

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
General Administration Building
210 – 11th Avenue SW, Room 324
Olympia, Washington
May 21, 2009
10:00 AM

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Karen Fraser
Dennis Haskell
Barbara Swift
Paul Blanton
Alex Rolluda

MEMBERS ABSENT

Sectary of State Sam Reed
Representative Sam Hunt
Representative Richard DeBolt
Senator Dale Brandland

OTHERS PRESENT

Albert, Jim DIS
Alhadeff, Sally, DIS
Bremer, Linda, GA
Cowen, Diane, GA
Davidson, Eliza, Arbutas Design LLC
Donald, Craig, GA
Edens, Cindy, Wright Runstad & Company
Evans, Tom, GA
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Hall, Steve, City of Olympia
Jackson, Carleen, Office of the Secretary of State
(for Sam Reed)
Jennings, Marygrace, GA

Johnson, Bill, WRS
Jones, Nathaniel, GA
Klein, Greg, South Capitol Neighborhood Association
Koal, Penny, GA
Levine, Mindy, NBBJ
Mead, Art, FTE News Magazine
Noble, Ron, GA
Olmsted, Susan, Mithun
Poitra, Vikki, GA
Price, Deanna, GA
Sadie-Hill, Shelly, GA
Szumlanski, Paul, GA

Vice Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. He introduced new members Paul Blanton and Alex Rolluda and described their professional experience and education. Mr. Blanton is from Spokane and represents eastern Washington. Mr. Rolluda is from Seattle. Both members have distinguished backgrounds.

Announcements and Introductions

Mr. Haskell reported the notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian*. Public comments will be accepted after completion of each agenda item. Other public comments will be accepted at the end of all agenda items.

Approval of Agenda

Paul Blanton moved, seconded by Senator Fraser, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes – January 9, 2009

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Dennis Haskell, to approve the minutes of January 9, 2009 as presented. Motion carried.

Selection of New Chair and Vice Chair – Recommendation to Governor

The agenda item was deferred to later in the meeting after Ms. Swift's arrival.

Director's Report

Linda Bremer reported on her meeting with Mr. Blanton and Mr. Rolluda and her impressions of their personal commitment to community. Mr. Blanton is traveling from Spokane to attend and contribute to the committee by providing oversight and expertise. Mr. Rolluda is a strong advocate for inclusion of small businesses and diversity at all levels. His commitment to the International District and the Pike Place Market is important. She thanked both members for their willingness to serve on the CCDAC.

Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan – GA is working with its partners to complete a highly transparent alternative analysis process. The committee is comparing the four alternatives using a common set of criteria, which reflect the interests of the community and CLAMP member entities. A review draft will be released to the public in early June 2009. The review period will close with a public workshop on June 24, 2009. A final synopsis report will be completed by July 22, 2009, incorporating public comments. The CLAMP Steering Committee is scheduled to render a final committee recommendation to GA by August 21, 2009. The Department will move forward to develop an independent recommendation for the State Capitol Committee before the end of the year.

Informational Piece on Olmsted Brothers – At the last meeting, Senator Fraser suggested developing a public information brochure on the original Olmsted landscape design and legacy. Staff is developing the brochure, which will be available to visitors to the campus.

New CCDAC Staff Coordinators – CCDAC's chief staff coordinator for the last seven years, Tom Evans, is retiring from state service on May 28, 2009. Ms. Bremer presented Mr. Evans with a certificate of recognition from the committee recognizing Mr. Evans' achievement in design excellence for the Capitol Campus since 1998 and for distinguished leadership and service to the CCDAC.

Mr. Evans commented on his service to the committee and how much he enjoyed working with the committee. Members thanked Mr. Evans for his service. Mr. Haskell pointed out some of the specific projects involving Mr. Evans' oversight. He expressed appreciation for his work and wished him well in his future endeavors.

Ms. Bremer commented on the recent budget decisions each agency is undergoing. In the interim, Martin Casey, Performance and Accountability Director, will be filling Mr. Evans' position. Diane Cowen is the new Administrative Assistant to the CCDAC. Ms. Cowen is the point of contact for agenda items and for general information.

Ms. Bremer advised that more information on capital projects and the department's budget will be shared at the committee's next meeting.

Wheeler Site Redevelopment – Project Update

Jim Albert, Interim Director, Department of Information Services, reported on the appointment of the new Director, Tony Tortorice, effective July 1, 2009.

Mr. Albert updated members on the Wheeler site development project. He also acknowledged and extended thanks to Mr. Evans, who has been a valuable asset to the Wheeler project by attending all weekly meetings and neighborhood meetings, as well as participating in the acquisition of the developer.

The Data Center and the DIS Building were approved by the Legislature during the last session with the Governor signing the Capital Budget Bill last week. The budget changed the nature of the project by expanding the size of the project to house other state agency tenants to be determined by the Office of Financial Management (OFM). The latest expansion adds 80,000 square feet to the design previously reviewed.

Ms. Bremer added that the initial design was larger than the approved square footage authorized by the Legislature. The initial design included two large office complexes and the Data Center, which was revised to a single office building, Data Center, and a mechanical building.

Mr. Albert said DIS is working with OFM to identify other agency occupants for the office building. DIS has until the end of the year to identify tenants. The redesign includes a larger conference area and other changes in the office building to accommodate the additional square footage. Design construction drawings are at 100% for the Data Center. Revised drawings are underway for the office building. The project will encompass approximately 360,000 square feet, which includes 250,000 square feet of office space and 110,000 square feet for the Data Center. The additional 80,000 square feet provides the capacity to house an additional 400 state employees, bringing the maximum occupancy to approximately 900 state employees.

The new budget estimate for the new facility is \$255 million, which is a significant reduction from the initial project. The Runstad design team and Project Manager Sally Alhadeff have pursued value engineering of the project to control costs. Currently, DIS is working on determining the amount of the financing contract to fund the construction, which will be reviewed by OFM as well as the State Finance Committee. The bonds are expected to be sold in late June or early July. DIS is working closely with the legal and finance team and with the Office of the State Treasurer on the financing element. The project will be funded through an alternative funding method involving a 63-20 financing structure, which is a public/private partnership.

The project was subject to a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review with a Modified Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) issued on April 25, 2009. The South Capitol Neighborhood Association appealed the determination and a formal hearing with an Administrative Law Judge was held who issued an initial order in December 2008, dismissing the appeal. The Director of General Administration issued a final order on April 22, 2009, affirming and adopting the findings, facts, and conclusion for dismissing the appeal. The appellants have until May 22, 2009, to file a petition for judicial review. Two members of the neighborhood association filed a petition for judicial review of the determination on May 14, 2009.

The current status of the design, exterior of the building, and the landscaping concepts will be presented to the committee for review and input. Ms. Edens thanked everyone involved in pursuing approval of the project. The project is dynamic and with the closing of the bonds at the end of June, mobilization will begin in mid-June on demolition activities.

Mindy Levine, NBBJ, reviewed the architectural form of the buildings. She presented a series of slides representing the design since the committee's last review. The project includes a four-story building on the north portion of the site connected to a three-story office complex on the southern portion of the site with the Data Center located east and behind the three-story complex. The front entry is located between the two office complexes. A mechanical building is located behind the main complex. The three-story

complex includes a conference center, cafeteria, and a café. To accommodate the extra square footage, the office building was enlarged by two stories to a total of six stories. The adjoining complex is maintained at three stories by filling in the area previously used for mechanical purposes, as well as behind the entry on the second level to provide more area for tenant space. The conference center has moved behind the entry. The mechanical building remains in its previous location as well as the Data Center complex.

Ms. Levine displayed a slide representing the footprint of the complex. The footprint was maintained even though an additional 80,000 square feet was added ensuring the efficiency of the site is maintained. Parking entrances for the 300-car garage remains the same. Entering the parking garage is from the north portion of the site. The entrance is a right in and right out only. The second entrance is located in the southern portion of the site with a right in as well as a left turn in and a right-out only. The loading area is located behind the three-story office complex and the Data Center with delivery trucks traveling along 16th to the service utility area. Additionally, off Jefferson Avenue, an entry is located for visitor drop-off and visitor parking.

Bill Johnson, WRS, commented on how the principles pertaining to how the site relates to the overall campus remain intact. It's important to provide a sense of the campus to the site. One way is considering the current campus and how it's rooted in the history of the Olmsted Brothers' approach to landscaping. Not all of the Olmsted plans were implemented on the campus. The project provides an opportunity to employ some of the Olmsted principles to the site's landscaping design. Some of the key principles include the extension of Maple Park to as far east as possible to blend with natural vegetation and sloping along the corridor. Another principle is from the freeway approach to ensure the area is viewed as an introduction of Capitol Campus and the Olmsted spirit. The northern edge of the property will include the gentle character of the Olmsted landscapes involving a mix of deciduous trees and conifers in a casual setting while opening space to Jefferson Avenue by plantings and a mix of flowing trees placed within the rolling terrain. Jefferson remains as the place of distinction and identity.

Mr. Johnson displayed a diagram of the proposed Jefferson landscape. The area along Jefferson includes a campus green allowing approaches of two walkways moving away from Jefferson and into the site and arriving at the entry court. The casual arrangement of deciduous trees moves away from the street and form a somewhat open campus in the same spirit as the west campus.

Maple Park is a series of trees that blends with the conifers from the lower part of the site. There is an opportunity to pull existing 10 and 12-inch caliper red oaks for storage and replanting after completion of the buildings to provide the site with some mature trees throughout the landscape.

The central court and arrival area includes a visitor parking lot. Parking is placed within the grade, which provides some screening from the street. It enables a connecting walkway from the main entry to the south end of the building where the café is located. The café will provide a welcome interface to the neighborhood.

Mr. Johnson highlighted several features of the frontal area along Jefferson. The entry court is a square with simple paving indicating a circular area for vehicle turning and a drop off area for visitors. Natural stones will be placed strategically in the entry way and around the area of the café.

Mr. Johnson commented on different types of trees planned for the site. Not only are red oaks available to move, the plan includes purchasing a mature a Katsuratree placed near maples and oaks providing for an attractive setting for visitors arriving on the site.

Mr. Johnson reviewed some proposed distinctive lights along the entryway walkway and the idea of marking columns along the corridor to the entry. He reviewed the area of 14th moving along the grade. Grass will be of rougher texture with mowing occurring less often. There may be some ornamental grasses planted on the banks.

Ms. Levine reviewed the detail of the building façade and the larger massing and articulation of the building. She displayed an elevation of the north façade of the building. The building's design includes a repeat of horizontal bays to harmonize with west campus buildings. The building includes a base, middle, and a top. The base is an integral part of the design wrapping around the entire project. The middle portion, which includes 32-foot bays, is framed by vertical stone on each side with a larger stone element across the top. A metal accent is included in the middle to create strong verticality within the bay.

Barbara Swift arrived at the meeting.

Windows are a curtain wall system with defined mullions to give definition to the façade. The top of the building includes a cap. Within the base, punch windows will be included.

Ms. Levine reviewed the corner design of the main office building. The southern office building was setback to help step back the northern part of the complex. Another design element of the Data Center includes 32-foot bays with a glass screen wall as well as a green screen along the wall incorporating honeysuckle vines.

To help define the entry to the building, a glass entry was created with stone columns lining up with the datum that is carried around the building. The entryway includes lighter glass than other windows in the buildings. Vertical glass fins will be created that anchor into the stone column to lift the entry and create some verticality. The important aspect is to design a welcoming entry that is transparent and includes a glass canopy to frame the doors for weather protection as well as helping to define the entryway.

Ms. Levine commented on the extra work to redesign the corners of the building to include similar windows on the building corners to continue the same definition around the project.

Building materials include a darker base limestone and a lighter limestone above the base. Glass will be slightly tinted gray to allow daylight into the space while eliminating glare to tenants. The lower glass used at the base is more transparent to promote an open and welcome atmosphere. Metal components include a darker bronze, which will be used on the curtain wall system and a lighter metal for accents and details within the bay and an eyebrow cap piece at the top of the building.

Ms. Edens referred to a row of Douglas fir trees along 14th, which need to be removed as part of the project. Most of the trees were previously topped because of the utility lines. The trees will be removed and the lumber will be milled into boxes for storing the 25 red oak trees during the construction. Mr. Johnson is working on acquiring some large firs for the landscape.

Sally Alhadeff, DIS Project Manager, added that staff and the team are working with GA to communicate to the neighborhood and the community about the removal of the trees.

Mr. Rolluda asked whether it's possible to view the Legislative Building and dome from the site. Ms. Levine said it's possible to view the dome and the Legislative Building from the upper stories of the office building. The dome is not visible from the plaza. Mr. Rolluda spoke positively about the framing of the trees and the mix of tree types as well as the massing of the area to harmonize with the surrounding residential area.

Ms. Levine displayed an image of the Data Center behind the office complex. The Data Center wall includes a green screen attached to the lower portion of the concrete wall incorporating a rhythm of 32 feet consisting of a framed metal piece for Honeysuckle vines. It provides a green barrier to the adjacent neighborhood and the Maple Park extension. Above the green screen is a glass screen wall that complements the glass found in the project to carry through the theme.

Mr. Albert advised that the setbacks from 16th are much wider than the original SEPA specified. The setback is wider from Jefferson to the east as well. The structures fit well within the original SEPA review. The building is approximately 130,000 square feet smaller than the original plan. The number of tenants is reduced from 1350 to 850 tenants.

Senator Fraser asked whether there are any outstanding traffic issues. Ms. Levine pointed out the network of sidewalks on the site. One sidewalk is adjacent to Jefferson as well as one that meanders throughout the site. Visitor parking is provided. A bicycle entry into the building is provided as well. The building will house lockers and a secured bicycle area. Two vehicle entrances are provided into the parking garage. Delivery service trucks will travel down 16th and access the service corridor for loading and unloading.

Senator Fraser asked about the bike trail area on the north side of the site. Ms. Edens said a bike trail was included as a condition as well as the roundabout, widening of Jefferson, and adding a sidewalk on the opposite side of Jefferson. There are a number of conditions required of the project.

Senator Fraser asked whether the appeal of the environmental determination will affect the project timeline. Mr. Albert said the action is a judicial review of the MDNS. An injunction would require the appellants to file a bond and undertake a much more involved process. At this point, that is not occurring. The only action moving forward is the judicial review. That action will not affect the project's schedule. The hearing is scheduled for August 14, 2009. However, DIS can petition to move the date sooner. DIS is confident that the MDNS will be upheld by the judicial review. The judicial review does not involve a review of the findings or the mitigations.

Ms. Bremer referred to Ms. Swift's questions concerning landscaping gaps within the project site. She asked for clarification of existing landscaping gaps. Ms. Swift said her contention was that if there is an opportunity to use one of the few developable sites on the campus, there is an obligation to bring the entire site up to a level that is commensurate with the remaining campus. Part of the site that was under question is on the backside of the mechanical area among other areas. The issue is how that will be resolved. Ms. Edens replied that the area is a natural area with fairly steep slopes. The intent is leaving most of the area in its natural state with some planting in those areas that were disturbed because it's a steep slope that is heavily wooded. Additionally, the project has been substantially pulled back from that area as well. The area will be used for storage of the oak trees near the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) access road. Anything that is disturbed will be replanted. However, the team

hasn't reviewed how WSDOT will leave the area. Ms. Alhadeff said some of the property will remain intact as it's not state property.

Ms. Edens said that because of the widening of Jefferson and the installation of the roundabout, improvements to the other side of the street will be necessary. The committee will receive a presentation on the landscaping design once it's completed. Improvements were not planned for the other two corners, which was of concern to the neighborhood. The neighborhood wants the area to represent the gateway to the campus, with plantings on all four sides. DIS and GA are working together to resolve that issue.

Ms. Swift stressed the importance of the Master Plan and the designation of buildable sites on campus. Access to those sites requires responsibility of the site in terms of landscaping as it relates to the Master Plan. It appears the downhill area will be used as storage area that will receive some native natural restoration, which has not been shared with the committee. She asked about the current phase of the project. Ms. Edens said the Design Development (DD) documents are completed except for the addition of the 80,000 square feet. The project team has completed 50% of the Construction Documents (CD). She offered to share the CD landscape drawings, which are 90% completed. Ms. Swift said there should be intent for a full project to include that information on SD, DD, and CDs to obtain a sense of the intent of the restoration.

Mr. Johnson said pulling the project from the upper edges of the slope is fortunate for the site to avoid issues with erosion and other concerns. During construction, the red oaks must be stored. The area provides for temporary storage of those trees. After the trees are planted on the site, the storage need will disappear. Whatever has been disturbed will be replaced at a level consistent with the nature of the slope.

Ms. Swift noted that restoration can occur to the existing level, which is not a contributing element. There is also the option of improving the site. She suggested improving the site with a mixed lowland forest to begin building a robust green area. Ms. Edens cautioned against planting trees that may create a management issue in the area because of the presence of high voltage lines. Ms. Swift said the issue is to improve the area beyond its current condition, which is in disarray. Mr. Edens advised that the team will review the suggestions.

Senator Fraser inquired about the northeast area of the roundabout and whether the area will be maintained as a storage area. Ms. Bremer said the area needs restoration, which GA will examine. Senator Fraser inquired about whether the roundabout lanes are of sufficient width to accommodate buses and trucks. Mr. Johnson said the roundabout meets standards for truck and bus traffic. As the surrounding right-of-way is owned by the state, plenty of space is available for a larger roundabout.

Senator Fraser inquired about parking for Dash customers. Tom Evans advised that Dash parking is provided at a parking lot located near the WSDOT Building that can accommodate up to 38 vehicles. The area is designated for Dash parking. Senator Fraser commented on whether the parking lot is sufficient to accommodate parking during the legislative session. Deanna Price replied that the parking lot was used by Dash customers during the last legislative session. Based on needs during the legislative session, parking might be tight. Senator Fraser suggested adding parking during the legislative session to the committee's future meeting agenda.

Discussion ensued on parking needs and potential partnering opportunities to accommodate parking needs.

Carleen Jackson asked how the size of the building and the number of tenants was resolved with respect to the parking garage only accommodating 300 vehicles. Mr. Albert advised that DIS is working with GA on available parking located within the Plaza Garage. Currently, there are over 100 DIS employees who park in the Plaza Garage. Other efforts include indentifying other available parking currently available within the Plaza Garage. The garage is used to store many fleet vehicles. GA and DIS are working on a commitment for the availability of at least 300 to 350 additional stalls in the Plaza Garage.

Ms. Swift asked whether the project has undergone a final value engineering exercise. Ms. Edens confirmed the final value engineering process has been completed. Additionally, the state is fortunate at this time, as the market for construction materials has decreased significantly. Mr. Albert added that the original two-building project proposal estimate was \$360 million as opposed to the estimated cost of \$255 million today, which includes the additional 80,000 square feet.

Ms. Swift said the models and the images illustrate transparency as well as the quality of the transparency in trying to connect to both sides of the campus, which is dependent upon the depth of the windows to create a layer of shadow.

Ms. Levine described more details of the building's design and the materials.

Ms. Swift said her only concern is that the 14th Avenue entrance appears to lose some strength in terms of the visitor arriving on the site given the speed the visitor will be traveling. On the south side at the 16th Avenue entrance, there is robustness and a degree of order that holds the site appropriately. Mr. Johnson suggested increasing the massing of the conifers within the area of concern.

Ms. Bremer inquired about ADA access and asked how the team has responded to initial questions concerning accessibility. Ms. Levine outlined the areas of accessibility. ADA parking is available in the visitor parking. The difference between Phase 1 of the project compared to the current phase is the removal of the raised plaza, which created accessibility issues. It was noted that all opportunities have been pursued to enhance the ADA standard. However, there are some realities associated with the site to include 29 feet of elevational change from north to south. From a design standpoint, the team has worked to exceed ADA standards wherever possible.

Mr. Bremer emphasized the importance of discussing accessibility as the ADA community has traditionally been ignored and it's important to ensure accessibility is discussed and assured.

Ms. Bremer commented on the importance of accommodating electric cars. She asked whether that aspect has been considered for the parking garage as GA has been directed to retrofit existing parking garages to accommodate electric vehicles. She asked the design team to review Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) goals in more detail during the next project review. Ms. Edens advised that the target is to achieve a LEED Gold and Platinum for the interior. The minimum is Silver.

Ms. Bremer referred to the work by Ms. Jennings and Ms. Swift on the campus landscape master plan. It's important for discussions to occur with the landscape group to insure landscape elements are considered.

Paul Blanton questioned how the large complex will visually correspond to the remaining campus. Visually, the visitor will become oriented with the campus dependent upon what is viewed when the visitor arrives. It's difficult for two-dimensional drawings to reveal what the complex will represent. He

said he would have liked to see a three-dimensional study as to how the complex will impact the campus. He acknowledged the work that has occurred up to this point and questioned the future in terms of parking, size of vehicles, electric cars, and other issues. Future studies will need to be undertaken to address various issues. He commented positively about the building design, building massing, building design articulation, and the landscape program. He questioned how the property with the slope will be used from a master plan standpoint and cautioned against having the area ignored with no future thought as to its future use. Mr. Haskell replied that the committee reviewed earlier studies on access, views from the roadway, and how the complex is perceived. Ms. Bremer acknowledged that the building is tall for the area. However, Mr. Johnson and other members of the team have worked well in framing the complex within the natural environment.

Senator Fraser added that based on information from a prior meeting, the team has maintained a protected view corridor from the freeway to the capitol dome. She suggested that DIS consider a vehicle no-idling policy for delivery trucks at the loading bay as well as the Dash shuttle when stopped for a period of time. Mr. Albert said most of the delivery trucks to the Data Center are service vehicles. The amount of truck traffic will be minimal.

Mr. Haskell said the team has done an excellent job of interpreting campus style and contemporary buildings. The team also addressed the building corners effectively. He said he appreciates the improvements to the entryway in terms of transparency and the glass without sacrificing style and quality of the remaining building. He complimented the team on their work.

Mr. Haskell invited public comments.

Greg Klein, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, said he attended the community meeting on the project the previous evening. He said he believes the neighborhood appreciates DIS meeting with the neighborhood and sharing details about the project. The neighborhood responded well to the downsizing of the project. Overall, the mass and scale has been accepted by the neighborhood. The neighborhood sees the project moving forward and is accepting the project. There are however, several ongoing concerns involving parking and traffic to include cut-through traffic through the neighborhood at peak hours and the issue of completing the traffic study. Neighbors are also concerned about the traffic circle, how it will work in terms of the neighborhood, connectively to the north, as well as impacts to cyclists and possible parking impacts that might result in overflow parking occurring in the neighborhood.

Ms. Edens advised that as a condition of the MDNS, another traffic study is required, which is nearly completed. The next step involves meeting with the City of Olympia and WSDOT to review the study.

Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Senator Fraser, to express strong support of the project as it's matured. The committee appreciates the response to the variety of questions raised by the committee, GA, and representatives from the community. The committee requests DIS, GA, and the design team address the range of issues addressed during the review involving ongoing concerns around post-construction operations and administration as it relates to the community, traffic, transportation, and operations, and that there be a proactive effort to address and a commitment to the portion of the site that is not under development, and provide a status report to the committee on those issues. Motion carried.

The meeting was recessed at 12:00 p.m. to 12:31 p.m. for a lunch break.

Selection of Chair and Vice Chair

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to nominate and elect Dennis Haskell as Chair and Barbara Swift as Vice Chair. Motion carried.

Mr. Evans confirmed the Governor will review the committee's recommendation for appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair.

Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Project Update

Craig Donald, Project Manager, reported on the four-year effort by the state to build a complex that would express some enduring principles of the current era for the community and visitors. For 1,000 days, the committee strongly supported the unwavering goal to build a Heritage Center (HC) and an Executive Office Building (EOB) for the people and for the ages. The committee developed Design Opportunity Recommendations to guide the process through design as well as advising the design team during the schematic design and design development phases and imparting trustworthy technical advice during the construction document phase.

Customary measures for success of a construction process relates to scope, schedule, and budget. The original and the revised predesign called for a 200,000 square-foot HC to house the State Library, State Archives, Museum, and conference facilities. It also called for a 120,000 square-foot office building to house elected officials displaced by the Nisqually Earthquake. By all accounts, the project successfully addressed, and in fact, exceeded program needs. Throughout the past four years, milestones were established to monitor and evaluate the project. Every six months, the project faced another milestone. Each milestone was met.

The authorized budget for the project was approximately \$221 million. The most recent and independently reconciled budget estimates were more than \$5 million under the authorized budget level. Scope, schedule, and budget were all successful because of the collaboration and hard work of the design team led by SRG Partnership, GG/CM Mortensen Construction, the leadership of the Office of the Secretary of State, and the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. As proposed and designed, the HC/EOB would have been a national leader in sustainability, accessibility, facilities, construction, and overall design. Among the innovations that a smaller project should consider, if affordable, includes LEED Gold standards established by the US Green Building Council. The project was on track to achieve the Gold standard as well as the National 2030 Challenge cutting by half the fossil fuel usage in the building and reducing green house gases. The project would have reduced potable water consumption on the campus by over 50% or approximately three million gallons annually. Plans included installing a 575,000 gallon reclaimed water-holding tank under realigned Cherry and Water Streets. Reclaimed water would have provided the entire west Capitol Campus water needs for toilet flushing, fire suppression, landscaping, and for the Tivoli Fountain.

The HC/EOB was designed to be the first universally accessible building inside and out on Capitol Campus. It would have also addressed one of the major goals of the City of Olympia to create a direct connection between west Capitol Campus, Heritage Park, and the City. The building would have been among the leaders in the country to utilize virtual design and construction technology and just-in-time management methods.

The building's design masterfully melded with the other historic west Capitol Campus buildings creating a building for the present time and for the ages. The exterior would have been Wilkinson sandstone from

the Wilkinson quarry in Pierce County similar to other west Capitol Campus buildings. Sandstone was slated for some interior public spaces where floors were marble matching floors within the Legislative Building and other historic buildings. Public areas would have been finished with wood and bronze. The building is of timeless design. However, beyond design and construction, what occurs within the building is of more importance. In the HC, educational and cultural programs would have provided exhibits and events of the shared history in government for an exceptional visitor experience. The EOB would have brought statewide elected officials back to Capitol Campus enhancing customer service by collocating elected functions where they can be more readily accessed by citizens. The high performance features of the building would have increased worker efficiency and effectiveness.

The project was on schedule, under budget, was timeless in the design, and filled program needs. The schedule was on target to finance the project in May. The question is why it hasn't moved forward. The answer is two major reasons – project financing and vacating the GA Building.

Early on, the team began working with the Office of the State Treasurer and relied heavily on the office's advice and counsel regarding project financing. Entering the recession, a major revenue source supporting the HC element of the project fell. The revenue source has historically recovered as recessions ease, and it's recommended that the state should wait until that revenue source recovers before selling bonds. Additionally, the bond community would be reluctant to purchase \$220 million in certificates of participation because of the current economic conditions. Additionally, planned interest rates are significantly higher than previously advised. Finally, although the Build America Bonds program was recently established and could have provided interest rate relief, the program's availability came too late to incorporate within the financing plan.

The second major reason concerns the vacancy of the GA Building. There are many reasons, but currently, the GA Building has relatively low lease rates. If tenants were to move, they would likely have to pay higher lease costs adversely affecting operating budgets. Additionally, there were and are potential projects that might provide space for current tenants. Finally, there continues to be some people who want to preserve the GA Building.

The Legislature has directed pausing the project, as designed, until a predesign review is conducted. The Legislature has asked the team to look at an alternate scope to reduce the project size and cost. The Legislature provided two alternatives – reduce the scope and size that can be supported by rates and identified supporting fees, and reducing the size of the HC to house only the library, exhibit space for historically significant documents, and space for rotating museum exhibits. The EOB should only provide for committed tenants who are identified to be located on the west Capitol Campus in the Capitol Campus Master Plan.

Currently, the team is working to develop specific scopes, detailed work programs, budgets, and schedules with the objective to complete the report by the next legislative session.

Mr. Donald asked the committee to continue supporting the effort during the predesign review as well as being vigilant, in that, if the project becomes unworthy, that the committee should support the project to end.

Mr. Donald shared a video that speaks to the committee's strength and the unwavering support of its legislative members and the steadfastness of the Office of the Secretary of State and the Office of the Insurance Commissioner.

Mr. Haskell excused himself from the discussion because of the potential conflict of interest.

Senator Fraser thanked Mr. Donald for his leadership and achievements on the project. Many people supported the project and still do. The project was placed on hold because of the economy and the revenue that was to fund the HC suffered. It would have required the state to contribute \$75 million from the capital budget. Everyone who stood by the project is incredible and worked hard. The Governor included \$28 million in the capital budget to make up for the decline and fee revenues. However, the economy continued to nosedive. The other two budgets involving the Transportation and Operating Budgets supported the project until the very end. The project is on hold. One of the ideas from the House is to study the Pro Arts site as a potential for some tenants. Many people continue to support the project and the continued review is important. She said she's pleased the review will be completed prior to the next session.

Mr. Blanton commented that it's an exciting project that would be a wonderful addition to the state's history and heritage. The project was not cancelled, but was postponed requiring some patience until the economy turns around.

Ms. Jackson said since the end of January, fee revenues have turned around and are rising. There is some optimism that the situation will improve prior to the next legislative session.

Ms. Swift asked several questions in terms of the two alternative predesigns and CCDAC's role in supporting the project. Mr. Craig reported the legislative proviso describes two alternatives. One involves what can be supported with the revenue. If the revenue source improves, it may be able to support the original level of bonds necessary for the project. However, as time progresses, costs will rise in terms of construction materials and labor especially in light of the activity involving economic stimulus funding. If fee revenue does increase, it may not keep pace with rising construction costs. One option is looking at the building's program and scope that can be supported with available revenue. That effort involves working with the tenants. The second alternative is looking at only placing the library and a portion of the archives of importance for public access. There would also be space for rotating museum exhibits. For the EOB, the Legislature wants to identify committed tenants and only those that are identified within the Capitol Campus Master Plan as appropriate for locating on the west campus.

Senator Fraser commented on the Port of Olympia's plan to construct a hotel and conference center at the East Bay site. She suggested maintaining contact with the Port of Olympia to monitor progress on the project.

Mr. Craig advised the committee on what it can do to assist in the predesign effort, as well as continuing to be vigilant in ensuring the team's intent on achieving success leads to a project that meets the needs of citizens and the state. If compromises do occur, it will be important for the CCDAC to provide some guidance and steer the process appropriately, even it means putting the project on hold for a longer period. He noted the team will continue to utilize the committee's Design Opportunities Recommendations during the process because they speak to the committee's value in terms of buildings on the campus.

Ms. Bremer described the committee's Design Opportunities Recommendations process for the benefit of new members. Staff was asked to provide a copy of the committee's discussions to the new members.

Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Paul Blanton, to declare support of the project and express appreciation for a well-managed, coordinated, designed, and tracked project that would serve as an anchor for the campus. Motion carried.

GA Capital Budget for 2009-2011 - Overview

Mr. Evans briefed members on the Department's 2009-11 capital budget projects. Many of the projects submitted by GA were not funded. He referred to a list of projects submitted totaling over \$97 million. The Legislature funded seven of the projects in GA's budget as well as three additional projects that were not included in GA's original budget request. The total appropriation is \$42,270,000.

Ms. Bremer commented on the magnitude of the budget reduction and difficult decisions facing the capital budget. Because of the economic problems throughout the state, there were fewer projects submitted in the Governor's budget. Major issues on the campus include infrastructure, asset management, and operational upkeep expenditures.

Mr. Evans reviewed the funded projects. Of the projects, the committee at future meetings will review project #8 – Heritage Center/Executive Office Building Predesign, and project #10 – Predesign and design for the ProArts site. He referred to the list of unfunded projects that have been moved to 2011-13 and beyond.

Ms. Bremer commented on the funding received for emergency repairs of \$2.5 million. GA delayed major repairs to the GA Building because it was slated for demolition under the HC/EOB project. The Department requested \$1.9 million in emergency repairs. However, a subset of repairs totaling \$800,000 is necessary for the building.

Landscape Master Plan – Progress Report

Marygrace Jennings reported the State Capitol Master Plan update was adopted in 2006. The proposed Landscape Master Plan is a component of that master plan. With funding approved by the Legislature in 2007, GA has been developing a Landscape Master Plan for the west Capitol Campus. The primary focus is the historic core of Capitol Campus. The final draft of the plan is under review by GA. The presentation will include highlights of the plan.

The purpose of the Landscape Master Plan is to create the framework for the long-term care and stewardship of the west Capitol Campus. In 2007, the committee adopted a statement to guide the work:

“ A landscape that respects the design principles of the original Olmsted plan, honoring characteristic features and concepts of the historic design while demonstrating sustainable landscape management practices and acknowledging the dynamic and increasingly urban context of the historic Capitol grounds.”

An assessment was completed in 2001 by Susan Black and Associates, which reviewed the history of the campus and the underlying Olmsted design assessing current landscape features. Following historic preservation methodology, the process entailed identifying character defining features of the campus and measuring its integrity based on the original design intention. The goal statement was then created. A subcommittee of the CCDAC was formed involving Ms. Swift, Mr. Haskell, and Shane Hamlin from the Secretary of State Office. The effort was renewed in 2007 with Ms. Swift and Mr. Haskell continuing to work with the team as a subcommittee.

A subarea of the campus was selected for a planting effort in the perimeter area of the Temple of Justice Building. The committee encouraged GA to place high priority on development of an entire campus plan and then work on implementation at the subarea level. The committee also stressed high priority of "Large Tree Layer" because campus trees are aging. Subsequently, development of the plan includes three important elements, a Master Landscape Plan to inform and guide planning efforts, a Large Tree Layer Plan to focus on initial tree rejuvenation recommendations, and a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) to provide specific steps and practices that over time will bring the Master Plan to fruition. The report includes a cost/benefit analysis of recommended actions to assist in setting priorities.

Since the work began in 2001, the context of the work has changed dramatically in the last 18 months because of the downturn in the national and state economy, which has changed the perspective and reshaped thinking about the outcome of the project, as well as sharpening the focus on the practical elements of the work.

Values related to environmental sustainability, energy savings, and cost efficiencies were added to the values of historic preservation, stewardship, and design excellence. Implementation of the plan will be incremental and will require progressive thinking, creativity, and interdisciplinary efforts to incorporate landscape improvements into other capital projects and ongoing practices.

Ms. Jennings referred to a double-sided executive summary summarizing the recommendations. The complete report is available on the department's website at www.ga.wa.gov/masterplan.

Ms. Jennings introduced Susan Olmsted of Mithun.

Ms. Swift commented on the importance of the study and its addition to the master plan because it fills an important role within the master plan's package of policies. The plan addresses issues ranging from conceptual to historic preservation to big spatial issues, as well as detail in identifying which trees are beginning to fail and the recommended actions and whether there are strategies tied to operations and maintenance that can ease the burden in this point in time. It appropriately spans a fairly broad scale spectrum. Most master plans are at a fairly elevated level. It's important when economic downturns occur because there is an obligation and an opportunity for major institutions to have the benefit of a tool, such as the plan, to help assist the agency with financial infusions to begin slowing the tide of losing big scale trees for example. The plan provides an opportunity of taking only a small element and implementing action without financial or political problems. The consultants were asked to present a brief and focused presentation to provide information for the committee to ask questions and to review some of the recommendations and how those elements are tied together.

Ms. Olmsted reported she is a landscape architect with Mithun. She introduced Eliza Davidson of Arbutus Design.

Ms. Olmsted said the project boundary generally corresponds with the 50-acre portion of the west campus. She outlined different opportunity sites. The plan contains some recommendations for how those projects can interface with the west campus to reinforce the larger vision. The charge was initially to develop a preservation master plan and vegetation management plan to guide stewardship of cultural resources. The plan's goals, recommendations, and actions contained in the report also encompass considerations of environmental and economic sustainability.

While the west campus is immaculately maintained, it's well used and highly valued, and while many of the primary character defining features are intact, much of the Olmsted design intent remains unrealized and has been lost to attrition or development or is critically jeopardized by encroachment, age, or deferred preventive care. The campus is park-like, but resources are aging and declining, and there is no concerted plan for preservation, replenishment of resources, or ongoing stewardship. Though the campus has changed over time, the bones designed by the Olmsted Brothers and Wilder and White are remarkably intact. This condition combined with the wealth of historic documentation and correspondence recently discovered provides an opportunity for cultural landscape preservation. The essential structure is in place today along with the historic blueprint. It's possible to continue to build upon the essential framework in place today to realize the Olmsted Brothers' historic vision.

Ms. Olmsted referred to findings described within the document about the condition of the resources. The most notable relates to the three dimensional spatial hierarchy that was historically intended by the Olmsted Brothers versus what exists today. This is more clearly observed by the vegetation patterns and the layering of trees and shrubs throughout the campus. This aspect of the project was highlighted for a variety of reasons:

- Culturally, this aspect of the master plan holds the greatest potential for realizing the historic Olmsted Brothers' vision.
- Economically, this aspect of the plan holds the greatest opportunity to realize operational cost savings and long-term cost benefits.
- Environmentally, this aspect provides the greatest opportunity to demonstrate the wise use of resources and looking forward to the 21st century.
- Experientially and visually, the layers of trees and shrubs holds the greatest potential to achieve the most significant contribution toward realizing the Olmsted Brothers' vision that progression and sequencing of movement throughout the landscape and the creation of rooms within the landscape and the appropriate scale of the landscape to provide a foreground to the grandeur of the Capitol dome.

One-third of the originally intended trees exist today. The layers and arrangements of trees and shrubs intended to create gateways and landscape rooms are missing today. The issues are further compounded by the projected loss of additional trees. She displayed a tree condition map with circles representing an existing campus tree. Many trees are in poor or fair condition. The tree population has declined 15% since 2001 and only a few of those trees have been replaced. Nearly half of the existing trees are in poor or fair condition. In the near future, if actions are not undertaken to prevent further decline and attrition, very little trees remain for the future. Over one-third of existing trees exhibit current or potential risk. The changes are incremental and happen over time. However, the timeline is the near future and will impact the historic vision. The plans describe the vision for what can be accomplished coupled with a detailed framework for how to achieve it as opportunities arise over time over the course of the next 50 years. The master plan preserves and honors the characteristics and features of historic design while accommodating compatible uses, modern function, and increased ecological performance. The tool establishes a clear framework for decision-making and it leverages incremental change in the wisest way, it protects and enhances the existing legacy, and it identifies ways to begin.

The document includes the vision of the master plan with the practical implementation and ongoing maintenance strategy contained within the VMP.

Ms. Davidson reported she is a consulting arborist, horticulturist, and a landscape designer. The team developed a preservation master plan, a large tree layer plan, and a VMP. The plans provide a toolkit for action connecting decision-making from the broadest to the most specific and from planning to project design to pruning. Individual actions can be beneficial if they are consistently completed and mutually reinforcing. The documents offer a framework for working smart during difficult times as well as good time with an overarching goal to protect the heritage and future of the State Capitol Campus, which was designed as a whole of buildings and landscape.

The VMP is a tool used to combine long-term vision with action appropriately applied over time. It is a bridge between design ideas and practical realities, and it targets positive, incremental change.

Planting and maintenance methods can shape a landscape character just as much as capital projects. VMPs promote adaptive management by enabling course corrections based on what's successful or unsuccessful to fill clearly articulated design goals. The VMP insures that specific maintenance and management practices tie into the big picture.

The tree progression map is based on an inventory of 530 trees. The inventory occurred between November and April 2009. The inventory revealed tree trends and issues that need to be addressed. All relate in some way to how humans interact with trees on the campus. The VMP provides tools to maximize tree quality and lifespan. Trees are part of the Olmsted vision and for the sustainable future. The inventory revealed important characteristics of existing trees, species and age diversity, site and care-related challenges, individual condition, and patterns of potential risk. One example is cherry trees, which represents one-third of all the trees on the landscape. This proportion does not reflect the Olmsted Plan. The preponderance of cherry trees leaves the landscape vulnerable to multiple problems associated with the tree species.

Inventory results are contained in the comprehensive table of trees, which lists recommended actions for each individual tree. The inventory could become the basis for a campus tree management system and could provide immediate benefits as a decision-making tool. Proactive tree management is the answer to tree loss and decline. It insures that trees receive appropriate cradle to grave attention especially in youth and old age. The west Capitol Campus needs new generations of trees. The right trees need to be planted in appropriate places within the right order, in the correct manner, and with appropriate established care. Used together, the table of trees and the large tree layer plan will provide that direction gradually fulfilling and then sustaining the master plan vision.

Tree management needs and priorities vary by area within the campus. The VMP divides the grounds and defines management areas according to intended landscape character. Among the management areas, the balance and sequence of management tasks will differ, but share in common a pallet of horticulture methods and a comprehensive tree management approach that transcends and unites the landscape over time.

Ms. Bremer commented that after the restoration of the Legislative Building, GA discovered ongoing practices did not adequately maintain the structure from a preservation perspective. The campus landscape has evolved more to a day-to-day decision-making approach rather than a living Olmsted vision. The goal is implementing the practices and the plan, as well as ensuring funding is available. Funding for the landscape should be considered in the realm of importance similar to a trust fund or an endowment fund that outlives everyone and continues the priorities. Three important actions include implementing the practices through development of a practical manual for operations, determining the

priority of urgency, and developing a prioritized plan to guide implementation activities during the first five to ten years. Additional discussions will be required concerning the percentage of cherry trees because any change in the number will change the image, views, and the expectations. The campus is part of the community and GA's decisions on which trees to remove or replace will require some public engagement. Changing the fabric of the campus will entail a community conversation.

Ms. Bremer said one of the recommended actions involve the lawns. The public is used to having manicured lawns. The proposal pursues a more ecologically based lawn, which will be different in appearance than manicured lawns. Those issues need consideration of stakeholders and the community. Many members of the public continue to express appreciation for the lawns on the campus. Ms. Bremer said she hears the comments quite often throughout the community. Any changes to the campus will likely be debated.

Mr. Haskell agreed an implementation plan is necessary as well as an outreach program. He asked whether the plan as it was developed was vetted within the community. Ms. Jennings advised that there was a public meeting on the first draft in March. The meeting was well attended by approximately 20 individuals representing a range of interests. Mr. Haskell suggested that even with initial input, if actions are significantly different than anticipated, people's expectations will be different. He suggested a public outreach component might be appropriate prior to finalizing the plan.

Ms. Bremer said she also expressed concerns as well because of concerns involving the budget and the cuts to education, healthcare, and public services. Timing was questionable for conducting a public meeting on trees. She agreed there is a need for public outreach, but the issue relates to timing. Outreach must take place prior to finalizing the next steps. Mr. Haskell agreed everyone is sensitive to the issue and it depends on how it's framed as the plan covers the next 50 years. There are recommendations in the plan suggesting changes to current practices that may be important to vet with the public.

Ms. Swift said staff and the consultants have done an extraordinary job and it raises some important issues. She recommended accepting the plan as a draft and then pursuing later in the year a soft unveiling or a beginning conversation on important opportunities contained within the plan.

Senator Fraser agreed with the concept of adopting the plan as a draft at this point in time to eliminate pressure for a public discussion at this time based on the economy and political climate. At the appropriate point, the plan would be subject to further public conversation.

Ms. Bremer said she's not suggesting any changes, but as GA moves forward to implementation, outreach will be important.

Members and staff discussed timing associated with implementation activities within the plan. Ms. Davidson pointed out that many of the recommended changes are gradual and more often those gradual changes will likely not be as noticeable to the public other than the public recognizing that there have been some improvements.

Members acknowledged the importance of having a plan and discussed recommending adoption with details worked out over time. Ms. Jennings noted that there are many small actions that can occur gradually that will build public support. For example, test areas can be established for testing different types of grasses while providing some opportunities to educate the public about what the state is trying to achieve while also receiving input. At this point, huge changes are not anticipated.

Ms. Jennings responded to questions about the involvement of grounds maintenance staff in the process. Key members of grounds maintenance staff were members of the committee.

Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to endorse and recommend adoption of the draft West Capitol Campus Landscape Master Plan with appreciation for the excellent work and that the reason for adopting a “draft” plan is acknowledging that recommended changes in the plan will require additional discussion with the community in terms of issues of form, function, and character. The committee urges the consultants and GA to give consideration to comments to include implementation of the plan as part of the grounds crew efforts, the development of a manual of activities, and a prioritized implementation element as part of those efforts. Motion carried.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 2:08 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services