

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Remote Access Meeting
Olympia, Washington 98504

February 17, 2022
10:00 a.m.

Final Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dan Miles, (Chair) Architect 2
Randy Bolerjack (Alternate, Secretary of State)
Marc Daily, Urban Planner
Steve Hobbs, Secretary of State (Late Arrival)
Senator Sam Hunt (Late Arrival)
Chris Jones, (Vice Chair) Landscape Architect
Representative Joel McEntire
Alex Rolluda, Architect 1

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Representative Laurie Dolan
Senator Phil Fortunato

OTHERS PRESENT:

Matt Aalfs, Building Work	Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society
Ruth Baleiko, Miller Hull	Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services	John Sounder, S. Capitol Neighborhood Association
Clarissa Easton, Dept of Enterprise Services	Michael Sullivan, Citizen
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services	Cristine Traber, Miller Hull
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	

Welcome and Introductions, Announcements & Approval of Agenda

Chair Dan Miles called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) virtual meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. A quorum of the CCDAC was attained.

Members provided self-introduction.

Chair Miles reviewed the meeting agenda: review and approve the Joint SCC-CCDAC January 25, 2022 meeting minutes; receive public comments; and receive an update on the Legislative Campus Modernization Project. An update on the SCC Statute Workgroup was deferred to a future meeting.

Approval of Joint SCC-CCDAC January 25, 2022 Minutes - Action

Marc Daily moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to approve the Joint SCC-CCDAC January 25, 2022 meeting minutes as published. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.

Public Comment Period – Informational

Chair Miles invited public comments and outlined the virtual comment format. The public was invited to submit comments by email to DES no later than 4 p.m. on the day prior to the meeting.

John Saunder, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, referred to a letter from the association highlighting several concerns surrounding the Legislative Campus Modernization Project and the Newhouse preliminary design. Members believe the Newhouse Replacement Building project should have visual interest on all four sides with the primary entrance located on the north side facing Sid Snyder Avenue. Other buildings on the campus are oriented similarly and prioritize orientation of the campus overall from surface parking. Landscaping must reflect the Olmsted design and decades of planning to

include the Capitol Campus Master Plan. The current design calls for landscaping to be essentially asphalt as the entire site is dedicated to surface parking and it is not consistent with the Capitol Campus Master Plan or the Olmsted vision. The request is to investigate alternatives for a landscape plan. Additionally, a comprehensive review of campus access issues including parking and transportation both during the legislative session and after sessions should be pursued. A proposed budget proviso is under consideration by the Legislature that would implement comprehensive planning. Mr. Saunder asked for the committee's consideration of the three issues during its discussion and thanked the committee for the opportunity to provide input.

Michael Sullivan said his studio served as the architectural conservator for Capitol Campus for 15 years prior to and following the Nisqually Earthquake. He continues to follow maintenance, restoration, and additions to the campus. He appreciates how the Newhouse design process is in its infancy; however, it appears there is a basic question as to whether the front of the building is similar to the neoclassical formality of the historic capitol group or whether to change direction. The proviso dictates following basic neoclassical design of the new building as it would serve as a larger presence on the campus. He believes the appropriate façade and formal entry of the building should be facing north as it joins the other historic buildings on the campus. The building will be important on one of the most beautiful capitol campuses in the entire country. He thanked CCDAC members for their work and efforts.

Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society & Bigelow House Museum, reiterated several points conveyed previously by the Society. The Society is appreciative of the opportunity to provide comments as the state moves forward with the projects. The Society is similarly divided with planning for the rehabilitation of the Pritchard Building with a new addition and is interested in preserving the Prichard Building and rehabilitating it appropriately. The Society plans to follow the design process. Although, the Society acknowledges and regrets the replacement of the Newhouse Building on Opportunity Site 6, the Society also supports the stated goals of the replacement project as being compatible with the character of the Capitol Campus Historic District. With respect to references of compatibility with the American neoclassical style, he is unsure as to whether there is a clear understanding of that style other than referencing the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation as the guide for the design process. Standard 9 states, "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." In this case, the property would be within the Capitol Campus Historic District as well as the adjacent South Capitol Neighborhood Historic District. The standard serves as good guidance for the committee, DES, and designers to be aware of as they move forward on design. Additionally, the Society reiterates its support for not demolishing the two press houses and encourages all efforts to relocate the houses for rehabilitation elsewhere while acknowledging that the removal will necessitate mitigation for the loss of the two contributing features to the Capitol Campus Historic District. Both the Ayer and Carlyon Houses merit every effort to preserve, move elsewhere, or preserve and recycle or rehabilitate elsewhere. The existing location is tied to both structures' historic context and architectural significance. Mr. Griffith thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak as he looks forward to further engagement with the committees moving forward.

Project Manager Dragon advised that DES received a letter from the South Capitol Neighborhood Association by the 4 p.m. deadline. The letter was copied to CCDAC members.

Legislative Campus Modernization Project Update - Informational

Chair Miles invited DES staff and the consulting team to provide an update on the status of the Legislative Campus Modernization (LCM) project.

Project Director Clarissa Easton acknowledged the comments of Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Saunder, and Mr. Griffith, and the letter from the South Capitol Neighborhood Association.

Project Director Easton reported the update would cover recent progress, the Pritchard Validation Study scheduled for completion later in the month, and an update on the Newhouse Building Replacement project. DES submitted a building permit application for the temporary building (LCM modular building) located at the southeast corner of the Executive Residence parking lot. Hoffman Construction is serving as the GC/CM for the project as the schedule is on a critical path to shift occupants from the Newhouse Building to the temporary facility so construction can begin on the Newhouse site. Cost estimates on the temporary building are pending and will be shared with the committee when completed. Efforts are ongoing on the LCM non-project SEPA with several drafts completed and under review by internal stakeholders. The team is conducting monthly stakeholders meetings with a meeting with the public scheduled on the Newhouse Building Replacement project next week via zoom.

Project Director Easton conveyed appreciation to Mithun, the Peer Review Panel, Project Executive Team, CCDAC, and the State Capitol Committee for supporting the efforts as all options were explored for rehabilitating and expanding the Pritchard Building. Mithun and its team are working on the cost estimates and documentation for the validation report. The proviso requires SCC approval of the validation study by March 31, 2022. The validation study has received positive comments on the preferred alternative to expand the building. DES is establishing the selection process for the design team for the project.

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork, reviewed the goals developed for historic preservation at the beginning of the study. The preferred alternative meets all goals and the team received support and consensus from the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation and other stakeholders on the preferred alternative.

Ruth Baleiko, Partner, Miller Hull, updated the committee on the Newhouse Building Replacement project schematics. The team worked with the goals as outlined for the project in terms of design principles and the way the building will contribute long-term to the legacy architecture on the campus. She described several diagrams outlining how the building fits within the campus holistically in terms of where buildings meet streets, building entrances, how entries are identified, landscape architecture, and massing of buildings.

Mr. Aalfs said the team recognizes the removal of the three buildings on the site requires a mitigation plan compatible with the Capitol Campus Master Plan, the original plan by Wilder and White and the landscape plan by the Olmsted brothers. The architectural character should be compatible with American neoclassical design. The design team recognizes the need to meet the goals while also creating a contemporary building that meets high quality standards.

Ms. Baleiko noted that most of the buildings have a symmetrical axial entry that lends consistency across the campus. American neoclassical is a style that has evolved over time and is defined by principles, such as scale and proportion, symmetry, recognizable depth and relief on the building's façade, milder colors, historically simple forms, as well as care in terms of the proportion of areas of windows and solid walls. Large expanses of windows or solid walls are not generally a supported design element which calls for attention to the repetition symmetry and proportion.

Ms. Baleiko identified existing buildings on campus. Over the course of the short period, the campus reflects consistencies in the American neoclassical design with all buildings reflective of having a base, a shaft, and a capital (top) of different proportions and expression, while maintaining consistency between the buildings.

Mr. Aalfs added that the team has undertaken efforts to preserve the Pritchard Building in part because of its significance as a modern interpretation of the 1950s era American neoclassical style while also compatible with the Wilder and White and Olmsted Master Plans.

Ms. Baleiko reported the building placement on Opportunity site 6 has been identified along with where the areas of entry should be located. Each entry sets up a slightly different architectural response. She displayed an image identifying an entry on the north side, an image reflecting the entry in the middle of the

west façade, and an image depicting the entry on the northwest corner of the building. In keeping with some of the research on the campus and with the neoclassical period, a symmetrical axial entry is a consistent feature.

Project Director Easton pointed out that the images at this point are only conceptual boxes and are not reflective of any final design. Ms. Baleiko noted that when architects begin design efforts, the starting point is based on existing conditions. The images reflect only a diagram of the building as a base to begin applying the neoclassical design principles to the base, the shaft, and the capital based on knowledge of existing buildings on campus. The building height is defined as a neighboring height to the Cherberg Building. The building footprint has been defined. The team then begins exploring where structural grids can begin to inform repetition, modular, and proportion with the exterior of the building diagramed to consider ways of identifying areas of windows and solid materials. Those stages of design have not been started. The illustrations are used to assist the team in identifying the preferred entry to the building, as it drives subsequent design features of the building.

Ms. Baleiko displayed a study model of the building reflecting how a center entry on the north facing the Great Lawn could work for entry into the building from Sid Snyder Avenue and consistency with other buildings on the campus. The grade is manageable in terms of accessibility by pedestrians. The base of the building includes a portico. Another image places the building in context with other surrounding buildings and some existing trees, which are deemed as significant and worth preserving to the extent possible.

The floor plan meets the criteria included in the predesign for spaces and parity of office spaces. An entry from Sid Snyder includes a central area with elevators and circulation space. The west entry into the building is close to an existing Douglas fir tree deemed as a significant tree. Ms. Baleiko displayed a 3D illustration depicting a centered west entry to the building. An entry on the left bay of the building would retain some of the functions of the lobby and the waiting area in the northwest corner while presenting some challenges for expressing some of the core principles of neoclassical design relying on symmetry, central entries, and street frontage.

Ms. Baleiko displayed a comparison illustration of the three entry areas, which is fundamental in the layout of the first floor. It is important to ensure consensus on where the entry is located moving forward through design.

Director Easton thanked Ms. Baleiko for reviewing the schematic designs and Mr. Aalfs for his insights on the historical importance of Capitol Campus.

Secretary Hobbs thanked the team for clarifying how the illustrations are simply placeholders as he has received some complaints. He plans to share information with community members about the intent of the illustrations to identify the location and placement of the building.

Alex Rolluda asked whether a site plan was available of the different plazas and walkways reflecting how buildings interrelate as pedestrians travel between buildings and how entries from the north, west, or northwest corner might be affected by pedestrian traffic. Ms. Baleiko replied that in previous presentations, a larger campus plan tracking the pedestrian network of pathways between the buildings was included. The current image depicts all building entries with the Legislative Building surrounded by other buildings with central entry points showing how pedestrian traffic flows between the buildings. However, a number of back door entryways within the different buildings are available for individuals who are more familiar with the campus. Mr. Rolluda noted that entryways of the Pritchard, O'Brien, and Cherberg Buildings are located to accommodate pedestrian traffic and not all are facing north. His preference is a north entry for the new building as it would be more reflective of the neoclassical character.

Marc Daily asked whether the Newhouse Building Replacement project would result in more, less, or a similar level of parking spaces on campus. Director Easton replied that she believes the proviso required a loss of no more than 60 parking spaces. Based on the tentative preferred alternative for the Pritchard

Building and for full transparency, the loss of parking would likely entail a loss of more than 60 spaces. Staff continues to work on data and metrics associated with parking for both the Newhouse and Pritchard projects as project designs advance from preliminary schematics. Mr. Daily thanked Project Director Easton for the information, as he did not recall the proviso language, which speaks to his question.

Secretary Hobbs added that many legislators who work in the Newhouse Building would be very upset if the parking behind the building was eliminated.

Chair Miles cited a chat note offered by Mr. Rolluda about the benefits for the committee to receive a site plan of the proposed Newhouse replacement in relation to the preferred option for the Pritchard Building.

Chair Miles added that the illustration provided during the review helped to create and describe the visual axes that are so important on campus. However, it would also be important for the committee to receive a diagram that speaks to the hierarchy of vehicular and pedestrian traffic to assist the committee in analyzing and understanding how it impacts the final choice of building entry. Although the 3D diagram was helpful, it appears that much of the traffic to the building would be coming from the west, which is why a western entrance was included as an option to study. As Mr. Rolluda alluded, the formal principles of American neoclassical architecture support a north entrance approach.

Chris Traber referred to the north option illustration. She pointed to the legislative entry, which is highlighted on the west side of the building. The ceremonial entry is on the north side of the building with an entry on the west to accommodate pedestrian traffic.

Project Director Eaton noted that Ms. Traber serves as the Project Manager at Miller Hull and is working on the replacement design daily. Additionally, the team discussed the entry location with internal stakeholders and ways a side entry option could shift to the south. However, the function across the south base of the building would serve the legislative support services production and design function. That function would migrate from its current location off Washington Street to the new building and it offers another challenge in defining the building's entry points. She pointed out the axis along the east-west from the eastside of the building and potential parking on Opportunity Site 6 to the entry on the west closer to the Cherberg and Legislative Buildings.

Chair Miles referred to the conceptual structural column grid and asked the team to describe the process because structure often tends to create expectations in building design. Ms. Baleiko said the four-story building serves as an office building and would consist of a steel and wood structural system. The column grid is reflected in the schematic designs. Chair Miles noted that the programming of the building often determines span requirements and that the structural grid is used to organize individual spaces within the building. Ms. Baleiko advised that because the building has a specific height limit, the intent is to include four floors of program space. The team is seeking a system that can accommodate a depth that enables good floor to floor heights. The team is exploring the use of mass timber, a great Pacific Northwest economic resource benefitting indoor spaces.

Senator Hunt inquired about the displacement of current parking and the future accommodation of parking in the parking lot housing the modular building. Project Director Easton explained that the temporary loss would total approximately 50 to 60 parking spaces. The team continues to work on parking issues as the parking assignments would be reassigned to a different location. Paul Campos is working on a solution for reassigned parking with many parking options explored when the modular is constructed on the parking lot. Ann Larson pointed out that an internal group recently met to include the parking team and the team responsible for construction of the modular to review existing parking needs to reshuffle assigned and zone parking. The group plans to prepare a parking plan with the parking office staff meeting with tenants in the next several weeks to engage in preliminary parking discussions about parking impacts.

Senator Hunt said the proposal from an aerial perspective offers a stark view of parking primarily because of the lack of any landscaping and vegetation. Implementation of a landscaping plan would soften the

appearance of parking. Project Director Easton agreed the aerial illustration speaks to the starkness of parking areas, which speaks to the need to focus on improving the renderings by highlighting heavy plantings, ground cover, and small ornamental trees and replacement conifers as part of the landscape transition between the two historic districts. The next set of graphics will reflect those plans.

Chris Jones agreed that the graphics provides some disconnect between the actual elevations of the building and plan views. Ms. Baleiko explained that the plan incorporates stairs and ramps. The illustrations were cropped and those details are not easy to recognize. Ramps are included on both sides of the ceremonial entry walk and ramping and stairs are included at the northwest corner. Mr. Jones asked whether the team has considered any strategy to lower the building because of elevational accessibility challenges to afford a better connection on the north and west sides of the building without resorting to the use of ramps. Ms. Traber advised that the finished elevation on the ground floor is 129 feet while the street level is 126.5 feet resulting in a 3.5-foot delta between the Sid Snyder sidewalk and the front entry. There are several reasons for maintaining the elevation as it is lower than the existing building. The new building elevation will be lowered by several feet. Additionally, all elevation issues require further study. The team is working through accessibility issues as there is quite a bit of delta between the streets and the platform containing the press houses and the Newhouse Building.

Mr. Jones said he also has similar concerns as voiced by many in terms of the consistency with the neoclassical style and the front door connection. He agreed with the importance of exploring the grades and how the new building connects to the north and west sides, as well as concerns surrounding a sea of parking adjacent to the South Capitol Neighborhood community because it speaks to the difficulty of meeting the intent of the Olmsted Master Plan and the deep multi-level and layered landscape on the south side of the building. When that level of detail is reviewed, the committee likely would be interested in how the team plans to achieve the desired landscaping style.

Mr. Daily requested additional information as to the two structures resembling single-family homes and any issues associated with removing the structures that have not been discussed. Mr. Aalfs explained that the buildings were originally constructed as residential buildings. The building to the north is the Carlyon House and was originally occupied by P.H. Carlyon and his wife, Edna. Mr. Carlyon served as Mayor of Olympia and later as a state legislator. The building to the south is the Ayer Duplex designed by architect Elizabeth Ayer. In recent decades, both buildings were used by members of the press as offices and places of activity on the campus during coverage of state government business. Both buildings are known as the “press houses.” The project requires the removal of all three buildings. A mitigation plan will be developed to identify strategies to compensate for the removal of the structures.

Chair Miles asked whether the functions of the houses would be relocated. Mr. Aalfs replied that the functions have been relocated. Project Director Easton added that the first step of the LCM project included working with the tenants in the buildings as well as buildings and grounds staff to achieve renovation of a portion of the Legislative Building to relocate press members. Press members were relocated to the Legislative Building in September 2021.

Mr. Jones inquired as to the any resolution for sourcing Wilkeson sandstone for the Pritchard Building project as the quarry has closed. Mr. Aalfs said the current proposal for the rehabilitation of the Pritchard Building includes a strategy of removing existing sandstone to accommodate the addition of windows and other design features and reinstalling the sandstone. The strategy for the new addition has not been determined in terms of the material for the building. The determination may involve a different product other than sandstone that might be appropriate. Wilkeson sandstone was used on Capitol Campus buildings and although it is beautiful material, sandstone is soft material and creates maintenance challenges over time. The question of the addition cladding will be addressed by the future design team.

Mr. Jones asked about the status of the project in terms of the design phases. Project Director Easton advised that for the Newhouse Building Replacement project, the schematic design package is scheduled

for delivery to DES on February 25, 2022. Miller Hull's cost estimator and the GC/CM are reconciling the schematic scope over the next 30 days to align with the budget. By the end of March, DES should have good estimates of the schematic design package. The Newhouse Building Replacement project work plan reflects design development beginning in April 2022 and completed in June 2022 with another cost estimate completed at that time as well.

Mr. Jones inquired about the alternative selected for the schematic design package. Ms. Baleiko said the preference by the team is to include the design incorporating the north entry as it aligns with the Capitol Campus Master Plan principles and the neoclassical principles as required in the proviso.

Mr. Rolluda asked about the timing for the next presentation on the project. Project Director Easton advised that the next update is scheduled for the May meeting with an update to the SCC on March 17, 2022.

Chair Miles thanked and acknowledged DES and all project teams for providing a clear and helpful presentation on some of the major issues as schematic design nears completion for the new structure.

Future announcements and Adjournment of Meeting – Action

For information on future meetings, visit the SCC and CCDAC website for meeting dates, minutes, and meeting agendas. The next SCC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, March 17, 2022 at 10 a.m. The next CCDAC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, May 19, 2022 at 10 a.m. At this time, all meetings are scheduled as remote meetings. Instructions for accessing the meetings are provided on the meeting agendas posted on the DES website for each meeting.

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