



**STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE
Remote Access Meeting**

**March 17, 2022
10:00 a.m.**

Final Minutes

SCC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kelly Wicker, Chair & Governor Inslee's Designee
Randy Bolerjack for Secretary of State
Lieutenant Governor Denny Heck
Katy Taylor for Commissioner of Public Lands

OTHERS PRESENT:

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork	Lana Lisitsa, Mithun Architecture
Ruth Baleiko, Miller Hull	Jason Marquiss, Department of Enterprise Services
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services	Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Clarissa Easton, Department of Enterprise Services	Chris Moore, WA Trust for Historic Preservation
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services	Ray Outlaw, Floyd Snider
Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd Snider	John Saunders, S. Capitol Neighborhood Assn.
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Walter Schacht, Mithun Architecture
Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society	

Call Meeting to Order - Action

Chair Wicker called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) remote meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Chair Wicker welcomed members, staff, and guests to the meeting.

Members and staff provided self-introduction.

Chair Wicker reviewed the agenda. The agenda includes approval of minutes, public comments, and updates on the LCM Project-Pritchard Building Rehabilitation/Expansion Study and Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

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

Chair Wicker requested approval of the minutes of the Joint SCC-CCDAC January 25, 2022 meeting pending any changes or corrections.

Lieutenant Governor Heck moved, seconded by Randy Bolerjack, to approve the Joint SCC-CCDAC January 25, 2022 meeting minutes as published. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.

Public Comment

Chair Wicker outlined the format for providing public testimony and invited public comments.

John Saunders, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, thanked the committee for its leadership on the design for the Pritchard Building and the alternatives for consideration that are reflective of a positive outcome. The effort represents a great example of an effective stakeholder process that included peer review. The

outcome provides evidence that good input from all stakeholders including citizens can make a big difference. Moving forward, the Association plans to remain focused on the landscape design along the south edge of the Pritchard Building site and surface parking on the site, as well as on the Newhouse Building site, which is not consistent with the State Capitol Campus Master Plan and Olmsted's vision. The Association supports a peer review process for the Newhouse design and seeking guidance from a landscape architect with specific expertise in the Olmsted design. The primary public ceremonial entrance of the Newhouse Building should face north to Sid Snyder to maintain symmetry of primary entrances of the O'Brien, Cherberg, and Insurance Buildings. Although the design decision has not been rendered at this time, the Association offers those recommendations. The agenda packet includes some preliminary building designs that appear to lack continuity with other buildings within the group on West Capitol Campus. The designs could be contrasted with the Helen Sommers Building located across the campus that incorporates pillars and a plaza-style entrance reflective of the facades of the Insurance and Legislative Buildings. The Association is concerned that the preliminary information appears to fit more appropriately as a mixed use building in a commercial environment rather than as part of the group of public buildings dedicated to the democratic process. He asked members to consider those issues during its review of the project. The Association will continue to offer input on landscaping and surface parking. He urged the committee to keep Water Street open as the current designs call for the closure of the street. It appears there is no good reason to close Water Street. The current designs also create barriers to bicycle access to Water Street, which is unnecessary as it impedes both bicycle and vehicular traffic.

Chris Moore, Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, reported the organization is a statewide advocacy organization working to preserve historic buildings across the state. He echoed Mr. Saunders sentiments with respect to the Pritchard Building and thanked the committee and the Executive Project Team for pausing and reengaging the public in the studies to review the Pritchard Building to consider ways to expand and rehabilitate rather than demolish the building. In a perfect world, it is likely there would be a stand-alone Pritchard Building because the building is significant and important within the Capitol Campus cluster. However, since the world is not perfect, compromise is necessary at times. The organization is pleased with the expansion and hopes the committee supports the option. The organization plans to continue following the design because of the importance of articulating the new addition from the original mass and volume of the building to retain the existing relationship of the Pritchard Building to the Legislative Building and the proportional volumes represented in the group of buildings. The organization supports the current plan as proposed.

Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society and Bigelow House Museum, reiterated the comments of Mr. Saunders and Mr. Moore. Although he has no specific comments regarding the design of the proposed Newhouse replacement building, his previous comments speak to his interest in the outcome of the two press houses slated for demolition. He is aware some mitigation measures were proposed for the removal of the houses, which he supports in addition to ensuring opportunities exist for public events and programming to enable the public to visit and tour the press houses. The priorities should include moving the houses offsite to the extent possible because both houses are historically and architecturally significant and it would be a loss because of the each building's contribution to the campus and local history. The duplex referred to as the Ayers Duplex is significant because of its association with the architect, Elizabeth Ayer. It would be important to move the building, as well as the Carlyon House as Mr. Carlyon was a legislator, a mayor, and a prime mover in the design and shaping of the Capitol Campus. Mr. Griffith supported previous comments on progress for preserving the Pritchard Building and is appreciative of the alternatives. Detailed information has not been forthcoming at this time on the design of the renovation and addition to the Pritchard Building; however, based on illustrations included in the agenda packet, it is important to include more differentiation in terms of the massing of the buildings to ensure they are viewed as separately and distinctly as possible. It is also important to consider ways to incorporate light into the current stacks while avoiding the addition of windows in the solid

mass area to the extent possible. Some of the initial renderings included a curtain wall façade on the south side of the building, which would be a good option for incorporating light into the area of the stacks. He thanked the committee for enabling the process to include participation by all stakeholders.

With there being no further public comments, Chair Wicker closed public comments. DES did not receive any written public comments by the deadline of 4 p.m. on March 16, 2022.

LCM Project-Prichard Building Rehabilitation/Expansion Study – Action

Chair Wicker recognized DES and the design team to present findings and recommendations outlined in the Legislative Campus Modernization - Prichard Building Expansion and Validation Study.

LCM Project Director Clarissa Easton acknowledged the ongoing support and participation by the previous speakers, their organizations, and other citizens participating throughout the process.

Bill Frare, Assistant Director of Facilities Professional Services, reported the legislative proviso authorizing the project designates the SCC as the approving authority for the LCM Project-Prichard Building Rehabilitation/Expansion Study. In January 2022, the committee acted on a key milestone by selecting the preferred alternative. The proposal is to approve the draft LCM Project-Prichard Building Rehabilitation/Expansion Study report to meet the requirements of the proviso for submission to the Legislature and the Office of Financial Management (OFM) by the end of March 2022.

Project Director Easton introduced Walter Schacht and Lana Lisitsa with Mithun Architecture, authors of the study, and Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork, serving as the DES third-party objective historic preservation consultant.

Ms. Lisitsa reported since the committee's selection of the preferred alternative to rehabilitate and add an addition to the Pritchard Building, the team has worked on details of the study and confirmed the original assumptions including the estimated costs that are slightly lower than the preliminary figure of approximately \$120 million. The team submitted the draft report documenting the work completed as part of the Pritchard Building Rehabilitation Validation and Expansion Study and detailed analysis of the preferred alternative to DES and legislative representatives. The request is for feedback and approval of the final study as recommended in the report.

Mr. Aalfs reviewed some primary goals developed for the rehabilitation of the Pritchard Building:

- Develop an effective strategy to reuse the Pritchard Building to serve legislative functions
- Address life safety, accessibility and building code deficiencies with minimal visual and spatial impact to the historic character defining features of the building
- Restore the Wilkeson sandstone façade cladding

Mr. Schacht spoke to the importance of considering Architect Paul Thiry's vision for the Pritchard Building, as well as the building as it exists today. The intent is restoring the glassy open quality of the reading room as part of the original design intent. Although the building would be adaptively reused from the previous use as a library and archives to an office and public assembly building, some alterations are necessary to the reading room to restore the original vision of the architect and the building's architecture. The team considered various alternatives of adding a separate addition as opposed to a connected addition in the historic context and the original architectural vision of the reading room, which was deemed central to the connection to the historic capitol group. The selection of Option A was the best solution and it respected the historic context of the Olmsted and Wilder and White Plans.

Mr. Schacht shared a diagram of Option A indicative of the general intent to differentiate between new and old to preserve the historic building elevation as observed from within the campus. He shared an illustration of the Pritchard Building viewed from the Legislative Building with the reading room returned to its original glassy and open pavilion-like quality. Another view depicted from the O'Brien Building reflected the historic Pritchard Building despite the addition even though the two structures reflect a unified entity.

Mr. Schacht reviewed the major reasons for selection of Option A by the Project Executive Team and why it was recommended to the SCC. The option serves as the basis for the predesign report. It maintains the integrity of the Olmsted Plan, preserves the symmetrical/axial/figure-ground relationship of the historic legislative buildings sited along a shared open space, demonstrates the state's commitment to stewardship of historic resources, retains the National Register of Historic Places status, and maximizes access, wayfinding, and operational efficiency by consolidating the program in a single building. Mr. Schacht invited feedback and comments.

Lieutenant Governor Heck thanked the team for their work, as the plan is outstanding. The decision would not have happened 14 months ago without the continued engagement and advocacy of many stakeholders and the leadership by the committee. The proposal is very good for the long-term future of the campus. It is important to remind everyone of the sacred stewardship responsibilities for the campus. To consider the journey undertaken during the last 14 months to reach this point fills his heart with joy, humility, and gratitude.

Lieutenant Governor Heck moved, seconded by Katy Taylor, to approve the findings and recommendations as outlined in the Legislative Campus Modernization Pritchard Building Rehabilitation/Expansion Validation Study as prepared by Mithun and dated January 25, 2022. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.

Project Director Easton introduced Ruth Baleiko, Miller Hull, to provide an update on the status of the Newhouse Building Replacement project.

Ruth Baleiko reported the briefing through a series of illustrations and diagrams will update the committee on the status of the Newhouse Building Replacement project. She introduced Mr. Aalfs to review the goals of the project.

Mr. Aalfs reported the team established some goals for the project from an historic preservation perspective. The first goal was development of a mitigation plan for the removal of the three buildings. The team is working closely with the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation and other stakeholders. In accordance with the Capitol Campus Master Plan, another goal was clarified to ensure the Newhouse Building replacement building design is compatible with both the original Wilder and White Plan and the Olmsted Brothers Plan. The third goal is achieving the design goal of a contemporary building meeting high quality standards and criteria established for the project.

The mitigation plan focuses on three areas. The first is an analysis of existing buildings and identifying all materials that could be salvaged, reused, or recycled. The team is quantifying and documenting to avoid disposal of or limiting the amount of material to the landfill. The team is exploring mitigation strategies for the site history and context in terms of compatibility with the Olmsted Plan and the Wilder and White Plan and incorporating interpretative materials, art, and the history of indigenous uses. The effort is also analyzing ways the mitigation plan could address the social and cultural history. One way is the development of a comprehensive survey of Architect Elizabeth Ayers work. Ms. Ayers was the architect of the Ayers Building and the first woman licensed as an architect in the state. The team is also working to develop the history of the press corps on the campus to include oral and written histories.

Ms. Baleiko reported that similar to the Pritchard Building, the team is also focused on the importance of view corridors and axis that define the Pritchard Building but also relate to a number of buildings on the campus and how those building entries are oriented to the street. The team is considering the entire pedestrian fabric existing on and around the campus in terms of existing conditions and those that will be maintained or restored. Vehicular access around the site is another consideration, as well as closure of some streets and potential impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and the campus.

Ms. Baleiko displayed an illustration of the proposed building footprint with two entries under consideration (north and west). She shared a preliminary landscape plan. Some documentation includes new trees and existing trees to be retained. Several large significant trees have been identified for preservation.

The American neoclassical design has been adapted and is somewhat of a derivative from ancient classic architecture. Some consistent features include scale and proportion, symmetry, and vertical modules of both glazing and solid systems. Ms. Baleiko displayed several examples of existing American neoclassical design buildings on the campus to include the Insurance and Cherberg Buildings. As stipulated in the predesign, the new Newhouse Building will be no higher than the Cherberg Building. The illustrations serve only as a preliminary exploration to assist in considering the building's entrance from the north, northwest, or the northwest corner. She shared one view illustration of a preliminary example of massing of the building with the compatible height and the footprint within Opportunity Site 6 with existing trees. The north entry affords daylight throughout the building. The symmetry is indicative of the other buildings on campus. The team also examined a west entry; however, for a number of reasons, the west entry is not the preferred option. She displayed some examples depicting how American neoclassical design has evolved over time. The team has been studying some of the examples that exemplify the base, column shaft, and the capital elements of the building. Typically, large expanses of glass or solid walls are not typical as some of the buildings featured on the campus and would not necessarily align with the capitol group of buildings. Preliminary material concepts include mass timber floor decking serving as the structural component, light colored masonry or precast concrete, and finishes for exposed steel and other metal finishes.

Ms. Baleiko shared a series of illustrations of different views from the building looking to the southeast, northwest, and views along Sid Snyder to the west. The team is exploring options for sun shading to ensure some funds are allocated for development of shading strategy moving forward to ensure the comfort level of office spaces and to reduce glare and overheating within the building.

Ms. Baleiko shared a preliminary roof plan depicting the location of equipment to ensure a net-zero ready building and to meet the conditions of the proviso. Preliminary interior views depicted through computer drawings provide the team with design information on the placement of windows and the amount of daylight anticipated in the building. Another illustration was shared of the rooftop solar and potential solar installed over the parking lot that would be necessary to achieve net-zero energy. However, approval from Puget Sound Energy would be required because of the size.

Chair Wicker thanked the team for the update.

Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – Project Update - Information

Chair Wicker invited DES Project Manager Carrie Martin and the Floyd|Snider team to provide the update.

Project Manager Martin introduced Tessa Gardner-Brown and Ray Outlaw who are leading the multi-disciplinary consultant team responsible for developing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Study. DES identified the estuary alternative as the likely Preferred Alternative during a joint meeting with the Executive and Funding and Governance Workgroups. Additional details will be shared with the committee on the final EIS and how the likely preferred alternative was identified and next steps for the Funding and Governance Workgroup (FGWG) and the overall project schedule.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the work completed between November 2021 and January 2022 was focused on reviewing the comments received on the Draft EIS. More than 850 comments letters were submitted. Categorization of the comments resulted in more than 2,000 unique comments with the team reviewing all comments. The EIS team plans to work over the next several months to update the technical analyses in response to the comments. The areas of primary focus include Water Quality; 5th Avenue Bridge; Cost Estimates for in-water disposal of dredged material for all alternatives; Fish & Wildlife in coordination with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to review any additional, relevant studies related to bat impacts and consider potential mitigation measures and review fish-related studies submitted by stakeholders and update analysis as appropriate; Navigation; Cultural Resources; Response to over 2,000 unique comments from Draft EIS; and Agency Coordination to confirm range of assumptions included in the Draft EIS.

Next steps will continue coordination with agencies as needed to confirm or revisit some of the key assumptions included in the Draft EIS. The team will coordinate with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Port of Olympia on dredging assumptions, remedial actions in Budd Inlet, and alternative design (USACE only), the City of Olympia on the 5th Avenue Bridge, the Department of Ecology on water quality and remedial actions in Budd Inlet, and with WDFW on potential impacts to bats and distribution of New Zealand mudsnails.

A top theme from Draft EIS comments and state legislators is a necessity to identify a funding and governance approach for long-term maintenance. DES acknowledges the importance of long-term funding and governance for decision durability. The charter of the FGWG is to identify the long-term funding and governance approach. The workgroup developed initial recommendations that were included in the Draft EIS:

- Existing workgroup recommendations:
 - Construction funding: state responsibility
 - Long-term funding: Estuary: shared; Managed Lake: state; Hybrid: unknown
 - Begin workgroup meeting series in late March – invited legislative participation
 - Develop Memorandum of Agreement (or similar) to memorialize funding and governance approach for Preferred Alternative

Ray Outlaw reviewed the process for identifying the Preferred Alternative. The State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) authorizes the lead agency wide discretion with regard to when and how to identify the Preferred Alternative. That process was included in the Draft EIS. During the committee's December meeting, the team shared a list of the components for informed decision-making comprised of the following:

- The Draft EIS as the body of technical work that adequately discloses impacts and benefits
- Comments on the Draft EIS that inform whether additional technical work is needed, and an understanding of whether additional technical work may substantively change findings in the EIS. Although some findings may be revised in the Final EIS, DES has concluded that the changes would unlikely be significant across the range of technical analyses to change the Preferred Alternative.
- Input from engaged stakeholders on which alternative could be supported as the preferred. (Decision durability)

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed the decision-making criteria for the Preferred Alternative and the process the team used to identify the alternative. Of the criteria, five are technical criteria the EIS project team and DES applied to evaluate the alternatives:

- Project Goals – An evaluation of water quality, sediment management, ecological functions, and community use
- Environmental Impacts & Benefits – Disciplines in the EIS assessed were those with significant impacts or benefits that are not captured in the project goals
- Construction Impacts – Evaluated the magnitude and duration of work to include the potential closure of 5th Avenue
- Environmental Sustainability – Focused on the level of active management required to meet the project goals, while encompassing resiliency to climate change because of its importance
- Economic Sustainability – A comprehensive consideration of initial costs, funding opportunities, diversification of funding sources, long-term funding, and potential impacts should funding cease
- Decision Durability (see below)

Mr. Outlaw described the process for ensuring decision durability. In December, the team requested and received input from each of the Executive Workgroup (EWG) member entities and members of the Community Sounding Board (CSB). Membership of the EWG includes the Squaxin Island Tribe, Cities of Tumwater and Olympia, Thurston County, Port of Olympia, and the LOTT Clean Water Alliance. Members of the CSB include 23 interested stakeholder DES convened early in the project to represent a broad range of interests to include both individuals and organizational representatives. Both entities were asked to respond to an identical set of questions of: (1) *Indicate the level of support they represented for each of the alternatives on a scale of 1 to 10, and (2) Provide a narrative response describing what increase or decrease they support for each alternative to inform the overall work of the EIS, funding and governance, and other factors.* The evaluation included averaging each entity's score (6 EWG and 1 CSB). The average score for the Estuary Alternative was 8.1; the average score was 3.9 for the Hybrid, the average score was 3.2 for Managed Lake, and No Action received an average score of 1.1. Although the Estuary Alternative scored the highest, it is important to consider that decision durability is one of six criteria. The numerical score is important because it considered a final score whereas the alternatives evaluation against the five technical criteria continues throughout the development of the Final EIS.

Project Manager Martin reported that as described, the initial evaluation of the alternatives on the technical criteria and decision durability input enabled DES to identify a likely Preferred Alternative. The information is shared at this time to provide an update on the progress and to enable the teams to work on funding and governance for long-term maintenance. The Final EIS will include a section detailing the process and the final outcome. The likely Preferred Alternative is based on information available at this time, which generally represents probable impacts and benefits of the alternatives. The team is tracking some information that was used to evaluate the alternatives that could change as the technical analysis work continues. While some findings may be revised, the cumulative result of the possible changes is unlikely to be significant to alter the likely Preferred Alternative. However, the likely Preferred Alternative is not a final decision and designation

of a Preferred Alternative prior to issuance of a Final EIS does not restrict the final decision. The alternatives will be reevaluated based on new information and analysis prepared for the Final EIS. It is expected that the likely Preferred Alternative as identified will be confirmed as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS. All information evaluated as part of the robust decision-making process has led to the identification of the Estuary Alternative as the Likely Preferred Alternative. It is important to note that the work has not been completed and more work is necessary to deliver the Final EIS with the Preferred Alternative and the funding and governance approach.

Project Manager Martin invited feedback on the information as presented. There were no questions from members.

Project Manager Martin reported DES distributed an e-newsletter to the project's 5,000+ subscribers to share the current information and to provide links to materials posted on the website. The next step is convening six meetings of the FGWG beginning in late March. The goal of the workgroup's efforts is to develop a memorandum of agreement to confirm and memorialize the funding and governance approach for the Preferred Alternative.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the team's goal is to deliver the Final EIS in fall 2022. Current efforts include coordination with regulatory agencies, the FGWG, preparation of comment responses to the comments received on the Draft EIS, completing supplemental technical analysis, revising the discipline reports, and incorporating all content into the Final EIS to confirm the Preferred Alternative. Following the issuance of the Final EIS, the team will present the Final EIS key findings to stakeholders.

Lieutenant Governor Heck asked for a more specific timeline as to the release of the Final EIS in the fall. Project Manager Martin explained that the change in the legislative proviso requires delivery of the Final EIS by October 31, 2022.

Chair Wicker thanked the team for providing the update.

Future Announcements and Adjournment of Meeting – Action

Information on future meetings for CCDAC and SCC is published on the DES website with meeting information, meeting dates, and meeting times. DES posts all meeting agendas, minutes, and meeting packets as they become available. The next CCDAC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, May 19, 2022 at 10 a.m. The next SCC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, June 16, 2022 at 10 a.m. Both meetings will be held remotely at this time.

With there being no further business, Chair Wicker adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net