatives limits the dredging locations, which speaks to the next step of a scoping EIS that would help to identify an alternative.

Jonathan Taylor asked whether the scope of the work or the CLAMP process developed cost estimates for any of the management alternatives. Ms. Massingale said the 2009 alternatives analysis includes an accompanying document on the dredging and disposal analysis identifying costs for all alternatives. However, the analysis was completed prior to the identification of the invasive mudsnail. At that time, the costs factored open water disposal of sediments, which is a much lower cost than upland disposal. Six disposal options were evaluated that have since been narrowed to two options. The costs would need to be updated and are not accurate today.

Mr. Taylor asked whether the estuary would require more effort than maintaining the lake. Ms. Massingale said both alternatives are different in terms of managing the basin. Approximately 35,000 cubic yards of sediments flow into the basin each year. The permitting time line for the maintenance dredging conceptual scope of 100,000 cubic yards is approximately three years. During that period, the sediment expected to enter the basin would be roughly equal to what would be removed during a maintenance action. Another consideration is the use of Marathon Park as a staging area for maintenance

---

dredging, which could essentially mean the loss of the park permanently. Restoration of an estuary would require infrastructure changes to restore tidal action.

Chair Haskell said it appears the process is tending toward an estuary, which would require removal of the dam to restore tidal action. However, there are aesthetic and historical issues associated with maintaining a lake, which has been a lake for many years. The costs of maintaining a lake and maintenance dredging would be substantial. Those are the basic trade-offs discussed by the CLAMP Committee resulting in a split recommendation.

Mr. Taylor asked about the outcome of the mudsnail if the lake was restored as an estuary. Ms. Massingale replied that WDFW completed some studies in 2011 and allowed some back flushing of marine water to gauge the survival rate of mudsnails. In general, the estuarine environment would provide better habitat or benefit for more desired species and a more negative impact on some of the invasive species.

Representative Alexander commented that he would be interested in learning of the outcome of a vote by the citizens in the county on the two options the CLAMP committee reviewed. He asked about the process implemented to help eradicate mudsnails. Ms. Massingale said the mudsnail has been challenging to eradicate. Mudsnails have infested other areas of the basin. In terms of voting for any of the options, there is more of a disconnect today because changes have occurred and a maintenance dredge wouldn't necessarily restore swimming or boating or other public uses of the lake because of the snail, as well as ongoing water quality concerns. Representative Alexander pointed out that Heritage Park usage and the investment of \$20 million should be factored as part of the lake environment as outlined in the Wilder & White plan. Ms. Massingale agreed and added that an EIS would also factor environment, social and public views considerations.

The findings and analysis are documented in a Recommendations Report and in an associated permitting road map publicly available on the Department of Enterprise (DES) website at [www.des.wa.gov/about/pi/capitollake/pages/capitollakereports.aspx](http://www.des.wa.gov/about/pi/capitollake/pages/capitollakereports.aspx).

Senator Karen Fraser commented that the Department of Ecology's impending completion of the TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Study should help close some of the data gaps. Ms. Massingale said the TMDL Study would provide information on loading and actions that could occur within the basin to improve water quality. Data gaps for sediment pertain to the location of mudsnails and their impact on removal of sediment, sediment quality at the bottom of the lake, and sediment quality suitable for upland landfill disposal. Senator Fraser noted that the TMDL Study should help inform the effort as the study explores the source of water quality problems and potential ways to reduce the impacts to water quality. Ms. Massingale acknowledged that the TMDL study will work to identify improvements for water quality and loading.

Senator Fraser reported that over the years, regardless of the three alternatives under discussion, dredging would be required for each alternative. She asked whether dredging would be similar or different for each of the alternatives and whether permitting agencies would consider the lengthy process to reach some form of agreement on the management outcome of the lake. She questioned why it is not possible to move forward with a maintenance dredge that would benefit any of the three alternatives. Ms. Massingale said the conceptual scope explored areas with heavy accumulation of sediment that could be dredged under any of the alternatives. The challenge is the conceptual level of the alternatives. Documentation from the CLAMP process includes dredging for all three alternatives. However, dredging is very expensive and the state would be investing funds into a maintenance dredge activity where no environmental benefit has been identified. If funding became available and DES was able to initiate an EIS process, it would entail a regulatory program with public input to evaluate the alternatives. It would

---

entail an evaluation of what makes the most sense for the public, the environment, and infrastructure costs. A decision would then move forward by the agencies under that process because the decision would be defensible, creditable, and the public had an opportunity to participate. At that point, plans could be developed for a phased dredging plan or designing a dredge event.

Mr. Taylor questioned whether there is a need to move forward with a design process. It appears the recommendation is not moving forward with a dredge. Chair Haskell clarified that the consultant team was tasked with determining the permitting feasibility for a maintenance dredge. Ms. Massingale said the scope of work considered the budget proviso for a maintenance dredge. The road map includes permitting processes for a maintenance dredge or any scale of a dredge. If funding became available the next step would include developing a cost estimate or a scope developed for an EIS process. As the EIS process is initiated, it helps to advance the conceptual design to identify what local governments will be asked to consider in terms of cost sharing.

Senator Fraser asked why both a SEPA and NEPA would be required as part of the EIS process. Sasha Visconty, Senior Environmental Regulatory Specialist, Axis Environmental, responded that both environmental processes are coordinated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as the lead agency managing the NEPA process. However, the Corps typically does not complete many EIS processes but completes environmental assessments based on one alternative that likely would move forward from the SEPA process, which would carry forward to the federal regulatory process. With DES as the lead SEPA agency, DES reviews a broader range of multiple alternatives and options with extensive public and agency outreach to narrow potential mitigation measures to help determine the preferred alternative that would move forward to the permitting regulatory process.

Ms. Visconty explained how the Corps has a much narrower scope in terms of the types of resources that are evaluated while DES, under SEPA, would evaluate social, economic, recreation, and other broad-scale impacts that extend beyond the jurisdiction of the Corps, which is only focused on in-water aquatic resources.

Senator Fraser asked whether the purpose of NEPA and SEPA is to consider all alternatives and include all agencies. Ms. Visconty advised that during discussions with the Corps, officials indicated they likely would not pursue an EIS. However, the Corps could determine that because public interest in the project is high, it might require an EIS.

Ms. Massingale said the preferred alternative would include advancing the preferred design of the current alternatives under consideration to ensure the EIS accurately evaluates all the alternatives. As the environmental process is pursued, the final design is centered on the preferred alternative.

Alex Rolluda asked about the extent of the design work prior to submitting to JARPA. Ms. Massingale said many projects complete 30 percent design; however, for this particular project, design would be approximately 60 percent. The JARPA process includes larger impacts but could be amended when the final design is completed.

Chair Haskell invited public comments.

Bill Frare, Engineering Manager, DES, asked whether the study considered the effects on the Port of Olympia if the dam is removed. Ms. Massingale said the project scope did not consider those impacts and it did not include any evaluation of design. The study reviewed minimum impacts but no hydrodynamic or sediment trend analysis was completed.

---

Representative Alexander asked about the previous EIS completed during the Heritage Park planning process. Ms. Massingale affirmed a 1996 Supplemental EIS was completed for maintenance dredging of the middle basin. The alternatives analysis in 2009 examined an estuary alternative. However, no technical detailed sediment transport for the removal of the dam was ever completed. The only analysis completed is on sediment movement within the basin.

Senator Fraser referred to conversations with the Ruckelshaus Center, which is a combined group of representatives from the University of Washington and Washington State University who work together to resolve challenges. If the decision is to move ahead with an EIS process, she suggested consideration of the sequence for both processes.

Bob Wubbena, Capitol Lake Improvement Protection Association (CLIPA), reported that the organization's science panel includes 20 scientists from the greater Olympia area and several former scientists. He has 40 years of working watershed experience and understands the sediment issues. CLIPA has studied the issue for five years and approached the Legislature in 2011 to request \$200,000 to begin the process. He indicated that he takes exception to several of the report findings because there were many studies completed under the CLAMP Steering Committee and those studies document six feet of mud every 10 years accumulating in Budd Inlet without the dam. Work needs to move forward soon. The estuary option includes a dredge of over 400,000 cubic yards from Capitol Lake. CLIPA proposes a phased approach beginning with removing 100,000 cubic yards of sediment. Even considering the tidal flat option, over 400,000 cubic yards would be dredged. It would not be difficult to determine the locations for removal of sediment. That is also consistent with the lake alternative. CLIPA also has detailed analysis prepared by professional engineers, environmentalists, scientists, and two PhDs' from The Evergreen State College who are working with CLIPA on biological and water quality aspects. CLIPA understands the models very well and was not provided with an opportunity to meet with the consultant who reviewed the work with DES. The information provided by CLIPA is well documented and the group plans to approach the Legislature in January with a 2014 action plan based on science and facts from data used by the consultant team. The information is available, but what is lacking is leadership. CLIPA is also working with the City of Olympia and the Port of Olympia to seek some leadership and a partnership with DES to move the process forward. The study was initiated in 1995, it's now 2013, and nothing has been accomplished. CLIPA is prepared to work with DES at no cost to move the process forward.

Chris Liu, DES Director, disclosed that he met with CLIPA representatives after they requested a meeting. They were informed that all members have access to his office to present data and information. Assuming that the process moves forward with the Ruckelshaus Center, CLIPA likely would be involved. Statistics and scientific data provided by CLIPA add value to any process moving forward. He supports Senator Fraser's proposal to include the Ruckelshaus Center to ensure all stakeholders have equal input.

Bob Jacobs said his interest is flooding risk as it's been indicated that if the lake isn't dredged, the flooding risk to downtown Olympia increases. He asked the consultant team to address the flooding issue.

Ms. Massingale said that anecdotally, the consultant team had a similar understanding. The team reviewed technical reports from the last several decades including CLAMP sediment transport and the CLIPA reports. The team reviewed the 2007/2008 hydrodynamic report that examined flooding and found that a dredge operation could allow an additional five to ten minutes of warning time before flooding occurs to downtown Olympia. Based on the modeling, a dredge would not afford much time. The report was included within the CLAMP technical documents reviewed by the consultant team.

---

Allen Miller said he's an attorney and has been working on Capitol Campus issues for many years including the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park to include Capitol Lake. He has also worked with Professor Johnston, who is the founder of CCDAC and the author of the book on Capitol Campus. A statute exists in law of 79.24.700, which states that the Legislature found that the historic facilities of the Washington State Capitol are the most important public facilities in the state and are a source of beauty and pride, a resource for celebrating our heritage and democratic ideals, and are our exceptional educational resource. The public and the historic facilities of the State Capitol Campus should be managed and maintained through the highest standards of excellence, model the best of historic preservation practices, maximize opportunities for public access and enjoyment, and carefully preserve them for the benefit of future generations. It appears that under the statute and preservation of the Wilder and White design of the State Capitol Campus, the only alternative is to preserve and maintain Capitol Lake to its highest standards. He asked members to consider the statute.

Dave Peeler, President, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team, said he is a former employee of the Department of Ecology and attends the advisory committee meetings for the Deschutes River/Capitol Lake/Budd Inlet TMDL Study. The department is reworking some of the technical study data partly because of the need to include impacts from nutrients entering Budd Inlet from North Puget Sound (Pierce and King Counties). The department will complete the technical work in early 2014 and begin drafting the TMDL Report. Technical work to date has revealed that by far the major impact to water quality in Budd Inlet is the dam. One of the most significant actions for improving water quality in Budd Inlet is removal of the dam.

Chair Haskell reported that DES is moving the project forward and establishing a direction for the long term that hopefully will satisfy all interests.

#### **1063 Block Replacement Office Building – Status Update**

Chair Haskell introduced Rick Browning, Project Director, DES. Chair Haskell recused himself from the discussion. Alex Rolluda led the briefing and discussion as Vice-Chair.

Project Director Browning updated the committee on the status of the 1063 Block Replacement Office Building project. The new office building replaces the 1063 Capitol Way South block with a high efficiency 200,000-225,000 square foot building. The project includes performance guarantees and tenants from the current group of tenants on Capitol Campus of the Washington State Patrol, Office of Financial Management (OFM), and several legislative agencies.

The building will be a high-performance multi-tenant office building with a five-year performance guarantee on energy, operations, and maintenance through a fiscal commitment by the design-build team. Currently, a design competition is underway with a Request for Qualifications issued for submittal of qualifications. The project team received five submittals from highly qualified teams. The project team evaluated the submittals and selected three teams as finalists for moving forward to the second stage. The second stage is a 2-1/2 month process to develop a tangible design with costs. The designs are due in late February 2014. DES will select one firm and proceed with the project.

The three teams include Hoffman Construction with Belay Architecture and GBD Architects; Mortenson Construction with SRG Partnership; and Sellen Construction with ZGF Architects.

The project team finalized and released the Request for Proposal (RFP) document on November 21. The RFP provides instructions to the three teams on the state's specifications for the office building. The RFP is available on the DES website. During the development of the RFP, the document was subject to a review by over 20 reviewers both internally and externally by other state agencies.

---

Mr. Browning credited the CCDAC for the Design Narratives section of the RFP pertaining to architecture, urban design, interior finishes, programming, and landscaping. Much of the information was from the Design Opportunity Report authored by the CCDAC. Staff is appreciative of the CCDAC's time and submission of the information.

The project team is also working with a multi-disciplinary predesign consulting group led by OAC of Seattle, which specializes in construction management and includes Perkins+Will, a design firm. Under Perkins+Will direction, the RFP includes extensive programming information. The programming for the building was honed down to a more efficient building of approximately 210,000 square feet.

An initial public community meeting was held on Thursday, November 14. The meeting was well attended by approximately 80 individuals. An overview was provided of the project by Mr. Browning and Tom Henderson followed by a question and answer session. Most of the public comments and questions are summarized in a FAQ document and posted on the DES website as a separate webpage. The project team foresees continued public outreach opportunities with the next public meeting presenting the three teams' proposed designs sometime in February after receipt of the submittals.

The next steps include a series of meetings with tenant groups and DES representatives with each design team. The proprietary meetings will help move the design process forward and answer all questions. After submittals on February 20, presentations to the community will be scheduled. The winning team will receive notification in the second quarter. Legislation requires OFM to validate financial elements of the proposal with construction scheduled in late 2014/early 2015.

*Representative Alexander left the meeting.*

Director Liu commented that DES also utilized the WebEx program to enable others to participate in the public meeting without the need to attend the meeting. DES intends to use WebEx at all public meetings to enable the public to participate in public meetings electronically. The use of technology opens the public process to a much wider base than in the past.

Senator Fraser asked about the steps leading to the final design decision from the three proposals in terms of how the proposals are evaluated and whether the public has an opportunity to provide input. Mr. Browning said the design teams would submit detailed designs with a cost proposal. The submittals will be detailed, supported by drawings (possibly three-dimensional renderings), and include a cost proposal. The project team is also seeking a few limited design alternates within the RFP. Each team was asked to submit an alternative as part of the design for one level of parking below grade. Parking is explicitly not part of the funding provided by the Legislature and the project team is not committing to the parking option at this time. However, inherent in the construction process are efficiencies and potential opportunities to create below grade space. Additionally, the project team is also considering overall parking impacts on campus as well, which might help inform a decision about the parking alternative. Other design alternatives are small variations in the design. Each team is presenting one main and complete design concept for evaluation.

Similar to the RFQ process, the project team anticipates, in conjunction with DES management, to seek a broad spectrum of project reviewers to include a CCDAC representative to establish an evaluation committee. Representation will also be sought from the private sector. The evaluation committee will review the submittals. A due diligence review will be conducted by legal and financial staff to ensure each design meets pass/fail criteria. The legislation requires OFM to validate the evaluation committee's recommendation.

---

Each design team is anticipated to provide a presentation to the community while the project team deliberates on the selection of the proposal. A combination of all those factors will lead to a final selection of the design-build team.

Senator Fraser said it appears the public meeting is for the design teams to present the proposals rather than the design teams receiving input from the public or an opportunity by the public to react to the compatibility of the design with the community. There is a substantial need to ensure there is community compatibility. The public requires a process to provide an opportunity for feedback to the design teams. Additionally, it's important to consider a worst-case scenario, such as similarity in all three designs or the designs utilize the same maximum height and square footage. Including a maximum square footage automatically ensures the teams design to that maximum square footage, which may not be compatible with the community. She encouraged the project team to re-think the process to include public feedback.

Mr. Browning said that at the first community meeting, the design build teams were asked to send representatives on a voluntary basis. Each team sent approximately four representatives including senior design staff. At that meeting, all the design teams received feedback from the community. Although the process is somewhat insular in terms of how the design teams will be working, the project team is attempting to provide opportunities for public input.

Senator Fraser stressed the importance of providing a robust public comment opportunity.

Don Skillman asked whether the parking impact study is an independent study that the CCDAC could review sooner rather than later. Mr. Browning replied that the parking study is an independent process that supports and aids the design proposal process as part of the SEPA checklist for campus-wide parking impacts. The CCDAC would be able to review the study while underway. The study is an update to the 2009 Campus Parking Study, which has been redefined as a Transit and Parking Study to account for different methods of access to Capitol Campus.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that once the selection of the architect/construction firm is finalized, there would be many opportunities for input on the design process.

Tom Henderson added that the initial proposal is a schematic-level design, which requires additional work before final construction documents are completed.

Mr. Browning said much work remains to be completed after selection of the firm. The history of similar kinds of competitions reflects some changes in the design. There is some expectation of changes to some degree. The RFP includes a requirement for a guaranteed maximum price. The RFP includes the contract and all the legal provisions for all project requirements. When changes occur, the design-build team presents changes and prices established for that work with open book pricing. The RFP includes defined overhead and profit margins. No additional points are awarded for a low bid on the building. The goal is receiving the best lifetime value for the cost of the building.

Vice-Chair Rolluda asked whether it's possible to incorporate ideas of value from the other proposals after a firm is selected. Mr. Browning affirmed the RFP provides the department with the use of all ideas offered within the proposals.

Senator Fraser asked whether the design teams receive a stipend for the proposals. Mr. Browning said it's likely each team contributes approximately \$500,000 of time and resources to develop its proposal. The

---

unsuccessful teams receive a \$200,000 honorarium. Teams not fulfilling the minimum requirements of the competition forfeit the honorarium.

Members agreed to an interim discussion on the parking study rather than receiving a presentation of findings.

**Capitol Campus Planning – CCDAC Handbook, Committee, Assignments, Process**

Chair Haskell recognized Director Chris Liu.

Director Liu shared that in his new role as Director, it's important for him to understand the role of the CCDAC, as well as ensuring his operational role is within the proper guidelines. The Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee Handbook was last updated in 2009. He asked members review the handbook to ensure the handbook is appropriate in today's environment.

Chair Haskell offered to review the handbook.

Mr. Rolluda referred to language within the handbook under enabling legislation (paragraph 5) that speaks to the development of property known as the 1063 Block, which states, "The committee may review the proposal selected by the Department of Enterprise Services but must not propose changes that will affect the scope, budget, or schedule of the project." He requested clarification as to why the language is included in the section as it appears to be a recent addition.

Tom Henderson said the inclusion is from the proviso language from the 1063 Block legislation and its inclusion was intended to address a specific property.

Chair Haskell questioned whether a handbook spanning multiple years and projects should include specific language if legislation includes language directing the committee. Mr. Henderson said the language could be removed. Mr. Rolluda and Chair Haskell agreed removal of the language would be appropriate.

Director Liu agreed the handbook is intended to serve as a broad guideline and should not be specific to any particular project.

Director Liu explained that the handbook is the guide for DES in its interaction with the CCDAC. It facilitates an effective and efficient development of high quality design advice to guide DES and the State Capitol Committee and Capitol Campus facility decisions.

Director Liu reported a request to the Legislature was submitted requesting the appointment of two CCDAC members. Representative Alexander is planning to retire and it's important to have the position filled.

Director Liu recommended pursuing some conversations about future development on Capitol Campus. After completion of the 1063 Building, some discussions likely will center on the disposition of the GA Building, the Conservancy structure, or stabilization of the hillside. All the issues are important work for the CCDAC to undertake, as well as ensuring all projects incorporate good public outreach and feedback. The CCDAC should begin to initiate some discussions on what the future projects may entail and possibly the timeline as a formal project to seek public input early rather than later in the process.

Chair Haskell acknowledged the need to review and possibly update the Capitol Campus Master Plan. Director Liu said the master plan provides design guidance on campus development. The committee's

---

discussion could help determine whether a full update of the plan is necessary. Chair Haskell agreed an update is necessary especially in some of the graphics identifying opportunity areas on the campus that have since been developed.

Senator Fraser commented that one weak area within the plan is circulation and transit. It's important to include circulation and transit within the plan. The campus has received some improved transportation to and from the north urban areas. Transportation options during the legislative session should be an area of focus as it helps to reduce freeway trips and provides for more citizen participation and democracy.

Mr. Gillman asked about the process for replacement of committee members. Mr. Henderson explained that the two positions are Republican members of the Senate and the House. The appointments are voluntary. DES is working with the Senate and House on appointments of new members. The Landscape Architect position is vacant and DES is pursuing a selection process. Many CCDAC members provided names of potential candidates and DES plans to contact those individuals as well as pursuing a public search.

### **2014 Agenda Items**

Mr. Henderson reviewed the agenda setting process to afford an opportunity for members to provide input or identify time sensitive issues, such as the capital budget process, which has established timelines for submission. Regular business agenda items are standard. The CCDAC is scheduled to consider the update process of the Capitol Campus Master Plan, and receive scheduled updates on the 1063 Block replacement project, and on the Ruckelshaus Center review process for aligning future decisions moving forward on the management of Capitol Lake.

Another time sensitive issue is appointment of committee members. The intent is having all positions filled by the first meeting in February. The selection of the Chair and Vice Chair is an annual process.

The budget update includes the department's 10-year plan. Some information should be available through the master plan update that includes priorities and important future investments on the campus to help establish a focused approach to the budgeting process.

Other agenda items include master plan for landscaping and tree replacement. Within DES, elements of interest include *Results Washington* and Lean culture activities to improve processes and support mechanisms for agencies DES serves.

The committee also has the opportunity to recommend agenda items.

Chair Haskell asked about the status of the GA Building. Mr. Henderson said the discussion surrounding the GA Building would be part of the master plan update as the intent after moving tenants from the GA Building to the 1063 Building is closing the GA Building. Questions on the next steps for the future demolition of the building would be addressed during the update process.

Mr. Rolluda asked about the status of the ProArts Building. Mr. Henderson said a predesign was completed for the replacement of the existing structures. No activity has moved forward with the predesign. The site is considered an opportunity site for construction.

Director Liu pointed out that similar to the GA Building, there are many issues the CCDAC should examine with DES to help understand future activities and the impacts to the campus and to tenants.

---

Mr. Gillman commented that the Secretary of State has worked with the Legislature to obtain some assistance for space for archival and storage needs. He encouraged some flexibility in terms of locations for archival and records storage. Mr. Henderson replied that part of the GA Building proposal includes consideration of 50,000 square feet of available space when the data center moves to the Jefferson Building. There are some options under consideration. Approximately \$20,000 remains from the predesign funds for reuse of space in the OB2 Building.

Director Liu questioned the need to consider access, security, or controlled environment requirements for archives and records storage. Mr. Henderson affirmed the need for a controlled environment and access, as well as other considerations to factor in designing the space.

**Public Comment**

Bob Jacobs said he volunteers with the League of Women Voters and several other organizations. He thanked members for the openness of the meeting process. It is a model that he cites frequently. The meeting process enabling the participation of the public will create goodwill with citizens. One potential area of improvement is the use of microphones.

**Other Business**

Chair Haskell encouraged members to review the CCDAC Handbook. He offered to provide the continuity of forwarding all comments to Director Liu.

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled on February 20, 2014 at 10 a.m.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:56 a.m.**

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net

---