



STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE

**Legislative Building
Senate Rules Room
304 15th Avenue SW
Olympia, Washington 98504
October 6, 2016
10:00 a.m.**

(Approved: January 4, 2017)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brad Owen, Lieutenant Governor (Chair)
Lenny Young, for Commissioner of Public Lands
(Peter Goldmark)
Mark Neary, for Secretary of State (Kim Wyman)
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bob Covington, DES	Bill Frare, DES
Jim Erskine, DES	Nouk Leap, DES
Ann Larson, DES	Jen Masterson, OFM
Lenore Miller, DES	Marygrace Jennings, DES
Rose Hong, DES	Carrie Martin, DES
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Ron Major, DES
Scott Kibler, DES	Tony Aitken, DES
Debra Delzell, DES	Eric Aman, Schacht Aslani Architects
Bob Wubbena, CLIPA	Yona Makowski, House Democrats Caucus
Walter Schacht, Schacht Aslani Architects	Allen Miller, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association
Jason King, Mithūn	

Welcome and Introductions

Lieutenant Governor Brad Owen called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. A quorum was attained.

The SCC meeting agenda was published in *The Olympian* newspaper. Public comment for each specific agenda item will be received when the agenda item is under consideration. Comments for items not on the agenda will be received at the end of the meeting.

Approval of Minutes – April 25, 2016 and June 16, 2016

Lt. Governor Owen moved, seconded by Kelly Wicker, to approve the minutes of April 25, 2016 and June 16, 2016. Motion carried.

Naming Campus Buildings - Action

Renaming of OB2 – Human Services

At the request of Deputy Director Covington, the agenda item was deferred until later in the meeting when Commissioner Goldmark was anticipated to join the meeting by teleconference.

1063 Block Project Update – Information, Discussion and Feedback

New Work of Art

Marygrace Jennings, Culture Resource Manager, reported that under the guidance of the State Arts Commission, a seven member Arts Selection Committee was created. In late April, after reviewing works of arts and artists, the committee selected Beliz Brother from Seattle to develop a concept for artwork in the 1063 Building. Ms. Brother has met with the design team and visited the site several times. She also viewed a virtual tour of the building reflecting the interior finishes. Ms. Brother is currently developing the concept for the art. The concept and the final proposal will be presented to the SCC for review and comment, as well as by the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC). The Arts Selection Committee is responsible for approving the final selection of artwork.

Relocation of General Administration (GA) Building Art

Art in the GA Building includes the mosaic mural located in the lobby of the building completed by Jean Cory Beall, who was commissioned by the SCC in 1956, and a bronze State Seal located on the building façade. Designers for the 1063 Building considered both works of art in the new building's design and selected potential sites for the artwork; however, no funding has been identified to move the artwork.

At its April meeting, the SCC directed DES to determine what's needed to protect the artwork in the GA Building through either temporary or permanent relocation, should the building be designated for demolition or for long-term closure. Staff explored three options and associated costs. Each scenario includes costs to clean, repair, and stabilize the mosaic at an estimated cost of \$30,000.

Two options for relocating the artwork to the 1063 Building range in cost from \$275,000 to \$325,000, dependent on timing. A second option is moving the artwork to temporary storage at an estimated cost of \$275,000 for the relocation and \$1,000 a month for storage. The third option of preserving the artwork in place costs approximately \$40,000 for the mural plus ongoing monitoring of conditions. However, many uncertainties exist about the capability of the building's HVAC system to environmentally control the building. The mural is resilient in terms of temperatures between 50° and 80° as long as there are no large swings in temperature and humidity. No assumptions are factored for the environmental control capacity of the building.

Relocation of the State Seal to the 1063 Building would cost approximately \$10,000 with the cost approximately the same for removal and storage of the seal with an additional cost of \$250 a month for storage.

Lt. Governor Owen questioned the rationale for the high cost of moving the mural to the 1063 Building. Manager Jennings said the cost includes conservation cleaning as well. The cost is based on engineering required to remove the mural from the lobby, move the mural to the new building, and reinstall the mural. The mural is currently located on a curved wall and is vulnerable to breakage. The recommendation would move the mural as one piece as the artwork wasn't constructed in sections. The piece is large and heavy and requires a crane and significant machinery. Moving the mural would require thorough protection regardless of its new location. Until there is legislative direction that includes funding, DES is unable to move forward.

Lt. Governor Owen suggested DES should present a funding request to the Legislature as early as possible to afford the Legislature with an opportunity to determine a decision to either protect the artwork or not save the artwork.

Mr. Neary asked whether demolition or remodeling of the GA Building requires relocation of the mural. Deputy Director Covington responded that it would be dependent upon the type of renovation and daylighting options for the building.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 3 of 19

Assistant Director Bill Frare added that one option for the GA Building is extending daylighting to two floors only.

Ms. Wicker asked about the history associated with the mural. Manager Jennings replied that Ms. Beall was an upcoming woman artist during a time when it was uncommon. She was also a socialite in Seattle and had many connections. Her husband was the Vice President for Development at Boeing. After completing the mural, Ms. Beall was appointed as one of the first members of the State Arts Commission by the Governor. Other significant work was commissioned by Seattle City Light of another mosaic mural of the same scale as the GA Building. That mural is currently in storage. The mural's theme focused on electricity and power. Another existing mural is in the Theater Building at the University of Washington. Ms. Beall traveled extensively to learn about mosaic art and studied in Mexico and Italy. The GA mural was fabricated in Italy.

Graphics, Wayfinding and Quotes Conference Room Names

Architects for the new 1063 Building are developing a graphics package to help the public navigate the building, and to lend a consistent and professional look and feel, while supporting a distinct style for each floor.

The proposal is a thematic framework reflecting five "Washington Ideals" for each building floor by using graphics and quotes near the elevator lobby on each floor, as well as naming conference rooms publicly available after significant individuals in Washington state history whose achievements reflect those themes. Beginning at the ground level, the floor themes include Exploration, Discovery, Cultivation, Industry, and Preservation.

A group of advisors representing museums, the State Historical Society, former Supreme Court Justices, and others were invited to serve as the consultant team to select a list of names for the conference rooms. The recommended list was presented to the CCDAC at its last meeting. The committee recommended further study of the entire proposal with more vetting. CCDAC members also agreed that the idea of naming rooms could be perceived as divisive. Consequently, DES is reconsidering the proposal to name rooms in the building and is presenting a revised strategy and approach to the CCDAC. The SCC will receive an updated presentation at its next meeting.

Naming Campus Buildings

Deputy Director Covington recommended tabling the presentation and action until the next meeting because of the unavailability of Commissioner Goldmark to participate in the meeting.

Members agreed to table the agenda item.

Campus Combined Heat and Power Plant – Replace Central Heating & Cooling Plant – Update, Discussion and Feedback

Lt. Governor Owen recognized Ron Major, Resource Conservation Manager.

Manager Major briefed members on the proposal for a new Campus Combined Heat and Power Plant.

Manager Major displayed a photo of the existing Power House. The plant has produced steam since the 1920s serving east and west Capitol Campus with nearly three miles of steam and condensation piping providing steam to 12 of the 19 campus buildings. During a recent analysis of the system, the operating efficiency of the system was determined to be only 34%. A central chilled water plant located within the Power House serves only west campus buildings.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 4 of 19

Ms. Wicker asked how the remaining buildings are served. Manager Major responded other buildings are heated by either electricity or a boiler system. The goal is connecting all buildings to the new plant.

Manager Major reported the campus steam system is over 80 years old with one boiler installed in 1960 and two boilers installed in 1974. The system is comprised of many different types of equipment with many beyond useful life and most not meeting modern codes or safety criteria.

Manager Major displayed a map of the campus revealing the steam piping distribution system. He identified the proposed location of the new central plant.

Analysis of the system was completed through the Energy Savings Performance Contracting Program at DES. DES contracted with University Mechanical Contractors through a competitive process to conduct an investment grade audit (preliminary design effort) and investigation. The effort included comparison of three scenarios against a business as usual model (BUM) of today's system upgraded to meet code and safety requirements. All three scenarios were modeled through the Office of Financial Management's (OFM) life cycle cost analysis tool over a 50-year growth horizon. Each scenario was analyzed to establish operational savings compared to the baseline of the BUM model. Risk evaluation was included because of the location of the plant along the shores of Capitol Lake, which exposes the plant to unstable slopes and future seismic activity.

The three modeled scenarios include:

- Option A: Business as Usual – Analyzed the operation of steam boilers, steam piping, and all other infrastructure requiring upgrades to meet current codes while also increasing efficiency.
- Option B: Converting Steam System to a Hot Water Distribution System – Opens more opportunities because it enables the sharing of loads within buildings on campus and requires less energy to produce hot water than steam. The option was explored using the existing Power House location and necessary upgrades, which prompted the risk assessment for the Power House location.
- Option C: Construct a Hot Water Distribution System at a New Location – The option includes a new building, piping, and new energy transfer stations and buildings. Additionally, a connection exists between heating and cooling buildings affording an opportunity to evaluate a chilled water system based on available funds and the project schedule. Although the west campus is served by the Central Chilled Water Plant within the Power House, east campus buildings have distributed chillers affording each building with a chilling plant with cooling towers, chiller, and piping within each building's footprint. The analysis explored combining chilled water into one system.

The recommended solution is Option C, a new district energy plant with chilled water. The analysis also explored an option of including combined heat and power to produce thermal energy. Electricity produced by the system would offset the campus electrical load purchased from Puget Sound Energy by approximately 50% reducing utility costs, the carbon footprint, and increasing system efficiency from 34% to 70%. The combined heat and power plant could produce 2.6 megawatts of electricity. The proposal includes a new chilled water plant for the west and east campus for all 19 buildings on campus, as well as accommodating future growth on the campus.

The procurement method is through the Energy Performance Contracting method providing a turn-key project with guaranteed maximum costs, savings, and performance. The process contemplates leveraging capital dollars with Certificates of Participation (COPs) through the Treasurer's Office. The method

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 5 of 19

provides utility incentives beyond the normal conservation efforts because of the combined heat and power component of the project, as well as an opportunity to pursue federal grants.

Manager Major displayed a graphic rendering of the new plant. The illustration is a conceptual rendering and not representative of a powerhouse with a large smokestack. The intent of the proposed design is blending the building into the campus architecturally, as well as concealing the building to the extent possible. The location is near OB2 with a third of the plant located below grade. The plant would reuse vacated space in the basement of OB2. The project replaces steam equipment that have exceeded its useful life in campus buildings, generate power to help ensure continuity of government operations, provide an estimated \$129 million in avoided operating costs over 50 years when compared to the business as usual model, and provide efficiency of operations by enabling optimal space utilization and efficiency of systems. The existing plant has space constraints and would require the construction of an additional building adjacent to the existing plant to provide a 50-year growth horizon.

Lt. Governor Owen said the rendering appears to include solar panels. Manager Major replied that one direction from the CCDAC was incorporating ways to enhance the gateway to the campus. The rendering at this point is only conceptual and could include solar panels integrated into an awning over a pedestrian walkway.

Deputy Director Covington pointed out that the panels extending across the roadway generated a negative reaction by some CCDAC members. Staff reiterated that the rendering was only a concept and would change as design progresses. Asset Manager Miller added that the CCDAC also emphasized the importance of the area as a major gateway to the campus and that the building should be designed as an attractive and inviting entry point. The CCDAC also recommended using the landscape to soften features of the building. Manager Major affirmed the committee's suggestions are included within the team's approach.

Manager Major reviewed the financial benefits of the proposal. The capital project cost as recommended is \$125 million. The average annual avoided cost is \$2.5 million. Upgrading the existing plant would entail an investment of \$16 million to upgrade the plant to meet codes and satisfy life safety. The total cost of ownership of the existing plant over 50 years is \$281 million while the total cost of the new plant would be \$264 million to include debt service. The 50-year avoided operating cost of the new plant is \$129 million and reduction in carbon emissions would net 54%. The reduction in carbon emissions would assist DES in meeting its mandated goals for the agency.

Because of the existing plant's location on an environmentally sensitive waterway feeding into South Puget Sound, the plant houses a 350,000 gallon fuel tank containing approximately 35,000 gallons of diesel fuel at any one time. The fuel is used because of the agency's interruptible gas schedule with PSE that could result in curtailing the use of natural gas because of Puget Sound Energy needs creating a need to switch from natural gas for the boiler to diesel fuel. The project would eliminate the fuel tank hazard. As the plant is located along the shoreline, the plant is at risk for seismic events and slides from the hillside. The building also requires seismic upgrades. The project also provides a pathway for a net zero campus by creating the ability to change the way buildings are heated and cooled. After implementation of the new plant and system, it creates a new baseline for efforts to reduce the carbon footprint and operating expenditures for energy.

Manager Major reported the project combines asset preservation, energy efficiency, carbon reduction, disaster preparedness, and life safety improvements in one single cost-effective package. The guarantees are provided through the Performance Contracting Program providing obvious short- and long-term

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 6 of 19

benefits to the state enabling the leverage of limited capital dollars through energy lows through the Treasurer's Office, utility incentives, and federal grants.

Mr. Young acknowledged that the projected reduction in total carbon emissions is 50%, but pointed out that the source of the emissions will be intermingled and close to areas where people walk and work because of the plant's location next to OB2 and the Natural Resources Building. He questioned whether the team considered exposure to gas emissions from the new plant location versus the existing plant's location. Manager Major said the team considered gas emissions. He identified the location of the stack within the combined heat and power plant, which sits above the roofline of NRB and OB2. Scrubbers are installed as part of the exhaust system. The intent is extracting heat from the process through scrubbers. DES is required to meet more stringent clean air requirements for the new plant resulting in improvements in the emissions. Emissions would be vented up and away from the buildings.

Mr. Young noted the complexity of emissions in terms of respiratory health because it involves the volume and nature of the emissions, as well as the distance and how people are exposed. He asked about the outcome when combining all those factors resulting in lower emissions but in closer proximity to state employees. Manager Major responded that today, dependent upon prevailing winds, the existing plant emits emissions across the entire campus because the top of the stack is closer to the elevation of the campus. Although, not able to confirm definitively, the new plant would move emissions further away from the campus and from people who are working or visiting. Emissions from the plant would be directed towards the freeway. Mr. Young asked about the nature of the scrubbers and other improvements that could be implemented to reduce the amount of emissions. He specifically asked for information about the grade between adequate and best possible to reduce emissions. Manager Major advised that he's unable to provide a good answer other than his personal preference as part of the development team would include striving for the best outcome as possible. Mr. Young encouraged staff to explore the issue with additional follow-up to the committee. Manager Major added that DES must meet current standards. The team has similar goals to achieve the best outcome.

Lt. Governor Owen referred to performance guarantees required of the contractor for both costs and emission reductions. He questioned how those guarantees could be asserted when those requirements are normally part of the negotiations with the contractor during the contracting process. Manager Major replied that the Energy Savings Performance Contracting Program has been in place for more than 20 years, and during that period, no project has ever been arbitrated or challenged in the courts. The guarantees have been invoked multiple times. All energy service companies in the program compete through a selection cycle and are required to reapply to the program. Companies participating are required to sign a master services agreement stipulating guarantees required by the company.

Mr. Neary asked whether the project includes utilization of any existing steam infrastructure. Manager Major said all existing infrastructure requires replacement creating some challenges because of the installation of new piping and timing the transitioning of switching between the old plant and new plant. Scheduling of the switching between the systems has been thoroughly examined. After transitioning to the new plant, older infrastructure would be removed.

Mr. Neary asked whether connection to the 1063 Building is contemplated to the new plant. Manager Major said the new building is included on the list of potential buildings to connect. Some existing equipment would need replacement enabling connection to the new plant. Additionally, it's possible to utilize the building's ground source heat pump wellfield under the footprint of the building as part of the system. The intent is creating a flexible distribution system in terms of different fuel capability, utilizing future technologies, and taking advantage of thermal storage.

Mr. Neary questioned the plan for the steam plant after removal of the diesel tanks. Manager Major said the team is considering future options for the reuse of the building. The project includes cutting, capping, and securing the structure for mothballing until future use has been determined.

Lt. Governor Owen inquired about the status for submittal of a funding request. Deputy Director Covington advised that DES submitted a decision package for the project to OFM.

Capitol Lake Management Plan – Update, Discussion and Feedback

Deputy Director Covington briefed members on the status of planning efforts for Capitol Lake. Currently, the process is nearing Phase 1 of a three phased planning effort. Funding for Phase 1 was provided by a \$250,000 legislative proviso with directives and key objectives.

The collaborative effort involved government and tribal partners representing the cities of Olympia and Tumwater, Thurston County, Port of Olympia, and the Squaxin Island Tribe forming the Capitol Lake/Estuary Executive Work Group. A Technical Committee was established of members representing the same entities and the Department of Ecology and the Department of Natural Resources. The process included extensive public participation. The consultant team assigned to the project indicated the effort included more public participation than what occurred for the SR520 Bridge project.

Progress to date includes agreement on some objectives through a two-step review process involving all the groups (Executive Work Group, Technical Committee, and the community). As materials were developed and existing studies were introduced, all groups had an opportunity to participate in the review and feedback cycles during first and second touch reviews. Following the first touch review, any modifications and refinements to documents were presented for a second touch review to produce a final document for inclusion in the Proviso Report.

Except for some minor pending adjustments, the groups developed a Purpose and Need Statement. The statement was shared with the community at a public meeting the previous evening. The community offered additional comments requiring some minor refinements. The Purpose and Need Statement is a critical building block to support moving forward to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

As directed in the proviso, the effort identified conceptual options for shared governance and shared funding. The partners have solidified support for shared governance and funding and agreed on the attributes critical for the selected management alternative of a lake, estuary, or other alternative.

The process included identifying best available science by identifying and inventorying all historical materials developed over the past and establishing a way to identify and determine best available science. The consultant team identified some approaches with the Executive Work Group achieving consensus on the approach for determining best available science.

Currently, the first touch process is underway for information on the general estimate of costs. However, it's not possible to provide precise costs at this point in the process until a significant amount of scientific and technical work is completed. The consultant team consolidated information from previous documentation to include the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) studies to create cost comparisons between various alternatives for different components of any management alternative. The consultant team created a graphic illustration of the proposed alternatives to provide a visual comparison of costs for each alternative. During the recent community meeting, one stakeholder group indicated some of the information didn't appropriately characterize their proposal. DES plans to meet with the stakeholder group to review issues and concerns. DES anticipates some adjustments and refinements to

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 8 of 19

the material. The effort is striving to ensure information contained in the Proviso Report is accurately described and represented. Although the cost estimates are not precise, the cost valuations must be equitable between the alternatives.

All participants during the Phase 1 want to move forward to ensure a future decision is rendered on a management alternative. All work during Phase 1 was geared for building and supporting a foundation to initiate Phase 2 to complete the EIS process followed by a decision on the alternative.

Lt. Governor Owen commented on the necessity of either identifying a project for completion of an EIS or completing an EIS on each of the proposals. Deputy Director Covington advised that the EIS process doesn't necessarily identify a project at the onset. The EIS process would identify various alternatives through an early screening and evaluation process to determine viable alternatives to advance for evaluation through the process. The outcome would identify alternatives that are measured against the objectives and the Purpose and Need Statement.

Lt. Governor Owen referred to the extensive number of years spent studying the management of the Capitol Lake system. He cautioned against placing too much merit on the previous work completed. Future outcomes are more important than what occurred in the past. He contended that the significant number of studies and the extraordinary amount of funds spent in the past resulted in a pre-determined outcome. He questioned why the process even considered previous studies. The process should move forward as the EIS would provide more credible information than previous efforts. Deputy Director Covington advised there is agreement for moving forward. The effectiveness of the process has been the level of involvement from the community and government partners with all parties achieving agreement at this point. He's convinced the process has advanced to the point where all stakeholders are ready to proceed to an EIS, which will definitively answer many of the questions. DES has included a request for funds in the package to OFM for supporting an EIS. Additionally, all parties understand the most critical component of any management alternative is sediment. Sediment impacts all alternatives because of disposal and long-term management. The EIS includes a significant effort to ensure appropriate availability of technical resources and capacity to address all questions.

Mr. Young asked whether the presence of the mud snail has presented any engineering problems, such as sediment disposal. Deputy Director Covington affirmed that the presence of the invasive species is a key cost factor for sediment disposal. The consultant team is working with the Dredge Material Management Program. Deep water disposal is not a viable option creating significant cost implications for disposal of sediment. The most cost-effective option is upland disposal. In addition to the snails, other invasive species include seeds from the Purple Loosestrife plant, which can survive in saltwater.

Lt. Governor Owen invited public comments.

Bob Wubbena reported he is a retired environmental engineer in watershed planning and co-chair of CLIPA, a local community organization. He introduced Allen Miller, an environmental attorney.

Mr. Wubbena stated that although the DES/Floyd|Snider team has been excellent in communicating and organizing the process of sorting facts from fiction and emotions from reality, one of the organization's basic disagreements with the process is the limited opportunity to meet with the key group to sort out questions and seek answers. The organization, over the last six years, has counteracted comments from the CLAMP report the organization believes was flawed. The organization continually responds to issues and has been unable to discover a pathway to resolve those issues. The contention that there are clear definitions of the alternatives for the EIS is one of the critical miss-points at this stage because data are

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 9 of 19

unclear supporting an estuary, managed lake, hybrid, and other sub-options. Although there are over 200 reports, extracting fact and fiction from those reports has been challenging. CLIPA is essentially a community organization comprised of a much broader group working with 20 professionals who have met every two weeks over the last seven years to sort through all previous and current studies. Many of the participants have over 30 to 40 years of professional engineering experience versus a group of volunteers who do not have similar backgrounds. Compiling and formatting information for the EIS process is very critical. DES and Floyd Snider have been very professional and cooperative; however, the process stops short of defining the alternatives. The key issue surrounds CLIPA's response to the questions and the lack of an opportunity to sort through scientist to scientist or engineer to engineer to ensure the questions are properly interpreted by all parties, as well as the data as a whole. As the challenging process progressed, DES invited submittal of all studies by CLIPA and interpreted the studies from the consultant team's perspective. Subsequent materials were then introduced for a first touch review. However, the process of confirming the information, which essentially entails two alternatives of retaining or removing the dam, is where the debate exists as the remaining alternatives are sub-options to either retaining or removing the dam. CLIPA proposes retaining the dam at 25% of the cost to remove the dam for engineering, technical, and scientific reasons. Last week, DES appropriately introduced its first touch cost comparison of the five alternatives identified through the process. CLIPA was unaware of the format and the data represented in the information. However, the information was released during the community meeting prior to vetting by CLIPA to ensure it properly represented what CLIPA believes to be true. The public document shows, in a relative sense based on the CLAMP studies, that the cost is \$100 million for the estuary alternative and \$125 million for the managed lake using historic data from the CLAMP study. CLIPA is unaware of how data were recreated and has requested the source of data. CLIPA members met and recreated the data to the extent possible in terms of interpreting the data based on the \$100 million figure and applied CLIPA criteria (put forth over the last six years of technical studies) to arrive at a new figure of \$25 million rather than \$125 million, which is substantial. There are many documentable reasons for the difference; however, the process at this point hasn't allowed CLIPA to identify the method. Today, the material has been released to the community and a typical layperson would look at the chart of estimated costs and consider the cost of \$100 million for an estuary and \$125 million for a managed lake. CLIPA believes there are many messages behind the figures, which is frustrating because it's important to ensure that what CLIPA believes is a \$25 million project is presented to the public, as well as affording an opportunity for CLIPA to meet with the Technical Committee, as well as engage during the public debate. That piece of the documentation for the alternatives and the data and reports supporting the alternatives should move forward to the EIS process. Currently, CLIPA is scheduled to meet with DES representatives. CLIPA believes it has the information to support the estimate based on professional engineering and science background. CLIPA's scientist, Dr. Dave Mill, a retired professor from The Evergreen State College, has authored three 30-50 page documents outlining why he believes the lake is the best environmental, scientific, and water quality solution. Essentially, the Department of Ecology came to the DES process and discounted the information because it wasn't peer reviewed. CLIPA's struggle is "fighting city hall." However, this process not only includes city hall, but it includes the state capital and the federal government. CLIPA contends it's important to create the history and documents to enable CLIPA to publicly release its documents, which likely has a value of over \$1 million worth of technical effort over the last six years, and to place them side-by-side for a non-interested third party review to evaluate differences and consistencies. CLIPA believes it's important for that to occur prior to the EIS to ensure the EIS process is initiated with clean, clear, and well-documented alternatives for evaluation during the process.

Allen Miller stated that he is President of the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association and has been a resident of City since 1982. Upon arrival to the area, he viewed the railroad tracks below the Temple of Justice and questioned their presence, as the campus should serve as the

state's National Mall having grown up in Washington D.C. and played on the National Mall. He has become acquainted with the Wilder and White Plan over the last 35 years. The SCC serves as the trustee of the Wilder and White Plan that was adopted in 1911. The plan includes four major elements of the City Beautiful architectural plan established in the late 1800s governing the group of buildings on the campus, which was a revolutionary idea at that time where architects determined more than one building was required to establish state government. The first element, Capitol Lake, was created by the tide lock to reflect the beautiful buildings on the hill. The third element was a promenade along the lake extending out to Puget Sound. The fourth element is the view corridor the Olmsted Brothers included within the 1928 Landscape Plan adopted by the SCC with views across the Lake to Puget Sound and the Olympics.

For 105 years, the plan has been the policy of the state of Washington to enhance. The state has done a very good job as reflected by a recent aerial photo of the campus except for one building remaining in the view corridor and not maintaining Capitol Lake for the last 30 years. Architectural historians around the country, such as Professor Henry Russell Hitchcock, stated in his book on state capitols, "It was in Olympia, Washington that the American Renaissance in state capitol buildings reached its climax. Such a collection of classical buildings on a plateau surrounding a green hill about 117 feet above sea level proved an irresistible vision. It would be a spectacular monument with Mt. Rainier in one direction, the Olympic range in another, and forests between; all mirrored in the blue water below, Capitol Lake. The City Beautiful, a concept of perfection evolved for dense urban scenes seemed destined now to achieve its finest expression in the natural landscape of the Pacific Northwest." Norm Johnston, who founded the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee, recognized the City Beautiful movement in his book, *The Audacious State Capitol and Its Builders*. It's important to consider when changing a major element of the 1911 Plan and the 1928 Olmsted Brothers Plan, to be very cautious because the campus is on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Miller said although he did not attend the recent community meeting, he understands that the figure was \$270 million to remove the tide lock and complete infrastructure work, which in essence would destroy the City Beautiful monument created over the last 105 years for no environmental or community benefit. It's not just Dr. Mill, but it is also Dr. Oscar Soule and Dr. Katie Lad of The Evergreen State College that reviewed the information and indicated that Capitol Lake actually helps improve water quality to Budd Inlet. Considering the removal of the dam with sea level on the horizon as the only mechanism available to control flooding on the campus and in downtown Olympia doesn't make any sense. Based on the engineering and the \$5 million to \$10 million spent every decade, the lake could be dredged to maintain what has been created over the last 105 years. The cost of \$270 million to remove the dam versus \$5 million to \$10 million every 10 years is an alternative most taxpayers would want. It was incredible to read in *The Olympian*, a figure from the CLAMP process professing the lake as the most expensive option. That information was inappropriate and CLIPA wants to set the record straight.

Lt. Governor Owen commented that he is hopeful DES realizes CLIPA is comprised of a group of respected professionals. He's been involved in the issues surrounding Capitol Lake for many years and the state has likely the most robust public process than any other state in the nation. However, he has rarely been exposed to information that is backed up by a group of respected professionals. He cautioned the department that regardless of whether there is agreement or disagreement with CLIPA's numbers, once the process proceeds forward, CLIPA figures will be released and likely would contrast with the numbers released by DES making it imperative that the information is analyzed independently to avoid public discourse over differences in numbers and assertions. DES didn't consider the information. He added that he doesn't know whether the figures are correct or incorrect, but he knows that members of CLIPA are professionals and are significantly different from other groups who have previously testified,

which has mostly been driven by emotion. It's important for DES to make the effort to provide a credible answer to CLIPA's numbers.

Deputy Director Covington responded and expressed appreciation to CLIPA and the information submitted in addition to other organizations participating and providing other information. The process has valued that input. DES met with CLIPA representatives, reviewed, and received agreement on the information as described. At this point, the process hasn't defined dollars or the range of magnitude. Within the Proviso Report, DES is not reflecting a dollar amount for any of the alternatives other than a graphical presentation of the comparisons between the alternatives. If the graphic is not reflective of CLIPA's alternative, the meeting between DES and CLIPA should clarify the information.

Lt. Governor Owen pointed out that the numbers have been publicly released. Deputy Director Covington replied that no numbers have been released other than for the graphical presentation that compares the alternatives with no dollars assigned or associated with the alternatives. Lt. Governor Owen asked for clarification, as information was conveyed about dollar figures in *The Olympian*.

Mr. Wubbena explained that his reason for stating \$100 million was to demonstrate how the graphical information includes no dollars. There is uncertainty as to how the graphic was developed because of the lack of a source document. Lacking a baseline, it is difficult to present a comparison between the alternatives. Information was conveyed that the estuary alternative was based on CLAMP 2006 data with a value between \$100 and \$300 million. However, the managed lake option included another value but lacks a baseline or source document. The meeting between DES and CLIPA should include a discussion on those issues.

Director Deputy Covington said another important aspect of the controversial project is recognition that the status and the work completed during Phase 1 to develop a Purpose and Need Statement and the objectives will not drive the EIS to any specific option, but rather serves as a base to ensure a successful EIS process. Questions surrounding whether the science is valid can be debated forever; however, should the Legislature allocate funding for an EIS, those numerous issues would be definitely answered by professionals with credibility during the EIS process.

The meeting was recessed for a lunch break from 11:30 a.m. to 12:10 p.m.

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

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, reported the Legislature authorized funding for updates to the Capitol Campus Master Plan with a focus on opportunity sites for development. The Master Plan identifies some sites available for future development. One key objective of the update was obtaining more data to support decision-making. Consequently, the update includes more information on five of the sites. DES hired Schacht|Aslani Architects to assist DES with the update. The consultant team researched previous information and studies and synthesized the information to form a foundation for moving forward with the development of some alternative scenarios for each site.

Walter Schacht and Eric Aman with Schacht|Aslani Architects, and Jason King with Mithūn, provided self-introduction.

Mr. Schacht reported the firm has been fortunate to partner with Mithūn's landscape architects, who are working on the campus supporting infrastructure upgrades and an initial preservation plan for the Olmsted Brothers Landscape Plan.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 12 of 19

Mr. Schacht said the work was generated by two legislative provisos. The Capitol Campus Predesign Proviso directed predesign of four sites with another site included because of the importance to the process. The sites include the Pritchard Building, ProArts site, the General Administration Building, and the Newhouse Building. The predesign was identified as a short-form feasibility study to consider potential tenants, project costs, and schedules. Some urgency surrounds the selection of tenants based on the replacement of the Newhouse Building for both legislative staff needs and Senate and House needs. The second proviso on the State Capitol Master Plan was limited in scope and includes identification of potential development sites and infrastructure development to enable development. A second scope directs DES to provide a list of all fiscal committees of designated parking areas.

Manager Miller noted that in addition to the work by the consultants on opportunity sites, DES is reviewing the current Master Plan and developing some recommendations for changes to opportunity sites.

Mr. Schacht reviewed an aerial illustration of opportunity sites on the campus from the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan. Sites designed in blue are included in the scope of the study. Site 11 is the 120 Union Avenue Building, which was also included as a fifth site.

The consultant team reviewed the 2006 Master Plan and identified the following guidelines for the opportunity sites:

- Public Use and Access
- Delivery of Public Services
- Community Vitality
- Preservation of Historic Properties
- Design
- Technical Performance

Design guidelines in the Master Plan are broad with limited prescriptive information. The O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings establish the maximum height for future development on the West Campus. Additionally, a focus on technical performance speaks to conserving resources and ensuring sustainability.

Mr. King said Mithūn and other team members worked on the West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation Master Plan in 2009, which followed the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan. The effort was aimed at developing strategies to achieve the goals of the Olmsted Plan in support of modern needs of the campus.

Some aspects of importance for the opportunity sites focus on the arrival sequences and the Olmsted concept of compression and depression or creating anticipation in arrival by compressing and opening spaces at the pedestrian and vehicle scale. The importance of Sid Snyder Way as the entry was identified, as well as defining open space and buildings on the south campus at a macro scale when arriving to campus from the north and south providing some compression as it opens up to the views of the Capitol Group. Another aspect is interfacing with landscape strategies along the edges and the idea of returning to the original design intent of the Capitol Group as a formal landscape with greensward (open space) providing outdoor space. Street edges along the north and south interface with the City of Olympia and the South Capitol Neighborhood and focus on pedestrian amenities of street trees and connectivity. The hillside along the west side provides a natural edge. The original plan did not include the Pritchard

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 13 of 19

Building as part of the Capitol Group. Subsequently, the native conifer edge along the O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings was intended to create the extension of the Pacific Northwest native landscape wrapping around the south campus, as well as providing delineation and buffering future development along the south edge.

Another strategy was connectivity through views and pedestrian connections by maintaining connectivity through Columbia, Water, and Sylvester from the south neighborhood. The intent is for the campus to reflect a unique place upon arrival, as well as woven into the fabric of the community,

Another aspect influenced by future development is parking on campus. A number of studies examined the amount and location of parking spaces for visitors and employees, as well as proximity to particular services. Redevelopment of some sites would need to be balanced in terms of the appropriate level of parking today without overbuilding parking that might not be required in the future. An opportunity exists to place parking in locations that could provide opportunities to enhance other areas of the campus.

Another consideration is enhancing the experience of visitors arriving to the campus while ensuring options do not increase traffic patterns to the South Capitol Neighborhood or downtown Olympia. It's important to provide an experience and infrastructure for visitors with different needs ranging from students to people planning to demonstrate. It's important to consider wayfinding and identifying areas to serve as a place for visitor services. The Pritchard Building was identified as a potential site for offering those types of visitor services.

The strategies were mindful of the opportunities from the master planning efforts to:

- Achieve key master plan principles
- Restore the historic Olmsted Brothers Landscape Plan
- Reduce the rainwater going to the City sewer system and frequency of overflow
- Leveraging infrastructure improvements to meet multiple goals
- Improve pedestrian experience and connections to neighborhood

Mr. Schacht reported some diagrams were created to provide a better understanding of spatial and programmatic order of the campus, centrality of the dome, and the arrangement of government functions within the buildings and along the perimeters of buildings. Also examined was the interrelationship of open spaces. Public experiences are concentrated in spaces between the buildings. He described the importance of spaces and views from the Legislative Building to other buildings on campus.

The development chronology for the West Campus considered buildings currently listed on the National Register and those buildings that are eligible for listing to include the Newhouse Building and the Conservatory. All West Campus buildings with the exception of both press houses and a temporary building serving as the City's Visitor Center are on the National Register.

Most campus development occurred in the 1920s and 1930s with development slowing until the GA Building was built in 1955 followed by the Pritchard Building in 1958. From that point, all new development occurred on the East Campus. The lack of any new development on the West Campus spans 59 years.

Prior to planning and evaluation, the team cataloged all work completed over time to evaluate each opportunity site. Value was recognized for completing an analysis of all previous studies, as many of the studies hold value today.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 14 of 19

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 storm water development for the 1063 Building. The challenge with the GA Building site is the expense of the project whether renovated or replaced. Specific figures for construction will be included in the report.

Lt. Governor Owen commented about criticisms that the Pritchard and GA Buildings do not fit with the architectural design of other West Campus buildings. He asked for feedback from the perspective of the consultants. Mr. Schacht said the GA Building is representative of the architectural character of its time. He also believes it fits architecturally with the remaining campus partly because of the distance from the historic buildings. The historic buildings are neo-classical and represent an architectural quality for state legislative buildings that is replicated across the country. Physically, the GA Building is located at a distance that speaks to its own monumental quality. Although, the architecture represents its timeframe, the design is not a remarkable piece of architecture for that time. The Pritchard Building is different, and is, on one hand, very much an international style post-World War II architecture with a strong classical gesture with the columns and classical composition of the library volume relating to the stacks. It is also physically located on axis with the Legislative Building and is symmetrical with the grouping of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. The siting of the building and the quality of materials fits comfortably within the historic buildings on campus.

Mr. Schacht referred to the largest scheme proposed for the GA Building and the drawings from the 2012 study, which explored the option of either renovating the building for reuse or cutting an atrium through the building to improve energy use and performance of employees. The latter is an option the team is moving forward for consideration.

Similar to the GA Building, the Pritchard Building has been studied numerous times. The building is a purpose built structure as a library. While the building functioned well as a library, the building today presents a challenge for future use because the building is so specialized. Typical of its time and similar to other buildings around the state with a closed stack format, limited floor heights are no longer effective. Studies were completed to modify the stacks and add space for office space; however, the scenario was not cost effective because costs were estimated at \$1 million per office space. The likely highest and best use of the building is as a public function enabling the use of large spaces, such as public gathering space or similar functions. The building is seven stories tall with each floor 7'6" high. Reuse of the stacks would likely require removal of every other floor reducing the building height to three floors. The stacks are physically important from the exterior in terms of the historic character of the building. However, usable space is on the main floor. The proposal also includes a parking garage with a park over the parking structure that is currently the Pritchard parking lot site located to the east.

Multiple studies were completed for the Newhouse Building built in 1934 as a temporary structure. 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 55,000 square foot building with parking under the building and a larger 150,000 square foot building on the Visitor Center block with both garages linked. A second study was also completed for the same proposal for a larger, but similar project.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 15 of 19

The ProArts site has only been studied once. The original building was constructed in 1959. A 2010 predesign reflected a large office building consistent with best practices in creating a flexible contemporary workplace with 50 parking stalls under the building.

One of the directives to determine the highest and best use was considering the maximum development capacity for each site applying Master Plan guidelines. The team examined the notion of flexible contemporary workplace. As an example, the ProArts Building conforms to best practice paradigms 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 and expansion over time. The center core prototype was selected because it might be more effective for some programs resulting in smaller footprints enabling the construction of incremental additions between 65,000 and 87,000 square feet.

The team tested the prototypes and compared the tests to previous predesigns.

The GA capacity analysis revealed that by using the atrium option, the building would provide 250,000 square feet of space. Additionally, the team was asked to maximize parking under each site because of parking deficiency on campus. The team factored a constant four-floor parking scenario for each site. The 2007 GA predesign included no parking. However, for the GA Building, it would be impossible to add parking under the existing building should the building be renovated.

Deputy Director Covington pointed out that the Master Plan acknowledges that additional buildings increasing the number of visitors or employees to the campus must recognize the impact it would create to parking.

Mr. Schacht offered that it might be possible to consider unused property to determine if the footprint of the GA site could accommodate a multi-story parking facility should the building be renovated.

The consultant team was asked to consider replacing the Pritchard Building, which could be challenging as the building is on the National Register of Historic Places. The intent of the study was to consider all ideas that could be evaluated and tested. The team examined a replacement building extending to the Pritchard parking lot with four floors of parking for 420 vehicles. The prototype analysis also placed a new building on the existing Prichard parking lot site to determine the amount of office space that could be developed. The prototype revealed approximately 75,000 square feet of office space with parking for 201 vehicles.

Lt. Governor Owen asked whether the illustration depicting the Pritchard Building was at scale, as it appears to be substantially larger than the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. Mr. Schacht replied that the building size requires additional evaluation as to whether the building is too big for the Capitol Group, as well as too long to the abutting neighborhood. Analysis would be required to determine whether the building could be articulated or reduced to give an appearance of two buildings linked internally. Some strategies could enable reduction in the scale of the building. The Pritchard Building is the same height as the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. However, views from the south porch of the Legislative Building

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 16 of 19

include only the portion of the building framed by the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. The building is larger and poses the question of whether to consider moving forward with new development or redesign.

Mr. Leary asked about concerns surrounding the hillside. Mr. Schacht said the intent is reducing and withdrawing away from the hillside enabling the upper floor to cantilever outward and affording some open space at the ground level. The study also considered constructing a 75,000 square foot building on the east lot with parking. In that scenario, the existing building would remain affording an additional 55,368 square feet. However, retaining Pritchard and constructing a new building on the east lot would not add any parking. Another possibility is renovating and adding to the building netting four floors of 44,344 square feet and parking for 99 vehicles. Programming for a renovated building could be used for public functions.

The Newhouse/Visitor Center 1974 predesign would have included 220,000 square feet in a single building with 568 parking stalls. The 2007 predesign includes two phases of development with the first replacing the Newhouse Building and a larger building on the Visitor Center site. Both buildings would total 200,000 square feet with parking for 700 vehicles. The team's prototype study increased the square footage to 265,000 square feet using the wing and core prototype. The prototype gives the illusion of four buildings, which would help achieve the sense of reasonableness in scale to the other buildings even though the building size is 265,000 square feet. The north ends of the building would be narrower than the south end intentionally in relationship to the Insurance Building. On the neighborhood side, a series of courtyards could be featured and expressed as individual buildings. Parking could accommodate 840 vehicles beneath the building, which speaks to access and the historical character of the site.

For the ProArts site, a full block site development scenario creates a 225,000 square foot building. A half-block development scenario creates a 150,000 square foot building. The scenarios resulted in less square footage than the 2010 predesign for a half-block site because the design includes 20,000 square feet below grade. Parking is maximized on the full block site to accommodate 840 vehicles and 420 vehicles for the half-block site. Height of the building is only constrained by the height of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. It would be possible to construct a nine-story building on the ProArts site but it would not be at scale with other campus buildings.

The development scenario for the east block of the 1001 Washington Street site creates a building size of 117,750 square feet with 210 parking spaces.

Mr. Schacht reported the capacity analysis affirms available capacity for development on Capitol Campus. The state has much capacity both on and off campus.

Mr. King reviewed campus infrastructure. As part of the work on the 2015 West Capitol Campus Drainage Master Plan, many of the principles of the Master Plan and the Olmsted Brothers Plan were factored as part of the review of infrastructure improvements to address problems and consider strategies for accommodating future development. Work continues with a current study led by Reid Middleton for the utility plan updates. The ProArts site and the Washington Street block, although part of the campus, are tied more to the City's infrastructure.

During the development of the 1063 Building, some infrastructure updates expanded the outfall to Capitol Lake affording additional capacity to handle storm water not only from the 1063 Building, but to the GA site, as well as a portion of storm water previously diverted to the combined sewer system. One of the sustainability goals is removing the campus off combined sewer and managing storm water onsite to the extent possible.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 17 of 19

The Pritchard site includes an existing outfall reducing additional impacts to the campus. Preliminary analysis determined the outfall could be enlarged to accommodate redevelopment of the Pritchard site.

The Newhouse site is more complicated because of the presence of a critical storm water line along the south diagonal that would require upsizing to handle new development. Low impact development strategies would be implemented for the site as part of the guidelines. Any development on the site triggers the need to replace the storm water line. One option is the opportunity to connect to the City of Olympia's system, but it would be counter to the idea of disconnecting in terms of achieving sustainability goals. However, it might provide a streamlined approach for development.

Mr. Neary asked whether the combined system essentially means the storm water is not segregated from sewer with all discharge treated by the Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater and Thurston (LOTT) Clean Water Alliance. Mr. King affirmed the combined system treats both storm water/sewer at the LOTT Plant. The critical issue is additional flow and the impact of combined sewer overflows. Some onsite accommodation can mitigate some of the impact. Management of storm water onsite and directing flows to the lake are preferred strategies for the campus.

Several key elements surrounding the update of the Utility Master Plan is consideration of the capacity analysis, strategies under development as part of the Master Plan, and ensuring the utility team is included when considering future development scenarios, as well as including the information as part of the Combined Heat and Power project.

Parking facilities at some of the opportunity sites could affect some critical infrastructure and might require relocation and increase project costs. Those situations would be handled on a site-by-site basis.

Mr. Schacht reviewed the alternatives analysis factoring site capacity, building configurations, and scale. Three issues identified are tied to buildings and to programs. Today, three buildings are in aging and deficit condition. They include the Newhouse, Pritchard, and the GA Buildings. The analysis did not include an evaluation of the costs of retaining underutilized properties. When the 1063 Building is completed, the GA Building will essentially be unoccupied.

The programming element identified legislative office needs for the Newhouse site with redevelopment creating 25,000 square feet of office space for the Senate. The House also has space deficiency with a program need equivalent to Senate space totaling 60,000 square feet to accommodate either program or 85,000 square feet of gross space.

Visitor Services are important and serve as an interface between the Capitol and the public. There is also some legislative interest to co-locate educational agencies within a renovated GA Building.

Mr. Schacht described several options. South Campus Option A includes Office Building 1, Office Building 2 (same size), and the renovation of the Pritchard Building. The option replaces Newhouse with a prototype building design similar in footprint scale to the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. The option replaces the parking lot adjacent to the Pritchard Building with a similar-sized building used by both the House and the Senate. However, the program demand for both chambers is not large. The scenario includes renovation of the Pritchard Building for reuse as a public function for Visitor Services. Office Building 2 would be located on the Pritchard parking lot. Both buildings would net over 150,000 square feet of gross office space and 100,000 square feet of net usable office space with parking between the two providing 420 parking stalls.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 18 of 19

Another pending discussion is the appropriate location for new buildings on the Newhouse and Visitor Center site relative to the north face of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings. Currently, no specific guidelines are available as to how to locate new buildings on sites. The issue limits the amount of building square footage. Placement of the buildings on the Newhouse and Visitor Center sites could be placed at 90 degrees creating less development capacity but affording better solar exposure. The CCDAC preferred alignment of new buildings with the Insurance Building.

Mr. Schacht displayed an illustration from the lawn with views across Sid Snyder Way revealing the northwest face of the O'Brien Building in the distance. The illustration includes boxes depicting new development with no other articulation but offering a perspective inclusive of existing development.

South Campus Option B is a single building scenario providing less square footage. Any of the scenarios could include the renovation of the Pritchard Building. The benefit of a single building if uses could be co-located includes reduced construction costs. The CCDAC was comfortable with either option of a single building with a north-south orientation. However, construction of a four-story building in the Pritchard parking lot should consider the building's relationship with the neighborhood.

Another consideration in terms of the options is the appropriate space available along Sid Snyder Way to maintain that sense of compression and to allow green space development to help accommodate storm water. Either Option A or Option B provides sufficient space between the north face of the building and the street and would retain trees from the Sid Snyder Way improvements.

Mr. Schacht displayed photos of Option A and Option B, which were added to Google maps to provide a broader context. Option A includes two 75,000 square foot buildings on separate sites. Option B co-locates all office space on one site. New development along Sid Snyder Way affords more campus green and provides a strong edge along the north side. Some level of development on the south end would also help define the sense of space of the campus.

Mr. Schacht said some analysis was completed of the adaptive reuse of the Prichard Building. The analysis explored conversion to a resource center, touchdown space for visitors, improvements to food service for public access, and adding hearing and meeting rooms on the upper floors. At the time of the analysis, a program for Visitor Services was not available. However, the analysis considered saving the library volume, reading room volume, and stairs as viewed south from the Legislative Building. The stacks were removed because of the difficulty of renovating the space. Additionally, reducing the number of floors was too impractical. The scenario eliminates the stacks and replaces the same volume to preserve the physical historic appearance from the campus while providing the ability to add space to the back and the two upper floors.

Mr. Schacht shared that the team also explored the placement of office functions in the GA Building if an atrium was added to improve daylighting within the building. The evaluation included whether open work stations would be effective because of closely spaced columns. The team is analyzing a similar building on the University of Washington campus. The analysis demonstrates that it's possible to include work places.

Manager Miller advised that the team is continuing its work for completion of the report. More information is forthcoming for the GA Building, ProArts site, and the half-block site. The goal is submittal of the report by February 1, 2017. The information provides several development alternatives for each site to provide more options for decision-makers.

SCC MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Page 19 of 19

Lt. Governor Owen inquired as to whether the analysis considered the ongoing threat of serious deterioration of the buildings. Mr. Schacht said the consultant team included structural and electrical consultants in addition to landscape and civil experts. Each building was inspected and previous condition analysis reviewed. Although difficult to identify from a building perspective which building is the most important, the GA Building is costing the state money to operate even though programming indicates the need for more space. Environmentally, the GA Building is not ideal to occupy because of indoor air quality and other issues. Using the building to solve some programming needs is not recommended. The building doesn't meet life safety standards and represents a threat to occupants. Additionally, during meetings with legislative staff, it was pointed out that solving other problems while the GA Building remains intact actually serves as an impediment for solving those issues. The Newhouse Building would clearly need replacement. Concerns surrounding the Pritchard Building are maintaining the landmark building recognizing the costs to rehabilitate the structure increase over time.

Lt. Governor Owen referred to the report's caution for listing buildings on the historic register. He believes that some buildings on the register are less desirable as historic as they often don't provide historic value. He asked whether there is a reasonable process for removal of an historic listed structure. Mr. Schacht said he's not aware of any building's removal from the national register. However, a designated building doesn't constrain the state from determining the fate of the building for either modifying or demolishing the building.

Manager Jennings added that some steps are necessary to include documentation and mitigation dependent upon the action.

Mr. Schacht added that the GA Building was nominated for placement on the register by a private citizen rather than by the state.

Manager Miller advised that the committee is scheduled to receive a briefing on the final report at its December meeting with recommendations for changes to opportunity sites. The work completed on the opportunity sites will serve as an update to the Capitol Campus Master Plan.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Lt. Governor Owen adjourned the meeting at 1:33 p.m.