



**STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE**  
**Legislative Building, Senate Rules Room**  
**Olympia, Washington 98504**

**December 12, 2019**  
**10:00 AM**

**NOTE:** These Draft Minutes of Meeting are subject to change upon approval of SCC their next regularly scheduled meeting.

**Draft Minutes**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Cyrus Habib, Lieutenant Governor (Chair)  
Brule Burkhart (for Hilary Franz, Commissioner of Public Lands)  
Mark Neary (for Kim Wyman, Secretary of State)  
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services  
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services  
Marygrace Gardu, City of Olympia  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Richell Geiger, Washington State Legislature  
Brad Hendrickson, Senate  
Ashley Howard, Department of Enterprise Services  
Majid Jamali, Department of Enterprise Services  
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services  
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services  
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services  
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services  
Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services  
Rachel Newmann, South Capitol Neighborhood Assn.  
Valerie Robinson, Department of Enterprise Services  
Anne Roderer, Mahlum Architects  
Ronell Witt, Department of Enterprise Services  
Oliver Wu, Department of Enterprise Services

**Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Cyrus Habib called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A quorum was present. Members provided self-introduction.

Chair Habib recommended postponing the roundtable discussion on the roles and responsibilities of the SCC, Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC), and the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) following a discussion with Secretary Wyman and Deputy Secretary Neary to enable time by the Assistant Attorney General to provide a briefing and to afford an opportunity for all members to participate.

**Approval of Minutes – Joint September 19, 2019 SCC-CCDAC Meeting - Action**

**The minutes were approved as published.**

**Capitol Childcare Center Progress Update - Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Oliver Wu, Project Manager, DES.

Project Manager Wu introduced Anne Roderer with Mahlum Architects, who provided an update on the progress of the Capitol Childcare Center project.

*Brule Burkhart for Commissioner Franz arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Roderer reported the facility would address demand for quality childcare in the area and to create joy on the campus by bringing children to the campus and enhancing opportunities for parent and child interaction throughout the day. The project is currently under design. Documentation and permitting are scheduled during the first quarter of 2020. The site is located at the southwest corner of East Capitol Campus on the site of the old IBM Building as identified in the State Capitol Development Study. The site sits directly west to the Employment Security Building.

The site is visible and accessed from all sides and is served by two adjacent bus stops offering fixed route service and free Dash bus service. Vehicular access is from Maple Park Avenue with pedestrian access from Capitol Way and Maple Park Avenue. The site is also visible and accessible from the pedestrian bridge connecting to the visitor parking lot.

The site design will provide improved pedestrian access and a landscape buffer along the two public facing fronts to enhance the native edge as envisioned in the Olmsted Plan and along the more formal tree-lined boulevard character of Maple Park Avenue. The landscape design is a naturalist approach along Capitol Way encompassed in a sustainable landscape gateway similar to campus gateway conditions at Snyder Avenue and the Helen Sommers Building.

The site design includes short-term parking to provide drop-off and pick-off for parents and for service access to the site. The entry courtyard can be accessed from all four directions. The building and associated outdoor spaces are oriented east-west and located toward the north edge of the site to maximize solar access.

Strategies prioritized for the project include supporting ecological and human health through low impact stormwater management, habitat restoration, lower carbon strategies, passive systems, an enhanced envelope, embodied carbon tracking capabilities, materials to help transparency, operator flexibility, and empowerment. The project aims to create child-centered spaces designed for all types of learners to capture a feel and spirit that is bright, airy, and clean. The building will provide sensory experiences for the children, as well as providing sufficient space and resources to support a high-quality child education facility. The orientation of the building to maximize solar access will provide natural daylight into the spaces to improve the performance of the overall facility.

The building design is a double-loaded corridor with program spaces on both sides of the corridor to optimize space and operational efficiencies. The corridor shifts to a configuration of an "S" type corridor enabling through views from the corridors to interior spaces to the outside natural spaces. Additionally, views and direct access are visible from each of the interior classroom spaces to an outdoor learning space. Spaces will be wrapped in tactile material to reduce the scale and modulate the façade, as well as providing more sensory experience for the children.

The outdoor learning environments will aim to establish a connection to nature through the play areas and by creating a fun and flexible outdoor learning environment designed at a children's scale landscape level.

Ms. Burkhart asked about the number of children the center would be able to accommodate. Ms. Roderer said the center's capacity is 78 children but it is dependent upon one room that would be designed as an infant/toddler flexible room to address demand.

**Insurance Commissioner Office Building Predesign – Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Majid Jamali, Project Manager, DES.

Assistant Director Frare provided some preliminary information on the project. The proviso for the Office of the Insurance Commissioner (OIC) Building predesign specified meeting the needs of the Insurance Commissioner and exploring four locations on Capitol Campus. The OIC approached DES with a proposal to include another agency for a larger facility to co-locate with the OIC. Subsequently, DES conferred with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to explore the option. OFM staff did not object to the proposal as long as DES fulfills the requirements of the proviso and did not seek more funding from OFM. To date, DES has coordinated with OIC and with the Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) to proceed with the project as identified in the proviso to study the four locations for a 65,000 square-foot facility that meets the needs of the OIC, as well as considering a larger facility that meets the needs of both the OIC and DCYF at the same four campus locations. No additional funds have been requested; however, DES asked for additional operating funds from both agencies to fill the gap between the original cost and the projected cost for a predesign that combines both facilities. Both agencies have agreed to provide funds from their respective operating budgets.

Program Manager Dragon noted that the work at this point is within the current budget allocation.

Chair Habib advised staff to keep relevant legislators informed on the status of efforts.

Ms. Wicker asked how DCYF was identified as an interested partner and whether DES considered other agencies that might be interested in co-locating with OIC. Assistant Director Frare said OIC proposed adding DCYF. DES did not pursue any additional outreach to other agencies or consider other agency needs.

Chair Habib commented that it could be important for OFM to consider other agencies because of the value of efficiencies that might not be obvious rather than pursuing an option that was offered by two public agencies.

Manager Jamali reported SHB 1102, Section 1092, included funding for the OIC building predesign to study the existing and the projected space use for the agency, parking impacts, potential alternatives to fund the project, development of a high performance net zero ready with an EUI of less than 35, and the potential of using cross-laminated timber products. The four sites in the study include:

- 1 - General Administration Building
- 6B - Visitor Center
- 7 - Old IBM Building site (currently under development for the Childcare Center)
- 12 - ProArts Building

The preliminary design due date is February 28, 2020 with the final report due by June 30, 2020.

To maximize the value of the project and the development of the site, the OIC is partnering with the DCYF to develop an alternate option. Existing facilities for OIC total 44,200 square feet to house 235 employees. Existing DCYF facilities total 136,600 square feet to house 704 employees. As outlined in the proviso, two phases were authorized for preliminary and final predesign. The first phase includes development of a problem statement and alternatives analysis. DES selected Mithun Architects and initiated the project in late October. A programming meeting was held by DES with OIC and DCYF to discuss programming space needs, parking, security, and the energy program. An initial meeting was held with the City of Olympia to discuss utilities, stormwater, and other impacts from the project. Another meeting is scheduled with City of Olympia to discuss the costs of the improvements by the City. The CCDAC received a briefing on the proposed project at its last meeting in November. The next step is developing preliminary financial scenarios with DES. The CCDAC is scheduled to receive an update on the project at its February 2020 meeting prior to submitting the predesign to the Legislature on February 28, 2020.

Chair Habib pointed to the size of the programming need for DCYF and the increased number of employees in comparison to OIC. Although, the Legislature approved moving forward to study a location to consolidate OIC, it appears the proposal to co-locate agencies includes an agency that is four times the size of the OIC. Although, no additional funds were requested from the Legislature to study the option, each agency is using operational funds to support the predesign effort. He did not realize the proposal to co-locate was such a large change in course because it appears to relate somewhat to the larger discussion the committee plans to initiate around roles and responsibilities. He asked how the option of co-locating occurred.

Assistant Director Frare agreed with the analysis with respect to the size comparison between the two agencies and whether it would substantially change the scope. When DES was notified of the proposal, DES staff was also troubled about the size difference because a 200,000 square foot building would drive the process to a different solution or preferred alternative than a 50,000 square foot building. Initially, DES was uncomfortable, which is why staff sought direction from OFM. However, by maintaining the original direction of the proviso to provide a predesign, which is on track while also providing additional information on a combined facility, DES believes it is fulfilling its responsibility to deliver the initial predesign.

Ms. Wicker asked about the line of authority for determining the selection of the agencies that could be co-located in the predesign. Assistant Director Frare advised that the OFM Facility Oversight Committee plays a role on budget and direction through its secure planning process based on the agency's current and future needs and how it addresses those needs. The OFM Facility Oversight Committee is responsible for DES-managed properties on the campus, as well as all other state properties.

Mr. Neary added that part of the mission of the committee is to identify opportunities for co-location.

Chair Habib questioned whether that was the progression of this particular process as it appeared OIC initiated the suggestion. Assistant Director Frare confirmed that the OIC coordinated with DCYF to recommend co-location of both agencies. When the proposal was presented to DES, DES staff contacted OFM staff. Although, OFM conveyed no direct support of the proposal, OFM staff also did not object to DES moving forward and exploring an option beyond what was authorized in the proviso.

Chair Habib shared the scenario of his office approaching DES and requesting consideration of exploring the option of a possible building for the Office of the Lt. Governor. He asked whether that would be the

process to pursue if his agency was seeking a predesign for a new building. Assistant Director Frare said that such a scenario could be possible. Chair Habib said the information is important in assisting the committee's understanding of the process.

Deputy Director Meyer clarified that the funds for the predesign were included in the budget for OIC.

Chair Habib said his question pertained to whether his agency could contact DES and request consideration of co-locating with another agency that might be in the process of a predesign as another alternative as long as the agency has the necessary funds. Deputy Director Meyer advised that typically that process is not a standard routine and would likely not be considered. In this case, the request was pursued through the Legislature by the OIC although the DCYF portion did not. Chair Habib said his analogy would place his agency in the same position as DCYF. He asked whether such a process would be possible if he contacted DES and conveyed that the agency had met with the OIC and would like DES to consider a third alternative of including the Office of the Lt. Governor.

Deputy Director Meyer said she's unsure as to whether that process would be the preferred method. The OIC proposal was a situation that DES has never encountered, which is why DES contacted OFM to review the proposal.

Chair Habib said he offered that scenario as he was not in office when the SCC was first created. The committee is comprised of four statewide elected officials, and although similar to the Legislature, include elected officials with public credibility and oversight responsibility of the Capitol Campus. Should there be a future similar question that was unusual but did include convening a special session of the Legislature to act, one idea could entail approaching the SCC to present the proposal that would not be within the scope or mandate of a budget proviso but should be considered as an option. That scenario would appear to be more useful than the committee typically receiving informational updates. Obviously, OFM's critical oversight should not be minimized in terms of determining the legality of any proposal. However, the discussion raises the question of why it was not included as a debate topic for the roundtable to explore and whether that particular process is an appropriate path because of the potential of other interested agency heads not aware of the proposal.

Ms. Wicker offered that more work on the topic is warranted as there have been many discussions by the committee on the needs on the campus, the Legislature, and other entities. The co-location proposal was somewhat of a surprise and she would prefer to pursue a conversation about pursuing a more strategic process because all sites are located on the campus. The conversation would be beneficial for the committee in terms of identifying campus priorities.

Deputy Director Meyer added that the roles and the responsibilities of the committee also included conversations about the need for completing an effective Master Plan for the Capitol Campus. If such a plan had been vetted thoroughly and adopted, then those examples could have been included in the plan to accommodate agency and legislative ideas or suggestions to ensure they align with the Master Plan. An updated Master Plan would ensure planning is in place to enable better decision-making to address all concerns or options.

Chair Habib agreed that the Master Plan is important to help guide the process. Additionally, agencies use space in different ways with many buildings comprised of cubical offices or others with large auditoriums or large public spaces. When designing a building to be shared by two agencies, consideration should be factored as to the compatibility of the two agencies co-locating. Master planning is part of how that happens.

Deputy Director Meyer pointed out the importance of considering the highest and best use of sites on the campus that could be redeveloped. Highest and best use of sites is a consideration that should be thoroughly reviewed when considering a project on the campus.

Chair Habib noted the conversation is a good start on moving forward regarding the order of operations and roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Neary said that of the four sites to be analyzed, the GA Building is the only site that could accommodate a building of the appropriate size to house the two agencies.

Manager Jamali reported the tasks during the first phase include eight scenarios with four scenarios of the OIC Building and four scenarios for a shared use facility of the OIC and DCYF. Based on the scenarios, preliminary site and buildings layouts will be completed and evaluated for: parking requirements, building height, bulk and scale, technical site constraints, and feasibility of achieving performance requirements on each site. Based on the analysis, the preferred alternative will be evaluated followed by identifying the cost and required budget, as well as financing analysis. Phase 1 concludes with preparation of the report and presentation to the CCDAC and SCC. Phase 1 deliverables include an Executive Summary, Problem Statement with functional and technical requirements, alternatives analysis including alternative site development scenarios, cost analysis, and identification of a Preferred Alternative.

Manager Dragon said the legislative proviso directed a preliminary report and a final report. DES scoped the project to prepare the preliminary report. As part of the Preferred Alternative analysis, an in-depth analysis is included in Phase 2 to produce detailed cost estimates and alternatives analysis of what constitutes the real costs of the facility following an evaluation of the different alternatives to identify a recommended Preferred Alternative to receive feedback. The Phase 1 Preliminary Predesign is due to the Legislature on February 28, 2020.

Manager Dragon added that the SCC would receive a briefing on the Preliminary Predesign Report at its March 2020 meeting.

Chair Habib asked about the status of the DCYF's new facility on the Six-Year Capital Plan. Assistant Director Frare advised that he is not familiar with the needs of the agency with respect to the Six-Year Capital Plan or any modified predesigns that the agency might have previously submitted. However, DCYF, as a new agency, is partially housed in the Jefferson Building with 80 employees and five other locations housing the remaining employees. The agency is seeking consolidation of all employees to enable shared functions and improve efficiencies.

Manager Dragon added that based on his familiarity with the development of the OFM six-year planning process, each state agency identifies its needs over the six-year window relative to the growth projection of the agency and works directly with OFM's Facilities Oversight Committee to develop the six-year capital plan. OFM then consolidates all six-year plans into one statewide six-year plan, which is not specific to the Capitol Campus and speaks to the importance of having a Master Plan to guide development on the campus.

Deputy Director Meyer offered to follow up with OFM on the order of priorities with respect to a new building for DCYF.

**Global War on Terror Monument Planning – Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Program Manager Kevin Dragon.

Manager Dragon briefed members on the status of efforts by the Legislative Work Group to study and forward a recommendation for a new monument on the State Capitol Campus honoring fallen resident service members from the Global War on Terrorism. The Legislature included funding in the operating budget for DES to support the Global War on Terror Work Group. The update will bring the committee up-to-date on the current work underway for planning a new monument on the campus.

The effort includes a feasibility study for placement of a new monument. The Work Group was established in proviso language in Section 150(8) to plan the monument for fallen resident service members, address naming of those individuals on the monument, prepare monument draft designs, consider funding alternatives and offer recommendations on funding the monument, plan for an unveiling ceremony if funded, recommend a lead agency or committee, and plan for the ongoing care and maintenance of the monument in perpetuity. The Legislature has asked for a report from the Work Group submitted no later than November 1, 2020.

Additionally, WAC 200.230 specifically addresses the design and placement of major and minor works or monuments on the Capitol Campus and ensures the monuments reflect the lasting statewide significance for all people in Washington and protects and maintains both the open space and preserves the views associated with campus, conserves options for future generations, and requires a deliberate review and approval process that includes DES, Arts Commission, CCDAC, and the SCC. The vetting process is required for the monument and its placement on the campus.

A major work is defined as any statue, monument, or sculpture. Minor works are smaller items, such as plaques, trees, and shrubs.

Chair Habib asked whether the WAC defines the specific roles of the oversight entities. Manager Dragon explained that the WAC definition is a collaborative approach requiring proponents to work with the CCDAC on the appropriateness of the monument for the campus and through the process achieving consensus on the direction of a proposal. Chair Habib pointed out that attaining a consensus would be considered a high bar. He asked about previous processes for approval of a monument or sculpture. Manager Dragon explained that there have been no new major monuments on the campus for some time. The process is defined. The roles and responsibilities require DES to work with the proponent for the design and placement with the CCDAC reviewing architectural and aesthetic functions, environmental excellence, and landscaping plans for the monument. The SCC approves the design and site of the major works to be located on the Capitol Campus pursuant to RCW 43.34 and WAC 200-230-010. The SCC approves the development plans and temporary and permanent improvements on the Capitol Campus.

Manager Dragon displayed a photograph of the State Capitol Campus reflecting the West and East Campus divided by Capitol Way. The photograph highlights the location of monuments for both major and minor works on the campus. On the West Campus, monuments include Winged Victory commemorating World War I, World War II Memorial, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, POW-MIA Memorial, and a Medal of Honor Memorial. The Korean War Memorial is located on the East Campus. The Law Enforcement Memorial is located north of the Temple of Justice.

The Work Group's timeline is defined. The Work Group developed a schematic timeline for next steps outlining the framework of what occurs and how to meet the November 2020 deadline. The Work Group

has also encountered some challenges with the timeline and what it will entail to deliver a report. The timeline identifies CCDAC and SCC meetings with DES responsible for providing the committees with updates on the status of efforts. If funded, a formal proposal for a monument would move forward.

Chair Habib said the timing appears odd as the Legislature would appropriate the funds for the monument and then the committee would determine whether the monument would be constructed. Assistant Director Frare explained that the Legislature established the committee with no funding associated with the committee's work. As the process proceeds, the SCC will receive an update in June on the status of efforts, as well as in September and October as the report is finalized. The problems associated with the Work Group are two-fold. The first issue is the short timeline for the necessary work. Members on the committee are volunteers who hold other positions. DES is staffing the committee without a budget appropriation to complete the work or hire a consultant to assist in moving forward with designs and alternatives. The Work Group will need to solve the problems of funding and timeline in order to deliver the report by November 2020.

Government Relations Manager Larson added that staff has forwarded a request to OFM to provide for an extension to June 2021 for the report. The Governor's budget should be released shortly and hopefully the proviso is included in the budget. DES continues to work with the Legislature to identify any funds to address some of the resource issues.

Chair Habib asked whether the proposal originated from the Governor or from the Legislature. Ms. Wicker advised that she was unsure how the request was generated. Manager Larson advised that the proposal originated from legislation presented by Senator Hobbs. The proposal was reduced to a work group as a proviso with funding provided only for transportation.

Chair Habib asked whether DES requested that the Governor include more funds. Manager Larson indicated the work group requested the Governor consider a recommendation to extend the timeline. Members of the Work Group believed that the timeline would be difficult to achieve. The Work Group only requested additional time.

Deputy Director Meyer added that no request was submitted for funding; however, funds are not available for a feasibility study of the monument.

Chair Habib expressed interest in learning about any discussions on what the Global War on Terrorism means. Manager Larson replied that Work Group members discussed the definition and referred to the national definition. One of the Governor's appointees served on the selection committee for the national monument for the Global War on Terrorism to be placed the Washington, D.C. Mall. The Work Group agreed to use the national definition. Chair Habib asked for the definition of Global War on Terrorism and whether it speaks to Iraq, Afghanistan, firefighters who died during 9/11, victims of the San Bernardino shooting, or the Navel Station shooting in Pensacola, Florida. Manager Larson explained that the definition relates to military operations overseas since 9/11.

Manager Dragon added that during the federal declaration of the Global War on Terrorism, President Bush declared and set forth the definition, which relates to the operations that surround the war on terror, such as Iran, Afghanistan, and South Africa. Significant military tours are affiliated within the military circle of what constitutes the Global War on Terrorism. It is also well-defined by the military. The Department of Veterans Affairs recommended the national definition to the Work Group. The Work Group engaged in a long discussion and agreed to adopt the definition as it speaks to fallen service members.

Chair Habib said that based on the briefing, he does not like the term. Middle Eastern Americans do not like the term. The war in Vietnam is called the Vietnam War because it refers to the geography of the war; likewise the Korean War also refers to the geography of the war. The Middle East is not terror. Iraq is not terror, and even if a connection was substantiated about the 20-year operation in Afghanistan related to 9/11, many people do not believe that there is a link to Iraq or Iran. It appears the term; “Global War on Terrorism” is used as any military operation against a Muslim country that took place in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. He is very concerned and compassionate about wanting to recognize fallen service members during those operations because no matter how he feels about the choice to engage, they did not have a choice. He acknowledged that perhaps his conversation should be with legislators but suggested that it would make more sense to rename the monument to a “21<sup>st</sup> Century Memorial” because it involved more than just one country. The term should be broader as “Global War on Terrorism” has no place on the State Capitol Campus. He affirmed that although he is not a member of the Work Group, he would publicly express his opinion as the only elected Middle Eastern American in state government and he would be remiss if he did not vocalize his opposition.

#### **Capital Projects Update - Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Program Manager Dragon to provide an update on the status of capital projects. Manager Dragon reviewed the projects:

- ***Building Exterior Improvements – Capitol Court*** – The project involves the restoration of historic windows and doors and repair and cleaning of the building’s stone façade. Installation of the scaffolding is occurring now with black mesh covering to remain in place until April 2020. The planned completion date is May 2020.
- ***Campus-wide Sidewalk Repair*** – DES completed some ADA access improvements into the Sunken Garden and ADA sidewalk features missing at four locations. Irrigation, planting, and landscaping improvements will be installed and completed by spring 2020.
- ***East Plaza Waterproofing and Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B)*** – Replacement of the waterproof membrane above the East Plaza Garage has been completed as well as landscaping. Walkways have been opened for the public. The new landscape improvements are consistent with the vision of the East Capitol Campus Plaza – EDAW Plan. Electrical improvements within the East Plaza Garage will continue into early 2020.
- ***Insurance/Cherberg Roof Replacement*** – The replacement of the roof membrane and insulation is underway to meet current codes, as well as replacement of roof drainage and removal of obsolete roof-top heating/ventilation/cooling equipment. Four new skylights were installed on the Insurance Building roof. The Cherberg Building Roof Replacement project has been completed and is pending some minor work items.
- ***Legislative Building Cleaning – Insurance Building*** – The project includes restorative of façade by cleaning and stone repair. The projects address water intrusion issues at the lower level and improving the anchoring for the stone where necessary. The consultant is under contract and is performing a 3D scan of the building to provide a high resolution picture of the façade and development of a website with the high resolution façade imagery to determine the appropriate treatment of the facade. The design will be completed by January 2020 and reviewed by DAHAP and DES’ Historical and Cultural Resource Planner in February 2020.

Chair Habib inquired about the long-term status of the Insurance Building if the proposal for a Senate Office Building is constructed. Assistant Director Frare replied that during the last biennium, the Legislature requested a predesign on a New House replacement. The predesign identified a number of scenarios to include a joint House and Senate Building, a Senate-only replacement, and a building to replace the New House Building. DES prepared an alternatives analysis that was reviewed by the SCC and submitted to the Legislature. To date, the Legislature has not provided DES with any guidance. DES staff has followed up with the administration in the House and Senate and learned that there was no consensus between the bodies. Subsequently, DES asked the architect to prepare an alternative of the consequences of not rendering a decision because at this point, the New House Building is beyond its useful life and many building systems are failing. Building systems during the summer would typically not cause a concern; however, during the winter when the Legislature is in session, one of the major building systems could fail. The intent is to provide the Legislature with the information it needs to make an informed decision and that no action could be of some consequence. The architect is nearly completed and staff anticipates submitting the information to OFM and to the legislative committee. The New House Building decision does not intersect with the Insurance Building. There are no plans to change the occupancy of the Insurance Building.

Manager Dragon noted that the Insurance Building is included in the DES 10-Year Capital Budget to complete a renovation of the building that would involve three phases of a predesign phase to identify programming needs, design, and construction.

- ***Arc-Flash Study*** – The project is a safety study to assess all high-energy electrical panels on the campus for safety of staff and contractors performing work. The work will identify proper personal protection equipment (PPE) and safety perimeters necessary to work safely on electrical panels. DES conducted interviews of consultants and is in the process of scoping actual services for the consultant to complete site assessments. Site tours of each site are scheduled in January and February 2020. The consultant will prepare recommendations for PPE and training of personnel.
- ***Next Century Campus Study*** – Assistant Director Frare reported the study is of the power house. Staff and the consultant are finalizing the report that identifies the preferred alternative. The project is large as it would replace the power plant entirely. Submittal of the predesign to OFM is anticipated in the next month.

#### **SCC, CCDAC and DES Roles and Responsibilities Roundtable – Informational**

Chair Habib conceded that some of the initial conversation was interwoven within several of the agenda topics. He asked for additional feedback prior to the next scheduled meeting to help frame the roundtable discussion on SCC and its mandate.

Ms. Wicker acknowledged that following a discussion with Deputy Director Meyer, there is no clear direction as to the role and authority of the SCC other than different WACs and RCWs. It would be important for the committee to clarify its role and authorities. She thanked staff for citing the references.

Ms. Burkhart added that she plans to follow-up with staff about the possibility of amending the RCW to include a designee for the Commissioner of Public Lands. It has been difficult to ensure representation on the SCC regularly and having some consistency would add value to the committee.

Chair Habib offered that a clear understanding of the mandate and the control the committee has over processes would likely attract members to attend meetings, especially if it involves action to approve a building. The use of designees has likely occurred because of the unclear charge of the committee and its actions.

**Public Comments and Closing Remarks – Informational**

Chair Habib inquired about the process of scheduling a special meeting to either discuss potential actions for requesting a change in the statute or changing the agenda moving forward.

Manager Dragon advised that if the committee wants to convene a special meeting or work session, staff would contact the Chair and poll availability of the committee to establish a meeting place, date, and time mutually acceptable to all members.

Chair Habib asked that the Assistant Attorney General provide a summary/briefing of the authorities overseeing the SCC. At the beginning of the year, he and staff will determine whether a special meeting is necessary.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Habib adjourned the meeting at 11:32 a.m.**