



CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dennis Haskell, Alex Rolluda, Jonathan Taylor, Susan Olmsted

Secretary of State Kim Wyman

Senator Karen Fraser, Senator - Vacant Position

Representative Sam Hunt, Representative Drew MacEwen

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

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 20, 2014

(Approved: May 22, 2014)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair
Jonathan Taylor
Susan Olmsted
Senator Karen Fraser
Secretary of State Kim Wyman Don Skillman
(for Secretary of State)
Representative Drew MacEwen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator (vacant)
Representative Sam Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT

Rick Browning, Department of Enterprise Services
Kim Buccarelli, Department of Enterprise Services
Rick Bushnell, Office of Financial Management
Peggy Clifford, SCNA
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services
Jim Erskine, Department of Enterprise Services
William Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Tom Hill, City of Olympia
Arlen Harris, Department. of Enterprise Services
Anthony Ifie, Department of Enterprise Services
Bob Jacobs, Olympia Capitol Park Foundation

Marygrace Jennings, Department of Enterprise Services
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Amy McMahan, Office of Financial Management
Carrie McNamara, Employment Security Department
Lenore Miller, Department of Enterprise Services
Trina Regan, Department of Enterprise Services
Bonnie Scheel, Department of Enterprise Services
Brad Shannon, The Olympian
Don Skillman, Secretary of State Office
Ann Sweeney, Department of Enterprise Services

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Chair Haskell recognized newly appointed member Susan Olmsted representing the Landscape Architect position. Ms. Olmsted was appointed on January 10 with a term expiring December 2017. Ms. Olmsted

obtained a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree and a Masters of Architecture degree from the University of Washington. She is an architect and landscape architect with Mithun in Seattle. Some of her work projects include the restoration of the Mariposa Grove of Giant Sequoias in Yosemite National Park, the Louisiana Children's Museum Early Learning Village and City Park in New Orleans, and the Sustainability Treehouse at Summit Bechtel Reserve in West Virginia. Susan is a part-time faculty member at the University of Washington teaching architecture in the landscape. She serves as a Board Member for Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks, an organization focused on advocacy and preservation of Seattle's interconnected system of historic parks and boulevards. Ms. Olmsted's varied background and experience offers a well-rounded understanding of design issues and opportunities for the Capitol Campus. Ms. Olmsted assisted in the preparation of the landscape plan for Capitol Campus.

Representative Drew MacEwen was appointed to the committee on January 17 and fills the House Representative position. Representative MacEwen is the President and founder of Falcon Financial, Inc. He was the 2012 Board President of the Shelton Mason County Chamber of Commerce and continues to serve on the boards of the Shelton Rotary and the Alderbrook Golf Course. Representative MacEwen holds a BA of Science degree from the University of the State of New York, served six years in the U.S. Navy submarine force, and is a graduate of the US Navy Nuclear Propulsion Program. Representative MacEwen serves on four House Committees – Agriculture and Natural Resources, Business and Financial Services, Capital Budget, and Early Learning and Human Services.

Chair Haskell recognized committee members in attendance. Don Skillman is the alternate for Secretary of State Kim Wyman until her arrival.

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

Approval of Agenda

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Jonathan Taylor, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.

CCDAC will review one item on the agenda for Action: Approval of the Minutes - *December 4, 2013*; one item for Information: 1063 Block Replacement Project - *Status Update*; two items for Discussion: CCDAC Handbook - *Status Update*, and Capitol Campus Planning - *Master Plan Update and Process and Work Group*.

Approval of Minutes

December 4, 2013

Alex Rolluda moved, seconded by Jonathan Taylor, to approve the minutes of December 4, 2013, as published. Motion carried.

1063 Block Replacement Project – Status Update

Chair Haskell recused himself from the discussion.

Vice Chair Rolluda recognized Rick Browning, Project Director, DES.

Mr. Browning provided an update on the 1063 Block Replacement project.

The project is a 210,000 square-foot office building located on the site of the 80-year old 1063 Capitol Way South Building at the corner of Union and Capitol Way on the north edge of Capitol Campus. The process included a Design-Build (DB) competition. DES is anticipating DB submittals from three DB

teams by 3 p.m. later in the day. The next phase of the procurement process is the evaluation and selection of one submittal.

Previously, through a series of design workshops with the three candidate DB teams, the project team validated the project's program of three tenant agencies consisting of the Washington State Patrol, Office of Financial Management (OFM), and some legislative sub agencies. Placement of the tenants within the building was validated within the programmed square footage of the building. Tenants were also included in those deliberations and workshops.

The DB award is a \$65.5 million contract from a total project amount of \$82 million. Projections calculate a square footage cost of approximately \$300 for actual construction costs, which is competitive for a building of the proposed quality. The project team anticipates announcing the winner of the DB contract in late March, signing the contract by summer, with construction substantially completed by fall 2016.

Because competitive procurement processes are confidential, the details are not publicly shared, such as the composition of the selection committee. The composition of the selection committee is well represented by both the state and private industry. The process entails examining various aspects of the design in a series of meetings with the selection committee as well as sharing the information with tenant groups. One important aspect of the selection process is scheduling a public meeting to view the submittals with representatives of the DB teams presenting designs on March 19. The meeting will be broadcast on WebEx for current or later viewing. Time has been allocated for comments and questions from the public at the end of each team's presentation. Mr. Browning encouraged members to take advantage of the opportunity to attend. He asked members to refrain from sharing comments during the public meeting and invited members to submit comments and questions electronically via a mailbox established for the project or by telephone. The project team values input from the committee and appreciated the submittal of the Design Opportunity Report (DOR) authored by the CCDAC before design direction was released to the DB teams. The DOR was incorporated within the document the DB teams are utilizing as the prime direction for submittal of the project design. Shortly after the public meeting, the selection committee will complete final scoring and select a winner.

Mr. Browning invited questions and comments.

Vice Chair Rolluda asked about the deadline for sending comments following the March 19 presentations. Mr. Browning advised that the comments are needed immediately because the DB teams had some trepidation about providing the public presentations while also acknowledging the value, as well as understanding the need to reach out to the community. However, the DB teams are concerned with the time lag between a public presentation and a final selection by the committee. To help reduce those concerns, the project team scheduled the final selection during the afternoon of the following day on March 20. He advised members of his availability to receive comments that evening and during the early hours of March 20 prior to the scoring exercise. He assured members that comments submitted by the CCDAC would be discussed by the selection committee. If necessary, the process could be delayed; however, the project team prefers avoiding a delay in the schedule. The goal is to accommodate all CCDAC member comments.

Senator Fraser pointed out that the CCDAC is to be involved in all phases of design. At this point, the CCDAC provided some policy direction. She questioned whether any CCDAC member is a member of the selection committee. Mr. Browning advised that the composition of the selection committee is confidential. Senator Fraser suggested that if the CCDAC is to be involved in the process, a member of the CCDAC should be a member of the selection committee. Additionally, CCDAC members benefit by

exchanging information between themselves, which should be integrated within the selection process as the committee's responsibility is to provide advice. It entails more than submitting individual comments about the project. Members develop their respective opinions by sharing and learning from one another.

Mr. Browning thanked Senator Fraser for her comments and acknowledged that there are a number of factors at play. He offered to consider the comments and follow up with members on the process. Additionally, it's important for the teams to present their own designs as the designs are complex and it's important the work is not misrepresented or important features overlooked.

Vice Chair Rolluda offered a possible option of collecting comments from each member, providing an opportunity for each member to review the comments, and consolidating the comments into a document for submittal to the selection team. Senator Fraser said the option is an improvement over the existing proposal, but a meeting of the CCDAC is lacking where committee members can share their respective comments and concerns about the three proposals.

Director Liu offered an option of scheduling a special meeting to share information about the presentations.

Mr. Taylor suggested scheduling a special CCDAC meeting following the presentations to afford an opportunity to exchange information about the presentations. Director Liu offered to follow up on a schedule for the CCDAC to meet.

Senator Fraser suggested any recommendations, advice, or concerns by the CCDAC should be presented to the selection committee by a member of the CCDAC. Director Liu affirmed the request.

CCDAC Handbook – Status Update

Chair Haskell reported on the status of the update of the CCDAC Handbook. An earlier request to the committee generated no responses from members. Chair Haskell reported he worked with staff on several minor updates to the handbook reflecting the change in the department's name from General Administration to Department of Enterprise Services, as well as the change in how members are appointed to the CCDAC. There were no other substantive changes. He asked members to provide any input within the next several days to enable staff to finalize the handbook.

Capitol Campus Planning – Master Plan Update – Process and Work Group

Chair Haskell recognized Ann Sweeney, Special Assistant to the Director's Office.

Ms. Sweeney reported the briefing is on the planned update to the 2006 Master Plan for the Capitol of the State of Washington and a request to establish a CCDAC workgroup of four to five members to assist in the update.

At the December meeting, members discussed interest by the Chair to review the Capitol Campus Master Plan as well as the Director's interest in the department moving forward to consider a more comprehensive planning process for facilities planning.

Ms. Sweeney introduced members of the project team and outlined the presentation agenda.

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, outlined the proposed comprehensive planning process and the role of the workgroup.

The planning process is influenced by several factors. They include the Governor's Priorities, which are established for cabinet agencies and the department's Strategic and Business Plans, which inform and

often shape the facility planning process. A new influence occurred after the adoption of the 2006 Master Plan when the Legislature passed new legislation in 2007 on Accountability, Efficiency, and Oversight of State Facilities Planning and Management. The legislation initiated a significant effort to advance the state's oversight, management, and financial analysis of statewide facilities housing state government, specifically in office and support facilities. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) created the Facilities Oversight Program to oversee real estate procurement and management by applying statewide perspective within the analysis, as well as long-term planning, policy development, and statewide facilities portfolio management. Those changes dramatically changed the process. The 2006 Master Plan doesn't address the new direction and instead speaks to DES as the responsible agency. Today, DES planning efforts are integrating with statewide planning efforts.

Every two years, OFM will work with DES and state agencies to develop a Six-Year Facilities Plan. The plan adopts facility solutions responding to specific goals, such as facilities meeting the business needs of state agencies, healthy, safe, and sustainable facilities, and ensuring facilities are efficient in the use of state funds. To date, three six-year plan updates have been submitted with the next update for 2015-2021 beginning in March for consideration by the Legislature in 2015.

OFM has a comprehensive planning and engagement program to bring state agencies together to align long-range facilities planning with the agencies' strategic and business plans and budgets. DES believes its long-range facilities planning process and OFM's planning process will serve to inform both processes. The integrated planning process will integrate owned inventory with leased inventory, which OFM previously focused on.

The facilities planning process includes four elements of the State Capitol Master Plan, Long-Range Facilities Plan, 10-Year Capitol Plan, and the State Capitol Sub-campus Plan. The State Capitol Master Plan is a value-based framework for basing decisions supported by principles and policies. The Long-Range Facilities Plan is a comprehensive analysis of the department's portfolio of state-owned buildings and land at the State Capitol and the two satellite campuses in Tumwater and Lacey. DES is working in collaboration with OFM, state agencies, and other key players to identify strategies for all assets to understand what's necessary to be good stewards moving forward. In addition to establishing strategies, the process identifies schedules for various needs. It's important for DES to identify the timing for any significant investments, acquisitions, opportunities for redevelopment or new development, or when disposal or demolition of property might be necessary.

Working with OFM will be beneficial because OFM has current information about each agency's business priorities and facility requirements. DES can apply specific statewide policies and master plan policies during the process to develop the Long-Range Facilities Plan, as well as other DES policies pertaining to highest and best use and OFM's policies on alternative workplace strategies. Working together creates a synergy to provide a higher level of advancement in how well the state manages its facilities. DES can utilize the OFM model for the planning process and adapt it to different circumstances, such as owned versus leased inventory.

Ms. Miller asked for assistance from the CCDAC to assist in the update of the State Capitol Master Plan update as well as in the development of the process for the Long-Range Facilities Plan through development of the plan.

Senator Fraser asked how leased facilities and/or preferred leasing areas are factored within the planning process. Ms. Miller replied that the coordination between OFM and DES is important as OFM is charged with the primary responsibility of overseeing leased inventory. The role of DES has been predominately transaction-based. Interfacing with OFM affords sharing information on leased inventory.

Senator Fraser questioned how design considerations are factored for preferred leasing areas as those areas are considered part of Capitol Campus. Ms. Sweeney replied that DES established the policies for Preferred Leasing Areas (PLA) and Preferred Development Areas (PDA) in conjunction with local governments. The policy of how those areas are defined is the responsibility of DES. The CCDAC has provided advice on the PLAs and the PDAs in its role as advisory to the State Capitol Committee (SCC). The Statewide Six-Year Facilities Plan process is both strategic and tactical, considers owned and leased office and warehouse space statewide, and applies the PLAs, which is coordinated jointly by OFM and DES. The Statewide Six-Year Facilities Plan process was prescribed by law in 2007 and OFM has been working with all state agencies and in collaboration with DES. At this time, it's important for the CCDAC to provide guidance on some of those issues as part of the work of the workgroup. The six-year facilities planning process is approximately a 12-month process that is presented to the Legislature in December. The plan aligns with the Governor's proposed budget. After decisions by the Legislature, those decisions are implemented by DES.

Secretary Wyman arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Taylor asked whether the definition of "owned" and "leased" is strict in terms of real estate terminology and whether the state owns all buildings on Capitol Campus with lease space located off the campus. Ms. Miller advised that there are specific parcels of land owned by the state within the community with some under the management of DES and some under the management by other state agencies.

Ms. Sweeney added that OFM, through the Statewide Six-Year Facilities Plan, is responsible for the entire state, but the scope has been determined to be owned and leased office, warehouse, and laboratory space. Additionally, the State Capitol Master Plan and the Long-Range Facilities Plan tie to the entire Capitol Campus and Lacey and Tumwater campuses, which have been determined to be within the campus.

Ms. Miller said the current and previous master plans applied the principles to all state properties within Thurston County. However, the application of the principles was the responsibility of the agency having management responsibility with key transactions requiring CCDAC and SCC review and approval.

Senator Fraser asked whether such oversight includes buildings leased on land outside of the vicinity of the Labor and Industries Building. Several state facilities are located in Tumwater that are not located within the subarea campus.

Ms. Sweeney said the Statewide Six-Year Facilities Plan includes those properties. However, the State Capitol Master Plan does not include those properties.

Ms. Sweeney introduced Amy McMahan, State Facilities Oversight Manager, OFM, and Rick Bushnell, Facilities Analyst, OFM.

Ms. Miller reported that the master plan describes PDAs and established some design expectations for leased properties that are different in quality than the buildings on state and campus properties.

Senator Fraser remarked that some years ago, there was debate about what constitutes the State Capitol because of how a provision within the State Constitution describes the State Capitol. Consequently, the Legislature established a definition by statute that the State Capitol Campus encompasses the urban

growth areas of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater. Any update of the State Capitol Master Plan should include the entire area. The cluster of office buildings in Tumwater is substantial and affects the campus.

Ms. Sweeney suggested the questions are good workgroup discussion items as there are no preconceived notions of how broad or specific the Capitol Master Plan update should be. Things have changed since 2006 and the questions are appropriate for the workgroup to discuss and provide guidance.

Chair Haskell recalled that the two branch campuses were addressed in the master plan, which provides some framework for the discussions.

Director Liu remarked that the discussion would help to better define what the Capitol Campus Master Plan is in terms of what methodology should be addressed. The questions are issues staff was hopeful members would address.

Senator Fraser added that CCDAC's responsibility is to consider Capitol Campus and not just DES properties. The broader perspective is CCDAC's responsibility while DES has two responsibilities – DES properties and supporting the CCDAC and the SCC in the larger context of the State Capitol Campus. In 1990, there was a plan for two sub-campus and those plans were never developed with other activities occurring on an ad hoc basis. This effort should consider the campus as a whole as the Capitol is defined in statute as the urban growth area. The CCDAC is responsible for considering transportation and community design, which would not be possible unless the entire realm of properties is considered. Large clusters of leased properties should be included within the planning process.

Director Liu said the CCDAC could determine through its workgroup what should be considered as part of the planning process. It's important to include the conversations to enable DES to shape the entire Capitol Campus to include all auxiliary properties, transit planning, teleworking, and mobile work forces because all those factors should be considered comprehensively as the process explores what the campus should look like in the future.

Ms. Miller added that there are many other organizations, individuals, and institutions that would be engaged in the planning process.

Marygrace Jennings, introduced DES project members Bonnie Scheel, Michael Van Gelder (not in attendance), and Tony Ifie.

Ms. Jennings introduced the Stewardship Model. In recent years, staff recognized that the role of ownership and planning for state capitol facilities includes a role of stewardship, as well. The Stewardship Model is based on the values of the 2006 State Capitol Master Plan, which includes four cardinal points of Stewardship (goal and ultimate direction to achieve), Purpose (center of democracy, pride & symbolism, and service), Sustainability (wise use of resources, financial performance, technical), and Interconnectiveness (place, people, time).

Purpose was referred to as "function" within the 2006 plan and it speaks to the "why" of supporting the services of state government, supporting the center of democracy, enabling those services and the exercise of democracy for first amendment rights and democratic representations. Campus artwork and monuments speak to ideals and culture heritage, and the architecture and sense of place create a 'face' for state government.

Sustainability was referred to as “durability” in the 2006 plan and it relates to more than just the environment. It involves the wise use of natural resources and wise uses of economic and cultural resources accomplished in part through technical excellence and sound financial performance.

Interconnectiveness speaks to people, place, and time. It’s the engagement required to develop the plans, as well as informing the planning process in the development of the plans. Interconnectiveness is recognition of the environment socially, culturally, and physically. Transit plans are important for moving people from one place to another. A person’s experience is important through memories and anticipation of the future.

Four subordinate points of the Stewardship Model speak to areas of accountability. The Hopi tradition is meeting the needs of the current generation without compromising the next seven generations. It’s important to consider today’s impact on future generations. Fiduciary accountability is important to customers, employees, and the democratic process.

Additional elements of the planning process speak to how DES plans to engage in planning and stewardship, as well as considering mindfulness, collaboration, respect, and innovation, which are from the agency’s Strategic Plan. The center of the Stewardship Model compass includes planning cycles of short- and long-term plans, adaptation, and ongoing performance.

The goals of the Master Plan update is taking care of existing inventory and optimizing value, and planning for the future by becoming leaders in facility planning by addressing the changing environment, reflecting current values, making master plan more relevant and actionable, and filling gaps.

Ms. Miller reviewed goals for the Long-Range Facilities Plan:

- Integrated
- Relevant
- Actionable
- Innovative
- Sustainable
- Needs based
- Data driven

Staff proposes the following for the workgroup process:

- Identify issues for:
 - Update of Master Plan
 - Development of Long-Range Facilities Plan
- Provide expertise, diverse perspectives, guidance, and recommendations
- Help shape public engagement plan
- Review, analyze, and provide feedback on documents

Ms. Miller reviewed a proposed timeline based on some unknown assumptions in terms of the workgroup’s participation. The timeline includes scheduled CCDAC meetings in 2014, estimated regular meetings in 2015, and 13 workgroup meetings over a 20-month period. The timeline includes scheduled SCC meetings for 2014 and projected for 2015. The master plan update would begin in March with adoption by November 2015.

The Long-Range Facilities Plan includes developing the plan. Additionally, the 10-Year Capital Plan requires an update. Completion of the Long-Range Facilities Plan by December 2015 would help inform the update of the 10-Year Capital Plan in January 2016.

Based on the estimated workload, staff recommends scheduling the first meeting in March. The timeline includes 13 meetings in addition to the regular CCDAC meetings with a meeting duration between three to five hours. Meetings could possibly be held in Seattle to accommodate member schedules. Ms. Miller recommended a workgroup of four to five members to provide diverse perspectives and expertise.

Director Liu emphasized that the timeline is proposed at this point. He asked for feedback on any other factors that might affect the timeline and whether the commitment is reasonable to accomplish the goals.

Chair Haskell acknowledged the timeline is a good starting point and that after the formation of the workgroup, the timeline can be refined after some issues are identified. He volunteered to serve on the workgroup and asked Ms. Olmsted to serve on the workgroup because of her involvement in the landscape master plan.

Senator Fraser, Mr. Rolluda, and Mr. Taylor volunteered to serve on the workgroup. Secretary Wyman expressed interest in serving but had some concerns about the time commitment. Representative MacEwen expressed similar sentiments. Chair Haskell noted that the workgroup would provide regular updates on the status of the planning process during CCDAC meetings.

Chair Haskell affirmed workgroup members as Dennis Haskell, Karen Fraser, Alex Rolluda, Susan Olmsted, and Jonathan Taylor.

Mr. Taylor cited some experience in many committee meetings on large projects and emphasized the importance of strong leadership especially if the meetings are lengthy. Meetings exceeding several hours in length are generally not as effective. Some of the first meetings could involve narrowing the scope and the goals to help focus the workgroup.

Chair Haskell agreed that the first few meetings would involve formulating the process and the schedule.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, May 22, 2014 at 10 a.m.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:18 a.m.