



## CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Dennis Haskell, Alex Rolluda, Susan Olmsted, Architect Vacant*

*Secretary of State Kim Wyman*

*Senator Karen Fraser, Senator Ann Rivers*

*Representative Sam Hunt, Representative Drew MacEwen*

Legislative Building, Senate Rules Room 220

416 Sid Snyder Avenue Southwest

Olympia, Washington 98504

**June 6, 2016**

**10:00 AM**

*(Approved: September 15, 2016)*

---

### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dennis Haskell, Chair  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair  
Susan Olmsted

### **MEMBERS ABSENT**

Architect Position - Vacant  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Senator Ann Rivers  
Representative Drew MacEwen  
Secretary of State Kim Wyman

### **STAFF PRESENT**

Bob Covington, Department of Enterprise Services  
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services  
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services  
Nathaniel Jones, Department of Enterprise Services  
Marygrace Jennings, Department of Enterprise Services

Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services  
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services  
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services  
Lenore Miller, Department of Enterprise Services

### **OTHERS PRESENT**

Steve Masse, Legislative Staff  
Leonard Bauer, City of Olympia  
Kyle Overmiller, Legislative Staff

Jen Masterson, Office of Financial Management  
Ding Ye, Reid Middleton, Inc.  
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services

### **Welcome and Announcements**

Vice Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. A meeting quorum was not attained.

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**

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Susan Olmsted, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.**

*Chair Haskell arrived at the meeting.*

**CCDAC**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 6, 2016**  
**Page 2 of 11**

The CCDAC reviewed the following items on the agenda and deferred approval of the March 31, 2016 minutes lacking a meeting quorum. Informational briefings included: Renaming of campus buildings – *Office Building Two & 1063 Block Building*, Artwork for the 1063 Building – *5% Art Allowance, Building Graphics, Relocate GA Building Mural & State Seal*, Capitol Campus Exterior Lighting Upgrades, Campus Utility Renewal Plan – *Budget Proviso*, and Capitol Campus Planning - *Master Plan & Campus Predesign*.

**Approval of Minutes – March 31, 2016**

Action to approve the minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

**Renaming of Campus Buildings**

***Office Building Two & 1063 Block Building:***

Ann Larson, Director of Government Relations, briefed the committee on the proposals to rename Office Building Two (OB2) and the 1063 Block Building.

Current statute provides the Legislature authority to approve naming new or existing buildings on the State Capitol grounds based on recommendations from the State Capital Committee (SCC) and the Director of the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) with the advice from the Capital Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC). RCW 43.34.090(1)(b)(i) and (ii) states:

- (b) A new or existing building may be named or renamed after:
  - (i) An individual who has played a significant role in Washington history;
  - (ii) The purpose of the building.

Previous efforts to rename OB2 include:

- In February 2014, the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) Secretary Quigley requested that the OB2 headquarters building be renamed as the “Human Services Building.”
- With advice from the CCDAC and the SCC, the DES Director recommended OB2 be renamed to the “Human Services Building.”
- During the 2015 Legislative Session, House Concurrent Resolution (HCR 4401 was submitted at the request of DES. The resolution passed the House with unanimous support, but was unsuccessful in the Senate.
- During the 2016 Legislative Session, the House resolution was reintroduced and passed the House with unanimous support, but did not pass the Senate. However, the Senate introduced a companion Senate Concurrent Resolution, which failed to pass from Senate Rules.
- Both resolutions failed because of a lack of interest by members.

DES administration contacted DSHS about renaming the building. The agency is interested in moving forward with agency-sponsored legislation and asked DES move forward with an agency request.

Representative Hunt agreed there was lack of interest. As the prime sponsor of a House resolution, his efforts to solicit interest by the Senate to rename the building were fruitless. Not only did Senate members not see the need, they also did not want to take time to pursue action. OB2 is a terrible name and he is hopeful action can move forward to rename the building. He asked whether DSHS is considering any other alternative names.

Ms. Larson replied that during conversations with DSHS staff, agency staff expressed interest in renaming the building to reflect its purpose as the “Human Services Building.” Language was drafted for introduction during the next session. DSHS expressed interest in pursuing a joint concurrent resolution with DES as an agency request.

Ms. Larson reviewed efforts to rename the 1063 Block Building. During the 2016 Legislative Session, the supplemental budget included language renaming the 1063 Block Replacement to “The Helen Sommers Building.”

Helen Sommers was elected in 1972 as the representative for the 36<sup>th</sup> Legislative District. During the 1973 session, Ms. Sommers was one of 12 women in the 98-member House. At that time, there were no women in the Senate. Ms. Sommers served in the House from 1972 to 2009. When she retired, Ms. Sommers was the state’s longest serving legislator.

Representative Hunt expressed support for the proposal.

Ms. Larson said potential next steps for both renaming requests include no action, support agency-request legislation to rename OB2 and advise the SCC to recommend reintroducing a joint concurrent resolution with DSHS, advise the SCC to move forward on a process to introduce an agency-request legislation to name the 1063 Block Replacement to “The Helen E. Sommers Building,” or identify alternative options for either/both building names.

Representative Hunt reported that there is strong sentiment in the House to rename the 1063 Block building as Ms. Sommers served 36 years in the Legislature and was the first women to chair the Ways and Means Appropriations Committee. She led actions promoting equal pay for women. Ms. Sommers currently lives in Florida with her sister and suffers from dementia.

Director Liu recommended receiving feedback from the committee at its next meeting to afford direction to DES on both naming proposals.

Chair Haskell apologized for the inability to act on the requests because he fully supports both naming proposals.

**Artwork for the 1063 Building**  
*Art Allowance of .5%*

Chair Haskell acknowledged Marygrace Jennings, Cultural Resources Manager.

Ms. Jennings reported the Art in Public Places (AIPP) program was established in 1974 to acquire artwork for K-12 public schools, colleges, universities, and state agencies. New artwork is funded by ½ of 1 percent of the state’s portion of construction costs. The AIPP budget for the 1063 Block Replacement project is \$287,000 to include a fee for administration to the State Arts Commission.

Under the guidance of the State Art Commission, a seven-member Arts Selection Committee was established comprised of building tenants, a local artist, Arts Commission member, and Project Director Jon Taylor. Pat McLain, formerly with DES as the project director for the Legislative Building Rehabilitation project, serves on the committee as the local artist.

The committee is tasked to develop broad criteria and provide community context to a selected artist. The committee recommends options for siting large works of art in the building and selection of the artist to create a concept proposal. The committee reviews the proposal and approves the artwork.

The committee reviewed a list of available artists for work of this scale and narrowed the list during a subsequent meeting. On April 27, the committee selected Seattle artist Beliz Brother. Ms. Brother is an accomplished and recognized artist who completed several major installations of context-sensitive public art at Seattle City Hall and Harborview Medical Center.

Ms. Brother is scheduled to visit the site on Wednesday, June 8, and meet with the committee to become familiar with the committee's statements of value and context for the building. Ms. Brother will work with the architects to develop a concept proposal. The concept proposal and the final proposal would then be presented to the CCDAC for review and comment prior to final approval by the Arts Selection Committee.

The committee has a strong tendency to direct Ms. Brother to a single work-of-art rather than several smaller pieces. The preference is for an interior piece because more space opportunities are available within the building.

***Relocation of the General Administration (GA) Building Mural and State Seal***

The two works of art associated with the GA Building include the bronze State Seal located on the exterior of the building and the Jean Cory Beall mosaic mural commissioned by the State Capitol Committee (SCC) in 1956 and installed in 1958. There are no records in the archives of the commissioning process for the mural, other than there were a series of artists with Ms. Beall selected as the artist.

The future of the GA Building is uncertain at this time. Given that uncertainty, the SCC at its April 25 meeting directed staff to determine the necessary steps to protect artwork in the GA Building with a focus on temporary or permanent relocation.

The Beall mosaic mural has been considered a potential work-of-art for the 1063 Block Building. Additionally, the 1063 project team considered potential locations for the State Seal. At a practical level, DES explored necessary steps to relocate both pieces to the new 1063 Building. DES commissioned and completed a study in January 2016 on the potential cost and feasibility of relocating the Beall mosaic mural. The State Seal could be easily relocated or could be stored. However, because the mural is a curved surface directly applied, the artwork must be removed intact with the existing wall. The recommendation is moving the mural as one piece, which would be logistically difficult. Three opportunities were identified within the 1063 construction schedule recognizing that delaying action increases the cost. The earliest opportunity to move the mural to the building is when the construction crane is available on site. The mural could be placed by crane between October and November. That option is the most cost effective. Delaying relocation increases the cost and complicates the process.

Based on the timeframe and costs ranging between \$250,000 and \$300,000 to either relocate or store the mural, DES contacted the Capitol Furnishings Preservation Committee responsible for artwork and furnishings on the campus to assist in its fundraising capacity to raise funds to relocate the mural. Timing of the relocation does not enable legislative action except that it may be possible the Legislature could fund the project if DES delayed moving the mural. In the interim, DES is pursuing the possibility of seeking private funding.

Another issue surrounding the GA Building is its listing on the National Historic Register. Until clear direction is received on the future of the building, the state as the steward of the building and from a historical preservation standpoint should not select and move character-defining features from the building. As an agency, this creates a philosophical challenge in developing the proposal to demolish the GA Building.

Chair Haskell questioned the outcome of the previous three studies recommending demolition of the GA Building. Deputy Director Bob Covington advised that direction from the SCC was identifying and determining ways to preserve the artwork either through temporary or permanent relocation. The most recent study by the consultant is scheduled to conclude by summer. Given all elements, DES must identify ways to preserve important pieces of art. Upon completion of the 1063 Building, all occupants of the GA Building will relocate to the new building. At that point, the GA Building will be empty leading to concerns and issues surrounding the preservation of the mural. The direction from the SCC provided a good course for moving forward.

Ms. Jennings added that the direction by the SCC was important in terms of historic preservation. Anyone who is a fan of the artwork and even those not appreciative of the aesthetics understand that having a valuable piece of art located in a mothballed building does not afford justice to the artwork.

Chair Haskell asked for clarification as to whether the GA Building is planned for demolition or whether the SCC determines whether the artwork would be moved. Deputy Director Covington advised that DES received direction from the SCC to identify means or methods for the temporary or permanent relocation of the artwork. The key element is working within that direction to identify how DES protects the artwork pieces while acknowledging the historic significance of the building documented in previous consultant studies. Another consultant report is anticipated for completion by summer. He does not anticipate any surprise findings from the report in terms of similar information from previous reports documenting that the best value to the state is demolition of the building rather than rehabilitation.

Chair Haskell asked about the construction schedule to move the artwork. Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, advised that the draft consultant report would not be completed until September. Chair Haskell asked about the possibility of accelerating the work to enable coordination of all efforts. Ms. Miller responded that the initial review confirmed no definitive statement or data on why rehabilitation might not be the best option versus new development of the site. The consultant has been asked to accelerate completion of the report.

Mr. Rolluda asked whether any study has been completed on relocating the mural to the 1063 Building. Ms. Jennings advised that a site be identified in the 1063 Building located on the ground floor back wall near the elevators. The location provides a similar viewing distance as in the GA Building, as well as the ability to view the mural from several levels within the building. The floor also has multiple large conference rooms affording more visitor traffic than the mural currently has today.

Chair Haskell asked about the location of the State Seal as the drawings depicted the seal in several different places. Ms. Jennings affirmed the drawings depict the seal in three different places. She prefers the area above the 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue entrance because it escalates the importance of that entrance for downtown Olympia, as well as creating a more formalized entry.

Chair Haskell recommended staff should consider the schedule to ensure all actions are timely for the transfer to occur, as well as potentially extracting the GA Building site from the study separately as a way to prioritize the issue given the construction schedule of the 1063 Building.

Representative Hunt, Mr. Rolluda, and Susan Olmsted agreed with the recommendation.

Director Liu asked about the load rating of the crane located on the construction site. Bill Frare, Assistant Director for Engineering and Architectural Services, said the crane is rated of sufficient size to handle the mural. Director Liu asked about the availability of the crane from December through January for transferring the mural. Mr. Frare said the availability window for the crane begins closing in September. It is unlikely the crane would be available in December or January.

Ms. Jennings advised that Project Manager Jon Taylor has indicated the crane would be available from mid-October through mid-November to move the mural into the building. After June 1, building window walls are scheduled for completion in the new building. After that point, placement of the mural in the building requires removal of the window walls to roll the mural into the building and install the artwork. Timing of the relocation equates to cost effectiveness.

Director Liu recommended developing a cost estimate should relocating the mural happen outside the window of opportunity versus movement and storage of the mural. Ms. Jennings advised that staff is developing a draft of comparison costs.

Chair Haskell asked about the responsible party for development of the schedule to ensure the mural is moved. Deputy Director Covington advised that Engineering and Architectural Services is the responsible department. The greatest challenge is funding. Ms. Jennings has initiated some conversations about potential opportunities for funding.

Director Liu acknowledged funding is the greatest challenge, as well as a clear mandate to move the mural from the GA Building. Direction would be from the SCC, as well as the CCDAC, as some members would like the GA Building rehabilitated. Previous studies examined the building in many different ways over the course of three different efforts resulting in the same conclusion that it would be economically unfeasible to rehabilitate the building. It is important DES ensure the preservation of the art pieces.

Ms. Jennings added that staff also contacted staff from the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation to initiate some discussions.

Chair Haskell said it appears CCDAC members support advising the SCC to move forward as previously directed. Director Liu responded that DES would likely reconvene a meeting of the CCDAC to render a formal recommendation in the near term since a meeting quorum is lacking. Chair Haskell suggested considering a remote meeting via telecon for a single subject meeting.

Representative Hunt referred to the previous discussion on renaming the building and suggested including that topic as well, given the schedule for submission of legislative requests. Director Liu affirmed the request.

### ***Building Graphics***

Ms. Jennings reported on the status of the graphics and wayfinding package for the 1063 Building. The architects hired design firm, SC Studios, to develop a graphics package affecting all graphics from the typeface of the fire extinguisher box to the sign on the building. The goal is for a professional review to ensure consistency with respect to the style of the building. SC Studios developed an initial framework for the graphics, which are reflective of Washington State values and culture. The recommended themes

include Exploration, Discovery, Cultivation, Industry, and Preservation. The themes would be designated for each building level with different elements reflecting each particular theme.

To broaden vetting of the themes and the individuals selected to represent the themes through quotes, DES hired preservation professional and historian Michael Sullivan, a Professor at the University of Washington. Mr. Sullivan is working directly with SC Studios designers to review the work as well as sharing the themes within his professional network for additional feedback.

Next steps include SC Studios refining the details in the concept proposal with a complete package scheduled for review by the CCDAC prior to finalization.

Ms. Olmsted encouraged consideration of women in the state who have contributed to history, preservation, exploration, and discovery. Despite not having as much information, she encouraged staff to represent women when possible. Chair Haskell supported the recommendation.

### **Capitol Campus Exterior Lighting Upgrades – Information and Feedback**

Nathaniel Jones, Asset Manager, briefed members on the status of Capitol Campus Exterior Lighting Upgrades.

DES was directed to develop a Capitol Campus Exterior Lighting Upgrade Plan in the 15-17 Capital Budget to implement exterior lighting upgrades and to achieve energy savings. DES received \$1 million, which will be leveraged through performance contracting. DES also received some grant funding. The goals of the project are to increase safety through lighting, maintain the fabric, improve or maintain aesthetics, create savings, and use grants or energy savings for financing the improvements. The project area encompasses Capitol Campus grounds including the Old Capitol Building, Dolliver Building, and other off-campus locations.

DES completed an audit of the East and West Campus, Heritage Park, Sylvester Park, and the Deschutes Parkway. Currently, the process is in preliminary design with a series of internal stakeholder meetings completed.

The West and East Campus replacements apply only to exterior lights and do not include architectural lighting. Mr. Jones reviewed photographs of proposed light fixtures with two 46 watt LEDs proposed to replace higher wattage high-pressure sodium fixtures.

Along Deschutes Parkway, one existing type of fixture is the 400-watt street light. The proposal includes replacement with a modernistic fixture and LED light for energy savings. The second type of fixture along Deschutes Parkway is pedestrian lights of 70-watt high-pressure sodium light, which would be stepped down to a 24-watt bulb. In this case, only the bulb would be replaced with existing glass globes retained.

Representative Hunt inquired about the extent of the light output. Mr. Jones said the light output is similar with improved color rendition providing better definition and energy savings.

For carriage lamps, the proposal converts high-pressure sodium bulbs to LED lights.

Currently, the campus has a mismatch of light and color output across the campus. Lights on West Campus reflect an orange color typical of high-pressure sodium lights. The proposal reflects an even 4,000-watt Kelvin target across the entire campus except West Campus that would have a 3,000-watt

Kelvin for consistency with current lighting. Streetlights in the City of Olympia were recently retrofitted reflecting a 5,000-watt Kelvin target.

Mr. Jones reviewed lighting for Maple Park Avenue. Currently, the street has double-headed fixtures (flattened globes), which have been difficult to replicate to maintain aesthetics. The proposal replaces existing fixtures with a single fixture on each post rather than retaining the double-headed fixture. A variety of fixtures are available on the market and staff recommends a 112-watt fixture offering the greatest value in terms of initial capital cost and operating cost.

Mr. Jones invited feedback on light fixture aesthetics along Maple Park.

Chair Haskell commented on the difficulty of viewing existing fixtures along Maple Park.

Mr. Jones explained how the existing poles would be retained and the T-bar removed and replaced with a single-arm fixture. Ms. Jennings asked whether the transition from the pole to the post of the new fixture is of a similar diameter. Mr. Jones said it might be necessary to use a fitting because the objective is for the new fixture to use the existing pole.

Director Liu asked whether the proposal would also increase volume and quality of light. Mr. Jones affirmed the proposal improves lighting along Maple Park Avenue as the street appears dark to motorists and pedestrians today.

Representative Hunt asked whether the south side of Maple Park is the responsibility of the City. Mr. Jones said all proposed fixtures are located on state property, within the median, or on the north side, and would not replace the odd globe lamps on the south side of Maple Park Avenue.

Mr. Rolluda asked whether the existing fixtures face downwards. Mr. Jones replied that the existing lamps are not dark skies compliant and emit light in all directions. Most fixtures on campus are not dark skies compliant.

Ms. Jennings added that Maple Park Avenue is at the campus edge and includes residential on the south side with the Washington State Department of Transportation and Employment Security buildings located on the north side.

Mr. Jones noted that it is also possible for DES to shield residential buildings from light spillover.

Ms. Olmsted asked about any discussions surrounding the balance of dark skies while respecting historic character. Mr. Jones said the intent is to meet the requirements of dark skies standards. It is also easier to achieve with LED lights because light waves are directional as opposed to incandescent or high-pressure sodium lights. Ms. Olmsted asked about trade-offs. Mr. Jones advised that a full layout of all proposed lights is necessary to answer the question; however, the top side of the globe would likely be darker than the bottom, whereas today, the globe is emitting light in all directions.

Ms. Olmsted expressed mixed feelings about the proposal as she appreciates the aesthetics and the historic character of the globe fixture while also committed to sustainable design. She agreed it is a difficult conversation. Mr. Jones conceded that staff has not been able to identify an adequate replacement for the current fixtures along Maple Park Avenue.

Ms. Jennings expressed similar concerns as the fixtures speak to the period of East Campus development and the development of Maple Park. Existing lights tend to help bridge the gap from state government to

residential and are somewhat softer than the proposal. She expressed regret if the current globes are lost and not replaced with a comparable globe. Mr. Jones conceded that the proposal is a dramatic change aesthetically.

Ms. Olmsted agreed it would be beneficial to have consistent lighting throughout the campus. Energy savings are also important. Mr. Jones replied that the proposal would result in both energy savings and operational savings because the fixtures have a longer lifespan and require less maintenance.

Mr. Jones reviewed before photos of the Plaza Garage with high-pressure sodium lamps and after photos with LED lights. LED lights improved overall light quality and increase safety with a change in color rendering and uniformity achieving a 3,000-4,000 Kelvin target in color temperature scale. All wiring on the West Campus will be inspected and repaired because of the many challenges encountered by maintenance practices over the last several decades. Total exterior lighting energy savings is approximately 67% representing annual savings of approximately \$30,000. LEDs have 50% longer life than high-pressure sodium lamps.

Next steps include coordinating with external stakeholders (campus users, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, City of Olympia, and others) finalize material specifications, produce a detailed project schedule, and implement conversion by fall 2016.

#### **Campus Utility Renewal Plan – Budget Proviso**

Mr. Jones provided an update on the Capitol Campus Utility Renewal Plan.

DES received funding in the 15-17 Capital Budget to assess current utility conditions and develop a renewal strategy. The budget proviso requires a report by October 2016. Project boundaries are the same as the boundaries for the Exterior Lighting project. Current efforts include updating the campus underground utility map, as the last map was completed in 2009 of only the West Campus, and assessing conditions of existing underground utilities. The information will be used to draft the plan.

Mr. Jones reviewed the underground utility map reflecting an overlap of different utilities. The mapping program enables viewing of the map by layers. Staff is nearing completion in identifying locations of underground utilities and marking the location with spray paint for conversion to the electronic map. In some instances, staff has used ground-penetrating radar to locate utilities. Staff is also working on surveying and utility mapping.

The planning aspect involves a thorough review of all existing records by the consultant team. Condition assessment is pending when areas requiring more field inspection have been completed to assess conditions. Most of the utilities are electrical systems. The campus also has a utility tunnel. A camera to assess conditions will inspect the sewer and water lines. The campus is home to many brick manholes, which were contemporary when the West Campus was constructed. Many of those legacy systems are still in place.

The project entails identifying deficit components, prioritizing repair and expansion, producing a conceptual design and cost estimate for a limited number of priority projects to move forward to the budget process. After finalization of the report, DES is scheduled to submit the report to the Legislature on October 1. The strategy not only considers deficiencies but also coordinates with the Master Plan process to identify future expansion needs for Opportunity Sites and identify future service to accommodate growth. That information will be consolidated and included within the strategic plan.

Additional tasks include updating the Storm water Management Plan and Design and Construction Standards.

Mr. Jones referred members to a list of projects identified during previous processes.

**Capitol Campus Planning – Master Plan & Campus Predesign**

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, updated members on the status of the Master Plan and Campus Predesign.

Since the last meeting, the consultant team of Schacht/Aslani reviewed previous studies and reports completed on the Opportunity Sites. Staff and the consultant team toured the buildings and the sites and met with stakeholders to assess interest and to help identify what the planning process should address. The group included representatives from the City of Olympia, Thurston Regional Planning Council, Olympia Downtown Association, Thurston Economic Development Council, legislative administrators, Office of Financial Management (OFM), Visitor Convention Bureau, Intercity Transit, the Capital Budget Assistant, and campus parking managers. Representatives from the South Capitol Neighborhood Association were unable to attend. Another meeting is scheduled to meet with those representatives. Topics included transportation, parking, public and access, and Opportunity Sites in some key areas. Mr. Jones serves as the liaison for lighting and utilities.

Much of the conversation focused on transportation and parking needs during the session. From the Legislature and elected officials perspective, proximity and availability are important. Visitors were identified as a key issue as the campus is not meeting the needs of visitors to find parking easily, which is difficult during session. Many visitors who cannot find parking often park in adjacent neighborhoods. The consultant team plans to review all input and provide their expertise for informing the work on the Campus Parking Implementation Plan.

The City of Olympia spoke to a potential partnership with DES because parking demands during session often reduce demand for downtown parking presenting a partnering opportunity by sharing parking supply to meet seasonal demands. The conversation also included a desire to move forward with a more robust Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program. The conversation also recognized the importance of considering transportation changes in the future that might affect investments made today. The group's discussion also included current unmet needs during session.

The conversation on public use, access, and community vitality generated good input surrounding visitors and interest in meeting visitor needs. The campus is difficult to access, especially for buses with children or organizations creating difficulties in loading and unloading. Other issues involve basic fundamental needs such as an insufficient number of restrooms and the need to designate places to help visitors prepare and plan. Often, organizing by groups occurs outside or in empty offices in buildings. The conversation identified the importance of supporting different visitor needs. Additionally, difficulty in navigating the campus was acknowledged with suggestions on improving wayfinding and signage to improve the visitor experience.

The afternoon session centered on Opportunity Sites. The Master Plan Subgroup recently met and shared ideas on the Opportunity Sites from the previous work completed by the subgroup centering around what's driving development and what is the driving force. Representatives from OFM attended and shared information on the lack of any need for future presence on campus other than studying other state agency facility needs in the present as part of the update of the six-year plan. Space allocation between the House and the Senate was also discussed. The current plan includes the redevelopment of the Newhouse site and the Pritchard Building. The subgroup identified the Pritchard Building as a good

opportunity for visitor use, as well as utilization of the space more effectively by addressing ceiling heights to afford more space for House and Senate functions or public uses. The subgroup provided good feedback to the consultant team on potential use of the buildings to aid them in developing some concept proposals for future use of the buildings. The subgroup agreed to meet to advance the work to the next step.

Representative Hunt acknowledged the quandary surrounding space uses. Big tents are often installed on the grounds during session and then removed after a few days only to reappear for other groups. The campus grounds reflect a continuous series of large white tents because of the unavailability of meeting space for groups.

Chair Haskell shared his commitment to the subgroup and to the work of the Schacht/Aslani team, as it is important that their work support the Master Plan Update.

Ms. Miller reviewed next steps. The Schacht/Aslani team is nearing completion of the discovery phase and plans to present the initial assessments to DES. The next deliverable in early July are some alternative scenarios for each Opportunity Site. That presentation affords a decision point to select options to enable the Schacht/Aslani team to develop plans for each site. Some special meetings will be necessary during the summer. In early August, the Schacht/Aslani team will present a draft of the preferred alternatives for review and feedback. By the end of August, a draft review of the alternatives will be prepared for CCDAC's September meeting to provide feedback to influence the outcome of the draft that will be forwarded to the SCC at its October meeting to provide direction for finalization and forwarding to the Legislature by November 1.

Ms. Miller added that staff plans to explore opportunities for teleconferencing and utilizing shared digital documents to limit impacts to subgroup member schedules.

Chair Haskell added that there could be opportunities to engage in conversations between subgroup members and the consultant team on an ongoing basis.

Director Liu commented that as staff has explored new ideas for the CCDAC, it's important for members to share information on other successful models with staff. It is important for DES to deliver good service to the CCDAC, as well as meeting the needs of each member while meeting the needs of all citizens. Part of that entails a process that works for the entire team.

Chair Haskell remarked on the potential opportunities to review materials electronically. He expressed appreciation for staff's willingness to explore different meeting mechanisms.

#### **Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting is scheduled on Thursday, September 15, 2016 at the Jefferson Building.

#### **Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:29 a.m.**