



CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dennis Haskell, Alex Rolluda, Jonathan Taylor, Susan Olmsted

Secretary of State Kim Wyman

Senator Karen Fraser, Senator Ann Rivers

Representative Sam Hunt, Representative Drew MacEwen

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

September 18, 2014

10:00 AM

(Approved: November 20, 2014)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair
Jonathan Taylor
Senator Karen Fraser
Secretary of State Kim Wyman
Representative Sam Hunt

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Ann Rivers
Representative Drew MacEwen
Susan Olmsted

OTHERS PRESENT

Jim Anderson, Washington State Patrol
Leonard Bauer, City of Olympia
Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit
Rick Browning, Department of Enterprise Services
Kim Buccarelli, Department of Enterprise Services
Victoria Buker, Sellen Construction
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services
Debra Delzell, Department of Enterprise Services
Elizabeth Derrick, ZGF Architecture
Mike Eggleston, Washington State Patrol
Jim Erskine, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Mark Gjurasic, Gov. Bldg. Owners & Mgr. Assoc.
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Steve Hall, City of Olympia
Arlen Harris, Department of Enterprise Services
Darlene Heglund, Department of Enterprise Services
Shelley Sadie-Hill, Department of Enterprise Services

Tony Ifie, Department of Enterprise Services
Jim Keller, Site Workshop
Eddie Kung, ZGF Architecture
Marygrace Jennings, Department of Enterprise Services
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Steve Masse, Legislature
Lenore Miller, Department of Enterprise Services
Brian Nguy, Department of Enterprise Services
Deanne Price, Department of Enterprise Services
Trina Regan, Department of Enterprise Services
Nadia Sarno, Office of Financial Management
Bonnie Scheel, Department of Enterprise Services
Dan Simpson, ZGF Architecture
Helen Wheatley, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Comm.
Rick Williams, Rick Williams Consultant
Matt Wood, Washington State Patrol

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. A meeting quorum was not attained but was attained later in the meeting.

CCDAC

Minutes of Meeting

September 18, 2014 Page 2 of 17

CCDAC will review four items for Action: Approval of May 22, 2014 Minutes, 2015 Calendar, CCDAC Handbook, and the Capitol Campus Rezone; three items for Information and Discussion: Chair and Vice-Chair Recommendations, Facilities Reports – *Ongoing Campus Projects, 2015-25 Ten Year Capital Plan and Budget Request, and Ruckelshaus Center Situational Assessments*, and the Capitol Campus Planning – *Master Plan Update and Transportation and Parking Study*.

Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Director Chris Liu announced the reappointment of Dennis Haskell to the CCDAC in the Urban Planner position. Senator Ann Rivers was appointed to the CCDAC on July 8, 2014 and is unable to attend the meeting because conflicts with another legislative meeting. Members received a copy of Senator Rivers' biography. Senator Rivers represents the 18th District (Vancouver area). Director Liu recognized the remaining members of the CCDAC. Representative Sam Hunt and Senator Karen Fraser are scheduled to arrive shortly.

Notice of the meeting agenda was published in *The Olympian* newspaper.

Public comments will be accepted after the conclusion of agenda items.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was accepted as published.

Approval of Minutes – September 18, 2014

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Representative MacEwen, to approve the minutes of September 18, 2014, as published. Motion carried unanimously.

CCDAC Administration – Chair and Vice Chair Recommendations & 2015 Calendar

The item was deferred until establishment of a quorum.

CCDAC Handbook

The item was deferred until establishment of a quorum.

Capitol Campus Rezone – Status Update

The item was deferred until establishment of a quorum.

Facilities Reports – Ongoing Campus Projects

Bonnie Scheel provided an update on campus projects. Currently, seven major projects are in progress:

Legislative Building Exterior Repairs Phase 3

The project is continuation of exterior work from previous project phases. The intent is to conclude the project by mid-November 2015.

Capitol Campus Underground Utilities

The project repairs and/or replaces utility lines under Sid Snyder Way. Utility lines affected include steam lines, chilled water lines, potable water lines, sanitary sewer lines, fiber optics cable lines, irrigation lines, and power lines. The project is proceeding well with traffic detoured during the construction phase. The project is scheduled for completion by mid-November 2015.

East Plaza Stair Tower Replacement and Waterproofing Retrofit Project

The project is a continuation of the work begun on the East Plaza many years ago. The project is reconstruction of stairway towers one and eight because of deteriorating steel beams and panels along

with replacement of the elevator. The project is intended to resolve safety issues involving the elevator and the stair towers.

NRB Roof Replacement and Multipurpose Room Water Infiltration

The 20-year roof has numerous perforations creating leaks. The project replaces the roof. Project completion is scheduled in November 2014.

Capitol Court Roof Replacement and Window Repair

Roof replacement and repairs are scheduled for completion by mid-October 2014.

Critical Campus Steam System Repairs and the Governor's Mansion Boiler Replacement

The project replaces chillers and repairs the steam system. Savings achieved from increasing efficiencies will be used to fund the Governor's Mansion boiler replacement project.

Archives Building HVAC Upgrade

The project upgrades the HVAC failing system in the Archives Building. The project is scheduled for completion by December 2014.

2015-25 Ten Year Capital Plan and Budget Request

Ms. Scheel reviewed project highlights spanning the next 10 years for Health and Safety, Preservation, and Sustainability projects, as well as new construction projects. The plan includes construction funds for the 1063 Block project.

Ruckelshaus Center Situational Assessments

Ms. Scheel reported Ruckelshaus Center is a neutral third party conducting a situational assessment on Capitol Lake for DES. Senator Fraser connected the Department with the Center earlier in the year. The Center began working in August 2014 and is scheduled to issue a report by December. The report will inform recommendations to DES and to the Legislature for future funding for the management of Capitol Lake.

Secretary Wyman asked about the purpose of the \$350,000 for Capitol Lake long-term management within the 10-year capital plan. Ms. Scheel said the funds continue the master planning work initiated during the biennium. The planning work has been conducted in-house with the assistance of CCDAC members. Those funds would support consultant assistance to assist in the more technical aspects of site analysis, building capacity, programming, and working with other agencies to determine business needs.

Secretary Wyman questioned how DES plans to incorporate the cost if the assessment recommends dredging and how the efforts of CCDAC, State Capitol Committee (SCC), and the Center's project fit together in terms of the DES budget request. Ms. Scheel said the capital budget includes a \$350,000 request for moving forward with the Ruckelshaus process to the next steps, which could include convening community meetings to move consensus forward or pursuing third-party scientific analysis. The funding request is a placeholder in anticipation of the outcome of the Ruckelshaus assessment to ensure the process continues moving forward.

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, DES, added that the CCDAC and SCC's involvement is a standard process whereby DES, as the property owner for the State Capitol, identifies issues that are presented to the CCDAC to receive feedback and advice. After the committee believes sufficient information has been received, the committee typically forwards a recommendation to the SCC. The SCC may request additional information. At the point of the decision by the SCC, the committee has the authority to make

CCDAC

Minutes of Meeting

September 18, 2014 Page 4 of 17

decisions regarding the future management of the facility in conjunction with a separate legislative process.

Director Liu spoke to questions about permitting for a dredging operation. At one time, it was believed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would be heavily involved. However, the process is initiated by DES through the Department of Ecology to complete an ecological study.

Senator Fraser arrived. A meeting quorum was attained.

Director Liu reported the last ecological study was completed in 2009. Part of the Ruckelshaus process is coalescing all science completed on Capitol Lake. Various competing groups are arguing to either move forward or delay. The Ruckelshaus process identifies all issues by all interests and potential auxiliary issues attached to major issues to determine mutual agreement and disagreement with respect to the science. By all appearances, a three-tiered decision might be necessary to determine whether the lake converts to an estuary, remains a lake, or no action is pursued. Other stakeholder group proposals have been submitted through public meetings affording more than three options. The Ruckelshaus study ensures identification of all issues to help all stakeholders completely understand the issue. Considering the time spent on Capitol Lake in relative terms, progress is moving quickly in resurrecting an issue that needs to be addressed for the community and for the state to arrive at a solution rather than continuing to delay the decision. The process should involve the entire community by bringing all stakeholder groups together to discuss options for the future of the lake. Using it as a model, it is likely possible to coalesce all groups for determining the future of Capitol Lake.

Secretary Wyman supported the process as other volatile and contentious issues have benefitted by the work of the Ruckelshaus Center.

Director Liu recognized Senator Fraser for providing the link to Ruckelshaus Center.

Approval of Minutes – May 22, 2014

Jon Taylor moved, seconded by Secretary Wyman, to approve the minutes of May 22, 2014, as published. Motion carried unanimously.

CCDAC Administration

Chair and Vice Chair Recommendations

Ms. Scheel advised that the Chair and Vice Chair positions expire on October 10, 2014. Members are asked to nominate two members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair during 2015. RCW 43.34.080 directs the Director of DES to appoint the positions.

Vice Chair Rolluda opened nominations for the Chair.

Vice Chair Rolluda nominated Dennis Haskell as Chair. There were no other nominations. Director Liu approved the nomination and appointed Mr. Haskell as Chair.

Chair Haskell opened nominations for Vice Chair.

Chair Haskell nominated Alex Rolluda as Vice Chair. There were no other nominations. Director Liu approved the nomination and appointed Mr. Rolluda as Vice Chair.

2015 Calendar

Ms. Scheel requested the committee's approval of the proposed 2015 committee meeting dates:

CCDAC

Minutes of Meeting

September 18, 2014 Page 5 of 17

- Thursday, February 19
- Thursday, May 21
- Thursday, September 17
- Thursday, November 19

Jon Taylor moved, seconded by Secretary Wyman, to approve the 2015 meeting dates as proposed, with the understanding the dates are subject to change based on circumstances. Motion carried unanimously.

CCDAC Handbook

Chair Haskell reported the committee has reviewed and offered some revisions. The last revision was the inclusion of a reference to legislative actions forming the CCDAC.

Jon Taylor moved, seconded by Secretary Wyman, to approve the CCDAC Handbook as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Capitol Campus Rezone

Ms. Miller requested the committee's feedback and direction on the City of Olympia's request to rezone Capitol Campus. DES received notification from the City of Olympia in May on a proposal to rezone the State Capitol Campus to include three other parcels. The City is currently updating and adopting a revision to its comprehensive plan and the City wants to ensure development rules and ordinances complement and support the comprehensive plan.

The proposal would change Capitol Campus (currently under five different zoning designations) zoning to one zoning district – a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning district. A PUD is an area where a developer plans to develop property and prepares a master plan for future development. Typically, the City Council approves the master plan, which establishes zoning for the area. This case is unusual because the state has the authority to develop and that's been the practice for the last 30 years. The proposal reflects a housekeeping measure to ensure the zoning code aligns with the reality that the City doesn't apply the zoning code to the State Capitol Campus, as well as ensuring citizens understand that Capitol Campus is zoned differently. The proposal would rezone Capitol Campus to a special PUD that stipulates the SCC has the authority governing Capitol Campus and that the master plan adopted by the SCC would provide for future development of land use and development requirements that DES, CCDAC, and the SCC ensure are followed.

The proposal led to conversations on defining the boundary of Capitol Campus. The beginning point for defining the boundary was the Capitol Campus Master Plan's definition of the boundary of the campus and other parts of the community. Staff reviewed statutes and other rules that speak to the State Capitol as well as DES practices. Staff identified six different changes to the proposed boundary as currently defined in the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan.

Ms. Miller reviewed the six proposed changes to the existing campus boundary:

1. An addition of a site commonly referred to as the ProArts Building and the State Farm properties the state acquired after the development of the Master Plan in 2006.
2. Addition of the Legislative print shop building fronting Washington Street and a building located directly south currently leased to private businesses. The properties were part of the Dolly property acquisition in 1982.

CCDAC

Minutes of Meeting

September 18, 2014 Page 6 of 17

3. The addition of the Dolliver Building housing the Secretary of State Office off Capitol Way, which was acquired in 1999.
4. The addition of the old Capital building across from Sylvester Park.
5. Exclusion of property located at 600 S Franklin that the state no longer owns.
6. Exclusion of right-of-way area not owned by the state.

Representative Hunt arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Miller said the next step is presenting the proposal to the SCC for support in moving forward for the City of Olympia to change the zoning of the State Capitol and the boundary of Capitol Campus. Staff is seeking a recommendation from the CCDAC to the SCC.

Ms. Miller addressed questions from the committee. The proposal essentially aligns the State Capitol to the City's current practice and the authority of the state. The City's comprehensive plan doesn't speak to Capitol Campus other than references to the close collaboration between the State of Washington and DES and how the City has the authority to issue various permits. DES staff and Olympia staff have had several meetings on the proposal.

Senator Fraser asked about the timeline for adoption of the proposal. Ms. Miller said the City's schedule includes approval of the comprehensive plan in November with the rezones presented to the City Council for consideration in December. Senator Fraser asked about any additional provisions in the City's zoning code concerning PUDs. Ms. Miller said the City has other PUDs within the City, such as Bristol Court. A small parcel of state land is currently designated as a PUD as part of the Evergreen PUD. Senator Fraser recommended having the committee receive the proposed zoning code provisions for the proposed state PUD. Ms. Miller shared information on staff's previous request for details of the proposal because of the importance provisions within the PUD meeting the state's expectations outlining the authorities of the SCC and the role of the CCDAC and DES, and that the Master Plan is the governing document for land use and development. Senator Fraser recommended deferring any recommendation until the committee receives the proposed amendment to the City's zoning code. She asked whether Deschutes Parkway along the west side of Capitol Lake is within the campus boundaries. Ms. Miller advised that some sections of the road are owned by DES and other portions are included in a long-term lease with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The road is state property with roadway maintenance the responsibility of DES.

Representative Hunt asked whether the large mansion located near the railroad tracks off Deschutes Parkway uses state property to access the private property. Ms. Miller said the owner has obtained an easement for access. Some improvements were completed without the approval of DES and discussions continue with the property owner.

Mr. Taylor asked whether the proposal would essentially help both the state and the City. Ms. Miller said the proposal would codify what is currently practiced. Often, the City receives calls from citizens with complaints and it often involves confusion over what is state property versus city property. The proposal would assist in better serving citizens as they would become better informed when reviewing the zoning map.

Chair Haskell said most zoning codes include statements defining a PUD and provisions for rules and procedures with identification of existing PUDs within the jurisdiction. He asked whether the proposal includes general commentary about PUDs and their role. Ms. Miller said that based on information from the City, the proposal is not the typical ordinance for a rezoning. It would be different because of the unique situation. Chair Haskell asked that the committee receive information on a general statement

addressing zoning for the campus that overrides general provisions within the ordinance, as the ordinance establishes the PUD and what it can and cannot do to include additional specifics, descriptions, and limitations for the State Capitol PUD. It would be beneficial for the committee to receive both documents.

Senator Fraser asked whether the DES legal counsel reviewed any language. Ms. Miller said legal counsel is aware of the proposal and is assisting in the boundary issue but has not reviewed the proposed language. Senator Fraser asked about any options for pursuing another zoning designation rather than a PUD as she has some of the same concerns as the Chair. Ms. Miller advised that the City's planning department developed the proposal based on available options within the existing zoning code. She offered to follow up with the City to review other options rather than designating the campus as a PUD. Chair Haskell agreed it would be preferable to learn whether the PUD designation is the best option. Senator Fraser suggested asking legal counsel to research all options. The Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) likely has examples from other states. Chair Haskell suggested the proposal would better fit within a special use district.

Leonard Bauer, Community Development Deputy Director, City of Olympia, affirmed PUDs are included in the City's codes with general language, which was deemed the closest option aligning to the special circumstance of the campus. The City would be receptive to discuss a different zoning designation, such as a special use district that would be reflective of the campus.

Chair Haskell said that based on the committee's input, there appears to be agreement to pursue a special designation for the campus. Ms. Miller confirmed more information would be provided at the November meeting.

Senator Fraser shared information on her participation in a recent arbor tour of Capitol Campus. During the tour, she learned West Campus is registered as an official historic district. That designation should be acknowledged during the master plan planning process. Ms. Miller said the district designation is through the U.S. Secretary of Interior. Marygrace Jennings added that West Campus is designated as a national register historic district.

Capitol Campus Planning

Master Plan Update

Ms. Miller reported in December 2013, DES and the CCDAC formed a workgroup to work on the update of the master plan. The workgroup has developed a draft purpose statement, discussed the master plan authority and boundary, developed a draft work plan identifying critical items to address within the update, and developed a project plan and schedule.

In terms of purpose, the intent of the plan is providing a clear vision to guide future planning decisions to ensure responsible stewardship of the campus moving forward. It is important the master plan include a framework for decision-making as new development and decisions are rendered regarding the campus, as well as laying a foundation for integrating planning with the local community.

The work plan identifies areas of focus. Those areas include the boundaries, alternative workplace strategies, strengthening Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and parking sections within the plan, and improving future visitor experiences on the campus.

The authority and boundary is the scope of the master plan as it determines what the plan oversees. At the last workgroup meeting, members discussed and agreed the master plan should be the comprehensive plan for Capitol Campus with auxiliary inclusion of satellite campuses and leased properties. The master

plan includes broad policies or strategies. Some examples include consolidation and co-location of state government in the community, design guidelines and quality (high performance buildings), and how the campus contributes to community vitality. Strategies and policies with more specificity are applicable to the Capitol Campus in terms of focusing on visitors, function, and highest and best use models for tenancy requirements, etc. Strategies and policies are included for the physical elements of the campus to include open spaces, circulation, and axis and view corridors with members agreeing more detail should be included in the plan on the physical element of the State Capitol grounds. Opportunity sites have been identified in the master plan, which will be further developed on the campus and at satellite campuses. Members agreed with the need for a satellite master plan; however, the update of the master plan will provide guidance and direction to the future satellite master planning effort. Additionally, members discussed specific issues related to Preferred Leasing Areas (PLAs) and Preferred Development Areas (PDAs) that have relationship to leased inventory.

Ms. Miller said next steps include presenting updated elements of the update to the SCC to receive feedback throughout the process rather than presenting the draft plan at the end of the update process.

Transportation and Parking Study

Rick Williams, Principle, Rick Williams Consulting, presented the results of the Transportation and Parking Study. He thanked the DES team, Intercity Transit, and other staff members who participated in the study entailing 13 review drafts.

Mr. Williams reviewed and described the work completed since the last briefing in May and recommended key actions. The major scope of the study was parking and transportation in terms of existing condition of parking supply and how non-parking modes of access improve and create more parking efficiencies on the campus. The study also considered impacts to parking supply caused by the new 1063 Block project. Basic criteria for defining parking constraint identified campus employee parking in excess of 90 percent, (practical capacity) and parking exceeding 85 percent for visitors.

The campus was surveyed three times over the study year to determine a baseline during non-session and assessment two times during the legislative session. The study considered the blended average of the occupancies and constraints during the legislative session. During the non-session, the entire parking supply is 75 percent occupied of the total 6,100 employee and visitors parking stalls on the campus. During peak hours between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m., 1,500 stalls are empty with visitor supply the most underutilized parking supply. Six hundred visitor parking stalls are located on the campus or 10 percent of the total parking supply. The campus has 35 parking areas of which nine would have exceeded practical capacity during the non-session. During the session, parking capacity is nearing combined practical capacity in both visitor and employee parking. During the same peak hour, only 964 parking stalls are empty and available, which may not be conveniently located. Visitor parking facilities are extremely constrained. Eight of the 11 visitor parking facilities exceeded the 85 percent threshold during peak hours. Employee supply was below 90 percent practical capacity but it was nearly 85 percent. Parking is difficult throughout the campus.

The study considered the impact of the 1063 Block project in terms of existing surface and garage parking the project removes and the assumption of 400 new employees in the new building. All assumptions are documented in the report. The new project increases practical capacity levels above practical capacity, particularly during the legislative session unless status quo parking patterns change or are influenced by other measures. To avoid and reduce the need to provide more parking supply, the state must strengthen the campus parking management by improving the communication and signage systems and increasing access to information on available parking supply as well as emphasizing more TMD efforts. The

Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) goals established for the campus should be a goal the state should strive to achieve because it would have significant impacts on the amount of parking needed.

During the non-session, the impact is within the employee parking areas. The addition of the 1063 Building did not significantly affect visitor parking supply. Overall, combined parking during the non-legislative session increases from 75 percent to 83 percent.

The study evaluated campus CTR performance in meeting the goals established for each agency on the campus. Today, the established goals are not being achieved. Drive-alone rates are above 75 percent since 2003 with some minor fluctuations; however, combining the overall results for all agencies, the campus has a 77 percent drive-alone rate. Performance tracking was very difficult to achieve because there is no single source for the campus, which could be improved.

CTR could serve as a significant mitigating factor for parking supply by reducing 77 percent drive-alone to the target goal of 65 percent drive-alone both for the 1063 Building and in the near term, employee and visitor growth. CTR is an important option and tool and should be pursued through reaffirmation of intent and setting up the organizational systems to achieve the outcomes. However, that effort would be challenging and complex because of the complexity of the campus. If the campus could meet CTR goals, the construction of 395 parking stalls would be unnecessary to restore the parking system to levels below parking capacity. The value of 395 parking stalls at \$40,000 per stall total \$14.8 million to \$15.9 million. At a value of \$60,000 per stall, the total is \$16 million to \$18 million.

A previous question by the committee in May regarded the value of that parking per year versus using the funds for another purpose. The value of financing a parking cost between \$16 million to \$18 million would total \$1.2 to \$1.8 million annually in debt service, which does not include operating/maintenance costs. As the study identified, some balance of parking with CTR would be very cost effective.

Since May, many datasets have been refined, performance outcomes have been re-verified, and staff is working on report language and tone, as well including new ideas from staff. Additionally, the effort engaged Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, a transportation planning engineering firm, to evaluate non-parking infrastructure. Section 8 within the report summarizes the Nelson\Nygaard work with another technical memorandum detailing some of the specific recommendations. The task was identifying gaps in the current system that limit the ability to maximize and leverage transit, biking, and walking. Recommendations from the consultant linked well with the 36 recommendations contained in the report.

The final document has completed extensive internal review and five study sessions with internal and external partners.

The report includes 36 recommendations with details for each recommendation. The recommendations are intended to build upon one another as well as reinforce the four areas of implementation – policy, consolidation and organization changes supporting the balancing of CTR and parking services, specific operational recommendation on managing existing supply more efficiently, and funding.

Key recommendations include:

- Reaffirmation of the goals and objectives of the joint comprehensive CTR program and plan.
- Implement price parking by demand rather than at flat rates, which could be seasonal during legislative session and non-session.

- Consolidate the delivery of CTR and Parking Services under a Campus Access Manager.
- Provide adequate amenities to serve alternative modes of travel.
- Promote telework and flexible work schedules. The state's goal is 9 percent of all employees should be teleworking. Achieving that goal would save nearly 500 parking stalls. It's also one of the most cost-effective TDM programs.
- Evaluate a range of programs that incent people to consider other modes of travel.
- Restripe the Plaza Garage to add more parking stalls.
- Consider satellite locations, such as Deschutes Parkway with its 350 parking stalls.
- Equip leaders on campus with messages that TDM is an active component of the campus parking program and that parking and TDM are integrated on a consistent basis.
- Centralize performance tracking.

Mr. Taylor asked for additional information on the option of fluctuating parking fees during session and non-session. Mr. Williams said it would entail the application of technology to count cars on the campus through sensor systems or loop detectors in the road. The information would be communicated to roadway dynamic signage with lots assigned names and information displayed on the availability of parking stalls. Over the long-term, the state could take advantage of cell phone apps or a webpage for conveying parking pricing and availability. Variable pricing would depend on parking demand and availability. Many cities and government campuses across the nation employ variable pricing dependent on parking demand with rates higher during high peak hours and lower during low peak hours. Mr. Taylor asked about options for the average visitor who is attempting to attend a meeting and needs to find a parking space in the shortest amount of time, and whether technology systems are effective in helping visitors find parking by effectively reducing frustration. Mr. Williams said technology systems would reduce a visitor's frustration as a user of the campus by helping in the quickest amount of time and increasing the effectiveness of available parking. The second aspect is more difficult to answer as it pertains to how far the state is willing to increase rates to effect a person's decision to travel to the campus in another mode. The information system would make it easier to use existing supply. The complexity and challenge is using rates to match with transit, walking, and biking and the goals to achieve utilization of those modes. During legislative session, the cost of an employee pass could be similar or greater than the cost of a transit pass. Mr. Taylor pointed out that the savings could potentially pay for the technology. Mr. Williams replied that the report conveys support for evaluating the trade-offs.

Senator Fraser asked whether the recommendations are for action by DES. Mr. Williams said the recommendations are actions for the entire campus led by DES. DES would take the leadership role to implement the recommendations. One of the recommendations is establishing a campus-wide parking and CTR manager along with a quasi-transportation management association whose board of directors are represented by each agency employee transit coordinator.

Senator Fraser asked where the CTR program is currently housed. Ms. Miller said each agency has a CTR program. The program is tracked on a countywide basis. For Thurston County, Thurston Regional Planning Council is designated as the agency to track data on state agencies and other employers that fall under the CTR law to ascertain performance measurements under TDM and CTR goals. Currently, the campus has no assigned authority for managing the CTR program. The goal is to achieve a 65 percent drive-alone rate by 2015. Within the operating budget request from DES, a position was included to manage and work with all state agencies on campus in promoting participation in the program to achieve CTR and TDM goals to help reduce parking demand. DES also requested funds to restripe the Plaza Garage to create more capacity. Additionally, DES requested authority for the City of Olympia to assume responsibility for parking enforcement on the campus, which is currently under the Washington State Patrol (WSP). Effective parking enforcement assists in managing the appropriate use of parking supply.

Within the DES capital plan, some funds were requested for parking and transportation planning to consider future improvements to help support CTR goals.

Senator Fraser recalled earlier legislation directing a centralized approach for all state government in the greater campus area. She encouraged staff to review prior statutes. It was noted that a consolidated approach was assigned to GA and subsequently transferred to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Ms. Miller offered to follow-up on the statute.

Senator Fraser asked whether the study analyzed the number of employees living beyond the immediate campus area because achieving a 65 percent drive-alone rate would necessitate more transit options to the north. Mr. Williams said the team initiated an effort to geocode where state employees live. DES is the only agency that has the data for its employees. One of the recommendations through the consolidated program is to initiate a geocode project for the campus to identify the location of where employees reside and overlay existing transit and bike systems. DES is one of the best CTR performers on the campus. The data could help identify why there are differences between successful versus unsuccessful agencies.

Senator Fraser said many employees use vanpools. She asked whether vanpools were factored in the study. Mr. Williams affirmed vanpools, carpools, and other ride-sharing options were factored. The report prioritizes vanpools over carpools because they consume less parking. Geocode information would be useful for connecting employees with vanpool options.

Chair Haskell asked whether the study considered on-site shuttle service to shuttle people to, from, and between parking facilities. Mr. Williams said the Nelson\Nygaard report considered shuttle service in terms of gaps by improving existing shuttle service. Chair Haskell expressed interest in learning more about the savings achieved by investing in a transit system on campus with connectivity to other transit systems. Mr. Williams said it was examined, but there are no specific recommendations other than acknowledging the gap exists. Chair Haskell expressed interest in further studies on the option.

Ms. Miller agreed the study provided a good source of information, but more work moving forward is necessary. The study will assist the Master Plan Workgroup in considering how to integrate strategies and policies to assist the campus moving forward.

Mr. Taylor commented on the technology available in the airport rental car industry in terms of moving vehicles and assigning spaces. Mr. Williams affirmed the technology is available and works well on campuses.

The meeting was recessed from for a break from 11:42 a.m. to 11:56 a.m.

1063 Block Replacement Project – Design Review Update

Rick Browning, 1063 Block Project Director, updated the committee on the status 1063 Block.

Since the last update, no major changes occurred in the project definition. The project is a five-story, 215,000 square-foot high performance office building targeted to achieve LEED Platinum certification sited on West Capitol Campus at the corner of 11th and Capitol Way. Major tenants include WSP and OFM, and several legislative sub-agencies. DES successfully negotiated a three-phase contract with a Design-Build team with notice to proceed on design services only. Because of technical flaws in the original legislation, the legislation must be corrected to secure funding from the Legislature for construction. If funding is authorized, a notice to proceed for demolition followed by construction would follow.

Currently, the design phase is underway with the first portion consisting of a 90-day period for scope validation. Three teams submitted detailed design proposals. The validation period ends September 26. The validation period included a series of over 50 meetings with all stakeholder groups. The outcome of the extensive review resulted in no major design flaws or the need for any design changes. Most of the secondary changes can be easily accommodated within the envelope of the building.

A public workshop on ground level amenities and urban design was scheduled in late September but transitioned to a combined DES/City of Olympia three-day charrette on the greening of Capitol Way. The public workshop has been rescheduled for October to accommodate participation in the City's charrette.

Victoria Buker, Sellen Construction, reported Sellen Construction is a Pacific Northwest company based in Seattle and established in 1944. The company has worked closely with ZGF Architects for over 30 years with over \$500 million in projects completed in 2012. The most recent Design-Build project is the Federal Center South project of \$74 million in Seattle for the Army Corps of Engineers.

Other team member self-introductions included Jim Keller, Landscape Architect, Site Workshop, and Eddie Kung, Elizabeth Derrick, and Dan Simpson, Principle, ZGF Architects.

Mr. Simpson provided additional background on the experience and capabilities of ZGF Architects. The company has a successful relationship with Sellen Construction in Design-Build and has worked with a number of high performance workplace environments for private sector clients.

Mr. Simpson provided a high-level overview of the team's presentation and reviewed design drivers for the 1063 Block Replacement project. The building would become a model for future state offices and the made in Washington aspect of the building the team is striving to achieve. He shared several design illustrations of the building design and described the site's relationship to the West Campus, which also serves a gateway site linking the City to the north along the edge of the property to the campus. The building design would marry the interior environment to the exterior environment bringing the outside in and breaking down the scale of the new building into a series of smaller components.

Mr. Simpson described the building design composed of a series of 68-foot wide wings with one wing joined by an open porch on the side facing the Olmstead lawn to create civic scale and express a welcoming and openness between the public and building occupants. The corner facing the City is at the intersection of Capitol Way and Union. The scale of the building on the corner is one story higher than the south side of the building due to the 16' slope from the southeast corner to the northwest corner creating a one-story grade change. The proposal for the south side with the main porches unifies the building by the two flanking wings with an adjoining porch with columns while on the north side, the design would be somewhat opposite to create a three-part urban edge to relate to the scale of the City.

Mr. Keller said the site affords the ability to be the first new building on the West Campus overlooking the historic Olmstead lawn, as well as a catalyst to help the Olmstead Brother's vision that wasn't completed when West Campus was first developed. The Olmstead Brothers plan never achieved the understory shrub layer to compliment the big trees currently in existence today. According to the historic landscape master plan, the trees are beginning to decline and may need to be replaced. The site affords an opportunity to transition the garden envisioned in the Olmstead plan to the new site running from the front porch into the building and down through the building ending at the City side. It affords a visitor to the building an experience of entering the garden, which is what the Olmstead Brothers strived to do and which was completed successfully in a number of parks across the country.

Mr. Kung said the block is a unique site unlike most other buildings on the West Campus, which are object buildings in the greater Olmstead environment of landscape. The 1063 Block is an extension that creates edges between the City and the state. The goal is extending the Olmstead vision into the building with some different kind of elements of a sunken garden and fountain.

Mr. Simpson spoke to the increased environmental standards of the Northwest and the intent of leveraging the idea of connection to nature both inside and out but at bigger level. He shared an illustration of the inner court and the connection of the exterior realm entering the inside the building. The two narrower wings on the two lateral sides of the porch present a bicameral concept matching the two houses in government with the two wings in the building. A third wing is located on the City side forming the backside of the inner courtyard containing atrium space connecting the two entry points with a one-story separation with an internal staircase and elevator. The elevators are open-air elevators. Those are core elements occupying space within the center zone, as well as open and enclosed interactive spaces, such as conference rooms and lounges and breakout spaces shared by tenants and accessible to the public within the building. Those features are the organizational model of the building with common spaces in the middle and individual and flexible workspaces around the edges with a series of walkways and bridges connecting all the elements. The front porch spans a 50-foot height along with an upper view terrace to the north capitalizing on the views to the north over Budd Inlet and the Sound.

Mr. Keller said one important aspect of the project is saving the large oak tree on the corner by pushing the sidewalk back and bringing people into the garden. The building uses durable materials for the plaza and entry spaces with stairways for accessing the side wings of the plaza and a small stairway in the front.

Mr. Simpson added that the idea of transparency and extending and expressing the civic scale refrains from creating a classical portal or gateway but creates as much openness and connection from inside as possible. Behind the front glass wall on the upper levels, some interactive spaces will be programmed. The team is considering different options for exterior materials. Precast is one of the top contenders. If selected, it would include a mix of aggregate from the actual Wilkinson stone, which was the quarry source for most of the exterior stone on campus. The quarry no longer produces larger quantities of dimensional building stone. However, the goal is to obtain some pavers or site wall pieces.

Mr. Keller said that in terms of landscaping with respect to the Olmstead Brothers plan and the current master plan of the historic landscape, it would entail working closely with the state's botanist to design a seasonal landscape to serve as the catalyst for restoration of the Olmstead lawn.

Mr. Keller displayed images of potential durable materials for the front porch and open spaces, stairs, and seating.

Mr. Simpson said the building would include some weather protection, a collective sense of scale and welcome, and that the front porch area will serve as the forecourt to the building with connectivity to the campus.

Mr. Taylor asked about accessibility to the building without stairs. Mr. Keller identified the location of the parking drop-off area, which features a level entryway with parking located at the higher level, which is level with the building. The building is situated so that the main level is flush to the end of the block away from the intersection.

Mr. Simpson reviewed an illustration of the building from the Capitol Way side. The entire block is considered a gateway or transition zone between the City and Capitol Campus. The lower end is near the intersection of Union and Capitol Way and relates more to the City whereas the upper level near 11th

relates to the campus and lawn with the linking transition in the middle of the block. As the team considered the design of the façade, the intent was providing a unified connection at the upper level while providing a variety of interesting experiences at the pedestrian scale.

Mr. Keller reported the team is working with City of Olympia staff to develop an appropriate streetscape design for Capitol Way. Some consideration was afforded to retaining existing street trees along Capitol Way; however, ideas continue to be shared. Any outcome will include street tree presence along the street, as well as the inclusion of landscaping against the building.

Mr. Kung spoke to the change in the building scale, which includes winding of sidewalks along Capitol Way and a change in building materials from precast/stone to porous materials on the building at the corner of Union. At some point, the sidewalk widens to bring the pedestrians around to the Union entrance of the building.

Mr. Simpson reviewed some of the materials for the building façade ranging from stone or precast stone as a border and shielded window areas by a series of angled planes with screens designed to improve the energy performance of the building. Details continue to be reviewed with design impact and performance qualities mapped and calculated. Illustrations were shared of the building from the upper corner at Capitol Way and the lower level near Columbia. Discussions are underway with the state for potential parking along Columbia outside the scope of the project to address parking issues.

Mr. Simpson described the intent and form of the window screens, which are angled and open up toward the north to improve building energy efficiency. The team is evaluating whether to include operational windows from a security perspective at ground level.

Senator Fraser asked whether the operability of the windows would be at the discretion of employees or tied to the building system. Mr. Simpson advised it would be up to the employee's discretion to open and close windows dependent upon the building occupant policy.

Mr. Simpson reviewed energy efficiency ratings for the windows and fins during peak times of solar activity. He described the different types of materials that could be used dependent upon the degree of operability of the windows. The area is subject to summer breezes from the north with most of the winter weather generated from the south or southwest. The fins are oriented in a way that takes advantage of solar load reduction and providing natural ventilation.

Ms. Buker reported that one of the benefits of the Design-Build process is including the curtain wall vendor to assist ZGF in determining the best window solution to maximize the value for the building.

Mr. Simpson reviewed the Union Avenue elevation comprised of three major elements. He displayed several cross sections and interior views. The top floor includes an exterior terrace. Mr. Kung added that the profile of the façade wasn't deliberately parallel with the site because of the angle along Union. The desired option affords an opportunity to increase the amount of openness for a public plaza at Union and Capitol Way. Mr. Keller said the setback also afforded an opportunity to provide a large landscape plaza area. Some additional options include planting a new heritage tree or including artwork to transition West Campus to the corner as a new gateway for the City. Union also includes curved bulbs and parallel parking with an electrical vehicle charging station and curb drops. Landscaping on that side would assist in stormwater control with flows infiltrated in the landscape to afford cleaning of the water before discharging from the site. The roof deck includes some areas for shade, landscaping, and seating. The roof deck is accessible through a series of walkways from the center core of the building.

At this time, the team is estimating that 20 percent of the building materials could be sourced from Washington State with the intent to expand that amount as design proceeds. The team is considering internal wood finishes of salvaged or reclaimed materials from buildings within the state. The team is striving to develop the notions of made in Washington and Washington connections within the interior design themes existing within the historic mural. A potential site has been identified for re-installment of the mural.

Mr. Simpson shared illustrations of internal areas and described some of the preferred design details related to office space, conference rooms, location of the elevators, upper views, stairs, and environmental design, energy, and sustainability features. Current benchmarks metrics for energy use index (EUI) for office buildings target a score of 45, which previously was 88. The design teams projects the building achieving 30.1 EUI per square foot per year. Additionally, the east and west flanks of the building each have 39 vertical fins representing one for each county within the state.

Senator Fraser said she recently learned that the two historic trees in front of the building have extensive root systems that extend a great distance beyond the trees. Mr. Keller advised that the team is engaging the arborist team that worked on the Historic Master Plan for the West Campus to ensure any construction impacts are mitigated for the preservation of the trees because of the value of the trees.

Mr. Rolluda asked about the extent of security within the building since the building would house WSP. Mr. Browning said a recent meeting was held with WSP and other tenants to discuss building security and operational philosophy. The current design does not preclude a closed building or an open building with public access on both sides of the building. All tenant areas would be secure with a key card or an escort. It's possible for public access on the upper floors in the open space areas. The discussion is ongoing and it's likely some compromises will be determined.

Mr. Simpson said the current design assumes public access to the atrium and walkways. To privatize those areas would require some front door security. Atrium edges includes a series of open railing with some glass walls and full height walls, which vary dependent upon the need for privacy, security, or restricted access. Along some of the open walkways, some doorways limit public access of segments of the walkways to provide some control of the workplace zones.

Mr. Taylor asked about the status of the design work as there hasn't been any progress shared from the competition. He asked about next steps. Mr. Browning replied that the current activity is the scope validation period, which is a process to ensure the preliminary design is on track prior to investing in document production and moving forward on full design. The first milestone submittal is the 40 percent submittal. At this time, the process is not near that milestone. Because of the scope validation, some redesign of the interior would be likely, such as the distribution of some of the divisions for State Patrol, which will entail another exercise prior to executing the document production. The process is several months away from the 40 percent submittal.

Mr. Taylor complimented the team for considering the site first because the proposal affects the entire campus. He asked about any other discussions on the core design and expectations by the team as it moves forward. He would prefer to view more models and renderings that speak to the experience for the campus as much as for the building users.

Mr. Simpson said the design is still in the preliminary stage. The question pertains more to the appropriate balance of civic and collective experience within the building. The team has focused on balancing the programmatic goals, such as daylighting and common activity areas. Moving forward, the team plans to continue seeking adjustments in some of the balance.

Mr. Browning commented on the campus need during session for small meeting areas for visitors to the campus. Currently, there are minimal resources to accommodate those needs on the West Campus. The building may become popular for that kind of use if the building can be open to some degree. At this point, it hasn't been determined but there appears to be some demand for that type of use.

Secretary Wyman agreed the design and the concepts for the building are all wonderful. However, she cautioned that another prior proposal for the Heritage Center was initially to house the library and archives on Capitol Campus. The proposal expanded and grew into what could be considered the "Taj Mahal." The proposal died for several reasons, one of which was the economy, but the basic reason was questions about building a grand building during a difficult financial period to house state employees. She urged the team to consider the commons areas and identify the benefits for the public because the state is spending much money for a building at the end of the day houses state employees. The Heritage Center was controversial even though it would have housed the state's history and historic documents. This building speaks to office space that could be moved off campus for considerable less achieving the same result. The question is why a building is being constructed on Capitol Campus at such high standards when it could be constructed off campus or even leased for a lot less money while achieving a better return on investment. She cautioned the team as it moves forward as those issues would be difficult to justify.

Mr. Browning acknowledged that the team has also considered those same concerns. The building affords many potential public amenities and the tenant groups have made progress towards a higher efficiency standard for utilization of space. Legislative sub-agencies began the process with over 50 percent of private offices for staff. The legislative groups were able to move to nearly an entirely open space moving from 50 percent to less than 10 percent of closed office spaces. OFM and WSP have made similar changes. The intent is better utilization of the space, as well as becoming a template for future state office buildings to achieve high efficiency. The work is not easy and requires a leap of faith from some of the tenants.

Mr. Kung added that the number of conference rooms have been reduced to the various agencies, which increased the cost initially. Now conference rooms are shared within the commons.

Secretary Wyman pointed out that the comments were not intended as critical, but to highlight the political realities the team will contend with in selling the building.

Representative Hunt added that the lifetime costs should be factored as well of an 80-100 year-old building versus a 30-40 year-old building. He asked whether the ground floor on the side facing Capitol Way includes any commercial or leased space for local businesses. Mr. Simpson responded that the building is fully programmed to house state tenants. Mr. Browning said the potential has been discussed of providing coffee commercial service in the atrium floor serving visitors and staff.

Mr. Taylor complimented Mr. Browning and the team for their great job.

Chair Haskell referred to the committee's production of its Design Opportunities Report. The committee should receive information on how the team plans to address some of the issues in the report as the process proceeds. One in particular, is how the new building relates to the GA Building site and potential outcomes on that site in terms of setting a precedent for potential action for the GA site. The GA site is an important corner of the campus. He suggested the team should also consider how the building contributes and complements the existing cluster of original buildings. He recommended against too

much iconic and becoming part of the composition, as the scale of the porch might be too large and not at the correct scale.

Mr. Browning said the committee's next review could include addressing how the design fits or does not fit with the CCDAC's Design Opportunities Report.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting

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

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 1:08 p.m.

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