



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

Department of Enterprise Services

Conference Room 2208

1500 Jefferson Street SE

Olympia, Washington 98504

March 31, 2016

10:00 AM

(Approved: September 15, 2016)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair
Susan Olmsted
Secretary of State Kim Wyman
Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Ann Rivers
Representative Sam Hunt
Representative Drew MacEwen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Architect Position – Vacant

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Aman, Schacht | Aslani Architects
Nathan Bren, Department of Enterprise Services
Kim Buccarelli, Department of Enterprise Services
Victoria Buker, Sellen Construction
George Carter II, Department of Enterprise Services
Peggy Clifford, S. Cap. Neighborhood Assoc.
Bob Covington, Department of Enterprise Services
Jim Erskine, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Stefanie Fuller, Department of Enterprise Services
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Zena Hartung, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services
Nathaniel Jones, Department of Enterprise Services
Patrick Kinney, University Mechanical Contractors, Inc.
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services

Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Scott Locke, University Mechanical Contractors, Inc.
Ron Major, Department of Enterprise Services
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Steve Masse, Legislative Staff
Jen Masterson, Office of Financial Management
Allen Miller, N. Capitol Campus Heritage Park Dev. Assn.
Lenore Miller, Department of Enterprise Services
Tony Mollas, Department of Enterprise Services
Brian Nguy, Department of Enterprise Services
CV Nguyen, University Mechanical Contractors, Inc.
Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council
Deanna Price, Department of Enterprise Services
Dan Simpson, ZGF Architects
Keith Stahley, City of Olympia

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A meeting quorum was 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

Susan Olmsted moved, seconded by Secretary Kim Wyman, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

CCDAC will review one item on the agenda for Action: Approval of the Minutes – *November 30, 2015* and three items for Information: Legislative Session Update – *Renaming of OB2 – Human Services; 1063 Block – Renaming to Helen Sommers; Extending Sid Snyder Avenue; and 120 Union Avenue Building, Campus Parking Strategy Implementation Plan I – Proviso Actions: Reduction to Reserved Stalls; Visitor Parking Lot Pilot Project; East Plaza Garage Improvements; Enhance Parking Enforcement; & Other Actions – Increase Visitor Parking Stalls, 10-Year Capital Plan Update – Briefing. Two Information and Feedback items - Campus CTR Program – Management Strategy & Progress & Capitol Campus Central Plant – Amendment to Assess Alternate Location, and one Guidance & Information item – Capitol Campus Planning – Master Plan Update: Opportunity Sites – Development Plans and Capitol Lake Management Plan.*

Approval of Minutes – November 30, 2015 - Action

Secretary Kim Wyman moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the minutes of November 30, 2015, as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Campus Parking Strategy Implementation Plan - Information

Proviso Actions:

- ***Reduction to Reserved Stalls***
- ***Visitor Parking Lot Pilot Project***
- ***East Plaza Garage Improvements***
- ***Enhance Parking Enforcement***
- ***Other Actions: Increase Visitor Parking Stalls***

Chair Haskell recognized George Carter II, Fleet Operations and Parking Services Manager.

Prior to Mr. Carter's presentation, Senator Rivers inquired about the number of parking spaces available at the Jefferson Building and the number of employees working in the building. Deputy Director Bob Covington advised that approximately 1,100 employees occupy the building. Approximately 285 parking spaces are located under the building as employee parking. A waiting list for parking is maintained by the Department of Enterprise Services (DES). Other parking for employees is located in the Plaza Garage. Visitor parking is located in front of the building and at a parking lot off Maple Park Lane. Parking is a challenge for the building especially with the training facilities located within the building.

Mr. Carter reported that in July 2015, DES was directed to develop a Capitol Campus Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan to include planned action items to reduce reserved stalls, complete a cost-benefit analysis on parking arms and parking attendants, consider a proposal from the City of Olympia to provide parking enforcement services, and increase capacity of the East Plaza Garage.

The Capitol Campus Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan was initiated based on several concepts surrounding parking as a valuable asset and because of the high cost to add more parking capacity. Some

of the recommended improvements include addressing those specific challenges that DES, employees, and visitors to the campus often experience. Often, parking is the first and last impression visitors have of the campus and challenges associated with finding parking can be frustrating to visitors. An assessment was completed of current conditions, opportunities were identified, and the proviso directives were factored to achieve some gains over the last eight months.

Effective parking management entails a better use of parking stalls by increasing efficiency. Parking Services moved to Fleet Operations to better align Capitol Campus transportation and parking services to reduce costs and increase convenience to users by helping them locate a parking space while minimizing the need for additional parking spaces.

DES submitted the Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan to the Legislative Fiscal Committee in November 2015. That process was coordinated in collaboration with consultants Shriver Starling Lane and Transpo. Both companies completed several similar projects in the Seattle area on college campuses with similar parking needs.

Senator Karen Fraser arrived at the meeting.

DES partnered with several internal programs to include Real Estate Services, Asset Managers, and Parking Services in discussions with agency representatives to determine ways to utilize existing parking resources as effectively as possible while still meeting agency needs.

Directives within the proviso include:

- Reduce agency reserve stalls. Reserve stalls are assigned by agencies for fleet vehicles, visitors, or for training purposes. The reserve stalls are not accessible to anyone else. Mr. Covington noted that the plan converts the stalls from reserved to zoned parking to increase accessibility while maximizing the use of stalls. Approximately 10 percent to 20 percent additional capacity is provided by reserved stalls.
- Complete a cost-benefit analysis of incorporating parking arms and attendants to accept payment for campus parking during legislative sessions. Information revealed that parking arms are not the most cost-effective way as there are challenges for including future technology to obtain data to assist in data-driven decisions.
- Install two electronic boards, or other methods of providing the available parking capacity in the East Plaza Garage.
- Work in cooperation with the City of Olympia to receive a proposal from the City to enforce parking on Capitol Campus.

Mr. Carter reviewed the status on each of the directives to date. Since September 2015, approximately 501 reserved stalls were converted to zoned stalls in collaboration with agencies working to assess their particular business needs. Some agencies with assigned fleet vehicles are taking advantage of the DES Motor Pool operation for daily rental reservations from 1 to 30 days. Some agencies were able to turn in fleet vehicles and use Fleet Operations vehicles freeing up reserved stalls for zoned parking. Pending efforts include conversion of 183 reserved stalls to reach the goal. Conversations are scheduled with several agencies over the next several months to meet the target goal.

Representative Hunt arrived at the meeting.

In consultation with the consultants, parking arms and parking attendants were determined to be outdated technology. The Implementation Plans seeks a strategic approach for integrating technology. Effective May 1, 2016, a pilot program will be launched utilizing pay-by-plate technology in the Dash Lot (14th and

CCDAC
Minutes of Meeting
March 31, 2016 Page 4 of 20

Jefferson) allowing visitors to key license plate numbers at the parking meter. Future applications could entail using a smart phone to pay for parking affording an ability to extend the number of parking hours if required.

Restriping a portion of the stalls in the East Plaza Garage is currently underway to maximize stall spaces by adding approximately 100 stalls, as well as improving wayfinding signage in the garage. DES is working with Transpo on the design of the stalls. Stalls designated as ADA (American with Disabilities Act) will be located near an elevator or an office location of the employee. Visitor stalls are also required by many agencies for employees who work off campus or are attending a meeting. The design includes designating areas for state employees attending meetings. Many employees are using visitor parking on surface lots. The new approach would free up more visitor parking by having employees use the garage for temporary parking.

During the recent legislative session, DES completed some metrics to assess parking capacity. The results indicated capacity is average in the Plaza Garage at 89.70% compared to the industry standard of practical capacity of 85% to 90% depending upon the type of parking lot. Some of the gains from the conversion of reserved stalls were realized during the legislative session.

The proposal for the City of Olympia to provide parking enforcement on the campus required preparation of a scope of work to assist the City's preparation of a proposal for parking enforcement. A draft proposal was reviewed by the City's Land Use and Environment Committee on March 17. The City submitted the written proposal to DES. DES is currently in the process of finalizing and negotiating the terms of a pilot program anticipated for initiation in September 2016.

Mr. Covington recommended providing a copy of the City's initial draft proposal to the CCDAC to afford an opportunity for members to provide feedback prior to finalizing the agreement.

Mr. Carter noted that as part of the pilot project, the City is requesting an interlocal agreement with DES, which is underway by the DES Contracts Division to ensure the framework benefits both agencies. Parking enforcement by the City will begin in the East Plaza Garage with surface lots added in the future. Because of the challenges associated with lots with multiple types of users, the City wants to ensure correct citations are issued.

Mr. Covington added that with the recent release of the budget, some adjustments were included for the scope of the parking enforcement proposal. Collaboration with legislative staff and some legislators is still necessary to ensure clarity of the budget proviso and compliance with the intent of the pilot project.

Mr. Carter reviewed progress on several of the plan's action items. Parking Services moved to Fleet Operations on October 1, 2015. The reorganization better aligns Capitol Campus transportation and parking services. DES hired a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Manager reporting to the Fleet Operations Program. The TDM Manager is making good strides in collaborating with several agencies and entities, such as Intercity Transit and Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) for implementing a holistic approach as to how employees travel to the campus using different modes of transportation. The parking office was relocated to the Capitol Court Building at the corner of 11th and Washington to increase accessibility and convenience to customers. The move should be completed by May. DES is developing policy criteria for reserved parking, ADA accommodations, and assigning stall requests for Capitol Campus. Agency assigned stalls will be reviewed to determine the need, length of use, and type of vehicle.

Next steps include:

*CCDAC
Minutes of Meeting
March 31, 2016 Page 5 of 20*

- Identify additional remaining reserved stalls and implement remaining reduction of reserved stalls.
- Pilot use of pay-by-plate technology at one visitor parking lot.
- Restripe Plaza Garage parking stalls to increase parking supply.
- Complete schematic design and cost estimate for an integrated parking management system at the East Plaza Garage.
- Work with the City of Olympia to implement a pilot program for parking enforcement at the Capitol Campus.
- Implement opportunities to increase visitor parking during legislative sessions.

Alex Rolluda asked whether electric charging stations are included within the plan. Mr. Carter affirmed electric charging stations are located in different areas of the campus. The need was identified during the restriping to ensure some dedicated areas are included for visitors, employees, and for the fleet. The goal is to convert 20% of the fleet to electric vehicles by 2017.

Susan Olmsted expressed appreciation for the number of strategies included within the plan, as well as the creative thinking to ensure best usage of existing assets by optimizing parking capacity. As the landscape architect member of the CCDAC, one area of concern is the distribution of parking particularly on the West Campus in places that were never intended to accommodate parking. A part of the conversation should be about strategic conversion or relocation to afford the opportunity to utilize civic spaces for citizens who wish to exercise their democratic freedoms. Specifically, areas should be considered for bus loading and unloading of children and tour groups. One other aspect is the inaccessibility to the Flag Circle to afford an opportunity to people who want to exercise their rights because the area is so convoluted with parking that wasn't initially intended to be in that location. She asked that the plan consider strategic relocation of parking as well.

Senator Rivers asked whether the Flag Circle area could be used for loading and unloading of children and other visitors from buses. Ms. Olmsted said the Flag Circle likely would not be the site for loading; however, one of the areas that would be conducive is the north diagonal and the Winged Victory Monument, which are part of the circulation. There are some questions about the Pritchard parking lot serving that use in the future. Further study would be necessary to support the possibility. The historic vision for the Flag Circle under the original Olmsted Brothers Plan was for the area to have a greater civic presence that would include sunken gardens and a reflecting pool. The parking strip was supposed to be temporary but because it was 1934 during the Great Depression, the temporary measure remained. There is greater potential for highest and best use in one of the most important civic spaces in the state.

Senator Karen Fraser expressed appreciation for the creativity involved in the work. She asked about the allocation of some 15-minute parking spots located throughout the campus for short visits and errands. She referred to information about the possibility of building a new parking garage, which was not mentioned in the update. Information she's received indicates the 120 Union Street Building is possibly under consideration for a parking garage. She asked whether any additional parking structures were factored in the planning because several years ago there was a proposal for placement of underground parking near the Flag Circle.

Asset Manager Lenore Miller responded that two projects are included in the 2015-2017 budget targeted as development sites. Four sites were identified initially at a minimum. An update on the sites is scheduled later in the meeting. The proposal includes a parking component in the east block of state-owned property located off Union and Washington that could include an above-grade parking structure.

Mr. Covington added that the House Budget originally included a proposal for a parking structure. Ms. Miller clarified that it was a conversation between DES and Office of Financial Management (OFM) staff surrounding opportunity sites and parking. The site affords an opportunity to build an above-grade parking structure, which is less expensive than a below-grade parking structure. The idea has been discussed between staff, as well as with legislative staff. Representative Hunt added that a proposal was included in the House Budget to redevelop Pritchard and the half block property.

Mr. Covington said that part of the proviso funds for the update of the Master Plan and predesign activities include a review of opportunity sites on the campus to include the portion of the block at Union Avenue.

Senator Fraser advocated for including parking structures as part of the long-range parking plan. She asked whether the plan considers different alternatives during peak periods during the session. Mr. Carter confirmed the plan addresses options for peak times of the year from January through April and peak hours from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. Senator Fraser added that peak hours often extend beyond 3 p.m. during the session.

Mr. Covington reported that during the session, staff delayed engagement with some agencies and legislative staff because of session activities. The plan would include those conversations and creative solutions for that area of the campus.

Senator Fraser suggested including a placeholder chapter within the plan to address those issues. She agreed more consideration is warranted for bus loading and unloading. Circulation and parking are two issues that need to be considered jointly. She encouraged improving community relations by adding signs on the campus allowing parking during non-business hours as many people believe they might be ticketed if they park on campus in the evening.

Representative MacEwen commented on the legislative parking lots and internal changes that might not be conducive to parking enforcement by the City. Mr. Covington advised that the intent of parking enforcement by the City of Olympia did not include parking enforcement in legislative lots unless legislative contacts requested enforcement action. An ongoing discussion is warranted as the proviso identifies parking enforcement on the East Campus except for diagonals. Additional clarity is required for the legislative lot areas and the ability of the City to enforce parking in the Columbia Street Garage and GA surface parking area. Resolution of potential issues is possible as the program is a pilot during the biennium to test the program followed by agency requested legislation to support ongoing parking enforcement.

Chair Haskell supported the comments by Ms. Olmsted regarding some of the public spaces on campus, as parking diminishes the campus and civic spaces while only providing a minimal amount of parking and convenience for a few people. Every effort to return those spaces to civic use rather than car use would enhance and benefit the campus.

Chair Haskell recognized the arrival of Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt.

Campus CTR Program – Management Strategy & Progress – Information & Feedback

Chair Haskell recognized Tomy Mollas, Transportation Demand Manager. Mr. Mollas briefed the committee and requested feedback on the Capitol Campus Parking Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Program.

Mr. Mollas reported he was hired by DES in January 2016 after working in the private sector with over 17 years experience in transportation logistics through United Parcel Service and State Farm Insurance Company. His experience involved distribution of space and parking stalls and metrics of measurements in the utilization of parking spaces.

Major integration exists between parking and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) to include the Commute Trip Reduction Program (CTR). In response to the parking proviso, DES established the Transportation Demand Manager position and integrated fleet operations, CTR Program, and the Parking Office because of the interconnection.

Parking on campus is a sensitive issue as often involves parking in areas requiring a person to walk some distance. The campus has sufficient parking to accommodate all users except many of the spaces are not located in the right area and most people do not know how to access those areas creating more confusion. TDM assists people in finding parking quickly.

The CTR Program is one of the few programs that not only benefits the campus but those visitors living outside of Thurston County and the environment. The main cause of greenhouse gas emissions is vehicles. Reduction of vehicles on the roadway is a win-win for both the campus and the environment.

DES is moving forward by providing leadership in the CTR Program for all state agencies by consolidating all resources to include Intercity Transit, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), TRPC, and other agencies to meet monthly to share information on resources, common goals, and steps to pursue to ensure the CTR Program is supported and implemented in a sensible way for those taking advantage of the program. One idea is enhancing commute alternatives through various discussions on multimodal transportation options to the campus. It is important to provide support to Intercity Transit and provide bicycle lanes to and from the campus through the downtown and from I-5. Reducing single occupancy vehicles to Capitol Campus is one of the goals. In recent time, vehicle miles traveled decreased since the last reporting cycle year by 9.7%. Many people are leaving their cars and traveling in alternative ways. However, when gas prices decrease, many people revert to driving causing an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). One way to reduce VMT is through incentives or disincentives to reduce single occupancy vehicles. Other ways to promote alternative modes is coordinating CTR events and fairs on the campus. On April 14, DES is sponsoring, in conjunction with other agencies/organizations, a Sustainability Fair to help promote green initiatives, the CTR program, and electric vehicles (EVs).

In addition to ongoing efforts, DES is leading efforts to reestablish the 2009 Joint Comprehensive CTR Plan for state agencies in Thurston County to increase the support and leadership role of state agencies in the CTR Program by ensuring all agencies are involved to help reduce drive alone trips and VMT. Previously, top down support was lacking for the program. Assigned Employee Transportation Coordinators (ETCs) are the lifeblood to ensure the CTR Program is effective. ETCs tend to be employees who working in other positions as many agencies do not dedicate ETCs as full-time. Subsequently, CTR is often an afterthought rather than a proactive promotion of the program to implement CTR policies. DES is promoting a commitment by agencies to issue a Declaration of Leadership Commitment to the CTR Program to ensure all leadership in each organization understands the program and the status of the CTR Program within their respective agency. Two top elements in every successful CTR Program are management leadership and an active, enthusiastic ETC. Strong leadership in every agency is important to ensure the CTR Program is successful. Additionally, to support agency efforts, it is important to reestablish a CTR dashboard for the program providing data on the current status of any CTR program on Capitol Campus.

Recent efforts by DES include:

- Streamlined the management of the Parking Office with Fleet Operations and TDM.
- Developed CTR on-boarding material for Human Resources for new employee orientation.
- Collaborate with the Learning Management System to provide students with information on alternatives modes of transportation when traveling to attend class on the campus.
- TDM Manager is now a member of the CTR Planning Committee for Thurston County. The TDM Manager will help lead the development of the Capitol Campus and Thurston County CTR Programs.
- Sponsoring and promoting the first ever, inter-agency CTR Program Fair for Capitol Campus with Intercity Transit, WSDOT, and TRPC on April 14.
- Identify, share, and collaborate resources from state agencies on Capitol Campus.

Next steps include implementing several transportation demand strategies:

- Capitol Campus CTR Program
 - Build on existing CTR programs and policies. The Interagency CTR Board adopted policies designed for consistency among state agencies.
 - Include LEAN strategies for parking management
- TDM Framework: TDM utilizes policies, programs, services, and products to influence whether, why, when, where, and how people travel.
 - Establish TDM measures to motivate people to shift travel modes by walking, cycling, using transit, or ridesharing instead of driving alone. Making fewer trips by using telework, flex, or compressing working schedules and driving more efficiently by utilizing electrical vehicles, combining errands, and avoiding peak travel hours and congested routes.

Senator Rivers thanked staff for the information and efforts to date. She offered consideration of some alternatives as the effort moves forward to the larger public audience, as well as to Republican legislators. Environment is often not the number one priority for many people. As the effort moves forward, it's important to include some balance such as cost-savings and other achievements that convey a message that's perceived favorably by most people.

Senator Fraser thanked Mr. Mollas for his work as it appears the effort is striving to consolidate all efforts by all agencies. During the session, it is virtually impossible for anyone to travel to the campus by bus. She suggested strong leadership could include working with transit agencies to develop a pilot project by designating special buses during the session with two-way routes from central Puget Sound cities (Tacoma, Federal Way, Seattle) to Capitol Campus. The Legislature conducts important hearings during the session and most people testifying live outside the county. Realistically, it is nearly impossible to reach the campus except by vehicle. Additionally, it could include efforts to ensure that better information about bus transfers is available. Many of the hearings are in the evening and it is often not possible to use Sound Transit as the service is closed when a person wants to return home. She encouraged considering some pilot projects in conjunction with regional transit agencies to increase the ease for people to travel to the campus to participate in civic actions with the legislative branch. The CTR Program should also include employees who do not reside in Thurston County. She is amazed at the number of employees who live outside the county. Many legitimately convey that they must drive to their job. She added that she has often supported the concept of providing peripheral parking areas with shuttles. Having parking available on the campus is costly and construction of yet another parking structure would eventually fill to capacity. It is important to be smarter about circulation and parking and consider those employees residing outside Thurston County.

Mr. Mollas responded that the CTR Program is not effective without considering visitors. Creating a great system whereby visitors or commuters could easily take a bus from Seattle to the campus makes sense.

Secretary Wyman echoed similar comments and added her appreciation for the work completed. In terms of transit, she has researched using transit many times and found that her commute would increase from 20 minutes to approximately 90 minutes using transit. Similar to the suggestion offered by Senator Fraser, a pilot program during the session from the Lacey Park and Ride Lot with express service to the campus would likely increase the number of employees using transit. People traveling from Tacoma or Seattle who knew about express service to the campus would likely use the service to avoid the problems of parking on the campus. Any pilot program must emphasize convenience. She also agreed that the impact on climate should not be the primary reason to promote alternative ways to travel as some people will not agree and consider it yet another political commentary.

Representative Hunt mentioned vanpooling. Intercity Transit has many vans available for vanpooling. Agencies should be encouraged to participate in vanpooling. When attending legislative meetings, he often uses metro vanpools. He referred to the numerous satellite campuses in the county and asked whether efforts are inclusive of those locations as well. Mr. Mollas advised that the primary focus is directed to Capitol Campus. However, there is some impact to areas located off campus. Vanpools require a dedicated pool of riders. Increasing the number of vanpool participants could include pursuing more sign-ups to determine the extent of the audience. An element of the problem is employee unawareness of the program.

Mr. Carter described how DES also works with the satellite agencies to employ technology and carpooling of employees traveling back and forth to the campus.

Representative Hunt remarked that Dash service once included a stop at the Tumwater Labor and Industries (L&I) Building until funding was cut.

Ms. Miller commented on the parking shortage at the L&I Building. Tenants have conveyed some concerns to DES, and it is an important issue that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Covington said much of the discussion and comments align with many improvements in play in terms of parking and parking technologies, such as demand-based fees and tying technology with the CTR Program. DES is also evaluating the current site for Fleet Operations, as the site is over capacity and difficult to access. Those issues are under evaluation. As progress occurs, the committee will receive updates for assistance and help as the issues tie directly to the Master Plan and some of the budget requests for the 2017-2019 budget. He thanked members for their feedback.

Director Chris Liu commented on the changes in the DES team and the addition of the Transportation Demand Manager. The future vision of accomplishments can only be realized through the support of both the committee and the State Capitol Committee (SCC). Progress can move forward now that the team is in place. The opportunity to contribute input is timely as many of the projects culminate in preparation for the next session requiring a lead time of 18 months to two years prior to the session and budgetary cycle to afford an understanding of future needs, as well as ensuring efforts are properly staffed to support the vision the committee has of Capitol Campus. Finally, it is important to convey to those who can influence the process to demonstrate how the efforts are supported. DES is also seeking other ways to utilize market forces rather than seeking funding appropriation from the state to complete some of the action items. DES is fully engaged in how market forces influences its delivery of services and ways DES can drive the use of market forces and pay the full share without using state government as the only

funding source. The team is fully engaged in exploring all those aspects, as well as fulfilling the committee's vision. DES is providing the necessary support to demonstrate its commitment to the vision by supporting and formulating necessary infrastructure to support the vision.

Representative MacEwen urged staff to consider providing data as a way to promote the effort. Most people want to see data. Additionally, data on the dispersion of the state workforce would be helpful, as well as working hours because many employees work different hours or participate in flex programs.

Senator Fraser remarked that the April 14 fair provides a good study opportunity because the goal is to attract as many participants as possible. Addressing how they arrive and where they park is an opportunity. She was not aware that the parking lot across the street is for transit users, which explains why the lot was full. The event provides both a study opportunity and a challenge.

Chair Haskell agreed on the importance of combining efforts but questioned how they work in conjunction to achieve the desired outcome for supporting the vision of the Master Plan. Each program must be mutually supported and not pursued in isolation. It is possible to reduce commuter trips or provide parking in other places; however, he questioned what those outcomes ultimately support. An overall effort based on a vision should be pursued where independent and incremental decisions are rendered rather than only incremental decisions. He expressed appreciation for initiation of the effort while acknowledging that it's difficult to envision how the combined efforts will join together to produce the desired outcome. Each program manager should consider working together to integrate all efforts into a larger vision within the larger plan.

Mr. Covington agreed there are many independent efforts occurring on a parallel track. Most of are trying to achieve an outcome that benefits each process. Combining Parking Services and TDM and aligning them with Fleet Operations all tie together. Moving the needle of TDM or CTR by only 1% equates to a substantial impact in the reduction of consumption of parking on the campus. It ties into teleworking and other modes. Other agencies are making strategic moves in the same direction because not only does it impact parking, it impacts facilities. DES is responsible for Real Estate Services and lease facilities for agencies. Many agencies are eliminating work stations with many employees not assigned a permanent work station as many are field employees. Eliminating that capacity could equate to 20% to 30% in more capacity that could be converted to different uses. There are avenues available to pursue with other agencies. Currently, no one document exists combining all efforts. It would likely be beneficial to have one document that speaks to all the elements. The work of the CCDAC on the Master Plan is a large part of the effort as the structure of the Master Plan addresses whether to continue to construct buildings with no parking. The Master Plan lays out the recommendations for the future based on strategic policies and decisions. Ms. Miller added that the Master Plan creates the vision for the future and helps inform other elements.

Legislative Session Update - Information
Renaming of OB2- Human Services
1063 Block – Renaming to Helen Sommers
Extending Sid Snyder Avenue
120 Union Avenue Building

Representative Hunt reported on the status of renaming Office Building 2 (OB2). A proposal to rename the building has been considered twice in the last several sessions. This session, the bill passed the House but failed in the Senate because of lack of interest in renaming the building. Renaming of the building should be revisited.

Several members in the House expressed interested in naming the 1063 Block after Representative Helen Sommers who served in the House for 36 years and serving many years as Chair of the Appropriations Committee. She retired and now resides in Florida. Former Representative Dunshee also supported naming the building after Representative Sommers. Representative Hunt recommended moving forward with a formal naming process.

Previously, the City of Olympia opposed renaming the entire roadway of Sid Snyder Avenue extending along the entire loop to Cherry, Water, 11th after Sid Snyder to afford one contiguous route to aid in visitors in wayfinding along the loop at both the north and sound end. Representative Hunt recommended pursuing the renaming of the entire loop after Sid Snyder.

Representative Hunt referred to the 120 Union Building currently housing several tenants. DES announced plans to close the building because of cost. Several lobbyists and an internet provider are tenants in the building. Several of the tenants moved from the 1063 Block and now find that the building is scheduled to close. Several representatives have concerns about leaving the building empty. Many of the lobbyists have indicated that the building could include many more tenants as long as a long-term lease could be provided, which would assist DES in recouping some of the costs associated with maintaining and operating the building. A private party has also offered to purchase the building; however, selling the building might not be conducive because of its location. Representative Hunt advocated for finding a way to maintain the building and increasing the number of tenants to help offset some of the costs for improvements to the building.

Mr. Covington replied that during the development of the 2015-2017 budget to identify 15% in cuts, the 120 Union Building was identified for closure as the building historically has cost too much in operations with DES losing approximately \$25,000 annually. The building was acquired as a future opportunity site and not necessarily because of the existing buildings. The issue surrounds the capital investment for the building as the roof is experiencing challenges with costs anticipated at more than \$250,000 to repair in addition to other issues and concerns surrounding the structure. The issue was the loss of operational funds and future capital investment. The proviso directed continuing the operation of the building with an increase in rents and utilizing the Capital Project Surcharge for the building rather than contributing the funds to the pool with a caveat of utilizing \$60,000 to repair a severed sewer line and pursuing more leases with a provision enabling DES to terminate the lease in the event of any major building failure.

Senator Rivers shared that she pulled the renaming bill for OB2 from Rules because of the lack of interest and because of other legislative priorities. Senator Fraser pointed out the possibility of DES submitting a legislative departmental request to rename the building.

Representative Hunt asked about future steps for renaming the entire street loop after Sid Snyder. Mr. Covington advised that staff would prepare a proposal for presentation at the next meeting.

Capitol Campus Planning – Guidance & Information

Master Plan Update:

- ***Opportunity sites – Development Plans***

Capitol Lake Management Plan

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, DES, updated members on the status of Capitol Campus planning. The Legislature appropriated funds within two different proviso authorities of \$200,000 for campus pre-design and \$250,000 for the State Capitol Master Plan. The State Capitol Master Plan proviso guides the work to identify potential development sites and infrastructure that may be needed to further development. The proviso aligns with the work of the Master Plan Subgroup, which identified future opportunity sites.

The Capitol Campus proviso directs the development of a pre-design for uses of the Pritchard Building (to include parking lot area) and the ProArts site, replacement or rehabilitation of the General Administration Building, and replacement of the NewHouse Building to include identification of potential tenants, project costs, and development schedules for each site. DES anticipates including the Union and Washington half-block site.

Ms. Miller displayed a site plan of the sites and identified the members of the Master Plan team to include a staff member from OFM to assist in developing the space plan for state agencies. The consultant, Schacht|Aslani Architects, was recently selected to assist the team. She introduced Eric Aman as the Project Manager. Walter Schacht is the Principal Planner for the project.

The OFM manual defines pre-design as a clear and accurate understanding of a specific facility need or problem. The Secretary of State is currently in pre-design because of a business need to store records and archival materials and establish a State Library because current locations are not meeting business needs.

The pre-design is more similar to a development plan not driven by programmatic need but an evaluation of each property to determine best use. The scope and the deliverables include identifying site development potential with support from the consultant, recommendations on what changes should be made to the Master Plan for opportunity development sites, infrastructure, information, and project cost and schedule. Additionally, DES is working on two other projects in conjunction with this work. One is a Campus Utility Renewal Plan under development and integrated within the State Capitol Master Plan by forecasting future demand for infrastructure to identify needs for future renewal or replacement of campus infrastructure. The infrastructure study also informs the project about the type of infrastructure and availability of infrastructure. The second project is a development proposal for converting the campus steam system to a hot water system.

The abbreviated pre-design work includes identifying tenants or functions that could be later aligned with a particular agency based on the highest and best use chart in the current Master Plan. There is also an opportunity to clarify function more clearly to afford those making decisions to have better information and a better process for rendering decisions.

While engaged in the solicitation process, several consultants visited with the team and toured the campus. One of the goals of master planning is having an understanding of the entire system to include structures that support buildings and functions. Circulation is one function in terms of how vehicles and people move. It is difficult to consider a pre-design of the buildings without considering the whole to ensure all functions are factored from many different perspectives to include other uses of the property and how the change could affect other surrounding uses or abutting neighborhoods. The team anticipates the consultant will contribute those ideas to the process to ensure the sites are reviewed as a whole with an understanding of any implications.

Ms. Miller reiterated that DES received legislative direction and funding to begin the work and obtain better information to ensure the Master Plan better informs the people who are making the decisions. She acknowledged that the process is not the preferred method but it has been established based on legislative direction to DES.

Chair Haskell remarked that when he first learned of the proposals he was somewhat stunned as many members have worked for many months on updating the 2006 Master Plan to provide a vision the previous plan lacked, as well as examining opportunity sites instead of treating the sites individually without the context and vision surrounding circulation, transportation, urban design for the entire campus,

and the difference between West and East Campus. A master plan creates the long-term comprehensive vision. When he learned the proposal was to examine four sites and develop pre-designs, which have been previously studied before, he was stunned in terms of why the larger effort on updating the Master Plan was halted, which would have produced an overall vision for the entire campus rather than planning for four sites and attempting to determine what occurs on each of the sites without the benefit of the vision and the context for the entire campus. His frustration and discouragement is because previous efforts were not concluded and the new direction considers individual sites and decisions without context as to how each site individually contributes to the overall vision the Master Plan was attempting to achieve.

Senator Rivers asked about the potential nexus between the previous work and the new proposals and possibly melding the vision within the pre-designs. Chair Haskell agreed it's possible to give and take, but it could be less efficient in many ways. The work completed to date shouldn't be discarded; however, attempts to create the vision was the goal as the vision in a master planning process is the key and everything else supports the vision whether it's a parking program, a new building, or a transit circulation program. All help to reinforce the vision. The process that the workgroup undertook did not reach a point of defining that vision and likely could not help inform specific actions under the new proposal.

Senator Rivers asked about the timing to complete an updated master plan as a directive to inform the pre-designs. Chair Haskell said he would avoid speaking for staff because of commitments to other projects; however, if resources were available it likely would require another six to eight months to complete the update.

Ms. Miller responded that she was hopeful the vision could have been defined prior to the pragmatic and technical analysis because it would help inform and identify future uses of each site in the context of the entire campus.

Discussion ensued on the appropriateness of completing the master plan prior to pre-design work. Mr. Covington said DES is committed to engaging members of the CCDAC as part of the predesign work to ensure the work completed on the update of the master plan is integrated within the project. He agreed that funding and the need to move timely are both important in terms of the future of the opportunity sites as well as the vision. Integration of both processes and considering the projects holistically would likely lead to a better outcome. Additionally, updating the master plan more frequently could provide value by having a document that guides the long-term vision and provides clarity of existing resources for supporting and developing a site.

Chair Haskell added that his comments were not intended as a criticism of staff as he has a great deal of regard for staff and their efforts. Decisions about parking for each site is an issue that's part of the overall vision for the campus, as well as the parking study currently underway. He questioned how the sites were selected and whether other sites not identified in the proviso are more important or more appropriate for implementing the vision. Over the years during his membership on the committee, there has been many incremental projects completed. Each of the four sites has been previously studied. He questioned whether that work would be discarded.

Representative Hunt said the issue might involve a failure to communicate. When he first joined the committee, he was a member of the Capital Budget Committee and had the advantage of being informed about CCDAC's work. It could entail members of the Budget Committee unaware of CCDAC's work. The solution could be resolved by appointing a member from the House Budget Committee as his replacement.

Senator Rivers suggested inviting the chairs of the capital budget committees to attend committee meetings to assist them in understanding the scope of the committee's work. She expressed appreciation to Chair Haskell for his passion and the hours contributed to the committee.

Senator Fraser referred to a prior long-range visioning process completed by the committee. The meeting included an exercise with members forming groups with direction to consider the current and future time when existing buildings would be obsolete and how the campus might be redesigned. There were many good ideas and one idea was an opening of the tunnels to afford better views of the dome.

Chair Haskell recounted the same meeting and agreed it was a productive visioning session with some of the ideas consolidated and moved forward to a larger vision. However, the update never resulted in finalizing the document.

Director Liu said the message conveyed by the committee acknowledges how DES incorporates many of the visioning and other elements within its work moving forward but failed to adequately articulate those efforts. It is important for DES to market and articulate how planning on the projects includes efforts today on visioning, as well as considering how to align the different pieces within the vision. Some of those efforts likely will be incremental. However, the issue is coordinating all efforts within the entire framework. The Master Plan is an important piece and legislative leaders need to know how visioning is an important element of the work moving forward.

Chair Haskell added that during the discussion of the Master Plan, the idea was to update the four sites as well as the other opportunity sites; however, the overall framework and vision was the first step to complete. If communication has failed, it should be acknowledged that the work has been ongoing and will be completed at some point. He agreed with the suggestion by Representative Hunt to improve communications between the committee and the Legislature.

Secretary Wyman commented that the purpose of the CCDAC and the SCC originated with Secretary Ralph Munro who was frustrated because buildings suddenly appeared on campus without consideration of the long-term vision. At that time, decision-making was based on the long-term vision of the campus. It is important to ensure legislators on the committee add weight and value to the work completed by the committee. One example is the 1063 Building and the inclusion of language in the proviso that wasn't influenced by either the CCDAC or the SCC. The Legislature should value the CCDAC and the SCC and the chairs of the budget committees should view the work of the committees as valuable otherwise there is no reason to continue meeting.

Representative MacEwen noted his membership on the Capital Budget Committee for several years. He questioned whether any worksessions have been scheduled with previous or current chairs of the Capital Budget Committee. Secretary Wyman said much of the issue is dependent upon the presenter. Presentations to legislative committees by a director of an agency reporting to the Governor does not have the same weight as the Governor or the CCDAC or the SCC.

Mr. Covington recommended including the issue on the next agenda to pursue conversations on the next steps/strategies to achieve the desired outcome.

Secretary Wyman said the most recent press the SCC received was over the type of leaf blowers to use on campus. Considering the depth of work completed by both committees, some connections are lacking both with legislators and the public. Communicating that work should be leveraged differently.

Senator Fraser said pursuing legislation through the Legislature requires credibility. Between now and the next meeting, it might be possible to identify someone other than committee members or agency staff who cares about the process.

Senator Rivers asked about the timeline for completion of the pre-designs.

Ms. Miller advised that the process of engagement and communication with staff includes working closely with OFM staff members to ensure understanding of the legislative intent. Additionally, the Legislature is important because of the housing of legislative staff. Consequently, conversations are being scheduled to discuss the intent, respective needs, and how those projects can support those needs. Ongoing communications include the CCDAC and the SCC, outreach to neighborhoods, as well as with the City of Olympia. In terms of master plan coordination, staff is utilizing the handbook. The master plan not only informs the planning project but the planning project informs the master plan. The master plan includes vision for the public experience by considering and addressing public issues and needs, as well as how public service is delivered in terms of location. The plan also includes historic preservation, design, and contributing to the vitality of the community, campus, and the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Miller shared a preliminary proposal from Schacht|Aslani Architects incorporating a phased approach of researching existing studies to identify items of relevancy, development of alternatives and analysis, with selection of some alternatives for development of the pre-design documents. The goal is submitting the documents to the legislative fiscal committees by November 1. The schedule aligns with meetings of the CCDAC and SCC with the potential of scheduling a special meeting in July to review alternatives.

Chair Haskell thanked Ms. Miller for the presentation and for her efforts.

Senator Rivers inquired about the possibility of incorporating the visioning process within the timeline. Ms. Miller reviewed the specific deadlines for different elements of the process. She refrained from committing to the visioning process prior to discussing options with the consultant and other design professionals.

Representative Hunt advised that he would brief Representative Tharinger on the proposal as the current Chair of the House Capital Budget Committee. He thanked Ms. Miller for the information. He recommended including the Olympia Downtown Association and TRPC in the engagement process.

Chair Haskell recessed the meeting from 12:16 p.m. to 12:40 p.m. for lunch.

Capitol Lake Management Plan

Director Liu updated the committee on the status of Capitol Lake management. He thanked Senator Fraser to ensure funding was appropriated for the proviso that was passed in the biennium budget to pursue Capitol Lake planning. Members received a copy of the proviso language and a draft execution plan. To date, the Executive Work Group has met three times with the public attending all meetings. A public meeting was held in earlier in the month to receive public comment on the work plan. All documents created to date are included on the website with the exception of public comments on the hybrid model.

The budget proviso includes five main elements to accomplish. The effort includes an Executive Work Group, community meeting and input period, Funding & Governance Committee, Technical Committee, and the consultant team of Floyd|Snider. Additionally, sediment management is an area lacking

information in terms of science and what is required to approach sediment plans. Subsequently, a special committee will explore sediment management.

The Executive Work Group is comprised of the representative governments of the cities of Olympia and Tumwater, Thurston County, Port of Olympia, Squaxin Island Tribe, and DES. Additionally, DES followed the Ruckelshaus recommendation to include local governments as members of the work group.

The five elements in the proviso are elements not completed in previous efforts or studies. The issue of Capitol Lake management begins in the 1980s followed by the 2009 process that produced the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) report exclusive of the five elements in the proviso. The five elements include:

- a. Identify and summarize the findings of the best available science concerning water quality and habitat as they relate to conceptual options of retaining or removing the dam.
- b. Identify multiple hybrid options for future management of Capitol Lake.
- c. Identify conceptual options and degree of general support for shared funding by state, local, and federal governments and potentially other entities.
- d. Identify one or more conceptual options for long-term shared government of a future management plan.

Phase 1 of the project culminates in a report to the Legislature in December 2016. The schedule is compacted to approximately seven months. A number of community meetings are scheduled to ensure community involvement throughout the process.

The Technical Committee vets and forwards recommendations to the Executive Work Group in terms of science and criteria. The Funding and Governance Committee's membership include representatives from each of the representative governments to include attorneys, finance directors, and others knowledgeable about funding sources.

The Work Group is beginning to address how the lake should be governed. As the lake is a state responsibility, it is important to consider how the lake impacts surrounding communities. The process will identify a robust funding model to ensure any future management option includes a funding source, as well as a governance model for future decisions affecting Capitol Lake and the surrounding communities.

In April, the Technical Committee is scheduled to meet, vet information, and release the information to the public following the meeting. The Executive Work Group will receive a briefing on the report from the Technical Committee followed by a community meeting and input period during the following five to seven days to provide feedback on the technical report and the work group's discussion or direction. Input from the community meeting will be reviewed by the Technical Committee followed by the Executive Work Group. The outcome of this process becomes the basis of the report to the Legislature at the end of the year. The Executive Work Group is only making recommendations on what should be included in the report rather than a recommendation on the future management of Capitol Lake.

The report will provide the basis for completion of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The first phase of the work covers a seven-month period and culminates in setting the stage to pursue a budget request to complete an EIS. The EIS process encompasses approximately two years based on professional opinions. However, the EIS process may extend beyond two years if more issues are identified. Following the conclusion of the EIS, a solution should be identified for the long-term management of Capitol Lake. At the conclusion of the EIS, the goal is identifying a solution to enable

implementation during Phase 3. The duration of Phase 3 has not been identified; however, it's possible it could cover multiple years.

Secretary Wyman asked whether both options of a lake or an estuary include dredging. Director Liu affirmed both options include dredging. Secretary Wyman asked about the status of dredging the lake since the last dredge in 1986. Director Liu said the question has been asked by many citizens; however, it would require the same timeframe to complete an EIS for a maintenance dredge as it would for a project EIS to define the solution. If the decision was to pursue a maintenance dredge, another two to three years would be required to complete the final solution EIS.

**Capitol Campus Central Plant – Information and Feedback
Amendment to Assess Alternate Location**

Chair Haskell recognized Ron Major, Resource Conservation Manager, who briefed members on the status of the alternative site analysis completed for the Capitol Campus Central Plant Conversion project.

DES received an appropriation in the 2015-2017 Capital Budget to consider conversion of the steam system to a hot water distribution system and incorporate combined heat and power within the system. The project team includes University Mechanical Contractors currently serving as the agency's energy services company. The integrated audit process is based on the Energy Performance Contracting methodology. Mr. Major identified other team members.

The basis of the design and investment grade goals is to improve the efficiency, performance, and safety of the Central Plant. The Central Plant is comprised of boilers and chillers providing heat and water to the campus. The intent is modernizing the energy infrastructure for the next 100 years and identifying all internal operating costs, capital costs, and utility costs. The project also includes assessment of the risk associated with the environmental impacts of the Central Plant's location, as it currently resides along Capitol Lake in accordance with the RCW. The project will also demonstrate technical, economic, and environmental benefits of all alternatives identified through the process using OFM's 50-year lifecycle cost analysis tool, as well as comparing all the alternatives against business as usual to bring the existing steam system to code compliance. The RCW mandates finding ways to reduce carbon emissions. Another goal is providing flexibility in the system for other energy sources as they become available and accounting for the future expansion of Capitol Campus.

The existing steam system has heated the campus since the 1920s from the Central Plant. Currently, 12 buildings are connected to the steam plant with three miles of underground piping, one boiler dating back to 1960, and two others from 1974. Some upgrades of the equipment have occurred throughout the years. The average annual operating efficiency is 34%.

Mr. Major reviewed a map of the steam distribution center throughout the campus. A majority of existing piping is located in utility corridor structures, which can be reused.

The Central Plant is located on the shores of Capitol Lake powered by a 350,000-gallon diesel fuel tank. The area has hillside stability issues and is one of the many reasons why other locations are under consideration.

Ms. Olmsted asked whether there are concerns about ongoing maintenance to operate the system in terms of staff and budget to maintain the system. Mr. Major advised that the analysis considers all those factors because of the importance of understanding the entire cost of the system.

The Central Plant is considered an historic structure. Screening above the roof was installed during the last installation of chillers sometime in the 1970s.

In terms of the 34% heating efficiency, the campus spends approximately \$640,000 annually to heat campus buildings resulting in heating benefits of only \$215,000.

The analysis reflects that conversion of steam to hot water is viable economically and deserves further study. Other challenges indentified are new and some are ongoing. In consideration of those challenges with the existing site, the team compared the existing site to a potential new site. Considerations included identifying the right location for the site, improving the overall efficiency of the site, reducing operating costs while providing an opportunity to consider synergy between the heating and cooling systems because of new technology, considering future growth of the campus, and considering potential climate impacts over the next 100 years.

When the team identified the need to consider an alternative site for comparison, several locations on campus were considered. The first site is the current GA site. The site is prominent on the West Campus but has some hillside issues. The second site was the old IBM site located west of the Employment Security Department providing good access to the Plaza Garage but located on the Capitol Way corridor, which is the gateway to the campus and likely not the most appropriate location to site a Central Plant operation. The third location was the Archives Building, which is under review by the Secretary of State as a future facility. The timing was determined not right and the building does not fit the need. The fourth site located east of the WSDOT Building was in a good location and provides access to the Plaza Garage, which is important for piping and infrastructure; however, it is too close to the neighborhood. The ProArts site was also considered but not ranked as a contender because of the importance of future development on the site. The site selected is located behind OB2. The site provides some distance from the surrounding neighborhoods. The former data center provides some space that could be reused while providing good access for piping to the Plaza Garage and tying into the existing network. An existing slope behind the building and its relationship to the street level and plaza level offers some opportunities to blend the building into the campus.

Mr. Major shared photographs of the site and identified surrounding state buildings. The area is also a significant gateway to the campus, which may afford some opportunity to improve the area. The team is exploring several preliminary designs of the facility. He described the placement of the building and how it would be equal in height to the level of Jefferson Street.

Representative MacEwen asked whether geothermal has been explored for any portion of the campus. Mr. Major advised that because of the scale of the system, it would be difficult to identify the wellfield space required for the energy source; however, looking forward in the next 30 + years, the 1063 Building will require replacement of some equipment, which has a wellfield providing an opportunity to utilize that space.

Director Liu inquired about the capacity required for wellfields on the campus for geothermal systems. Mr. Major advised that the team could estimate the magnitude of space required. Director Liu advocated for exploring all energy alternatives. Mr. Major agreed. Some options explored include reclaimed water as a potential source for a central geothermal system. As the design process proceeds, the team will consider all options.

Mr. Major shared photographs of other central plants providing combined heat and power. Some design opportunities exist to integrate the Central Plant into the campus overall.

Director Liu inquired about any noise factors associated with the Central Plant operation. Mr. Major affirmed there is a noise factor, which is one reason why the site near the WSDOT Building was disqualified. Preliminary design will also help to determine whether it is possible to place some of the building below ground to mitigate noise issues.

Ms. Olmsted suggested that since the primary location is a major approach to the campus, more figurative analysis of the landscape would be valuable. It appears the buildings would be designed appropriately while landscape is also important. The campus sits on a site that includes the natural environment on one side with the community on the opposite side, which is unique in terms of other capitals throughout the nation. She encouraged the team to consider the landscape as part of the design process. She asked about the future disposition of the existing facility because of its controversial location. Mr. Major affirmed the landscape will be an important element of the design process. No definitive decision has been determined for the existing site as the alternative site hasn't been selected. The current location of the Central Plant might be the best location; however, if another site were selected, next steps would involve the final decision on abandoning the site, which would likely include historically restoring the structure by removing the screening and equipment and mitigating any risks. The oil tank would be removed from the shoreline.

Senator Fraser questioned why the proposed new building is so much larger than the existing building and whether the improvements could be located at the current site because of the problems associated with other sites. Mr. Major said the main reason for the increase in building size is to accommodate future growth needs over a 50-year period. The total buildout based on a 50-year lifecycle cost analysis is 90 million BTUs of energy requiring a certain amount of equipment. The increased size would accommodate additional growth in BTUs.

Senator Fraser asked about the possibility of separating equipment and locating the operation on two sites. Mr. Major affirmed two sites could be possible.

Alex Rolluda spoke in support of the team considering the existing Central Plant as an option. Reuse of the existing building and upgrading from a sustainability and green point of view is an option to consider. Additionally, he asked how much massing of the proposed new structures would be above and below ground. Mr. Major replied that the top of the building would be at the same level of the existing plaza with the floor of the facility equal to the height of Jefferson Street. The height would vary dependent upon the height requirements of the equipment. The roof of the building would serve as an extension of the plaza to avoid disruption of the sight lines from the OB2 and NRB Buildings. The surface could be a green roof or a plaza.

Chair Haskell commented that the building should reflect an opportunity to enhance the site beyond just hiding it. Redevelopment of the site represents an opportunity to enhance the entry to the campus from the freeway. It is important to consider what could be done to enhance the area as an entryway to the campus.

Ms. Olmsted offered that it would be helpful to articulate the aspect of growth that is factored for the facility, as well as defining the energy reduction strategies considered for future growth to help explain why the proposal would not result in an overbuilt facility in any sensitive location. Mr. Major affirmed that the comments are included in the approach as it is important to accommodate new growth while acknowledging overall energy consumption decreasing over time, which automatically adds capacity to the system. The team is examining those factors to ensure buildout capacity is realistic because of the footprint of the building, selection of the equipment, and initial costs and operational costs over the life of the facility.

Representative Hunt asked whether it is possible to convert steam to hot water through existing pipes. Mr. Major said the system is over 80 years old and would be replaced

Mr. Major asked for feedback on the preferred location in terms of any red flags or barriers. Chair Haskell said the site was identified in the Master Plan as a significant site to enhance the entry of the campus. The question is what improvements are possible to enhance the entry to the campus rather than hiding the building or degrading the area.

Senator Fraser agreed the site has an issue of visibility and likely would invoke many conversations because of its location, which speaks to whether the facility could be split between two locations. The illustration gives the appearance of crowded buildings. Mr. Major advised that the illustrations are concepts as the team concentrated on identifying basic needs of the facility and it whether it could be located within that particular location. Senator Fraser added that a landscaping plan would be critical as well.

10-Year Capital Plan Update – Briefing

Ms. Miller provided a brief review of the Ten-Year Capital Plan as a prelude to the next meeting for a more thorough review and discussion. The plan includes the first biennium of 2015-2017. Projects not receiving funding move forward to future years in the plan. The plan includes the addition of another biennium at the end of the plan and a narrative describing major projects.

Representative Hunt referred to Capitol Campus planning and requested additional information for the committee on what agencies are in need of or requesting additional space. Mr. Covington recommended scheduling an update by OFM on six-year facility planning.

Mr. Covington introduced Bill Frare, Assistant Director for Engineering and Architecture. DES realigned Asset Management from Buildings and Grounds and moved it to Engineering and Architect Services under the direction of Mr. Frare. The intent was combining planning, engineering, and architectural pieces under a common department enabling Buildings and Grounds to focus on service delivery.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting

Mr. Frare reported the committee is scheduled to review an adjustment to the planning documents recognizing the State Capitol Historical Museum and receive updates on the Utility Renewal project, City of Olympia Master Plan, Opportunity Sites, Capital Campus Planning, Capitol Lake, and the ProArts Building. The committee might consider extending the length of the meeting to accommodate the agenda items, as well as adding a discussion increasing more effectiveness in tying the planning element of the Master Plan with the funding element to bridge the gap between the committee and capital budget chairs. The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, May 19, 2016 at 10 a.m.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 1:36 p.m.