



CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting
Department of Enterprise Services, Conference Room 2208
1500 Jefferson Street SE
Olympia, Washington 98501

September 15, 2016
10:00 AM

(Approved: November 10, 2016)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair
Representative Sam Hunt
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair
Susan Olmsted
Senator Karen Fraser
Greg Lane (For Secretary of State)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Architect Position - Vacant
Senator Ann Rivers
Representative Drew MacEwen

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
Tomy Mollas, Department of Enterprise Services
Jim Erskine, Department of Enterprise Services
Scott Perkins, Department of Enterprise Services
Carrie Martin, 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
Doug Kilpatrick, Department of Enterprise Services
Ron Major, Department of Enterprise Services
Jon Taylor, Department of Enterprise Services
Debra Dalzell, Department of Enterprise Services

OTHERS PRESENT

Steve Masse, Legislative Staff
Dave Peeler, DERT
Allen Miller, North Capitol Campus Association
Walter Schacht, Schacht|Aslani Architects
Eric Aman, Schacht|Aslani Architects
Jason King, Mithūn

Peggy Clifford, SONA
Jack Havens, CLIPA
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Maurice Perigo, Legislative Staff
Antonio Dellomo, Schacht|Aslani Architects

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) meeting to order at 10:09 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Approval of Agenda

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

The CCDAC reviewed and approved the minutes of *March 31, 2016 & June 6, 2016* and received briefings on the naming of – *Office Building Two to Human Services Building & 1063 Block Building to*

Helen Sommers Building, a 1063 Block Project Update, information on Extending Sid Snyder Avenue SW, a presentation on Campus Combined Heat & Power Plant, briefings on Master Plan & Campus Predesign, Capitol Lake Management Plan, Campus Exterior Lighting Project, Campus Transportation & Parking Implementation Plan, 2017-2027 Capital Plan Update, and Project Updates on West Campus Monument Repairs and Legislative Building – Restore Chamber Skylights.

Approval of Minutes – March 31, 2016 & June 6, 2016

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the minutes of March 31, 2016 and June 6, 2016, as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Renaming of Campus Buildings

Renaming OB2 – Human Services

Chair Haskell recognized Ann Larson, Director of Government Relations. Director Larson briefed the committee on the proposal to rename Office Building 2 (OB2).

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 advice from the Capital Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC). Current statute states that any new or existing building may be named after an individual who played a significant role in the state's history or named for the purpose of the building. The proposal would rename OB2 and name the 1063 Block Building.

During legislative sessions in 2015 and 2016, legislation to rename OB2 to Human Services Building was recommended by CCDAC. During both sessions legislation failed, in part, because of the lack of interest. The Department of Social and Health Services supports renaming and moving the recommendation forward.

Senator Fraser noted the legislation wasn't opposed or was necessarily lacking in interest other than there were larger issues before the Legislature.

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Representative Hunt, to advise the DES Director and the SCC to rename OB2 to the Human Services Building. Motion carried unanimously.

Naming 1063 Block Building – Helen Sommers

Director Larson reported during the 2016 session, the supplemental budget included language naming the 1063 Building Block Replacement to the Helen Sommers Building based on current statute to name buildings after historic figures. Helen Sommers played a significant role in Washington's history. Staff seeks a recommendation from the CCDAC to move forward with naming the 1063 Block Replacement Building after Helen E. Sommers.

Senator Fraser supported the proposal but pointed out that Ms. Sommers was always known as Helen Sommers rather than Helen E. Sommers. She recommended dropping the middle initial.

Representative Hunt supported the recommendation.

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Greg Lane, to advise the DES Director and the SCC to rename the 1063 Block Replacement Building to the Helen Sommers Building. Motion carried unanimously.

Senator Fraser recommended pursuing additional research on Ms. Sommers and the historic significance she played for the state. She suggested checking with the State Archives for additional information and whether an oral history is available on Ms. Sommers. Representative Hunt affirmed a legislative oral history was available. Senator Fraser added that Ms. Sommers was responsible for ensuring the state's pension system was one of the best pension systems funded in the country. Ms. Sommers was chair of the House Appropriations Committee for many years and was absolutely iron steady with respect to fully funding pension systems, which is difficult during the legislative process because of the cost and many other competing interests. She should be remembered for protecting the pension system in addition to her leadership as a woman in the Legislature.

Marygrace Jennings, DES Cultural Resources Manager, pointed out the formality of names on existing campus buildings such as John L. O'Brien Building or the Irving R. Newhouse Building. She was uncertain whether inclusion of the middle initial is a formality that's also practiced elsewhere and offered to research standards at other locations.

Discussion ensued on the lack of any written naming standards other than a long-held practice of using formal names. Deputy Director Covington noted that the CCDAC has the ability to recommend establishing a new standard.

Chair Haskell commented that the proposal was seeking a recommendation on a name rather than considering a standard.

Discussion ensued on how buildings names are often shortened to nicknames. Chair Haskell offered that the committee likely wouldn't oppose "Helen E. Sommers" if deemed appropriate.

Director Larson advised that the next step is moving the recommendation to the State Capitol Committee (SCC) for consideration.

Representative Hunt noted the oral history document refers only to "Helen Sommers."

1063 Block Project Update:
New Work of Art

Chair Haskell recognized Marygrace Jennings.

Manager Jennings reported Seattle artist Beliz Brother was selected by a seven-member Art Selection Committee under the guidance of the State Arts Commission to create artwork specific for the 1063 Building. Ms. Brother is presenting a concept proposal to the Art Selection Committee, as well as to the CCDAC. Ms. Brother is anticipated to tour the site next week prior to completing the concept proposal.

GA Building Artwork

Public art in the General Administration Building includes the Bronze State Seal and a mosaic mural by Jean Cory Beall located in the building's lobby. Designers of the 1063 Building considered both works of art in the building design should relocation be possible in the future. The SCC directed DES to explore costs for relocation of the art, as well as the practicalities of moving the art. DES explored costs, as well as researched costs for protecting, transporting, and storing the art or protecting the art in place within a mothballed building. The second cost scenario hasn't been completed at this time. DES is prepared to act depending on future legislative direction. However, at this time, DES has no funding to pursue any of the options.

Graphics, Wayfinding & Quotes

Manager Jennings briefed members on the request to provide feedback on naming public conference rooms in the new 1063 Block office building.

By statute, the CCDAC advises the Director of DES and the SCC on naming of state buildings and public spaces in buildings on the West Capitol Campus. The 1063 Building has approximately 30 conference rooms. The proposal is naming conference rooms after important people in Washington state history. The project began with the architectural team with assistance from SC Studios to develop a graphics package for the building. Early in the process, the team developed a concept of five “Washington Ideals” or themes for each of the five building levels of Exploration, Discovery, Cultivation, Industry, and Preservation. The themes would be applied to each floor in chronological order beginning with the ground floor theme of Exploration followed by the other themes for each building story. Each elevator lobby would feature a large graphic reflecting the theme for that floor with conference rooms named after important individuals in Washington state history. Additionally, at each elevator lobby, quotes would be featured reflecting the theme or ideal for that specific floor. Conference rooms for naming include those rooms available through public corridors of the building.

Michael Sullivan, preservation professional and Washington State history expert, worked with SC Studios to establish a team of project advisors to generate ideas. The goal of the selection of room names was to illustrate Washington’s story through the lives and words of people who have shaped its past. Similar to a composite biography of the state, the people and ideas honored reflect the geographic, chronological, and social diversity of the region, as well as a wide timeframe of achievements, adventures, and major chapters in Washington history. The advisors sought a broad cross-section of ethnic groups, areas of accomplishment, and organizational affiliations with particular focus for lasting works, ideas, and inventions benefitting Washington today.

Michael Sullivan pointed out how no one visits the campus without recognizing a narrative. In terms of interpretation, the campus lacks exploration of the state’s story for visitors. The campus lacks any information that speaks to the people who built the state. A brand new building serves to join the historic buildings and offers a place to convey the state’s story.

Mr. Sullivan recognized the 10 individuals serving as advisors for their willingness to serve on the committee and for assuming the task. Each member took time and submitted names by reviewing a lengthy list of individuals from colleagues, writers, teachers, and others. He spoke to the vetting process for the quotes and how the selection includes names not commonly known.

Manager Jennings referred members to a list of names and quotes for each floor. Some floors include an alternate name. She invited comments and feedback from members.

Mr. Sullivan noted that he and William Iyall, Chairman, Cowlitz Indian Tribe, worked through the spelling of native names rather than displaying the names phonetically.

Susan Olmsted commented on her knowledge of John Muir’s association with California and the Yosemite area rather than Washington. She asked about his connection to Washington. Mr. Sullivan replied that John Muir was one of the strongest advocates for the establishment of Mt. Rainier National Park. He climbed Mt. Rainier several times and was part of a party traveling to Alaska and returning through Washington. Mr. Muir wrote extensively about the Northwest. Senator Fraser acknowledged the excellent work of the advisors. She asked about the rationale for naming rooms in advance because it limits some flexibility for future names, as well as whether the

vetting process included a variety of individuals representing different interests. Additionally, she's unsure if other tribes in the state would agree on the inclusion of the proposed tribe. She shared recent feedback on the potential of visitors confusing building names with meeting rooms. Regardless of room names, all rooms would likely need numbering. Additional themes such as cultural, diversity, and science should also be considered. Names often lead to wayfinding challenges. She cautioned against proceeding with the proposal without additional vetting and more reflection.

Representative Hunt pointed out how Tom Foley, William O. Douglas, Henry Jackson, Warren Magnuson, and Julia Butler Hansen all identify with the Democratic Party while other names such as Dan Evans are lacking. Although supportive of the concept, naming rooms after individuals could create some subjectivity issues. He suggested identifying rooms as geographic areas rather than by individual names.

Deputy Director Covington inquired about the possibility of excluding elected officials to lessen potential conflicts. Senator Fraser commented on the risks associated with naming rooms after individuals. Alex Rolluda echoed similar concerns and inquired about how some of the categories and placement of individuals were determined. He's appreciative of the inclusion of Carlos Bulosan, a Filipino poet and playwright. Mr. Bulosan has some wonderful quotes that should be considered especially in terms of the early struggles of Filipino immigrants in the early 1990s, as well as the struggles by Chinese and Japanese immigrants.

Mr. Sullivan provided additional clarification on the intent to create wayfinding within the building. Each room would be assigned a number. The plan for naming rooms was a way to reinforce wayfinding and to help visitors identify rooms accessible to the public by strengthening the identity of public spaces for visitors. Advisory members discussed similar issues surrounding the selection of names during meetings and conversations. The entire list of names was quite lengthy. Floor themes are not included in the graphics for each floor and were primarily developed to help organize quotes and graphics.

Ms. Olmsted said that quite often, discussions could lead to splitting hairs between different names. Today, there are few places where it's possible to celebrate and honor significant contributions ranging from design or contributions by amazing people. Although perfection is the desired goal, it's not always possible to satisfy everyone. The proposal represents a great way to honor significant people.

Bill Frare asked how the recommendations from the CCDAC might affect the construction schedule and completion of the building.

Jon Taylor, Project Manager for the 1063 Block Building, spoke to the benefits of Mr. Sullivan's contribution to the project. His expertise assisted with moving the graphics package forward. The project team is working with graphic professionals to establish a graphics budget, which will affect the schedule to some extent. As noted by Ms. Olmsted, it's not possible to develop a package that satisfies everyone. The rooms are mostly for the occupants and shared with visitors. The ground level includes larger rooms. The intent of the proposal was having a great graphics package to help the overall identity of the building. Decisions made now can help in pricing the project with some room for adjustments later in the process. He suggested the committee could support the proposal with the caveat of retaining some future options to insert different names.

Deputy Director Covington agreed the proposal is an amazing body of work reflecting much effort. However, members of the committee offered some words of advice and some warnings. Additionally, any naming of conference rooms is subject to approval by the Legislature. From a schedule and timing perspective, it's uncertain whether CCDAC and SCC approvals moving forward in terms of placement of names on conference rooms might influence the project schedule.

Representative Hunt requested clarification whether legislation is required to codify names of meeting rooms. Manager Jennings affirmed the Legislature approves names for spaces. Director Larson advised that approval of names for spaces require a concurrent resolution similar to naming of buildings by the Legislature.

Chair Haskell said the committee has offered feedback and advice and unless offered, a motion might not be in order.

Campus Combined Heat and Power Plant - Replace Central Heating & Cooling Plant – Information & Advice

Chair Haskell recognized Ron Major, Resource Conservation Manager.

Manager Major's presentation updated the committee on the project proposal background, engineering analysis of options, recommended solution, and financial and environmental benefits.

The current steam heating system served by the Central Plant has heated Capitol Campus since the early 1920s through nearly 2.7 miles of steam and condensate piping in utility and tunnel corridors for steam heating to 12 of the 19 campus buildings for heat and hot water. The system's average annual operating efficiency is 34% or \$600,000 annually for natural gas producing approximately \$215,000 worth of heating.

The current steam heating system includes one boiler installed in 1960 and 2 boilers installed in 1974. Other high-pressure vessels throughout the system were installed prior to modern codes and testing creating an unsafe environment.

Manager Major displayed an aerial map of the campus steam distribution system. The Central Plant is located on the shores of Capitol Lake with piping extending to all West Campus buildings and into some East Campus buildings. The new Central Plant is recommended for placement near the OB2 Building.

Engineering analysis included an investment grade audit (IGA) conducted by University Mechanical Contractors to analyze all alternatives. The IGA compared various scenarios against a Business as Usual (BAU) model of maintaining the existing steam and chilled water system using the existing plant over a 50-year lifecycle in line with the OFM lifecycle cost tool. All operational savings were compared for each alternative against the BAU model. Additionally, the process included risk valuation for continued operations at the current site because of apparent risks associated with the existing site.

Scenarios evaluated with the OFM lifecycle cost tool included:

- A. Business as Usual (BAU) – continued operation of steam boilers located at the existing Central Plant with repairs provided to the existing steam distribution system.
- B. Hot Water System Located at the Existing Power House – hot water generated by a combined heat and power system, new hot water distribution piping and campus building modifications to connect to the new system.
- C. Hot Water System Located at a New Central Plant – hot water generated by a combined heat and power system at an East Campus site, new hot water distribution piping and building modifications to connect to the new system.

Following evaluation of the heating system, resources were available to examine the chilled water systems for East and West Campus under each scenario because buildings are heated and cooled.

The recommended solution was selection of Option C to construct a new Central Plant located adjacent to the OB2 Building with one-third of the structure below ground. The plant would convert the steam system to hot water with new distribution piping to serve all campus building, include a new 2.6 megawatt combined Heat and Power (CHP) Plant, and a new chilled water plant plus distribution piping for all campus buildings. The option accommodates the Capitol Campus Master Plan's 50-year growth projection for heating and cooling needs. Energy performance contracting provides a turnkey project with guaranteed maximum costs, savings, and performance of the equipment. The option contemplates leveraging capital dollars with Certificates of Participation (Treasurer's Office) (COPs), federal grants, and utility incentives.

The new CHP and Chilled Water Plant reuses vacated space in the basement of OB2 and replaces steam equipment in campus buildings beyond useful life. The space provides access from the Plaza Garage for operation of the distribution system and access to steam tunnels. An innovative approach for concealing the plant's exhaust stack is running the stack under the plaza and through mechanical space and then along an adjacent exterior stair tower and extending above the roofline of the building. The option preserves ingress and assembly areas for the Natural Resources and OB2 Buildings, as well as providing access to emergency responders.

Manager Major reviewed a conceptual illustration of the plant's design. The option provides opportunities for green roofs and extending the plaza for accessibility. The design is conducive for placement of solar panels or an awning structure. The option provides an estimated \$129 million in avoided operating costs over 50 years when compared to the BAU model. A new plant provides for efficiency of operations and enables optimal space utilization and efficiency of systems based on the design of the new plant.

Ms. Olmsted asked how the plant would interact with future buildings in terms of integration with new building renewables. Manager Major replied that the design factored a 50-year lifecycle projection. The 1063 Building is a new building employing a ground source heat pump system. In 30 years, the equipment would need to be replaced. Direction of the evaluation was clear to avoid any limitation of any technology or one option because flexibility was important when considering future technologies.

Ms. Olmsted recommended some careful consideration of the entry view to the entrance of the Plaza Garage.

Chair Haskell added that during master planning efforts to update the Master Plan, several sites were considered for major landscaping potential for entry into the campus. At the last briefing, the committee urged staff to consider the landscape and how the plant would be placed within the larger landscape. At this point, he's not comfortable with the proposed design as the canopy is likely not an appropriate entrance to the campus. Design of a building must consider how it fits within the entire landscape. He recommended involving a landscape architect to design the entire site rather than only the building.

Ms. Olmsted and Mr. Rolluda agreed. Manager Major agreed with the recommendation. The conceptual design was developed by ZGF Architects as a subconsultant to University Mechanical Contractors. All recommended ideas would be part of design considerations to ensure all building elements support master planning and the surrounding landscape, as well as enhancing the entrance to the campus.

Manager Taylor added that because of the building's placement below ground, other buildings could be placed closer because of reductions in noise and fumes. Manager Major acknowledged the placement of approximately one-third of the building below ground helps mitigate noise and other issues that otherwise would be challenging to address.

Chair Haskell pointed out how a good landscape plan could obscure the exposed part of the building as well, which should be considered as the structure is a utilitarian building located at a major entrance into the campus. Landscaping is an important component and should be of critical consideration.

It was noted that an existing access point for ADA access is an elevator tower with stairs. The conceptual design incorporates access through a ramp providing the basis for a structural cover, which could be extended over the driving area. The design is only conceptual at this time.

Manager Major said other information prompting the location of the building was Puget Sound Energy's gas line and other utility connections in addition to the ability to place part of the building below ground. The design was at a level to enable the contractor to develop cost estimates to arrive at a guaranteed maximum project cost.

Chair Haskell suggested the pricing exercise should include landscaping as an important component of the guaranteed maximum project cost.

Deputy Director Covington acknowledged the inclusion of landscaping in the project cost and the importance of the gateway entry. The proposal is to determine whether the option is viable or whether the direction should be to utilize existing resources. More information will be presented to the CCDAC and the SCC should the project move forward in terms of more detailed design and placement within the landscape.

Representative Hunt said the committee previously discussed similar concerns and during those conversations, an idea was mentioned to improve the appearance of the underground tunnel. He asked whether the proposal includes any of those options. Director Liu advised that the proposal does not include the underground tunnel; however, the tunnel should be considered in the near term. The design work on the master planning effort recognized the importance of improving the aesthetics of the tunnel.

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, pointed out how the 1991 Master Plan speaks to embellishing the interior of the tunnel to improve aesthetics and brighten the tunnel.

Director Liu supported the committee's idea for placement of light tunnels or light spaces to identify the area for people to use as a route.

Manager Major reviewed the financial benefits of the proposal. At a minimum, continuing with a BAU option would require approximately \$16 million in investment to maintain operation of the steam system and improve safety features. The project cost for the recommended project is \$125 million. No average annual avoided energy costs would be generated by the BAU option, but would total \$1.2 million for the proposed option. An additional savings in operating costs of \$1.3 million would achieve total savings of \$2.5 million annually. The total 50-year cost of ownership between the options is \$281,358,000 for the BAU option and \$264,651,000 for the recommended option (includes debt service). The recommended option achieves additional savings in avoided energy and annual operating costs over the 50-year lifecycle totaling \$129 million. Carbon emissions for the BAU option total 423,083 metric tons while the recommended option totals 192,814 metric tons resulting in a 54% reduction.

Director Frare noted that many building systems on the campus are nearing the end of useful lifecycles with many HVAC systems requiring replacement. The \$129 million in 50-year avoided cost includes \$16-\$20 million in capital renewals for other buildings and avoid investments in old technology.

Senator Fraser recommended including information on the financial benefits depicting the amount of funds no longer wasted because of system inefficiency experienced by the system today.

Manager Major added that the campus is contending with 19th century technology and an inability to solve 21st century challenges. The opportunity to improve the system also affords a technological leap while also achieving cost savings.

The environmental benefits of the recommended project reduce risks to an environmentally sensitive area along the shores of Capitol Lake currently housing a 350,000-gallon diesel tank that is used as a backup system to maintain the system. The proposed project eliminates the need for the diesel tank reducing environmental risk. The project protects the hillside against potential failure and reduces carbon emissions by 54% meeting the 2035 DES CO2 reduction goal. The project provides a pathway to control energy consumption within each building by replacing building systems.

The project combines asset preservation, energy efficiency, carbon reduction, disaster preparedness, and life safety improvements in one single cost effective package. It provides guaranteed savings through Energy Savings Performance Contracting, short- and long-term financial benefits, and enables the leveraging of limited capital dollars through COPs, utility incentives, and potential federal grants.

Greg Lane asked about the breakdown of costs for COPs. Manager Major said the amount depends on sources of other funding. Utility incentives include a range of savings between \$2 million to \$8 million with \$6 million anticipated for the project with some additional utility incentives possible. At this time, more information on the design is required to provide definitive cost savings.

Mr. Lane asked when DES anticipates requesting approval of the project from the Legislature. Deputy Director Covington replied that DES is at the point of retaining the project proposal to afford ongoing conversations with the CCDAC and SCC. At this time, DES has submitted the proposal to OFM in the proposed budget. However, many details need refinement to include the distribution of mixed funding and assurance of appropriate feedback from the CCDAC and SCC.

Senator Fraser asked whether any thought was afforded for the future of the old plant, such as recognition as an historic site for potential conversion for community uses. Manager Major said the proposed project would mothball and improve building safety.

Deputy Director Covington said all options could be considered with the primary goal of closing and improving safety. The costs of improving the building to the appropriate level of future functions have not been factored.

Senator Fraser agreed the proposal is a must-do project.

Representative Hunt said he's amazed that the projection of 50-year costs has been identified.

Chair Haskell said the assumption is that the committee would continue to review the design as the project evolves. Although the project is challenging in terms of design, it offers an opportunity for creative solutions.

Deputy Director Covington asked for guidance from the committee on a recommendation to the SCC on the proposed project.

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Susan Olmsted, to support the proposed Capitol Campus Combined Heat and Power Project as a high priority.

Chair Haskell acknowledged the need for the project but not without grave considerations concerning the site and development of the project on the site. At this point, he's unable to recommend approval of the project because of those concerns.

Manager Miller pointed out that the proposal is at a preliminary concept level and would complete a rigorous review similar to other new campus buildings.

Senator Fraser and Ms. Olmsted offered a friendly amendment to reflect that the CCDAC approves the concept of the project subject to future approval of a rigorous design process.

Motion carried.

Extend Sid Snyder Avenue SW – Staff Report – Information, Discussion, & Advice

Nathaniel Jones, Asset Manager, briefed the committee on a proposal from Representative Hunt for naming changes to streets on the West Campus.

The proposal would extend Sid Snyder Avenue to the north wrapping as a loop through the West Campus beginning at the southeast corner at 14th Avenue and Capitol Way near the entrance of the tunnel and extending west at Cherry Lane (to be renamed to Sid Snyder Avenue) and extending along 12th Avenue, Water Avenue, and 11th Avenue (also to be renamed) and ending at Capitol Way.

Currently, the process for naming changes on Capitol Campus does not exist. The last time a street was renamed was in 2006 when 14th Avenue was renamed as Sid Snyder Avenue. The process at that time involved the Director of General Administration working with the City of Olympia. The Council approved a resolution to change the name followed by an informal process by the SCC.

Staff recommends a different renaming process for future street name changes on Capitol Campus. During the process of considering steps for changing street names, staff discovered the state has the authority to change street names while acknowledging the importance of coordinating with other jurisdictions. The most important coordination is with the City of Olympia and Thurston County, particularly with Thurston County Emergency Services. Research revealed some of the street names on Capitol Campus have not been fully coordinated with Thurston County. Staff is currently making those changes to ensure Thurston County Emergency Services is aware of street names on the campus.

Staff is recommending a process involving consultation with the City of Olympia's Community, Planning, and Development Department and working with the CCDAC to ensure the appropriateness of the proposed renaming, and direction from the SCC to complete the coordination process with Thurston County. It's also important to work with the City of Olympia to complete the City's formal naming process as well. No City Council action is required or recommended at this time.

With respect to the current proposal, staff encountered some challenges and is seeking feedback from the CCDAC. The proposed loop does not include navigation on the campus as the series of 90° turns and changes in road names through the movements could be confusing to those who may be visiting the campus or is seeking a particular location. There is some merit in memorializing individuals or events in the naming of streets. However, staff is requesting feedback on the proposal.

Deputy Director Covington explained that one concern from a DES perspective is emergency services and the ability to identify a location. For example and for comparison purposes, another looped road within a

residential setting includes individual house numbers making it easy to identify locations. However, there are no easily identifiable addresses on buildings along the loop. Part of the conversation in consideration of the proposal pertains to both wayfinding but also consideration of emergency response. Other opportunities exist for renaming or including directional references to Sid Snyder Loop such as south, west, or north, or something similar providing more options to mitigate emergency response risks. Consultation with the Washington State Patrol and emergency service responders should be considered to receive feedback as to a different naming convention of southwest or north as a way to address the concerns by DES, as well as whether there are similar concerns about impacts to response time for emergency services.

Chair Haskell agreed with seeking emergency services input. Additionally, building references along the loop could assist in wayfinding.

Director Liu said renaming could entail a simple change such as Sid Snyder Loop Southwest or Sid Snyder Loop North.

Representative Hunt said the proposal arose from frustration when working with tourists and visitors arriving to the Legislative Building and questions on how to reach the GA Building or the 1063 Building by vehicle. Several years ago during the Lakefair fireworks show, one of the fireworks hit the ground at the Governor's Mansion and started a fire. He called 911 and emergency response asked for the address, which he was unable to provide other than it was at the Governor's Mansion. Further inquiry asked for the location and at that time, the only response was that it was located near the Legislative Building. Eventually, first responders located the fire, but only after the location were described as being next to the big building with a dome. After discussing the incident with the Olympia City Manager, it appeared the City would be agreeable to rename the streets. The proposal makes sense because it creates a Sid Snyder Avenue as a loop rather than five different street names.

Senator Fraser agreed with the proposal while acknowledging that no proposal is simple. She suggested assigning numbers to all campus buildings to enable emergency services the ability to identify locations during emergency response. She doesn't support adding north or south designations because the US Postal Service redesignated the campus by geographic quadrants. Designating a street address as "north" might be confusing. Additionally, Sid Snyder Avenue should be revised to reflect Sid Snyder Loop because it's more descriptive.

Manager Miller advised that all campus buildings are assigned an address but not all buildings are numbered. The Legislative Building address is 416 Sid Snyder Avenue.

Ms. Olmsted added that within the historic planting plans for the campus, Cherry Lane was originally designated as Dogwood Lane to acknowledge the native tree species instead of cherry trees. When the planting plan was updated, the next generation of trees was designated as dogwood trees to honor the history. Although not necessarily applicable to the proposal, the information is interesting as part of the history surrounding street naming. She supports the idea of a loop and honoring that circulation on the West Campus but would be concerned with 11th Avenue as it is part of the campus and crosses the street. In consideration of the boundaries and making connections, she questioned whether naming the loop strengthens the campus as a whole and increases identity within the West campus or whether it could lead to further confusion for visitors differentiating West Campus from East Campus.

Representative Hunt said he doesn't believe it would lead to any additional confusion, as the same situation exists with 14th Avenue. Most visitors are able to locate 11th Avenue and the DNR Building.

Chair Haskell said the proposal likely wouldn't lead to more disorientation as there are many examples of streets with different names at specific points.

Senator Fraser referred to an option the City of Lacey has implemented by adding the historic street name to major streets designated by a different colored street plate. If the proposal is implemented, the historic names (Cherry Lane) could be added as well.

Representative Hunt noted that within the middle of the loop the street network includes north and south diagonal streets, which also speak to the need for renaming.

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Senator Fraser, to accept the proposal as staff presented, and move forward with next steps. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Haskell pointed out that inherent in the motion is some advice about addressing building numbers and addresses.

Chair Haskell recessed the meeting at 11:55 a.m. to 12:23 p.m. for lunch.

Master Plan & Campus Predesign – Opportunity Sites –Development Plans – Information, Discussion, & Feedback

Chair Haskell recognized Lenore Miller, Asset Manager.

Manager Miller introduced Walter Schacht with Schacht|Aslani Architecture.

Mr. Schacht briefed the committee on progress of work on four opportunity sites and their relationship to the Capitol Campus Master Plan. He introduced colleagues Eric Aman, Antonio Dellomo, and Jason King.

The project involving Schacht|Aslani Architecture, DES, and other stakeholders originated from two legislative provisos for the Capitol Campus Predesign and the State Capitol Master Plan. The Capitol Campus Predesign proviso directed the review of uses for the Pritchard Building and the parking lot to the east, the Proarts site, General Administration Building replacement or rehabilitation, and replacement of the Newhouse Building (to include the Visitor Center site and adjacent block to the east). The proviso requested identification of uses, project costs, and schedules. The State Capitol Master Plan proviso requested identification of any other potential development sites and any infrastructure that might be needed for development of the four opportunity sites. The proviso also requested a review of parking areas and although the effort didn't address parking areas, the work has considered parking on the West Campus.

Mr. Schacht displayed an aerial illustration of the Capitol Campus designating the opportunity sites from the 2006 Master Plan. Site 1 is the GA Building, site 12 is the Proarts site (included is #11 although not included in the proviso), site 6 is the Pritchard Building with parking (#5), and site 6 is the Newhouse site with the visitor block located immediately to the east.

The team spent time reviewing the 2006 Master Plan to distill key points influencing planning and decision-making for development of the four opportunity sites. Key issues identified included:

1. Public Use & Access

- Maximize opportunities for access, interaction with state government

- Provide universal access
- Extend educational opportunities to the broadest audience
- Support public schools curricula
- Enrich visitor experience
- Give highest priority to uses that meet state government needs
- Preserve public assets

2. Delivery of Public Services

- Assess highest and best use of opportunity sites
- Encourage co-location of services to increase efficiency of operations

3. Community Vitality

- Control parking with management plan & alternative commute modes
- Renovate buildings when reasonable
- Incorporate low-impact development

4. Historic Properties

- Develop preservation strategies for long-term management of buildings, grounds, and collections.

5. Design

- Maintain & enhance major view corridors on campus as well as views into campus
- Provides features that link campus space
- Develop campus perimeters, create physical & visual transitions
- Maintain Legislative Building as dominant element
- Scale: O'Brien & Cherberg set maximum height for new West Campus construction
- Siting: site as part of existing open space/landscape pattern
- Style: blend with established style of West Campus, designed to be representative of their era

6. Technical Performance

- Create energy & water efficient buildings
- Create environments that contribute to occupant health
- Offer flexibility of office & agency use
- Design for building system integration into utility master plan
- Integrate with local infrastructure

Jason King, Mithūn, reported the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan serves as the baseline to frame some of the discussion surrounding opportunity sites. Another resource supplying additional context is the 2009 West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation Master Plan. The Olmsted Plan spoke to compression and decompression. As a design strategy, the idea of compressing space and opening up views and experiences occurs at the pedestrian scale throughout the campus through tree-lined corridors. The development of the north and south on a larger scale creates campus compression so that the scale of the development to the north and south actually provide some of the compression that opens views to the Capitol. The importance of Sid Snyder and 11th Avenue as entries into the campus is critical.

Another consideration is how the original plan developed landscape hithology. The Capitol Group, which is the original historic core of the campus, is a more formal landscape strategy. The Greens Core is open space. Opportunity sites to the north and south bleed into the street edge and interface with

residential neighborhoods and the urban edge to the north. The native edge of the slope wrapping around provides a design strategy framing the natural environment and enveloping the entire campus. Olmsted originally proposed continuing the natural edge to provide framing to the development of the campus and to the south because the Pritchard Building was not included where the campus ends south of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. Today, there is an opportunity to extend the natural edge by wrapping the edge around the south area of Pritchard and the Newhouse sites providing the ability to transition to the campus, as well as additional buffering for the South Capitol Neighborhood.

Ensuring public use, connectiveness, and access to the Capitol is served by maintaining both the view and pedestrian physical connectivity from the neighborhood to the north, as well as to the South Capitol Neighborhood by extending the landscape character and how it ties the fabric of the campus into the neighborhood while terminating public amenities for the campus and the City of Olympia within the green space.

The work also explored the relationship of employee and visitor parking located on campus. The idea that development of the opportunity sites would have impacts on existing parking and the location of those parking areas on campus, as well as integrating some of the larger strategies of Transportation Demand Management led to considering the idea of how the nature of commuting and single family vehicle use might change parking dynamics. The sites to the north (GA Building) and the south campus area would be impacted in terms of the effectiveness of parking on campus and allocation between visitors and employees.

Mr. Schacht added that one of the by-products of the work by the team was development of a digital three-dimensional model of the campus and buildings. Some of the drawings were generated from the visual model. The team is taking advantage of the model when completing some of the studies while the three-dimensional model would be helpful for future efforts for the sites.

Mr. King reported access is another big consideration for the GA and ProArts sites. The team examined how people access the campus and explored how building or redeveloping the south edge would enable clear access to those properties while also minimizing the impact to people traveling through the South Capitol Neighborhood.

The idea of a strong concept of visitor services was also considered. Today, existing visitor services is located within the Legislative Building. Considering how people access the campus, park, and the reason for visiting are important to acknowledge through spaces providing some amenities and clear wayfinding to enable those activities while working within the framework of the campus.

Mr. King reviewed a summary of opportunities from master planning efforts:

- Achieve key master plan principles
- Restore the historic Olmsted Brothers landscape plan
- Reduce the rainwater to the City's storm drain system and reduce frequency of overflow
- Leveraging infrastructure improvements to meet multiple goals
- Improve pedestrian experience and connections to neighborhood

Mr. Schacht said the group also diagramed some of the critical physical characteristics of the campus to determine what extent they inform future planning. The Capitol Croup's center is the Legislative Building and dome and is central physically, as well as programmatically because it not only houses both houses of the Legislature, it also houses other aspects of government including the Executive Branch. It's

a critical aspect of the campus plan. As architects and planners are aware, institutions inform physical planning. Physical planning creates relationships between people and organizations and informs how they coexist. The Legislative Building as the physical center of the campus actually has an impact on how state government works.

There are many inclinations to identify the axes by the orientation of the buildings to the north over the lake and the access through the center by the diagonals. The team took a different approach as the dome serves as the solid nature of the Capitol Group of historic buildings and open space and are what defines the campus experience. For the most part, it's not possible for pedestrians to travel along the axes because buildings block access. Spaces between the buildings serve as public rooms through a dense network of buildings to arrive at public space within buildings.

The team also recorded the development chronology and the time of building construction, as well as the buildings on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible buildings for listing. Two buildings not on the register are the Conservatory and Newhouse Building. Most of the West Campus was constructed by 1940 with two projects occurring in 1955 and 1959 of the GA and Pritchard Buildings. The 1981 Visitor Center is included, but consists of modular units. A construction gap occurs between 1959 and 2017. Most construction during that period occurred on the East Campus.

At the onset of the work, the team acknowledged the extent of planning completed for the West Campus. The team continues to find new information and consolidated and cataloged all the information in ways to answer questions concerning the sites and to avoid re-inventing the wheel. The GA Building has a number of previous studies, as well as a plan to cut an atrium through the building to enable daylight through the building. The Pritchard Library has fewer studies but poses additional challenges as it was designed and built specifically as a library with stacks making it difficult to adapt for reuse. The team is exploring some programming ideas for the building. The most recent study of the Pritchard Building was conversion to offices with the east site converted to a parking lot accommodating over 200 vehicles with a park on top. The study removed some of the floors to increase floor-to-floor height for offices.

Multiple studies were completed for the Newhouse and Visitor Center sites. A 1974 study called for a 300,000 square foot office building accommodating 800 stalls of parking under the building in a single monumental building, which today, wouldn't meet the contemporary understanding of the relationship to the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings.

A more recent study was completed for replacement of the Newhouse Building with a 50,000 square foot building with parking under the building and a larger 150,000 square foot building on the Visitor Center block with garages linked. A second study was also completed for the same proposal for a larger, but similar project.

The ProArts site has only been studied once reflecting a large office building consistent with best practices in creating a flexible contemporary workplace.

The value of this study is recognition of the previous studies for all the opportunity sites. Each study provides information on site capacity and development opportunity. One of the directives to determine the highest and best use was considering the maximum development capacity for each of the sites applying master plan guidelines. The team examined the notion of flexible contemporary workplace. The ProArts Building conforms to best practice paradym with no columns in the floor plan affording shared spaces and placement of partitions. The structure works well for sustainable design practices.

After reviewing the opportunity sites, the team developed options for each site for testing. One approach relates to the Transportation Building of a wing and a core. The study also explored whether modules were possible to allow sites to develop in phases. One of the challenges in developing the sites is the cost of the project. A phased approach of constructing smaller modules to meet current need could result in affordable pricing. The center core prototype is similar to the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings.

The team examined the GA Building and considered all previous studies in conjunction with the current study. The renovated facility and atrium costs are from the 2012 study. The 400,000 square foot development site is from the 2007 predesign study as part of the Heritage Center proposal. The team tested a prototype of two wings surrounding a core totaling 275,000 square feet. The 2007 study was larger because site development extended into the hillside at a much higher cost and likely no longer feasible because of the retainment work completed and stormwater development for the 1063 Building.

The team was asked to consider replacement of the Pritchard Building and rebuilding on both the building site and east lot. That scenario is unlikely as it would entail removal of a National Register building. Rebuilding a structure on the east parking lot would enable a 75,600 square foot building. The existing facility is 55,500 square feet, but lacks some usable space because of the floor stacks.

The Newhouse and Visitor sites were studied multiple times with different configurations. The team determined the site capacity at 265,000 square feet. The 2007 predesign was approximately 200,000 square feet, while the 1974 predesign produced a 300,000 square foot building. Based on the phased approach, it might be possible to achieve that level of development by constructing projects in wings with open spaces and a different sense of scale. With a different approach, it might be possible to achieve a development potential and still align with the scale of the historic Capitol Group.

The team was asked to go beyond the 2010 study for the ProArts Building and consider the entire block. The study determined the maximum development potential of 225,000 square feet in a five-story building. Using the study's prototype for a half-block development, the results reveal a 150,000 square foot building, which is somewhat less than the 2010 predesign study because of programmed space below grade and no longer applicable because of workplace standards.

The half block development at Union resulted in a 120,000 square foot building.

The study also considered parking garages under all the structures.

Mr. King reviewed infrastructure needs for the opportunity sites. Infrastructure costs would have impact on the extent of development for the opportunity sites.

The ProArts site would connect to the existing City system. Stormwater improvements for the 1063 Building have increased stormwater capacity and benefits redevelopment of the GA site. For the Pritchard Building, the possibility exists of managing stormwater onsite rather than diverting to an outfall to Capitol Lake. The Newhouse site is more complicated. Redevelopment of the site triggers the upgrade of critical campus infrastructure incurring an additional campus cost for redevelopment of the site. One opportunity to avoid those costs is tying into the City of Olympia's system, which is counter to the goal of removing the campus from the City's system.

Representative Hunt asked about the type of discharge to Capitol Lake. Mr. King said the discharge is treated rainwater prior to discharge.

For utilities, the team is working with Reid Middleton to coordinate efforts for future buildout of the opportunity sites to assist in sizing utility infrastructure.

Mr. Schacht reported that the efforts as previously described were part of cataloging and analysis of data from previous studies and the master plan, and evaluating the capacity to develop on the sites. The next section of the presentation focuses on several specific instances tested in more detail.

The one specific question brought forward as part of the work completed to date is what should be done with the GA Building. As the most studied building in the state's history, the building still stands and represents an expensive and complicated issue. Recent interest has surfaced for renovating and reusing the building. As part of the work, the team worked on an alternatives analysis for the GA Building.

A second question concerns the disposition of the Pritchard Building. Similar to the GA Building, the Pritchard Building is at the end of its service life in terms of building systems. If efforts are not expended to adaptively reuse the building, the expense of renovating increases each year. With the GA and Pritchard Buildings, the question concerns next steps for each building and whether they could be adapted for reuse.

The analysis indicates that the Newhouse Building should be replaced and is likely a project that might be pursued in the near term because of program demands of the House.

The team considered the four elements of the GA, Pritchard, Newhouse replacement, and House program needs and conducted further analysis.

The 2012 study for the GA Building concluded that the most sustainable approach is to renovate the building because of the retention of material and reduced demolition costs. Providing an atrium through the building enables an appropriate amount of daylight resulting in reasonable workspaces. The team's evaluation deemed that if the GA Building was renovated, the cost would be approximately 80%-85% of the cost for replacement. As a general rule of thumb, it would make more sense to replace the building rather than investing that amount of money to renovate the building. Essentially, the floors, columns, and exterior concrete panels would be retained with the rest of the building demolished. The alternatives analysis considered whether the structural configuration of column spacing would introduce a level of inefficiency in terms of configuration of space. A lifecycle cost analysis might reveal less cost to renovate but more expense in the long term for operations. This study did not include a lifecycle cost analysis or a total cost of operations analysis. The work completed by the team took the replacement versus the renovation one step further. However, future direction and decision would need to be determined.

Replacement of the Newhouse Building and providing program space to meet House needs is dependent upon the receipt of detailed program information on space need requirements. Based on recent conversations with OFM and legislative staff, it's likely a new or renovated 75,000 square foot building would be needed. At the time of the alternatives analysis, available information considered two 65,000 - 75,000 square foot buildings. The alternatives analysis is still relevant to the highest and best use of the sites pending program confirmation. Additionally, the location of the site on the south end of the campus lends to questions about the appropriate scale of the building as opposed to the sites located to the north. Although it's possible to construct too large of a building, it's also possible to build too small. The Newhouse site is worth considering because it doesn't fit with the Capitol Group not because of the quality of the architecture but because of the scale. In some ways, the largest increment of a new building might be the size of the Cherberg or the O'Brien Buildings or combined buildings. A 75,000 square foot building is a reasonable size to consider in terms of campus scale and sensible ownership.

South Campus Option A includes Office Building 1, Office Building 2 (same size), and the renovation of the Pritchard Building. The team considered adaptive reuse of the Pritchard Building for a combination of shared meeting room space for any campus function, for use by DES Visitors Services, and the potential for touchdown space for visitors on campus or visitors participating in lobbying or engaging with the Legislature. The site is constrained by the steep slope to the lake. The possibility exists of freeing up more space from the stacks and cantilevering the upper two stories to avoid conflict with the topography. It's possible to maintain food service and a dining area on the north side and a lobby or assembly space. Taking the medium-sized hearing room footprint from the O'Brien Building afforded a testing of stacking two floors of similar space on floors 2 and 3. Mr. Schacht emphasized the importance of developing a program for reuse; otherwise, the Pritchard Building would continue to sit vacant.

Representative Hunt referred to conversations surrounding the Heritage Building and issues associated with the stability of the hillside. He asked whether the study considered that issue. Mr. Schacht said another project was completed addressing stability issues. Manager Miller added the 10-year capital plan includes a future request to address the area of the Conservatory, as well as vulnerable locations along the edge of the hillside from the Pritchard Building north to the GA Building.

Ms. Olmsted disclosed that she works at Mithūn and Mr. King is her colleague. She appreciates the level of information shared with the committee, as well as compiling the information from the past that is still relevant and has some bearing on future work. The information is valuable and clear. She supports the reuse of the Pritchard Building as there have been many discussions about the building. Within the tieback to many of the values, she would prefer inclusion (if within the scope of the plan) of how some of the different scenarios serve the public benefit and includes pedestrian amenities to help identify the future of campus open space in relationship to potential build-outs. She also recommended including the view from the south side of Sid Snyder.

Mr. Rolluda supported the recommendations especially retaining and reusing the Pritchard Building. Option A includes a building next to the Cherberg Building that appears to crowd the area. He prefers Option B of the core & wing prototype, especially from the neighborhood's perspective because it enables a view of a courtyard and a smaller modular building as opposed to a solid façade. He asked for a view representative of the area from the neighborhood looking inward to Option B.

Chair Haskell commented on the importance of the west lawn and the relationship to the community south of the campus. It appears the scheme begins to help frame the west lawn from the south, as well as address the neighborhood to the south. Some conversation about the west lawn and its importance to the campus and how other buildings begin to frame the lawn should be considered.

Ms. Olmsted commented on how the team continues to receive program information as the team develops the information, which is influencing the extent of the development framing the study. She questioned whether the opportunity sites could accommodate additional programming needs identified later in the process in addition to legislative office space and how that might change the proposal for the different sites, as well as consideration of the vision for open space on the campus.

Mr. Schacht replied that the issues identified by the committee have not been articulated at this point. The team agrees with the points raised by the committee. The plan is to conduct another round of study to address those issues. The process has an advantage because of the digital model affording an opportunity to consider different layouts and views, as well as completing the missing step of identifying key master plan guidelines against the scenarios. To the extent that the scenarios are flexible, in some

ways it serves the next step positively as predesign hasn't been set and could change based on conditions that might change.

Senator Fraser recommended some considerations within the effort of previous proposals to place K12 and higher education buildings on the campus in the area of the GA Building and the 1063 Building with conversion of the Old Capitol Building to a small agency building, as well as a proposal for an Executive Office Building to the west of the Temple of Justice (currently a parking lot). Parking in the Flag Circle is designated as employee parking; however, for two-thirds of year, the area serves as visitor parking.

Capitol Lake Management Plan – Update, Discussion & Feedback

Deputy Director Covington reported the effort, currently in Phase 1, was initiated from a capital budget proviso in the 2015-2017 budget directing DES to make tangible progress on reaching broad agreement on the long-term management of Capitol Lake and lower Deschutes watershed. The proviso appropriated \$250,000 for the work and included components to identify and summarize best available science for water quality and habitat, identify multiple hybrid options for future management of Capitol Lake to include improving fish, wildlife, habitat, and ecosystem functions, maintain the historic reflecting pool, identify adaptive management strategies, identify general cost estimates for construction and maintenance of the conceptual options, include a range of public support to identify options and measure support for shared funding by state and federal agencies and other government entities, and identify conceptual options for shared governance of the future management plan.

The Phase 1 implementation plan began with the formation of the Executive Work Group comprised of government partners from the Squaxin Island Tribe, City of Olympia, City of Tumwater, Thurston County, and Port of Olympia. The Executive Work Group meets monthly. Additionally, the process includes a community meeting and input period, a Technical Committee to include the same stakeholders but different individuals representing the entities, as well as the Department of Ecology, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources, a Funding and Governance Committee comprised of representatives from the Executive Work Group organizations, and the Floyd|Snider consultant team who is leading the effort.

The work involves a two-touch process of review of materials and activities by each stakeholder group, i.e. Executive Work Group, Technical Committee, and the community. The effort was initiated in March with planning activities to define the process, costs, and approach. The effort moved to establishing goals and objectives by working through the two-touch process and with feedback from the community for reaching agreement on the goals and objectives to pursue as part of a long-term management strategy for the water body. The process moved to an approach for defining best available science with involvement by the Technical Committee with the necessary background and expertise to inform the effort. The process included a phase of identifying hybrid options to include evaluating new options offered by the community and considering options from the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) process and bringing the options together for review.

All of the work completed during Phase 1 forms the basis of the Proviso Report to OFM and the Legislature in December. The process is currently examining cost estimates, completing efforts for funding and governance, and drafting the Proviso Report.

The work has resulted in strong collaboration between the entities and the community in a way demonstrating that there is a path of agreement on many issues allowing the process to succeed to the next step, which is the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

Currently, Phase 1 is nearing completion of the activities for defining the statement of need and working through details with government partners to balance the objectives moving forward.

Deputy Director Covington reviewed the goals and objectives established in April. All stakeholders reviewed numerous activities occurring throughout the life of the lake beginning in 1949-1951 during the construction of the lake to attempts to dredge, the introduction of New Zealand mudsnails, and other issues that led the effort to a point of surveying the community to identify what's important to the public to consider for the long-term management of the water body. The response was significantly higher than previous surveying efforts. Respondents identified aesthetics, sediment management, recreational opportunities, and water quality as important considerations. Aesthetics do not necessarily equate to a lake, estuary, or a hybrid option. Aesthetics can be important for any long-term management option. Public input wasn't restricted to an online survey as many public meetings were held to receive feedback from the public.

As the effort proceeded to goals, the process identified previous goals from previous project documentation. Working with community stakeholders and government partners, the process identified primary themes of environment, infrastructure, community, and economy, which moved to agreed upon goals for long-term management of the water body. The goals served to form the foundation of the evaluation as it moves forward to Phase 2 and the EIS process.

The process is on schedule to meet the deadline for submittal of the Proviso Report. Everyone involved in the process want to move forward to reach a decision. Phase 1 was not intended to serve as a decision-making process. All work completed during Phase 1 positions the effort for next steps and supports requirements to complete an EIS successfully.

Director Liu commented that when the process was first initiated, it was understood that a diverse governmental and community opinion existed about Capitol Lake, what occurred in the past, and what should happen in the future. Many barriers had to be worked through to recognize the many frustrations of previous efforts. The intent of the process was not retaining previous frustrations and clouding the process moving forward. The government entities, by working together on a closer basis, were able to address concerns and create an environment to enable discussions on the issues each government believed to be important. The process has reached a good platform in terms of establishing a great forum to address issues and the methodology for how those issues should be approached. The Squaxin Island Tribe was instrumental in helping representatives work together to talk about issues openly. All stakeholder groups should be credited and acknowledged for the submittal of input throughout the process, such as CLIPA and DERT, and other stakeholders participating in the public meetings. The process sponsored more public meetings than the SR 520 bridge project held during its entire process.

DES also welcomed requests to meet with any stakeholder individually enabling an honest exchange of ideas. Other government partners also were generous with time and met with groups and other stakeholders. The process has been very transparent. Phase 1 is ending in a positive position for preparing for the EIS process and satisfying the directives of the proviso. Director Liu credited staff for their efforts to support the process, as well as the community to bring the process together successfully.

Deputy Director Covington acknowledged the incredible work by Floyd|Snider throughout the process. Included in the proposed capital budget is funding for the EIS process of approximately \$5 million. Moving forward, the effort will entail complex work with sediment management a major component to address as sediment management is important to many of the stakeholders. There is general agreement that at this point, there are not many options available moving forward without completing an EIS.

Representative Hunt asked about the timeline for completing an EIS. Deputy Director Covington said the EIS process should entail a three-year process. Director Liu added that most stakeholders experienced in completing an EIS have estimated the time between two to three years as the norm for completion of an EIS.

Campus Exterior Lighting Project – Lamp Design Change – Update, Discussion & Feedback

Chair Haskell recognized Asset Manager Nathaniel Jones.

Manager Jones provided a briefing as a follow-up to the committee's presentation in June for lighting upgrades campus-wide. The discussion will focus on the Maple Park corridor.

The June discussion centered on disk-shaped light fixtures currently installed along Maple Park. Feedback from the committee centered on a desire to retain the fixtures to the extent possible. Since then, staff has worked with a private engineering firm and energy engineers to retrofit the fixtures. Completion of the information as to whether the fixtures could be retrofitted is anticipated to be received soon.

Staff met with the Board of the South Capitol Neighborhood Association. The Board offered similar comments as the committee in terms of retaining the fixtures to the extent possible. However, the technical challenge of retaining the appearance of the fixtures hasn't been solved. Other feedback in addition to the fixtures included concerns about any lighting upgrade that would change the light intensity on Maple Park. Issues associated with streetlights are controlled by the City of Olympia rather than by the state, as the street is a City street. Any changes must meet City standards. Staff met with City staff, as well as with the neighborhood. Current information from the Transportation Director at the City identifies Maple Park as a neighborhood collector street requiring an increase in light intensity. However, City officials indicated some flexibility in the interpretation of the requirement. Further conversations with City officials centered on the possibility of time-of-day lighting. Time-of-day lighting adjusts the level of lighting along the street based on traffic volume. The City is interested in pursuing an experiment. The type of lighting controls available on the market today allow for a time-of-day option.

Another concern applicable to Maple Park are the trees in the median serving as shading for current lighting creating shadows on the street at night. DES is moving forward with a project to assess the health of the trees as some appear to have splitting trunks, dead limbs, and low-hanging limbs creating conflicts with vehicles. The project includes tree trimming to open the canopy to existing lighting.

Staff anticipates that the Maple Park component of the overall campus lighting project would be on a different schedule and that the project will continue moving forward for the remaining campus while work continues with the neighborhood and others to ensure an appropriate fixture design. Any changes in the design or style of the fixtures would likely generate response from the neighborhood. Staff plans to work with the neighborhood and offer alternative designs for consideration prior to moving forward with the project. Additionally, dependent upon the committee's interest, staff could schedule an update on the status of the design.

Additionally, lights installed within the median on Maple Park are some of the highest maintenance light fixtures on the Capitol Campus. The fixtures installed in the 1970s uses a ballistic system costing approximately \$250 each plus labor. The design of the fixtures require changing of the ballistics at a high frequency resulting in an overall higher operating and maintenance costs than anywhere else on the campus. DES is motivated to move to an LED light.

Staff is coordinating well with the City and the neighborhood and considered the committee's input on design. However, there continue to be some technical complications moving forward.

Campus Transportation & Parking Implementation Plan – Update on Action Plan Progress
Reallocate Reserve Stalls to Zoned Stalls

Chair Haskell recognized Tomy Mollas, Transportation Demand Manager.

Manager Mollas briefed members on the status of implementation of the Capitol Campus Transportation & Parking Plan.

Manager Mollas spoke to the importance of campus parking to visitors and employees as parking is a valuable asset leaving a lasting impression of the campus. Effective parking management leads to a better user experience and maximizes the use of existing capacity. Visitors and employees want to be able to find the best available spot closest to the destination they are visiting or working at, which speaks to the importance of an effective parking management program.

The July 2015 proviso directive focused on four main themes:

- Reduction (conversion) of agency reserved stalls to zoned stalls
- Cost-benefit of parking attendants or arms
- East Plaza Garage parking capacity improvement
- Parking Enforcement

Implementation actions have achieved 72% of the stated goal to convert reserved stalls to zoned stalls. The overall goal is conversion of 684 reserved stalls to zoned stalls. The methodology included one-on-one meetings with all agencies across the campus. The process emphasized a fair and equitable conversion of reserved stalls. DES is on track to convert 684 reserved stalls by the end of the year.

During conversations with agencies, the opportunity arose for the parking program to define central campus and southwest campus, which will support the permitting system and future work while benefitting everyone on the campus.

The parking study identified that the installation parking arms at the East Plaza Garage was not feasible and would cause traffic jams and congestion. Staff is taking advantage of technology and implemented a pilot program of pay-by-plate effective June 1 at the Dash lot to test the technology. Rather than paying for parking at the parking meter and placing the receipt on the windshield, visitors enter their respective license plate number at the meter and leave with no requirement to place the receipt in the windshield as the information is recorded. The pilot has generated some positive results. The pilot is scheduled to end at the end of September with the possibility of extending the program to the end of October to obtain more data to complete analysis to determine whether to deploy the technology campus-wide.

DES also is piloting the portable license plate reader for collection of data using a handheld device, fixed license plate reader, and mobile license plate reader technology to read license plates.

Manager Mollas distributed a copy of a draft parking notice warning. DES does not have the authority to issue parking citations; however, DES has the ability to issue parking notice warnings. During the pilot program, DES plans to issue parking notice warnings enabling people to correct behavior to ensure alignment with rules and regulations while on the campus. According to recent data gathering efforts,

the campus experiences a 30% non-compliance rate whereby people are not paying for parking in lots. The goal is to change the behavior and to seek cost recovery for the new technology.

Deputy Director Covington added that DES contracts with the Washington State Patrol (WSP) for law enforcement and parking on the campus. WSP issues parking citations; however, because of limited resources, WSP focuses on higher value activities.

Manager Mollas reported on efforts to increase parking capacity at the East Plaza Garage:

- Restriping project for Plaza Garage planned in October 2016
 - To increase parking supply by 100+ stalls
 - Improve wayfinding signage in the garage
 - Doubling the number of ADA stalls to be code compliant
- Request for Information (RFI) proposal being submitted for methods of providing available parking capacity to parkers (i.e. mobile/PC)

Manager Mollas thanked Senator Fraser for providing information to improve the scope of the RFI.

Manager Mollas displayed an illustration of integrated visitor parking in the Plaza Garage that includes the addition of visitor parking in the garage in level A to meet the need of multiple agencies for both visitors and visiting employees.

Staff continues to work with the City of Olympia on a parking enforcement proposal. DES submitted agency requested legislation to amend the RCW allowing DES to contract with the City of Olympia for parking enforcement on the campus. Legislation would authorize an interlocal agreement with the City of Olympia. The City would provide compliance data. The intent of the program is covering cost recovery for DES.

Deputy Director Covington noted that the proposal is not intended to reduce staffing at WSP, but rather to free resources to perform higher-level activities. Another element of the proposal is a provision in the agreement with the City to meet the needs of the campus. Last session, a change to the RCW exempted enforcement of the agreement for the West Campus. Rather than references to East and West Campus, parking strategy identifies the areas as East Campus, Central Campus, and Southwest Campus to recognize the unique nature of the Southwest Campus, especially during legislative session and to ensure a situation doesn't occur of disrupting or interrupting the activities of the Legislature during a legislative session or off-session activities. The capability of three zones rather than east and west would assist moving forward with agency-requested legislation to enable execution of the interlocal agreement with the City of Olympia.

Director Larson added that there was bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. The legislation failed to pass in part due to a jurisdictional issue in transferring jurisdiction of the infraction from Thurston County Courts to the City of Olympia Municipal Court. Legislation is required because it was believed to be a substantial policy change through a statutory change, which speaks to why DES submitted agency-requested legislation.

Manager Mollas reported DES is developing a comprehensive parking policy for management of parking stalls. The draft is under review. The policy would:

CCDAC

Minutes of Meeting

September 15, 2016 Page 24 of 27

- Supports agencies in the modern work environment
- Properly aligns ADA requested stalls to meet ADA requirements
- Allows agencies the ability to influence and meet the needs for individual agency parking utilization
- Helps to reduce customer agency costs

Other implementation next steps include:

- Convert remaining reserved stalls identified by DES and agencies
- Parking enforcement technology
- Develop RFP specification for an integrated customer service parking platform for Capitol Campus
- Work with the City of Olympia to implement a program for parking enforcement on the Capitol Campus
- Implement opportunities to increase visitor parking during legislative session
- Coming soon – pay-by-phone

Ms. Olmsted commented on the impressive thought, complexity, and array of strategies for addressing a complicated problem for the campus. However, as mentioned during previous discussions, there are areas that were identified for parking removal that would benefit the landscape as a whole and the public experience of that landscape to include loading and unloading areas for children, groups, and buses. That aspect has not been incorporated within the strategies of the plan as most of the strategies pertain to business and convenience rather than experience or resource stewardship.

Deputy Director Covington acknowledged the concerns and affirmed it is a significant undertaking as a next step. Progress has been in incremental components to ensure sustainability of the parking supply today while moving forward with changes. In some cases, parking has been removed and converted to green space. One example speaks to recent meetings with the South Capitol Neighborhood Association regarding areas dividing the campus from the neighborhood, which is included in the minor works proposal for the capital budget to remove parking stalls and returning the area to green space. Other elements for green space and loading areas speak to public resources should the Pritchard Building be renovated as a visitor center or for other public use. Moving forward with projects involving the Newhouse Building or parking for the Pritchard Building would also include removal of parking which speaks to adding green space.

Director Liu added that recent discussions with Visitor Services speak to the location of bus loading and unloading areas. The greatest demand for tours is during legislative sessions. There have been conversations for removal of space to enable the loading and unloading of schoolchildren at the entrance or moving the area to the west side of the Temple of Justice.

Deputy Director Covington spoke to the issue of campus security. Security capabilities on the campus are poor and speak to the ease of vehicles accessing the area of the Flag Circle. A recent incident involved four-wheel vehicles driving to the top steps of the Legislative Building. Technology investments align with the development of a strategic plan that accommodates appropriate circulation, public access, and security.

Director Liu spoke to his counterparts in other states facing similar controversies surrounding parking. A recent survey completed by the National Association of State Administrators focused on parking privileges, who pays, and who doesn't pay, and how seasonal demand is managed. The parking

controversy is a nation-wide issue and not just germane to the Capitol Campus. He spoke to the capability of Manager Mollas as the organizer to ensure all considerations are factored.

Senator Fraser reported on her attendance to a Microsoft conference with presentations on high tech approaches to parking. One technology is placement of cameras that read license plates of parkers enabling parking payment by cell phone. Today, statistics reveal that most cities collect only 15% of all potential parking revenue. That percentage is likely similar for the campus. The technology affords contracting with a company at no cost to the government with the company investing in the cameras and technology. The technology could likely be adapted for employee and visitor parking on campus. The technology also identifies available parking stalls. In many cities, 30% of traffic congestion is caused by people seeking a parking spot. Another conference presentation was on electric cars and the ability to install low-cost charging stations for electric cars by retrofitting garages plug-in stations providing the ability to measure electrical usage.

Deputy Director Covington spoke to recent conversations with Manager Mollas regarding new parking technologies, which DES is considering as it defines the appropriate approach.

Senator Fraser commented on the potential passage of the transportation package for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the plan's proposed extension of commuter rail to DuPont. Scheduling a bus during sessions between DuPont and the campus would help to reduce parking demand.

2017-2027 Capital Plan Update – Information

Chair Haskell recognized Bill Frare, Assistant Director, Facility Professional Services Division.

Director Frare shared information on the status of the 2017-2027 Capital Plan.

In preparation of the Capital Plan, staff evaluated past efforts and strived to avoid creating some previous mistakes. DES had previously considered a building-need aspect when scheduling major repairs or renovations by paring both major and minor repairs resulting in expensive projects that proved difficult to fund. For the next biennium, the intent is scheduling projects independently with prioritization focused on security repairs and upgrades.

The second set of priorities includes critical items. One is elevator modernization after an intensive testing and itemization of elevator deficiencies over the last six months. Work orders for elevators reflect 176 work orders issued during a six-month period or nearly one work order a day. The campus houses 88 elevators. Additionally, during the same period, the campus experienced 24 elevator entrapments. Elevators are in critical need of repair and are the second priority in the capital plan to begin a program to modernize elevators on campus.

The third priority focuses on building envelope repairs to buildings with leaking roofs and windows across the campus to prevent loss to infrastructure.

Deputy Director Covington spoke to examples of water intrusion to several building occurring for years. Over time, water intrusion will compromise the integrity of the building. The intent of the capital plan is prioritizing items of critical focus through a menu of projects to aid in making informed choices and garnering more support. The project list is scheduled by priority order and includes a process of consultation with building tenants and facility managers.

Campus security is a critical need. The operating budget for campus security includes adjusting the resource or capacity for patrol, which is contracted for on-campus security and law enforcement to increase patrol presence on campus 24/7.

Representative Hunt remarked that prior to the move of the Data Center, it was necessary to regularly place garbage cans on top of mainframe computers because of roof leaks. He suggested offering legislators tours of some of the buildings experiencing failing systems.

Senator Fraser commented on the frequency of elevator trucks parked next to her car. She questioned whether it might be more cost effective to replace elevators rather than incurring massive maintenance expenses. Deputy Director Covington advised of major issues surrounding maintenance of elevators. The contractor's presence today is because of repairs that should have been completed before. Today, the level of maintenance is at an appropriate level; however, because elevators are older, the proposed plan includes renewal and replacement of either the elevator or major components of elevators.

Director Frare reported the next three priority projects include projects currently in process.

The Combined Heating and Power Plant is the seventh priority project followed by minor works.

Project Updates – Information

Chair Haskell recognized Rose Hong, Asset Management Program Manager.

Manager Hong provided a status update on current capital projects:

Vietnam Memorial - Work was completed in time for Memorial Day 2016. The scope of work included:

- Replacing light fixtures to improve energy efficiency and reduce maintenance
- Recaulking of the concrete floor of the memorial
- Repair of cracked and spalling granite stone

Medal of Honor Monument – The project scope removes the raised concrete platform the memorial sits on. The platform is raised by approximately 34 inches creating trip hazards. The work will place the memorial in alignment with the sidewalk to eliminate trip hazard and enable ADA access. Other work includes realignment of the obelisk, which was offset during the Nisqually earthquake and repair of sidewalk cracks in the area. The project has been released for bids.

Tivoli Fountain – The last significant system upgrade was in 2003 to replace the 1953 pumps. Current efforts include a more comprehensive repair and rehabilitation plan for the next 25 years of operation. This year, the work includes replacement and reconfiguration of all drain lines in the fountain and the pump house to eliminate leaks in the system. Other work replaces nozzles, lights, electrical service, and replacement of concrete floors to create a shallower basin to reduce water consumption and improve the infiltration system. The project is ready for release for bids. Construction is planned to commence by winter 2016. Construction fencing will be installed around the site but contained in the fountain area and the pump house. Director Frare added that work is scheduled to begin in November or early December and extend through the legislative session. Construction fencing will be in place during the session and staff doesn't anticipate the project would create any access issues to or from the campus. Manager Hong noted the project includes some pedestrian rerouting around the fountain as well. The exterior of the fountain will not change with preservation of the original concrete outer rings of basin. The copper structures and circular iron fence would also be preserved.

Feasibility Study for Restoring Skylights in Legislative Building – The study scope would determine the feasibility and requirements for restoration of the original skylights in the House and Senate Chambers. DES staff is working with an historic architectural firm on the feasibility study. the study will be provide information on relocation of existing equipment to include HVAC lines, speakers, light fixtures, and other equipment in the area. The study will explore impacts to sound as changes in building material impacts sound quality, as well as identifying any changes to the light level in each chamber and requirements for replacement of existing building materials with seismic glass material. Next steps include a review of the 90% completed draft report and meeting with stakeholders and obtaining feedback. The report will be finalized for review by the CCDAC.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting is scheduled on Thursday, November 10, 2016 at the Jefferson Building.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 3:39 p.m.