

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting
1500 Jefferson Street
Conference Room 2113
Olympia, Washington 98504

February 21, 2019
9:00 a.m.

Final Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Rolluda, Chair, Architect
Senator Sam Hunt
Chris Jones, Landscape Architect
Dan Miles, Vice Chair, Architect #2
Sheri Nelson (for Secretary of State Kim Wyman)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Representative Beth Doglio
Representative Vicki Kraft
Senator Ann Rivers

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services	Ron Major, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services	Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Cara McClarty, Department of Enterprise Services
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services	Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services	Allen Miller, N. Cap. Camp. Heritage Pk. Dev. Assn.
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services	Rachel Newmann, S. Capitol Neighborhood Assn.
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services	Phillip Person, Department of Enterprise Services

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A quorum was present.

Chair Rolluda reviewed the agenda topics: Briefing on the Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Report; briefing on the Next Century Campus Study; Briefing on the status of Capital Projects; and an update on the 2019-2021 Capital Budget.

Members provided self-introduction.

Chair Rolluda reported notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian* newspaper. Public comments are welcome during the meeting.

Approval of Minutes – November 8, 2018

Chris Jones moved, seconded by Senator Hunt, to approve the minutes of November 8, 2018 as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Report - Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Project Manager Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), and Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider.

Ms. Gardner-Brown, Project Manager, Floyd|Snider, updated members on the status of the Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Report. The last update was approximately five months ago. At that time, efforts were just beginning to launch the project. Since then, a substantial amount of work has been completed.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed a process map, which was shared with the committee last September. The map serves as the roadmap for the EIS process and features required milestones for a SEPA Environmental Impact Statement under state regulations. Other information on the map identifies the processes to support a successful completion and legally defensible EIS. The map outlines work group engagements with the Executive Work Group, Technical Work Group, and the Funding and Governance Work Group. Other information speaks to coordination with decision-making bodies (CCDAC, SCC, Governor's Office, & Legislature). The map also identifies community engagement.

Since the last update in September, the project team initiated project scoping and outreach community events. Scoping serves as the opportunity at the beginning of the EIS process to formally seek feedback from the community, agencies, tribes, organizations, and others about what should be studied in the EIS, areas of concern that might require additional study, and identification of potential alternatives that would meet the project purpose and need.

Shortly after scoping was initiated, the project team met with each work group beginning with the Executive Work Group to seek feedback on the key areas of concern, factors to be considered as the process is initiated, and particular areas of consideration. Each work group was briefed on the how the EIS would proceed to ensure an understanding of the process.

Concurrent to work group meetings, the project team engaged the community through a series of briefings with community interest groups representing a range of interests. They included Capitol Lake Improvement Protection Association (CLIPA) members, Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT) members, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce representatives, Olympia Downtown Alliance representatives, recreational boaters, LOTT Clean Water Alliance officials, and the Olympia City Council. The briefings described the process and helped provide expectations on what a SEPA EIS entails and to answer questions. The project team received good feedback during the briefings. Participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about the process, ways to engage, and anticipated outcomes. The project team was able to describe how the process will select a preferred management alternative.

Following the meetings, the project team convened a full consultant team meeting to define the EIS scope of study. The team agreed a meeting of the coordinating agencies was warranted because of the variety of programs that might have a direct nexus to the EIS project or a geographical area that overlaps the study area. It was important for the project team to understand how agencies are moving forward with respective efforts and whether any specific areas should be considered. Two notable meetings were with the City of Olympia and the Department of Ecology. The City of Olympia has completed much work on sea level rise with respect to the resiliency of the downtown area. The downtown area is a direct nexus to the project area. The Department of Ecology shared information on the department's process and timing for the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Study, a watershed-wide water quality improvement program having a direct overlap with the study area. The agencies shared readily available information with the project team, such as geotechnical data or traffic trip counts across the 5th Avenue Bridge that will benefit the study process.

Mr. Jones asked whether the Department of Ecology expressed a preference for any of the alternatives. Ms. Gardner-Brown replied that the discussion did not focus on the alternatives other than an

understanding of the agency's intent to summarize conclusions of the modeling efforts for the TMDL Study.

Assistant Director Frare added that the meetings did not directly address preferences for a specific alternative. During the scoping process, the specific ask for feedback was on what the study should consider. The project team is striving to downplay political and some community preferences to enable a process that results in an objective preferred alternative.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported in November 2018, the scoping process was completed. The project team began drafting the scoping report with the full consultant team comprised of an interdisciplinary group of experts (sediment modelers, economists, and other experts). In January 2019, the project team met with each Work Group to provide a summary of the Scoping Report.

The 48-day scoping period was twice as long as a typical EIS scoping period. The decision by DES to extend the scoping period was because of the elevated level of interest by the community and the agencies, and to afford adequate time for thoughtful input. During the scoping period, two evening public scoping meetings were conducted in the Olympia area. The scoping meetings provided a forum for community members to talk with the project team and have questions answered. An online open house was conducted with over 1,000 visitors. The online open house provided the same information provided at the public meetings. Additionally, advisements of the meetings included email notifications to a mailing list of over 5,000 email addresses, Facebook and Twitter ads, and local media.

Over 900 individuals commented from 271 comment submissions:

- 200 individuals
- 9 organizations
- 7 agencies
- 1 tribe

The comments provided a good source of information to assist the project team in defining the scope of study for the EIS. A scoping report is not required for an EIS; however, it is recognized as a good tool to summarize to the coordinating stakeholders what information was shared during the scoping period. The scoping report summarizes scoping comments. The comments are not fact-checked nor are responses provided to comment submissions. The scoping report reflects another step that a typical report does not provide by identifying a general direction for the scope of the EIS

Ms. Nelson asked about the identity of the tribe that provided comments. Ms. Gardner-Brown replied that the Squaxin Island Tribe participated and offered comments.

Mr. Miles inquired as to whether the project team categorized the comments into specific groups. Ms. Gardner-Brown affirmed all comments were categorized by elements of the environment, i.e., water quality, sediment, new alternatives offered, recreation, etc. The scoping report was issued on February 4, 2019 and is available on the project website.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported that the scoping process enables input from all sources. Some of the input related to the project name. Subsequently, the project team refined the project name to "Capitol Lake – Deschutes Estuary Long-Term Management Project EIS" to clearly reflect the project area both past and present.

Numerous comments were received on water resources and ensuring the project team includes water quality and potential water quality under the alternatives. The community wants to understand the sources of impairment, why water quality is so degraded, ways to potentially improve water quality, and whether any of the alternatives would bring water resources into compliance with state and federal water quality standards. There were a number of questions about whether the team could collect additional water quality sampling in Capitol Lake to update recent data. The Department of Ecology offered assistance to the team.

Mr. Jones asked about the source documents that served as the basis of information for the community's feedback and questions. Ms. Gardner-Brown said the project website provided a general overview and summarized the EIS process and the primary alternatives of the managed lake, estuary, and the hybrid alternatives. The online open house provided more details about the information contained on the project website. Those two sources of information provided most of the information. Additionally, an alternatives report provided in conjunction with the scoping notice included more detailed information on the history of the project, history of the alternatives, and feedback received during Phase 1 completed in 2016.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported many of the comments surrounded sediment transport and geomorphology, such as the volume of sediment flowing down the system, deposit locations, how it might impact downstream resources, whether the team would be considering management of sediment under each of the alternatives, and how that might occur. Most of the comments on aquatic invasive species addressed New Zealand Mudsnaills and the opportunities to manage the species, whether the species could potentially be eradicated, and the influence saltwater might have on the viability of the species, and whether there are opportunities to manage the species effectively to restore recreation on the lake.

Many comments were received on fish, wildlife, wetlands, and vegetation that included:

- Summarize history of salmon and other native species in the waterbody.
- Establish baseline biological/ecological conditions
- Identify habitat restoration for each alternative
- Evaluate effects to several species:
 - Salmon
 - Southern resident orca population
 - Bats, birds, and other waterfowl
 - State-listed sensitive species
- Evaluate effects to wetlands, shoreline habitat and trees
- Consider potential loss of existing freshwater wetlands

Scoping comments on sea level rise and climate change included:

- Analyze sea level rise and the potential resiliency of each alternative
- Consider City of Olympia's Sea Level Rise Response Plan
- Evaluate how alternatives perform under climate change scenarios
- Evaluate each alternative's ability to sequester carbon and offset methane release (blue carbon science)

Scoping comments on air quality and odor included:

- Majority of comments in this category express an opinion:
 - Negative: "inappropriate for urban setting" "detracting from visitor experience"
 - Positive: Appreciation for "natural" odor of an estuary
- Describe historic conditions related to odor

- Evaluate potential odor impacts of a restored estuary, considering:
 - Tidal elevations
 - Wind conditions
 - Hydrogen sulfide production

Scoping comments on recreation and land use included:

- Evaluate change on impact to recreational use of the waterbody
- Identify recreational opportunities under each alternative
- Evaluate change or impact to trails during construction and operation
- Consider compliance with applicable Shoreline Master Programs

A majority of visual quality scoping expressed an opinion:

- Negative:
 - Capitol Lake is unsightly because of algae
 - Estuary-mud flats would be “ugly”
- Positive:
 - Capitol Lake has a pleasing aesthetic
 - Estuary is beautiful because of natural appearance

Some individuals asked whether the water level in an estuary would serve as a natural reflecting pool, or whether mudflats would be exposed more frequently.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the legislative appropriation directed the scoping to include an economic analysis as part of the EIS. Scoping comments included:

- Evaluate beneficial and adverse direct and indirect economic impacts of each alternative
- Consider costs to “downstream” parties:
 - Evaluate impacts to the Port of Olympia and waterfront businesses
 - Include economic impacts to LOTT
- Consider ecosystem service values for each alternative
- EIS is required to “consider an expanded area around Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet including the Port of Olympia for the economic analysis”

Historic, Cultural, and Tribal Resources scoping comments included:

- Historic and cultural resources comments supporting both the Managed Lake and Estuary alternatives
- Consider cultural heritage of the project area
- Consider the impacts of the dam on tribal treaty rights
- Consider cultural resource investigations to improve on archaeological and historic data available for the project area
- Evaluate impacts to the Capitol Campus National Historic District; consider importance of lake to Wilder & White and Olmstead plans

Environmental Health scoping comments included:

- Consider the impacts from existing, and potential changes in, contaminated sediment under the alternatives
- Include updated sediment quality data to establish a baseline characterization of sediment within the waterbody

- Assess the cost of upland disposal of dredged sediment if the sediment is contaminated (planning-level costs)
- Consider the potential for an increase in mosquito-borne diseases (e.g., West Nile)
- Consider potential changes to algae concentrations and how an estuary would mitigate the occurrence and spread of toxic algae

Transportation – related scooping comments included:

- Evaluate potential construction and operational impacts to surface and marine transportation
- Identify any changes needed to 5th Avenue Bridge, 4th Avenue, and Deschutes Parkway
- Other commenters asked whether changes to the railroad trestle separating the north and middle basins would be required

Ms. Gardner-Brown said the project team convened the larger team of subconsultants to develop an initial scope of study in conjunction with DES, as well as confirming the study scope in response to all comments and what should be analyzed in the EIS. In April, the team will convene a Community Sounding Board. The Community Sounding Board will be comprised of community members to exchange ideas and to share opposing viewpoints to help identify areas of consensus within the community. Recruitment is underway for membership, which is open to all citizens in the community. The recruitment closes on Monday, February 25, 2019. Membership of the Sounding Board will be confirmed in March. Currently DES has received approximately 26 applications. The first meeting date is scheduled on April 8, 2019. The project team will meet with each of the Work Groups after April 8, 2019. Two areas of review for both the Community Sounding Board and the Work Groups include:

- Development of measurable evaluation criteria
- Development of methodologies for key technical analyses

Following the series of those meetings, the project team will begin technical analyses. The CCDAC will continue to receive updates beginning in the second quarter of 2019.

Senator Hunt thanked Ms. Gardner-Brown and DES Public Relations Director Ann Larson or briefing Representatives Doglio and Dolan on the status of the project.

Chair Rolluda expressed appreciation for the degree of public outreach and the collection of information to produce an objective EIS.

Senator Hunt inquired about the process for applying for membership on the Community Sounding Board. Project Manager Carrie Martin advised that citizens interested in serving should register online through the DES website.

Next Century Campus Study - Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare.

Assistant Director Frare reported the campus power plant provides steam and chilled water to campus buildings for heating and cooling. The power plant is at the end of its useful life with only one reliable boiler (1964) providing service. The efficiency of the power plant is only 33% with approximately 67% of the energy lost in the lines before reaching buildings. Heat operation is required year-round because of the impossibility of closing the power plant during the summer because of contraction issues, which would impact the year-round viability of plant operations. Consequently, operating funds are required to keep the plant operating during summer months. The issues prompted DES to initiate an Investment

Grade Audit and Energy Proposal several years ago by University Mechanical Contractors (an Energy Service Company). The company completed a proposal to relocate the power plant to a site behind Office Building 2 (OB2). The proposal was presented to the CCDAC and the SCC several years ago. DES included the project within the capital budget request. Because the proposal was presented without input from all stakeholders, the proposal received scrutiny and initiated conversations between DES and the Office of Financial Management (OFM) about the lack of a pre-design for the proposal. However, an Investment Grade Audit and a predesign are very similar to a predesign although there are some distinct differences between the two processes. One is the outreach to stakeholders and enabling decision-makers to have more input in the defining the alternatives. Since some of the assumptions in the report speak to the make-up of the power system, carbon neutrality, and other new energy initiatives, the Legislature authorized \$150,000 to complete a predesign to fill in gaps from the Investment Grade Audit Report.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Ron Major, Resource Conservation Manager, DES, who provided an update on the Next Century Campus Study.

Manager Major displayed an aerial illustration depicting steam system distribution piping from the power plant located on the bank overlooking Capitol Lake. The campus includes many underground utility tunnels and steam lines through the Plaza Garage. The Chilled Water Plant serves only the west campus. The proposal would relocate the function of the power plant to a site behind OB2, centralize the chilled water plant to serve both the west and east campus buildings, and convert the steam system to a hot water distribution center to achieve a low carbon, highly efficient central plant.

Manager Major shared an illustration of the proposed site of the new Central Plant. Behind OB2 and adjacent to the basement is an area referred to as Level 50. Level 50 is the location of many generator sets from the former DIS Data Center. The space is not useful other than for storage at this time; however, there is sufficient room to accommodate all the function of the new Central Plant to enable the site to be below ground by one floor, which would mitigate some of the impacts of an above ground power house on the east campus.

Manager Major displayed several design concepts for placement of the Central Plant. If it is possible to take advantage of Level 50, it would provide good access to the Plaza Garage for distribution, as well as to many of the Central Plant functions underground by enabling an extension of East Plaza rather than placement of another building at the street level. The prior presentation to the committee resulted in comments specific to the quality of landscaping and integration of the Central Plant into the gateway to the campus. During the predesign, those options would be explored with much of the design concepts presented to the CCDAC.

Next steps for the project include consolidating all existing information and conducting a technical review of assumptions and the changing energy landscape in the state and how it relates to carbon emissions. Stakeholder meetings will be coordinated involving the community, neighborhoods, City of Olympia, LOTT Clean Water Alliance (potential for renewable gas), legislative bodies, Governor's Office, and Department of Commerce. The final report should be completed in June 2019. At the next meeting, the committee will be briefed on the current status and information documented to date.

Senator Hunt asked whether DES considered other sites on the campus. Manager Major affirmed several sites were considered. They included the old IBM site, ProArts site, and the GA Building site. However, because of the Central Plant's prominence on campus, those sites would serve a future higher and better use. The proposed site enables most of the plant to be located below ground to help mitigate noise, improve access to Jefferson Street, and reduce prominence of the structure on the campus and sight line impacts.

Ms. Nelson inquired about the possibility of using the site of the Archives Building if the Secretary of State receives approval to move forward with construction of a new Archives Building. Manager Major replied that the site might offer a possibility. The site was not considered during the site review process. Timing could be critical, as the building would need to be vacant before work on the Central Plant could begin.

Senator Hunt asked about the timeline for the project. Manager Major said that currently the process is in predesign and is scheduled for completion by the end of June. At that point, the management team would determine next steps. The prior proposal covered a two biennium period for design and construction of a new Central Plant.

Assistant Director Frare added that the project is at a substantial cost of approximately \$125 million to replace the plant and update all distribution lines.

Chair Rolluda asked whether existing underground trunk lines could be used. Manager Major said all piping would be replaced and existing infrastructure of the utility tunnels would be replaced with some reuse of existing systems. Some disruption on the campus would occur because of required trenching work.

Assistant Director Frare added that because the volume of hot water is considerably larger, it might not be possible to reuse the steam tunnels because of limited space. Heating the buildings during construction of new lines must also be factored.

Chair Rolluda asked about the percentage of the building that would be aboveground. Manager Major replied that the current plan reflects approximately aboveground space of 5,000 to 7,000 square feet. Rather than a building at ground level, it would be possible to extend the existing plaza. Chair Rolluda asked about the location of the stacks. Manager Major advised that it might be possible to place the stack near the northeast wing of OB2 to minimize its appearance. The stack would be above the roofline of OB2 and the Natural Resources Building (NRB).

Mr. Miles asked whether a stair tower is located in the same vicinity. Manager Major replied that an emergency exit stair tower might be located in the same area, which would require some integration of existing infrastructure.

Mr. Miles asked whether the master plan identifies future use of the power plant. Acting Campus Architect Dragon replied that the current master plan identifies the site as open space. The site is not explicitly identified as a development opportunity site. Mr. Miles remarked that conceptually, the proposal would serve as an extension of the plaza, as well as provide an opportunity to build a Central Plant. Acting Campus Architect Dragon added that sequencing would be very important for the facility as other new construction occurs on the campus. Additionally, the proposal should also be considered with respect to how it aligns with the net zero policy for energy initiatives and other new construction activity. Many of those factors are being assessed and considered as DES considers when the Central Plant proposal moves forward in relation to other needs on campus.

Mr. Miles asked whether the Sommers Building would be served by the new plant as he understood the building was a stand-alone system. Manager Major replied that when HVAC equipment in the building is scheduled for replacement, it would be possible to connect the building to the system in the next 20 years. It would also enable DES to utilize the geothermal wells located in the basement of the building as part of the overall system. The option of a Central Plant versus a distributed equipment system across the

campus was evaluated as well. Having standalone buildings increase the difficulty of withdrawing from the use of fossil fuel. It would also increase costs for maintenance and operations. A Central Plant in this particular case appears to be more effective and cost efficient.

Mr. Miles suggested one option of substantiating the importance of the Central Plant is to share information on current energy deficiencies compared to the efficiency a new plant would offer in savings over the term of payback.

Senator Hunt remarked that he envisions some difficulty of the community not accepting the site for the Central Plant. He suggested DES should be prepared for resistance by the community because of the proximity to neighborhoods and businesses. Acting Campus Architect Dragon said it speaks to the importance of more stakeholder outreach as part of the planning process.

Manager Major added that the Archives Building site provides some additional opportunities to explore

Chair Rolluda inquired about the long-term status of the existing power plant. Manager Major replied that the current plan would ensure safety of the building while new uses for the site are considered. Identifying other uses for the power plant is outside the scope of this project.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon noted the issue speaks to sequencing the 10-year plan and how to effectuate other campus goals. The power plant is one of the elements because there is both a goal and a need to address the existing power plant and its condition while also considering how it factors in the long-term for potential reuse.

Capital Projects Status Report - Informational

Chair Rolluda invited Assistant Director Frare to provide the update on the status of capital projects.

Assistant Director Frare's update included:

Conservatory Demolition: - The DES consultant team is preparing plans and a bid set for demolition of the Conservatory. DES plans to complete the packages by the end of spring/early summer.

East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B) – Work on Phases 1-4 involved East Plaza located north of 14th Street. Phase 5 work focused on the Plaza south of 14th Street. Phase 5A involved elevator and stairwell rehabilitation completed several years ago. Phase 5B is the area adjacent to the Department of Transportation Building (DOT). DES contracted with an architect and a general contractor to complete the work through a General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) delivery method. Under a Design-Bid-Build delivery method, the design is completed and bid documents are completed and released to contractors. Selection is based on the lowest bid. In the GC/CM delivery method, benefits are achieved by involving the contractor earlier in the process. The contractor is selected through both a dollar-based method and a qualifications-based method. The GC/CM is hired during the design phase to assist in constructive testing and investigation to assist in updating as-builts to develop a better design, as well as assisting in completing estimates, sequencing, and scheduling. All those elements are important for an occupied structure. The benefits of having the contractor involved earlier in the process creates a competitive bidding process as the GC/CM is only allowed to complete a specific percentage of the work and is required to release successive bid documents for subcontractors to bid on. The process does not preclude the GC/CM from bidding on those bids; however, the GC/CM's bid is competitively bid against other subcontractor bids affording the process with a price guarantee. Current efforts continue on producing a final plan set with construction scheduled to begin later in the year.

Relocate Mural from GA to 1063 – DES contracted with a designer and a contractor. The contractor is working inside the General Administration Building (GA) to separate the mural from the wall and determine how to transport the mural to the Helen Sommers Building in one piece. The next step is creating an opening in the front of the GA Building to move the mural from the building. The mural is scheduled for removal from the GA Building within the next several days. The Union Street entrance of the Helen Sommers Building will be opened to receive the mural for placement in its new location within the building.

Newhouse Replacement Predesign – The predesign has not been completed; however, some documentation was created for this session of the Legislature. The documents include a problem statement and an alternatives analysis of the three alternatives contained within the proviso. The three alternatives include a building for both the Senate and the House, one building for both the House and Senate, and a building only for the Senate. The analysis was shared with OFM and the House and Senate. Many questions were generated from those reviews about the alternatives, as well as requests for clarification on some of the elements.

Senator Hunt said it appears the Legislature will make a decision by the end of session. Assistant Director Frare said the options include either selecting an alternative or not rendering a selection.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon said the proposal is aligned somewhat with another project the CCDAC supported for campus south edge restoration. DES is proceeding with the project design. Later in the day, staff is scheduled to meet with City of Olympia to discuss road frontage improvements for any of the alternatives.

Senator Hunt thanked staff for a good job in removing snow on the campus during the recent storm events.

Legislative Building Exterior Preservation (Dome Cleaning) – Cleaning of the dome has been completed. The appropriation included funds for repairing leaks, repairing skylights, and repairing windows and doors. Cleaning of the building was completed first because of interest by the Legislature last year. DES is releasing another bid package for the repair work.

Mr. Jones asked staff to share information on the replacement of East Plaza at the next meeting. Acting Campus Architect Dragon affirmed an update would be scheduled during the next meeting.

Senator Hunt asked whether the East Plaza project would impact the community gardens. Acting Campus Architect Dragon said the project would impact the garden. Staff has discussed the project with the garden sponsors. Another project update will be the East Butte Project. Some design work is currently in progress and an update would be timely for the committee to provide feedback.

2019-2021 Capital Budget Update – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare.

Assistant Director Frare updated members on the status of the 2019-2021 Capital Budget.

DES has identified a considerable amount of work for Capital Campus from replacement of the Power Plant or renewal of DOT and Temple of Justice Building systems. Staff identified \$680 million in projects that need to be addressed. Other needs have been identified as well. Most importantly, the intent is

expending the funds wisely, which speaks to the importance of updating the State Capitol Campus Master Plan. The update of the plan is included in the Governor's Budget.

Other items included in the Governor's Budget are campus security for campus address systems and distributed antenna systems throughout the campus, the Capitol Campus Child Care Center, and a new grounds maintenance facility. Monitoring wells in the unstable slope housing the Conservatory have identified the movement of the structure from a quarter inch to an inch each year. The building is unsafe and needs to be demolished and removed to stabilize the slope. Grounds Maintenance personnel have worked in the basement of the Conservatory for many years. Building columns in the basement have degraded with many positioned at an angle. Most personnel moved from the building with the initiation of the Conservatory demolition project and now reside in the basement of the Legislative Building with one staff member continuing to operate from the Conservatory because of the lack of sufficient space. A grounds maintenance facility would provide an efficient location for personnel and for equipment maintenance and the storage of materials required for staff to complete their work, as well as providing a safe and supportive environment for employees.

Many campus buildings require HVAC repairs, repairs to systems, and elevator modernization. DES is responsible for 80 elevators on the campus. Most of the elevators are over 30 years old. Private sector elevators are updated every 15 years. Campus elevators continually break down and DES is developing a program for replacement of elevators based on an industry standard basis.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon said DES staff has completed an assessment on all elevators managed by DES. The repair work has been prioritized with a consultant to help identify priority elevators to define future project needs.

Senator Hunt noted that the two public elevators in the Legislative Building do not impart a strong sense of safety because of the noise and rattling during the operation of the elevator.

Assistant Director Frare said the budget includes funds for electric vehicle charging stations. DES is also seeking authority to sell the Tacoma Rhodes Center.

Ms. Nelson asked about the location designated for electric charging stations. Assistant Director Frare said some locations have been considered but not designated at this time. Electric vehicle charging stations began to appear on the campus with some sponsored by DES, DOT, and Legislative Support Services. Planning and coordination of the stations is lacking. With the advent of new technology and conversion of state vehicles to electric vehicles, DES should update policies and implement a coordinated response to meet needs. Staff plans to work on the plan over the next six months.

Deputy Director Meyer added that the DES Capital Budget supports the Governor's goals for conversion to electric vehicles representing 50% of all new purchase of vehicles in the next several years. The line item is not only for the DES fleet but it is also for other state fleets (DOT, DNR, etc.). The budget addresses campus-wide needs as well as other sites. DES is meeting with work groups to identify needs by agency and how to maximize efficiencies. Existing infrastructure has not kept pace with the need. DES is receiving feedback and questions during this session about personal charging stations near the Legislative Building. It is important to fund electric infrastructure.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon said that the installation of infrastructure would generate improvements. Electrical vehicle service may be near or at capacity for some of the garage locations.

Public Comments and Closing Comments – Informational

There were no public comments.

Chair Rolluda reported the next regularly scheduled meeting is on Thursday, May 16, 2019 from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. at 1500 Jefferson Street. He invited everyone seeking additional information to visit the link to the committee on the DES website.

Adjournment

Senator Hunt moved, seconded by Dan Miles, to adjourn the meeting at 10:18 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net

Approved by CCDAC at its regularly-scheduled meeting held on 05/16/2019.