

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**General Administration Building**  
**210 11th Avenue Southwest, Room 324**  
**Olympia, Washington**  
**November 19, 2009**  
**10:00 AM**

*Minutes Approved on May 27, 2010*

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dennis Haskell  
Barbara Swift  
Paul Blanton  
Alex Rolluda  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Representative Gary Alexander

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Secretary of State Sam Reed  
Senator Dale Brandland

**ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Steve Excell  
Ashley Forsyth

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Albert, Jim DIS  
Alhadeff, Sally, DIS  
Bremer, Linda, GA  
Casey, Martin, GA  
Childs, Harvey, OFM  
Cowan, Diane, GA  
DeMeyer, John, Citizen  
Dickison, Jeff, Squaxin Island Tribe  
Donald, Craig, GA  
Donehower, Chritina, People for Puget Sound  
Edens, Cindy, Wright Runstad & Company  
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Havens, Jack, CLIPA  
Forsyth, Dennis, SRG  
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia  
Gordon, Patrick, ZGF  
Henderson, Tom, GA

Hyer, Joe, City of Olympia  
Jackson, Carleen, SOS  
Jones, Nathaniel, GA  
Klein, Greg, South Capitol Neighborhood Association  
Koal, Penny, GA  
Lean, Sue, Citizen  
Lengenfelder, Jim, Olympia Yacht Club  
LeRiche, Ed, Treasurer's Office  
Levine, Mindy, MBBJ  
McClanahan, Neil, City of Tumwater  
Meixner, Russ, Friends of the Olympia Working Waterfront  
Miller, Allen, N. Capitol Campus Heritage Park Dev Assoc  
Noble, Ron, GA  
Simpson, Dan, ZGF  
Toteoff, Sally, Department of Ecology  
Trask, Tony, WSDOT  
Zieve, Rick, SRG

**Call to Order**

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

**Announcements and Introductions**

Chair Haskell reported the meeting notice 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**

Senator Fraser added a discussion on revising the committee's previous letter to the City of Olympia regarding the isthmus issue.

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Barbara Swift, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried.**

CCDAC will review four items on the CCDAC agenda for Action: Approval of the September 17, 2009 minutes; 2010 Meeting Schedule; ProArts Site Pre-design Review; and Heritage Center - Executive Office Building Project Pre-design Review; two items for Information: Capitol Lake Recommendation Briefing and Wheeler Project; and one item for Discussion: Letter to City of Olympia - Isthmus Issue.

**Approval of Minutes – September 17, 2009**

**Paul Blanton moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to approve the minutes of September 17, 2009 as presented. Motion carried.**

**Approval of 2010 Meeting Schedule**

Martin Casey reviewed the proposed schedule for the committee's 2010 meetings:

- Thursday, February 18, 2010
- Thursday, May 27, 2010
- Thursday, September 23, 2010
- Thursday, November 18, 2010

**Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Representative Hunt, to adopt the recommended 2010 CCDAC meeting calendar. Motion carried.**

**Director's Report**

Director Linda Villegas Bremer with the Department of General Administration (GA), updated members on current activities, projects, and issues:

***09-11 Operating and Capital Budget Update*** – The difficult budget situation the state is facing includes the largest drop in revenue in recent memory. The current revenue forecast is anticipated to create an overall operating budget shortfall. Some state agencies did not achieve targeted savings and must achieve savings by the end of the biennium. Revenues continue to decline with an additional \$2 billion shortfall projected during the current biennium. To put it into perspective, the elimination of all funding for all state universities, and the closure of the Departments of Health, Commerce, and Revenue would only achieve a savings of \$1.85 billion.

Of the \$31 billion budget, 70% is protected by federal mandates, the state constitution, or federal stimulus funding requirements. Approximately \$2 billion must come from the remaining 30%. That portion represents \$9.3 billion. Consequently, GA was asked to consider a 10% reduction in budget and staffing during the biennium.

***Staff Update*** – Diane Cowan, who has been providing administrative support to the CCDAC, is retiring at the end of December. GA is evaluating options regarding the position.

***Landscape Master Plan Update*** – Within the current budget constraints, GA has implemented some of the recommendations in the *Vegetation Management Plan*:

- Preparing beds on east campus for testing varieties of low-mow, low moisture turf seed for use on the campus.
- Changing mowing practices to “leave it high and let it lie,” mowing higher and less often.
- Removal of overgrown shrubs and replacement with Olmsted-design shrub selections.
- Contracting with an on-call arborist to guide tree care efforts and assist in implementing the *Vegetation Management Plan*.
- Working with private sector interests, including local historian and the non-profit Friends of Olmsted Parks, to develop an interpretive brochure about the Olmsted-designed campus.

### **Capitol Lake Recommendation Briefing**

Director Bremer reported the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee presented its recommendation on the future of Capitol Lake. She introduced Nathaniel Jones, GA, and CLAMP Steering Committee Chair Neil McClanahan.

Mr. Jones briefed the members on the committee’s recommendation. He noted that CCDAC has responsibilities and a role that other audiences do not have, as well as experience and expertise to lend to the discussion. He introduced Martin Casey, GA, City of Tumwater, Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology (DOE), Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe, and Joe Hyer, City of Olympia.

Mr. Jones reviewed the design history of Capitol Campus and the role Capitol Lake has played and continues to play on the Capitol Campus. He displayed a copy of the first survey of Budd Inlet by the Department of the Navy in 1856 and noted that Olympia is quite different today than in the mid-1850s. At that time, most of the area that is Capitol Lake today was exposed mud flats at low tide. The mouth of the Deschutes River was 2,000 feet wide at that time. The exposed mud flats troubled trade for some time. Dredging was an important element in the history of Olympia to ensure that the river channel was open to Tumwater’s water powered mills.

Mr. Jones referred to an image of the original Percival Landing. The drawings reflect the initial planning for dredge and fill to create a port berth. Northern Pacific Railroad already had begun fill operations for construction of a freight yard in the area. Fourth Avenue included a bridge on the east and west side of downtown. In 1891, buildings were on piles in the middle of the river along the mud flats. At this point, above the river on the bluff was identified as the desirable location for Washington’s State Capitol.

In 1893, Ernest Flagg, a nationally known architect, completed a plan for capitol buildings. Mr. Flagg’s concepts included a massive staircase on the north bluff below the area of the Temple of Justice and a major public thoroughfare along the shoreline. This theme is repeated in subsequent designs.

In 1895, Olympia’s Mayor was the first to recommend the installation of a dam and locks at the mouth of the Deschutes River. Mr. Flagg’s work was never implemented because of the financial panic of 1893 caused by a series of railroad and bank failures.

In 1911, the State Capitol Committee (SCC) hired the architects, Wilder and White, through a competition. In the same year they also hired the Olmsted Brothers as landscape architects for the new campus. The two parties had their first meeting in New York City and discussed the magnificent view from the bluff. Walter Wilder was in possession of Flagg’s drawings at that time. Mr. Wilder said it was important that the harbor and the inner harbor be kept as open water to preserve views. The inner harbor is the area of Capitol Lake. He was also interested in a 200-foot wide boulevard connecting a grand marble staircase (similar to Flagg’s) down to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to be surrounded by park land. The information

was derived from the notes of John Olmsted, from their meeting in New York. Mr. Olmsted believed they had plenty of work to complete on the Capitol Campus and that the idea of expanding efforts down to the marshes and lowlands might be eventually beneficial. However, at that time, the state did not own the land and there were industries along the shoreline that would need to be acquired. He believed they had sufficient work dealing with landscaping of the Capitol Campus proper. There was also vigorous competition between the Olmsted Brothers and Wilder and White through the entire design process.

The Olmsted Brothers finally produced a concept plan for the inner harbor at the prodding of Walter Wilder. Mr. Olmsted said the state should acquire the flats of the inner harbor and then decide rather to build a dam, to dredge a channel and fill the area for buildable land, or to consider Wilder's idea for a rectangular park and grand axial approach. Mr. Olmsted was noncommittal on Wilder's ideas but did say the first thing the state needed to do is to acquire the properties.

There is correspondence from the Olmsted Brothers to the Governor indicating that there had been certain suggestions and matters that cannot be taken seriously at this time but may be accomplished from time to time as the opportunity arises. Subsequently, the Olmsted Brothers forwarded a design, which is different than the Wilder and White approach. They proposed a dike along the east side of the river channel and that the state should acquire all the property behind the dike to the area near a proposed new street connecting Sylvester Park with Capitol Campus, and that the area should be mainly devoted to a saltwater pond maintained at a high level. It was a recognition that something needed to occur in the lowland areas.

Governor Roland Hartley wrote a confidential letter to the Olmsted Brothers regarding the Wilder and White's plans for buildings. He noted how the state has suffered and that Wilder and White had made blunders in the planning and furnishing of the three buildings already constructed. He asked the Olmsted Brothers not to be influenced to change what they believed to be right and expressed an opinion that Mr. Wilder's main goal is to wedge himself in so that he can collect for the work.

Mr. Jones displayed a painting from Wilder and White that was used in the design of Heritage Park. The painting has been used by the CCDAC and others proposing designs for the Capitol Campus.

When the Olmsted Brothers delivered the landscape plans, Wilder and White, who really had no authority to comment, used the opportunity to submit ten critical shortcomings of the plan. The first one was the improvement of the waterfront. Wilder and White contended that there had been very little study by the Olmsted Brothers and that it would be unfortunate to leave the waterfront in its current condition. They were also concerned about the relative position of the Capitol and the Temple of Justice Buildings, the dominant approach to the site, location of the boulevard connecting the campus to downtown Olympia, whether additional land was needed between the Capitol group and Capitol Way, and the alignment of roadways in that area between the campus and Capitol Way. They were concerned about the treatment of the north bluff and whether there should be a staircase in the short-term or a major retaining wall, the treatment of the marshes and the lowlands, and an extensive discussion about soil amendments. The Olmsted Brothers called for 600 tons of manure to be mixed with Capitol Campus soils. Wilder and White influenced the SCC by having only 50 tons of manure delivered to the campus. Those were the types of arguments occurring between the designers and also between the members of the SCC. The greatest argument concerned the grading requirements of the campus proper. Governor Hartley threatened to call a special session of the Legislature to give him the authority to override the SCC and allow him to design the grading plan for the campus.

In 1928, correspondence from the Olympia Planning Commission included a plan for Olympia's inner harbor with an indication that it would be shortsighted to permit the area north of the capitol grounds to develop into an industrial section and that the only dignified solution would be to incorporate it into the capitol grounds. It appears that the SCC was not calling for a lake but rather to channelize the river and fill the area for future development.

In 1928, the third of Wilder and White's three buildings, the Legislative Building, is completed.

An aerial photograph of 1930 revealed why the SCC wanted the inner harbor improved. Not only did the City of Olympia discharge its sewer into the river basin, the extension of 4th Avenue and the creation of the isthmus created a backwater that did not flush well. During the summer months, the area experienced stagnation. All sorts of shanties and ramshackle construction occurred in and around the railroad switching yard. The entire waterfront area was considered by some as dangerous, disagreeable, and detrimental to the citizens of Olympia.

In 1937, the Legislature took the first action to create Capitol Lake. Legislation appropriated \$150,000 for improvements to the Deschutes water basin. The act indicated the area would be incorporated into the State Capitol Campus. The intent was to acquire the necessary lands to construct a dam or a weir along the line of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, construction of a parkway along the west bank of the basin, preservation of the precipitous banks surrounding the basin, and construction of recreational areas. That action essentially began the planning process and the pursuit of federal funding. Some early design work was completed. In 1939, the SCC began holding public meetings to promote the concept of a weir along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is a low dam, holding water at a defined elevation with water flowing over the top. Shortly after, a permit application was developed for a spillway, which was submitted to the War Department. It was deferred until 1945 because of the war effort. In 1948, the design moved forward to receive bids for Phase I of the project. In 1951, the project was completed.

Shortly after the construction of the dam, Peter G. Schmidt, Sr. from the Olympia Brewery Company was quoted as saying that, "the erosion, in a few years, will so overrun the basin lake that only the channel will remain unless some action is taken." It is now known that the Deschutes River delivers 35,000 cubic yards of sediment annually, primarily during the heavy rain and flood season from December through February. Since the dam was installed, the basin has lost 60% of its holding capacity because of sedimentation.

Between 1978 and 1986, 314,000 cubic yards were dredged, but this material was simply moved to the shoreline and not removed from the basin. In 1995, GA submitted a dredge proposal for a maintenance dredge of the lake. However, there was opposition to the proposal and during that process the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was found to be inadequate. Estuary restoration had been rejected with little analysis. There were no formal legal complaints against GA's proposal, but rather a compelling argument prompted GA to withdraw the plan. Those discussions and negotiations resulted in the creation of the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee, which was established in 1997. The Steering Committee charge was more than analyzing lake versus estuary. From the beginning, the Steering Committee was to advise GA on all management considerations for the lake. The Steering Committee produced an EIS examining five different action alternatives that were projected forward to a "time of maturity."

Mr. Jones displayed a photograph of Capitol Lake in 2003 after the Nisqually earthquake, during a drawdown of the lake. At the south end, a large sediment trap was created for dredging repeatedly over

time. The work completed through the EIS pivoted around the importance of the sediment trap and its role in the ongoing maintenance of the lake. The *lake/river wetland without a trap* was essentially a status quo projection into the future. The idea was that the south and middle basin would fill and that the filling of the lake would progress from south to north in a fairly predictable manner taking between 50 and 85 years for the entire area to fill in to a wetland marsh with no dredging occurring during that period until sediment began entering the north basin. At that point, dredging would be required approximately 70,000 cubic yards every two years.

The *lake/river wetland with a trap* alternative involved maintenance of the sediment trap with dredging every six to ten years to extend the life of the north basin from 75 to 115 years. With both concepts, there was acknowledgement that there would be impacts on the ability to manage flooding.

The *lake alternative* allowed the south basin to fill in with dredging occurring in the middle and north basins. If dredging began immediately, every two years, approximately 70,000 cubic yards of sediment would be removed. The north basin could be protected with dredging occurring only in the middle basin.

The 1999 *estuary alternative* was different from today's estuary alternative. That alternative involved removing the tidal gates, thus creating a 75-foot opening. The idea was to let the basin fill, creating a river channel, which would take approximately 100 to 150 years. The reflecting basin would operate most of the time except during low tides.

Finally, a *combined lake/estuary alternative* was considered, similar to the proposal today. It involved building a dike and reserving 40 acres for a reflecting pond, but with the opening only 75 feet-wide. It was acknowledged under both estuary alternatives that mitigation dredging in the lower Budd Inlet would be required. Another concern of the combined lake/estuary involved the freshwater pond and concerns about the source of fresh water. A concept of using reclaimed water and other sources to keep water fresh and the pond filled was presented.

The 1999 process also acknowledged that there was not a good understanding of how an estuary would function and that there was a need for further study. The EIS did not move forward and there was no preferred option selected and no action to implement from that process.

In 2002, the CLAMP Steering Committee developed a 10-Year Plan. The Committee acknowledged a need for further study and determined during the study period that the basin would continue to be managed as a lake. The Committee developed 14 objectives within the plan. One of the objectives is the completion of an estuary feasibility study. From 1997 through 2002, the Committee spent approximately \$600,000 on studies and other activities, including public outreach and involvement. In 2007, the Committee delivered the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study. The study effort began at the end of 2004.

The study revealed that the simplest of the four estuary alternatives was workable. The study included much baseline information that is important for any management scenario. There is greater understanding about the lake, the river, and Budd Inlet. In late 2008, Department of Ecology (DOE) provided a Deschutes watershed study, the *Total Maximum Daily Load* (TMDL) planning process for the entire Deschutes watershed. It was not an element of the budget supporting CLAMP activities. The CLAMP activity benefitted because DOE completed two separate analyses: one as a lake and the other as an estuary. Information was developed documenting water quality impacts of the two alternatives because of the TMDL Study.

The committee completed its Alternatives Analysis in 2009. The Alternatives Analysis is a series of reports that enabled the committee to develop its recommendation regarding the future of the basin. The report is a synthesis of approximately six years of work utilizing a matrix model that identifies four alternatives and a number of analysis factors. The work occurring between 2003 and 2009 totaled over \$1 million for research and analysis. Major projects included:

- Conceptual Model of Estuarine Process
- Reference Estuary Survey
- Bathymetric Study
- Hydraulic & Sediment Transport Model
- Biological Conditions Report
- Design and Preliminary Cost Estimates
- Net Benefit Analysis
- Community Focus Group – 2006
- Independent Technical Review
- Dam Structural Report
- Dam Condition Assessment
- Erodability Assessment & Modeling
- Sea Level Rise Impacts
- Cultural and Spiritual Values Report
- Dredge Design and Cost Estimate
- Hydraulic Modeling Report
- Low-lying Infrastructure Report
- Comparative Fish and Wildlife Report
- Community Focus Group – 2009
- Community Economic Values Report
- Public Involvement Summary
- Alternatives Analysis Report

The Alternatives Analysis was designed around four different alternatives. Four alternatives were selected to create the framework of the analysis:

1. Status quo – maintain existing conditions with no dredging and allow the basin to fill in and eventually become a riparian woodland with a stream channel;
2. Managed lake – dredge to a 13’ depth throughout the middle and north basins and through regular removal of sediment, pursue restoration of the lake;
3. Estuary alternative – remove dam creating a 500 foot opening, dredge a channel and reintroduce tides; and,
4. Dual basin – build a dike between the Power House and the Eastern Washington Butte creating a 40-acre reflecting pond. Everything to the west would be restored as an estuary.

The alternatives were not meant to exclude other ideas but to provide a framework for analysis. Eight analysis factors included sediment management, plants and animals, water quality, infrastructure, downtown flood risk, long-term cost, public recreation, and cultural and spiritual values.

Mr. Jones reviewed aesthetic considerations of the CLAMP analysis process, which considered the design heritage of the lake as well as other cultural and aesthetic values attributed to the area. The Focus Group results indicated that with the status quo alternative there would be a gradual loss of aesthetic value. Under the managed lake alternative, current aesthetics would be maintained. According to the Focus Group, a huge change would occur with restored natural functions, and under the dual basin alternative, the change would result in a “weird” aesthetic.

A cultural and spiritual values analysis found four top tier values associated with the area:

1. The basin functions as a convergence point for social activity, as it has through time;
2. It has deep ties to the area’s unique and collective histories;
3. It symbolizes civic connections – as the seat of government, as a place for celebration, and as a trading center from the earliest times; and,

4. It offers an opportunity to experience nature, with ties to health and well being.

Public feedback on aesthetic considerations reflected that design aesthetics, historic legacy, natural beauty, and civic pride are significant reoccurring themes important to the community. The Committee found the analysis of values informative and insightful. It did not however, provide a compelling argument for the recommendation of any one alternative. Rather, it helped explain the controversial and divisive nature of the issues surrounding the basin.

The Committee hosted 13 community meetings, posted 10 interpretive signs around the north basin, took public comments at monthly meetings since 1997, maintained a website with a variety of reports, published nine fact sheets, provided presentations to schools and civic groups, sponsored focus groups, solicited comments on the Values Report and the Alternatives Analysis Report, briefed local governments, SCC, and others, collected emails, letters, website comments and feedback from public meetings and forums, cooperated with the media to release information, and published a snapshot of comments associated with the last public meeting last summer.

Mr. Jones reviewed the broad range of high and low costs associated with each of the alternatives.

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>High Cost (millions)</b>	<b>Low Cost (millions)</b>
Status Quo	\$4	\$8
Managed Lake	\$191	\$322
Estuary	\$115	\$225
Dual Basin	\$143	\$254

The Steering Committee forwarded a recommendation to the GA Director in early September 2009. The recommendation was not unanimous. However, the majority recommendation is not the alternative that was analyzed, but a comprehensive estuary restoration involving the cleanup of the inlet, addressing upstream conditions, and revising governance.

Director Bremer said she understands that the recommendation is a system-wide view of the area, which is also of importance in any of the alternatives. A comprehensive restoration would involve an integration of upstream and downstream activities.

Mr. Jones said the Steering Committee is conveying that a restoration of the lake basin is not possible unless a system-wide approach is undertaken. The Committee is requesting that GA coordinate the creation of a new governance system to implement the recommendation.

Mr. Jones reported that the City of Tumwater and the Port of Olympia recommend a managed lake for several reasons. The City of Olympia indicated that the selection of an alternative is not as important as quality implementation. The City called for a dedicated funding source to assure the issue would not become subject to political impulses. Common outcomes sought by all Steering Committee members included a call for a plan that recognizes that the lake is an element within a larger watershed, that long-term solutions must be economically durable, that acknowledges all stakeholders and community interests, and that recognizes the need for a collaborative approach. Other points of agreement include the importance of fish passage, an interest in cost-sharing and establishing some type of cost-sharing structure, a sediment management strategy for the lake basin, and pursuing alternative funding opportunities.



Mr. McClanahan identified members of the Steering Committee representing the cities of Tumwater and Olympia, WA, Thurston County, Squaxin Island Tribe, Port of Olympia, DOE, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Department of Natural Resources. He noted that a retreat was held to help members establish the ground rules to develop the recommendation. Members are elected officials and representatives of state department directors. The Steering Committee members jointly developed the alternatives and the final recommendation. Members had strong opinions and many had to seek the opinion of their respective agencies. Part of the Steering Committee's charge involved water quality. DOE's TMDL study is a systems approach for water quality planning for the Deschutes River. Activities occurring in the upper watershed affect water quality in the lake and Budd Inlet. Water quality was an important issue in terms of a managed lake and future water quality conditions in Budd Inlet. For water quality purposes, a whole systems approach is the best for the lake and Budd Inlet.

Mr. Jones added that two primary factors driving some members of the Steering Committee to support the managed lake alternative included the potential transfer of costs from state to local government and local businesses. Another is the potential impact to infrastructure and historic assets, particularly the Old Olympia Brewery Company.

Mr. Jones reviewed the decision process timeline. He shared that Director Bremer will make a recommendation to the SCC in 2010. The SCC will provide direction to GA on how the project moves forward and she will then submit a proposal to the State Legislature with an appropriation request for implementation. After funding is in place, as well as the scope of work, GA will drive the process to implement the outcome. An extensive permitting process will be required. This is currently projected to cover a five-year period, involving multiple state and federal agencies.

Steve Excell referred to the usefulness of the breakout on the alternatives used by the Steering Committee and asked whether a similar breakout is available for public comments. Mr. Jones commented on the difficulty of creating a framework for public comments because not all comments aligned with a specific alternative. A summary was provided of the public involvement process during the summer of 2009. The public is as diverse and as conflicted as the Steering Committee. GA is receiving input from all viewpoints. There isn't necessarily a majority position. Based on the public input the Steering Committee received through its process, opinions cover the entire spectrum.

Senator Fraser expressed appreciation for receiving the list of the studies. Some appeared to be missing from the website. She suggested it would be helpful to include all studies in one location on the website.

Representative Hunt inquired about the ownership of the dam and the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge. Mr. Jones advised that the concrete dam is owned by the state and the right-of-way on the earthen dam is owned and managed by the City of Olympia.

Representative Alexander asked whether the Steering Committee considered the investments that occurred between 1978 to the present. There were several capital plan investments, including Heritage Park, which were made beginning in 1978 with the idea that the lake would be dredged on a reoccurring basis. He asked whether those investments that did occur were captured in the data provided to the Steering Committee. Mr. Jones said the public asked the same question about the investment that has already been made in the Heritage Park and other improvements around Deschutes Parkway. Mr. Jones said he believes the Steering Committee considered the investments but it was not addressed formally or included within any of the reports. The Steering Committee is aware of the state's prior investment in the landscape and overall improvements. Some of the discussion involved whether those improvements

would be negatively impacted by the alternatives. Representative Alexander asked whether there was a cost benefit analysis completed. Mr. Jones replied that a net benefit analysis was completed. However, the Steering Committee wrestled with appropriateness and structure of a cost benefit analysis.

Chair Haskell referred to Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt's memorandum and asked Mr. Casey for feedback.

Barbara Swift said the Steering Committee's recommendation summary is extremely helpful. From her perspective, the comments by the Senator and Representative which turn the recommendation into a binary decision-point of one option versus the other would be unfortunate. She shared that the issue of budget sharing, given that this is a systems approach to a larger area, is extremely important for a number of reasons. The systems approach in terms of management is essential, which means that a budget sharing strategy, which may not be adequately developed at this point, really needs to be developed. The second observation is that the studies, in terms of design solutions, result in diagrams only. To consider the dual basin alternative and pronounce it a "weird aesthetic" is basically saying that the weird aesthetic is the diagram, which is the appropriate point to be at this time in terms of a planning study. In terms of turning this into an either/or decision point, it's related to design review. The issues of cultural and historical aspects are issues that need design work to consider how the alternatives would appear, particularly in the category of the dual basin. Finally, a study that brings together a broad committee that is often in conflict because of the different goals of each agency requires constant work to not close considerations. She suggested an option that is occurring nationally and internationally involving idea competitions. Ms. Swift distributed information on results from an idea competition for the future of San Francisco Bay given climate change. The competition provides ideas and strategies at a point when there might be several options which need further work, through a process that sets some basic expectations and solicits ideas from some of the best minds to develop concepts on what the solution might look like. Some of the difficulty the Steering Committee may be having emotionally or otherwise is what it will look like.

Alex Rolluda agreed and said the alternatives need to be studied in terms of appearance. He agreed a comprehensive estuary recommendation involving 270 square miles of watershed needs to occur and that the lake is a part of that. It's troubling that the water quality in the lake has degraded to the point where the lake has been closed for swimming since 1985. He expressed appreciation to the Steering Committee and staff for the work completed and that the presentation was very educational. He offered to submit more comments after he has the opportunity to study the materials.

Paul Blanton said the issue is a very complicated problem and the only way to manage the issue is through a systems approach that needs to be carefully designed to receive all points of input to ensure the final results are aesthetically, culturally, and socially acceptable to everyone to protect this national treasure. The Steering Committee has done an outstanding job over the last several years in obtaining as much input as possible. However, input will never stop. He applauded the work to date, but also has some concerns with future actions. In terms of the budget, it's even more important to receive as much input as possible. Although the issue is local to a certain extent, the system impacts everyone within the state and the region.

Representative Alexander said he appreciates the comments by members.

Mr. Excell said the letter from Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt is well done and closely reflects the position of Secretary Reed. The budget is an issue as no funds are available for any of the proposed

alternatives. He agreed there should be some thoughtful design alternatives because the lake is located within an urban environment in the front yard of Capitol Campus. It's not possible to classify it as black or white as there is an obligation to manage for people, Heritage Park, and the Capitol Campus while also managing for ecological values. It's possible to work for a win-win solution that recognizes both. There is an opportunity for creative thinking to bring both values together. Since there are no funds for moving forward with any of the alternatives, he questioned the rush. A delay might allow the creative process to move forward for a win-win solution.

Senator Fraser reviewed the main points of the joint letter:

- Premature to attempt to formulate a CCDAC "position" and SCC "position" in the next month or two.
- Need to account for the extraordinarily beautiful and significant design heritage of the Capitol Campus.
- Account for cultural values.
- All data must be considered before selection of an alternative and not develop an option and then develop the data.
- More work is needed on design features.
- Environmental and natural resource costs and benefits of the options should be more thoroughly analyzed and quantified.
- Review water quality standards in terms of freshwater versus marine water standards.
- Consider the relationship between the Deschutes River, lower Budd Inlet, the pollution sources of each, and the changes in degree and location of pollution of the various options needs to be better understood.
- The economic impacts of silting up the Yacht Club and the Port's turning basin and shipping channel.
- The economic worth of cultural and recreational values must be considered.
- Pursue an in-depth look at the most probable cost of construction of each option.

Representative Hunt expressed appreciation for the presentation on the background and history of the process.

Chair Haskell echoed similar comments. The Steering Committee has undertaken a fairly thorough job and weighed all the issues in developing its recommendation. He agreed with Ms. Swift that the design issue is important. How to implement and how to solve any of the particular conceptual directions currently on the table right now could be a telling factor. Before pursuing a specific alternative, more design study should be considered. There is clearly an emotional split about the lake and what it has meant too many people over the years as a reflecting pond. It's difficult to place value on that. It's important to preserve some of the manmade icons while at the same time not endangering natural values that are needed for sustainability. Both are important and difficult to judge. There is confusion about the "original plan." Even the Olmsted Brothers said something about dividing it up, so it's difficult to identify the original plan. Whatever the original plan was, all of them have been violated over the years by the placement of buildings, landscaping, and addition and elimination of features. Hopefully with a lot of give and thought and consideration of benefits and costs in terms of losses and gains there can be a compromise where design may play an important role. Finally, there are national manmade icons that could never be reverted, such as the nation's capitol, which sits upon a wetland marsh and Mount Rushmore. That's another balancing factor to consider.

Director Bremer said the Steering Committee has been working on the project for several years and provided a majority opinion that is based on studies, science, and some economic factors. That's an

important piece. To move a decision forward, she needs to answer the questions, which is why the input is so important. Both the Governor and the Legislature will need a comprehensive view of what's been discussed. What it will look like depends on who is looking. The Steering Committee and the CCDAC will consider the lake in the context of the campus, while others will view it through a natural aesthetics focus. The fact that the lake is contained within an urban setting makes a difference. There is an opportunity to examine the 270 miles of system pollution for cleaning up Puget Sound. The issue is very complex. She said she's very respectful of the Steering Committee's recommendation and needs to consider all the information to eventually render a recommendation.

In terms of why the rush, waiting another four to five years for another planning process is unacceptable and unconscionable. There is, at this point, no funding from the state budget, but there might be grant funding available for certain aspects of a system-wide solution. All of that needs to be factored. The issue of sedimentation is ongoing and current management entails the status quo alternative, which has been deemed unacceptable. Now there are health and safety issues and potentially more flooding downtown. Within the short-term, GA needs to do something. In relation to the alternatives, the recommendation from the Steering Committee includes a different governance structure, which will also take time to develop. Each of the alternatives has a different implementation plan. The Steering Committee is urging GA to move forward on the issue to ensure action begins on an implementation plan. Regardless of the implementation plan, it will take time. She expressed appreciation for the feedback, which will be helpful as she begins preparing a comprehensive report to the Legislature. Concurrently, GA has the stewardship responsibility of the lake and campus.

Ms. Swift questioned whether it would help the conversation for the CCDAC to pursue a variant on a Design Opportunity Recommendation (DOR) or having the CCDAC take a position that any of the alternatives need to address the role of state values in terms of design and aesthetics. If GA moves forward with an estuary recommendation, that alternative needs to be presented as an important statement of values that is embedded within the design. The CCDAC could assist in helping to frame the expectations of any solution.

Director Bremer agreed it would be helpful because she has spoken to some members of the City Council about the value of the manmade icon to the community. The goal is to prepare a report by March or possibly by May. The SCC meets in March and in June.

Chair Haskell said if the CCDAC is interested in pursuing the recommendation he encouraged members to provide comments to assist in developing a DOR. Director Bremer agreed the value of the committee's input would be from its professional perspective.

Senator Fraser supported the design competition idea that could provide some fresh eyes and perspectives that others are unable to do because of close involvement with the project. Chair Haskell cited the Tacoma Art Museum and its open ideas competition as an example. It's important to state clear guidelines. The museum received over 100 submittals.

Ms. Swift said another project similar in its complexity is the Grand Concourse in Brooklyn, which is as complicated in terms of historic issues and revitalization. The website for the project merits a review as it was structured extremely well. It might generate some ideas that could create some interesting community discussions.

Chair Haskell invited public comments.

**Allen Miller, President, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association**, reported he has been working on Capitol Campus issues since 1986. He expressed appreciation to the CCDAC for its assistance. The association views the CCDAC as the guardian of the Olmsted and Wilder and White plans and that the lake is the preferred alternative. He submitted a letter from the association.

**Jim Lengenfelder, Olympia Yacht Club**, submitted a letter. Mr. Lengenfelder responded to several of the CCDAC's questions involving public comment. GA has done a good job of ensuring the public is informed. Unfortunately, public input is gathering dust in the CLAMP process. He offered as examples, the 2002 public visioning process. That material was not included in the current plan and it's fairly close to an ideas competition where GA received many ideas on how to make Capitol Lake a better and more useful place. Likewise, the public input received by GA was consolidated and presented to the CLAMP Steering Committee. The Steering Committee did not discuss the comments nor did they make any decisions based on the input. The CLAMP recommendation for the estuary is dependent upon water quality, costs, and other factors. There are some major problems with the cost assumptions. It's clear to the Yacht Club that the estuary cost estimates include the lowest cost assumption for disposal while the managed lake option includes the most expensive disposal option. Another assumption within the report does not account for approximately 30% of sediment and there is no cost assigned to dealing with that sediment. Another element relates to water quality. Mr. Lengenfelder said he's been working over the last several years to understand the science used for freshwater and marine water standards. The assertion stated earlier in the meeting about no swimming in the lake isn't true. The 303 water quality standards quoted in DOE's water quality studies has only the south arm of the lake not meeting standards. The assertion continues that the entire lake is closed to swimming because of pollution. Thurston County, which continues to monitor the lake, has indicated that the lake meets both federal and state standards for bathing. The problem is weeds and algae in the lake, which are different issues and can be managed if efforts were pursued. Mr. Lengenfelder referred to the letter's content for additional concerns regarding data gaps in current information.

**Russ Meixner, Friends of the Olympia Working Waterfront**, reported the group developed a position paper which addresses missing elements in the CLAMP report. The 11-page report goes one step further and includes recommendations and plan of action. The group is available to answer any questions.

Chair Haskell reminded everyone that the CCDAC is not a decision-making body and provides input to GA. Most of the comments should be directed to GA.

**Sue Lean** said she's an exhibit project director for some exhibits in the Temple of Justice and in the Secretary of State's Office and has paid attention to the Capitol Campus and how the state presents the campus over the years. She referred to the Olmsted perspective and the idea about landscape as a metaphor for democracy. It's a fundamental concept where the collar of trees and natural vegetation on the edges Capitol Campus would gradually become more and more formal as visitors approach the Capitol Building, where formal decisions are made. The Capitol Lake reflecting pond is a part and parcel of a grand design that makes the most of this area as a place not unlike the Acropolis in Ancient Greece as an output for western democracy with a view of the Olympic Mountains, Mount Rainier, and southern Puget Sound. It's a very important factor not to lose this organized, formal aspect of the view of the natural environment to the formal environment. She said she is strong on ecology and there is great deal being done throughout the state on those matters and that she hopes that there will be some options.

Chair Haskell recessed the meeting from 12:16 p.m. to 12:45 p.m. for lunch.

### **Wheeler Project**

Jim Albert, Deputy Director, Department of Information Services (DIS), updated members on the status of the Wheeler project.

Building permits were issued for the data center, utility and office buildings, and the garage. Tenant improvement drawings were delivered and are under review by DIS. DIS is working with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) on the 90,000 square feet within the office complex available to other agencies. The team is working with OFM to identify those agencies. Originally, OFM indicated a desire to identify the tenants by December. However, other activities may extend that timeline by several more months affording time to identify and include those tenants within the project. The delay will not impact the project timeline.

Meetings continue with the neighborhood and the neighborhood association to meet the terms of the State Environmental Policy Act determination as well as meetings on the traffic calming devices to be installed on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue at the intersection of 16<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson, and the intersection of Maple Park and Franklin. A meeting is scheduled on December 2, 2009 with the neighborhood to discuss the roundabout at the intersection of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Jefferson.

Construction activities are on schedule. One large tower crane is on site and another is scheduled to be installed later this month. Mass excavation of the site is completed. Some toxic materials were discovered in the soil, which is being handled. Utility buildings footings are being poured and soil improvements for the stone columns are underway as well as a foundation for a second frame.

Mindy Levine, NBBJ, presented several illustrations of the site, building massing, and aerial photographs of the construction site. She identified the various building locations.

Cindy Edens, Wright Runstad, said the aerial photo is to provide a sense on the size of the utility building. The area behind the utility building includes a downhill slope that is not visible from any of the buildings. There was some previous interest by members of the committee to landscape that area. However, since a road will be installed for Puget Sound Energy access to its power lines, the team is recommending no landscaping be placed in that area and instead, focus the landscaping in the triangle area that is the front door of the project located on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of the roundabout.

Ms. Levine referred to the landscape plan and described some of the proposed landscaping for several areas. For the area north of the site, the intent is to create a gateway to the site by creating a site trailhead.

Mr. Excell commended the team on the work to date. He cited the steep slope where motorists enter the parking plaza between Office Building 1 and Office Building 2. In the winter, trucks often have trouble accessing the area because of ice. He asked how the roundabout will operate when half the area includes a steep slope under the underpass between the two buildings.

Sally Alhadeff, Sally, DIS, said the roundabout is located at the intersection and does not extend into the sloped area accessing the underpass.

Representative Alexander asked if there will be problems with motorists who miss the turn and end up traveling into the parking plaza. Ms. Edens outlined the traffic patterns and the how the lights will be synchronized to work with the roundabout. Representative Alexander said his concern is that truck

traffic should be turning right on Jefferson rather than proceeding through the underpass. Ms. Edens said signage will be incorporated and the team will look at a signage for truck routes. The team is working with the City of Olympia on signage requirements. Roundabout lanes have been enlarged to accommodate trucks. She offered to have the engineers provide an overlay of another intersection so that the difference in size can be viewed.

Representative Hunt commented on the width of the sections pedestrians will need to cross. Ms. Edens replied that the roundabout includes pedestrian islands. Ms. Alhadeff said one of the reasons the City wanted a roundabout rather than a traditional intersection is because with a roundabout there are opportunities for a pedestrian refuge in the middle. A traditional intersection requires a pedestrian to cross all the lanes. Roundabouts are safer for pedestrians.

Ms. Levine displayed a larger version of the triangle property off 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue owned by the state. Ms. Edens said the bike trail follows 14<sup>th</sup>. An Olmsted landscape will be featured along the corridor. A community garden could be featured in the center with places for bikes and parking spaces for entering the trail. The illustration is a schematic drawing at this point to begin the process of designing the area. The team is seeking approval of the design concept for moving forward.

**Barbara Swift moved, seconded by Alex Rolluda, to support the landscaping direction presented by the team for the area off 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Motion carried.**

#### **Heritage Center - Executive Office Building Project Pre-design Review**

Chair Haskell excused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Donald reported the project was originally scoped to be located on the current GA Building site of approximately 204,000 square feet for the Heritage Center (HC) and 120,000 square feet for the Executive Office Building (EOB) for a total of 324,000 square feet. The Legislature asked for pre-design review to bring the scope of the project in alignment with anticipated revenues. Revenue was less than the estimate and would not sustain the level of the payment on the bonds for the larger buildings. GA and the design professionals have been examining alternate sites. The GA Building site is costly because of demolition costs. Additionally, the GA Building site can accommodate a much larger building than the revenue stream will support.

Revenue estimates were provided by OFM to the Office of the State Treasurer (OST) to receive estimates on bond capacity. Mr. Donald referred to financial information on bonding capacity. OFM completed a forecast of revenues and the OST estimated the bond proceeds that could be supported by the revenues. Within those capacities, the team targeted bond capacities for the design professionals to develop the size of the buildings to meet both the programmatic needs as well as the dollar constraints on each of the sites. The team discovered that it would be extremely difficult to place more than one of the buildings on any of the alternate sites. Consequently, the project review is split to two buildings. The team developed alternate HC programming strategies to meet revenue constraints. As OFM has not identified tenants for the EOB, an agreement was made with OFM to size the building to a specific square footage. The size scoped includes 80,000, 90,000 and the original 120,000 square feet.

Mr. Donald advised that the briefing will include the program and scoping for each site, some of the building massing, and details of the top three sites for both projects. The sites include Site 1, the GA Building site for the original project scope; Site 2, the GA Building site for a downsized building site; Site 4, the Archives Building site; Site 12 located on the Governor's Mansion parking lot; Site 3 is the Dawley

Building site (Hands on Children's Museum and GA Parking Garage); and Site 7 is the current site of the Visitor Center. A matrix of the pros and cons of all 12 sites was developed. Two sites would work very well for the EOB. They are sites 4 and 12.

Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership, reported that at the last meeting, the team presented 10 sites with the committee assisting in narrowing the number of sites. Members also suggested considering the Mansion Parking Lot site for the EOB. The 1928 Master Plan included a building to the west of the Legislative Building that mirrored the Insurance Building. The team looked at that option assuming the Mansion was moved to the northwest corner of the Mansion Parking lot. Unfortunately, the cost of moving the Mansion is prohibitive. The conclusion is that moving the Mansion will likely never occur. The team using the current Master Plan and the Landscape Plan and studied whether it's possible to construct an EOB at the Mansion Parking Lot location. Studies of walking distances from the Legislative Building, consisting of a circle with a perimeter of approximately five minutes from the Legislative Building, indicated that the Mansion Lot location was ideal for an EOB. The nature of an EOB, according to the Master Plan, would need to be placed within that circle. Within that location, there is an empty site (the Soils Shed Site next to the Mansion Parking Lot) that is currently used for storage for earth materials for landscaping. Mr. Forsyth described a layout that would meet the intent of the Master Plan, and which would provide a backdrop to the edge of campus and projects for landscaping to meet the intent of the Landscape Plan. It would also satisfy the need for an EOB that is close to the Legislative Building. It's a good solution for the EOB.

The second consideration is the site for the HC. The team reviewed sites with the CCDAC and narrowed options to two sites with high potential to accommodate the HC. Those locations are sites 3 and 7. Both sites have pros and cons.

The team has initiated a discussion with the neighborhood that is a registered historic neighborhood regarding Site 7. The team believes the marriage of the historic neighborhood and the HC would be good. The team is working hard to create a relationship to ensure the success of the partnership between the project and the neighborhood. Site 7 is a good site as it's the prime location at the main entrance to the campus. It is possible that the visitor center could remain housed in the HC at Site 7. Site 3 is also a possible site for the HC. However, removal of the parking garage and existing buildings will delay the project and if replacement parking was a project expense the overall project cost might jeopardize the budget.

Mr. Forsyth asked for feedback from the committee.

Representative Alexander asked why the team eliminated sites 1 and 2. Mr. Forsyth indicated that site for Option 1 is unaffordable. The team looked at reducing the scope of the EOB to conform within the available budget. However, because of the requirement to demolish the GA Building and rerouting some utilities, a smaller scale building for the GA site would need to absorb additional costs when compared with the other sites that were considered. Representative Alexander said he never considered the demolition of the GA Building as part of the HC or the EOC. While it fits within the overall campus construction plan, the issue of why it fits into one plan and not another makes no sense. He feels that the original site for the HC is the best possible site for the building anywhere on campus because of its connection to Heritage Park and available parking below. He asked why the team took that option off the table.



Mr. Excell said another issue related to the GA Building site is moving tenants from the GA Building. If those tenants could be moved quickly to lease space, the projects would not incur the costs of construction inflation and an increase in interest rates. But, the concerns from both OFM and the House Capital Fiscal Committee that involve developing permanent state-owned buildings for GA tenants, might represent a four-year delay. Adding inflationary costs would be costly to the HC project as well as timing availability associated with the site. Representative Alexander said he'd appreciate more discussion on the GA Building site. Currently, there is vacant rental space available at reasonable prices to house tenants during demolition and construction, which should be factored into any decision.

Representative Hunt asked whether the recommendation for site 12 includes one or two buildings. Mr. Forsyth said the recommendation is for one building. The building would be approximately 80,000 square feet, and would house the Treasurer and the Insurance Commissioner. If other tenants come forward, a second phase could be built. The proposed option assumes only one building will be constructed now but future development on the site is possible.

Ms. Swift commented on the importance of the decision and that at some point in the future, there will be conversations about the decision point and that the decision respected the original Master Plan. She shared that it is important to consider the scale of the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings when looking at building on site 12. Building larger buildings in the area of site 12 could begin to over-scale the composition in that area of campus. The proposed plan shows holding the buildings back from the slope so that views to the top of the basin reflect the forest rather than buildings; it's important to retain that iconic view.

Ms. Swift referred to using site 7 for the HC. The HC is a use that can help to repair the relationship between the historic neighborhood and the historic campus. It would be a signature building anchoring the entry into the campus. She recommended site 7 as the one that merits continued work with the community to seek and find solutions that will address the neighborhood's concerns.

Senator Fraser referred to the financial information and indicated the driver of the decision-making process is design and cost. There seems to be inconsistencies in cost allocation. In some cases, demolition is counted and in other cases it's not included. Similarly, we treat parking costs differently among the alternatives. Perhaps the demolition of old buildings and parking should be considered as a Capitol Campus cost that is not tied to any one particular building. Those elements are tipping the scale for many of the choices. Parking and demolitions are impacting the choices. There appears to be no additional parking for the EOB but there is for the HC. If the HC is located on the Dawley Building block there is the assumption that more funds are required to replace the parking spaces. Mr. Donald advised that the replacement of parking lost by the demolition of the GA Garage is not included in the project budget. The only parking included for the HC is related to that building's needs. Senator Fraser said she's addressing a financial policy question on whether parking and circulation along with building demolition should be assigned to the campus and not to specific projects. Mr. Donald suggested that including those costs does enable a fair comparison between buildings on campus versus building at sites where there is only surface parking lots. It tends to affect decisions against building on a more constrained site if structured parking or demolition is included as part of the decision-making process.

Director Bremer asked if there is a requirement to include those considerations. Mr. Donald advised that there is no requirement. It's possible to move forward separately, but they would need to be funded separately.

Mr. Excell pointed out that there are several other issues involving design and timing issues. On site 3, there are several factors affecting timing involving the future relocation of the Children's Museum and its success in raising capital campaign funds for its new site. There is a potential delay of up to the year and there is the potential of using the GA Building as surge space for the O'Brien remodel. Delay can affect construction costs and interest rates. From a design consideration, the visitor center site is approximately 680 feet from the Legislative Building while the Dawley Building is 1530 feet from the Legislative Building. A busload of students from the Legislative Building to site 7 is more accessible by foot as well as when arriving on campus.

*Barbara Swift left the meeting at 1:30 p.m.*

Senator Fraser said she believes the South Capitol Neighborhood hasn't withdrawn its letter of opposition because of the issues of parking and circulation.

Director Bremer reported that the parking and circulation issue is part of the study completed by Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC). GA will be looking at campus needs that are not attributed directly to any one building. GA will forward information to the Legislature during the next session. She referred to the GA parking and indicated that if the site was selected, GA would remove the parking and determine a resolution without incurring a two to three-year delay. She suggested that it's a separate issue. Mr. Excell said the concern is the perception by the public of adding more street parking leading to public objection if there is no parking alternative. Director Bremer said there are other parking possibilities, such as a shuttle service.

Mr. Donald advised that within the pre-design review, there will be a discussion on parking alternatives. The team will look beyond building parking garages or acquiring surface parking and consider resources that can be applied to align with TRPC's study.

Mr. Donald said the letter from the neighborhood association regarding site 7 is negative. He suggested avoiding a conclusion that the briefing will only result in site 7 as the only alternative. Sites 2 or 3 are still possibilities. The other issue involving site 12 is that it's more expensive than site 4 and there is some resistance in terms of security issues and/or visibility with respect to the placement near the mansion. The next planning process step is to prepare the budget request. The team will be moving forward to the SCC in December with the intent of addressing some of the outstanding issues with answers.

Mr. Excell said he welcomes further dialogue with the neighborhood as the goal by both parties is to preserve the historical character of the campus and the neighborhood for future generations. The agency believes there is a way for the building to fit within the scale of the neighborhood and it could be a welcome addition. However, that effort takes time. He recommended consideration of the neighborhood's decision-making timeframe and affording time for the neighborhood to make an intelligent choice.

Senator Fraser commented that it appears there is pressure to determine sites during the meeting. She asked about the reason for determining the sites. Mr. Donald said the team - intends to include the most feasible sites for moving forward. That includes a number of sites for both the HC and the EOB. He noted that Site 2 with a combined building could still work financially. Representative Alexander expressed appreciation for consideration of that option. Mr. Forsyth said demolition could be factored as a separate component.

Representative Hunt pointed out that the decision will be a 100-year decision and that everyone should be cognizant of that issue. The House of Representatives is looking for surge space but will not block progress. He said he took some time and toured the campus and was surprised as the number of empty parking spaces and the number of state vehicles parked in spaces as well as some storage areas in the parking plaza. With proper use, there appears to be parking availability. He said he doesn't want to give up on sites 1 and 2 as everyone agrees it's the best location for the project.

*Representative Alexander left the meeting at 1:44 p.m.*

Mr. Forsyth referred to site diagrams reflecting the level of study of each of the sites. He reviewed details associated with the pros and cons of each site. The team completed an extensive site evaluation and placement of buildings on each site. The team prefers sites 7 for the HC and site 12 for the EOB.

Mr. Donald advised that he spoke with the Insurance Commissioner's Office about multiple sites that can meet their needs including sites 4, 9 and 12. The agency is willing to consider those sites for the EOB.

Rick Zieve, SRG Partnership, advised that if site 12 doesn't move forward, it's important for the committee to consider that site as a part of a the 100-year looking to future development of that site. Site 12 offers an opportunity on the west side of the campus that no other master plan has addressed to date.

Director Bremer reminded members that language within the budget proviso must meet the revenues of the Secretary of the State's Office. Mr. Excell said for planning purposes, the agency is looking at sites that will allow a project budget at \$116 million or below.

Director Bremer said Ms. Swift also addressed the scaling of the EOB and how it might impact the campus. She said as Director she is concerned about the designs that call for two buildings that only result in the construction of one building.

Mr. Donald noted that if the cost of demolition was removed from site 2, revenues might support financing the project scope on that site. Director Bremer questioned whether that option would be considered the highest and best use of the site. She said she prefers the original plan for site 1.

Senator Fraser referred to the issue of security for the mansion and suggested a design of one building instead of two building to reduce the security issues. Mr. Forsyth suggested that with a building in that location security could be improved. The budget proviso also requires a building that accommodates tenants that are willing to lease space in the building since lease revenue is what will be used to pay the Certificate of Participation Cost. It was felt that a building so relatively close to the Legislative Building will likely attract interest by tenants.

Mr. Excell proposed moving sites 12 and 4 for further analysis for the EOB and sites 3 and 7 for the HC, and if the GA Building becomes affordable it is the preferred site for combination HC and EOB.

Senator Fraser said the important issue is including funding in the budget. Site location at this time may not be as important. Some of the affordability will be based on what the Governor and the Legislature decide. Mr. Donald noted the budget request to the Governor will include the highest cost estimate with no reference to the sites, thus allowing for construction at any of the viable sites. The intent of the discussion is to narrow the sites for the discussion with the SCC on December 3. However, that

discussion with the SCC could be postponed to allow the Legislature to include a proviso subject to the authorization of the SCC. Senator Fraser said staff could summarize the CCDAC's conversation for the SCC. She recommended GA forward the concept of separating demolition and parking as a campus-wide approach as well as appropriation for removing storage in the plaza garage to create more parking spaces. Director Bremer said staff has been directed to reclaim parking spaces.

**Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Representative Hunt, to request GA seek budget authority for the EOB and HC based on the higher cost estimate as reflected on the site options and that fiscal policy options be explored for considering campus building demolition and campus parking on a comprehensive campus-wide basis and not necessarily tied to one building project. Motion carried.**

**Greg Klein, President, South Capitol Neighborhood Association**, reported the association submitted a letter of opposition to the project based on the information provided in October. Subsequently, the association has been working with the Office of the Secretary of State to deal with some of the negative impacts from the project as well as working on a partnership with the state and the City to help mitigate some of the potential problems associated with the project. At this time, the Board has decided not to withdraw the letter of opposition. The neighborhood is suffering from commercial encroachment and is very leery about negative impacts associated with building at that site, but are not closed to future dialogue. The neighborhood wants the CCDAC to consider all possible sites.

#### **ProArts Site Pre-design Review**

Chair Haskell reported the committee prepared and submitted a DOR to Ms. Koal and the design team.

Penny Koal, Project Manager, GA, thanked the CCDAC for the Design Opportunity Recommendations as they are valuable as a tool to help guide the team in its decisions. Progress to date includes studying optimal workplace strategies that will mesh well with the building that can address multiple issues. There have been discussions on changing workplace cultures as people begin working differently creating different building functions. The team is looking at sustainable and high performance concepts for the building. The overall building context has been examined in terms of access to the building, its placement on campus and to the Legislative Building and the east campus, and how it relates to the City.

The team has taken a cautious and thoughtful look at parking. While the tenants have not been identified for the building, the majority of the people located in the building are likely already on campus. The team proposes providing parking to handicapped individuals and visitors and for loading and unloading. The parking scenario for the building would require a four-story underground facility, which is cost prohibitive.

Budget numbers are scheduled to be finalized based on the committee's discussion and will be submitted to OFM the next day by close of business. The cost difference between the scenarios is very similar. The project schedule has changed with occupancy scheduled in summer 2013. The team is working on the schedule for design and construction to ascertain what kind of efficiencies or opportunities might be available to streamline the schedule. The team is on schedule to complete a draft of the report by the end of the year with review by OFM in January and submittal to the Legislature by February 1, 2010. The intent is move to design by spring.

Patrick Gordon, ZGF, reviewed some of the design drivers the team is using as the pre-design study moves forward. There has been a tremendous amount of effort into addressing workplace environment, sustainability, and a high performance work space environment that will accommodate any kind of tenant.

Pre-design is scheduled to conclude by the end of the year. The team will present design phases to the committee as the project moves forward.

Dan Simpson, ZGF, reported the root of sustainable design is the 2030 Challenge encompassing energy efficiency, which influences the approach to the building form and its site. Flexibility is important as the tenants have not been identified. Of importance is productivity and health through daylight, ventilation, and views. Others considerations involve connections to nature, such as adjacency of the park to the site and interaction and collaboration as generations change in the workforce. The team is considering how to achieve those kinds of environments while maintaining flexibility in a sustainable design solution.

The building program includes 90% open office and 10% private offices. A speculative program of was developed to help determine how to optimize for organizing elements within the footprint of the building and for dimensional control. State standards inform dimensional control. Shared space of conference rooms and break rooms will be located in areas of accessibility for potential sharing and to increase utilization that is not buried within a particular program that may appear off limits. The numbers assume efficiency in the different areas. The program data sheet indicates that the target of 215-square feet per person can be achieved using a specific model of use. The state planning standards were reviewed for developing two options for the layout of open office cubicles.

During the course of working with the team, some research has been cited on the importance of environmental amenities in terms of human health. Mr. Simpson shared examples of some workspace environments around the world.

Concurrent with workplace studies, the team also looked at floorplate studies and at different configurations in terms of energy consumption and orientation to the sun. The recommendation is developing those kinds of configurations that work from a workplace environment in terms of interaction and daylight and energy performance.

Mr. Simpson described site logistics. There is little expectation for vehicle access to the site off 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue because of the limitation of turning left because of the median. He reviewed the view of the capitol dome and the church, which are not driving the design scheme because of the lack of visual connectivity.

The original estimate for optimizing the site of 150,000 square-feet is valid based on a five-story configuration. There is no surface parking.

Mr. Simpson reviewed and described several schemes of the building from the inside out. He reviewed interior daylight spaces and relationship to trees.

Representative Hunt asked whether the team explored meeting space needs. Mr. Simpson said the team discussed meeting space needs. The program at this point has not identified additional meeting space needs. Ms. Koal added that the building does not include an auditorium but does include one large conference room for board meetings and for small agencies. Mr. Gordon said the team took the aggressive target of 215 square feet per employee in terms of a generic program. It's possible to accommodate the target, dependent upon the agencies. Any program that reduces office space will reduce the number of tenants. There is capacity for including meeting space, but at the expense of tenant space. The building is designed as a five-story building.

Mr. Simpson reviewed the massing of the building. The desirable message for the building is that it's open, transparent, connecting, and in harmony with nature with environmental performance.

Mr. Blanton referred to meeting space and asked about the campus need for meeting space. Mr. Gordon said the team is attempting to apply some metrics that pertain to private sector tenants. In most cases, there is a need for some meeting spaces. The program includes a significant amount of conference room space ranging from small to large. There have been some discussions about taking the larger conference rooms and placing them on one floor to gain some space efficiencies. Representative Hunt noted that during the legislative session there are many groups of people who constantly seek places for meetings of up to 100 to 200 people. At this point, that space doesn't exist. Mr. Simpson acknowledged that some options could be considered in the pre-design.

Mr. Rolluda said he supports the direction of the building in orientation, the axis to the dome, and respecting the park and tree, but cautioned against creating a building of canyons. Scheme C opens into the park area and provides the opportunity to have outdoor meetings and activities. He supported the direction of the team. He cautioned against too much glass.

Chair Haskell said he has similar concerns regarding the central space and how it's used and its connectivity to other areas in the building. Neither scheme appears satisfactory, and the one scheme that is more open is broken up and becomes too narrow. The other scheme is open and appears to be easier to program, but it's not open to the park. Somehow the building needs to engage the park. It's an opportunity that shouldn't be lost.

Ms. Koal asked for guidance on the two options as the team moves forward to the SCC.

Chair Haskell said he personally doesn't believe the solution hasn't been presented in terms of how interior space works with the park. The models are not convincing that it could be accomplished satisfactorily.

Mr. Rolluda suggested it would be helpful to receive some perspectives and sketches in 3-D to enable members to view the space to ascertain the volume of the space looking outward to the different landmarks.

Mr. Gordon reminded the committee the process is still in pre-design. The concerns expressed by the Chair are not adverse to the team's concerns. The team is struggling with some of the same issues. He asked for the committee not to express a preference for either scheme but that there is an acknowledgment of intent for a street presence and an engagement with the park as the park is a component of the site.

Chair Haskell acknowledged the intent of the team developing common space within the building that somehow relates to the park. The issue is figuring out how that works within the design process. Mr. Simpson advised that if the test of success for meeting the criteria is visualization tools then the team will want to develop, study, and provide options as in some respect the bones of the schemes are structured to favor connection to the park in the nature of spaces in the E scheme. The issue is the appropriate scale and how those relate to the identity of the whole. In the other scheme, it pertains to how it relates to sectional development because there is a zone of program between the central space, which is fundamentally internalized, and unless its broken, it has to do with the sectional development of raising that program block to provide connection at a major floor.

Mr. Excell agreed it's too early to provide direction on any of the schemes as more analysis is required. Part of the analysis should include lighting and what the actual view sheds will be from the inside. Some sunlight and natural lighting analysis and how they interplay should be explored.

Director Bremer asked whether the design accounts for mechanical equipment on the roof. Mr. Gordon said the images don't account for equipment but that there is a zone on the top of the building to accommodate equipment. Strategies are being explored for accommodating maintenance equipment.

### **Letter to City of Olympia**

Senator Fraser referred to two previous letters from the committee to the City of Olympia regarding proposed City zoning on the isthmus. A development proposal was submitted to increase building heights to 90 feet. The committee submitted a letter opposing the proposed change. A new zoning proposal has been submitted, which will not require a shoreline management permit because the property is not included within the shoreline jurisdiction. The City has scheduled a review before the City's Design Review Board in early December of the revised proposal. Senator Fraser suggested submitting a letter to the Design Review Board similar to previous letters submitted to the City's Planning Commission and City Council last year. She suggested adding a request to ensure the Board conducts an analysis using computer animation of the area, such as an aerial overview.

Director Bremer reviewed the proposed draft of the new letter, which essentially is same as the previous letter with an additional request to undertake an animated analysis.

Chair Haskell referred to Representative Alexander's note indicating that he would vote no on a "conditional letter."

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Mr. Blanton, to send the letter to the Olympia Design Review Board with the addition of a request to include an animation analysis. Motion carried.**

### **Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 3:01 p.m.**