

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting
1500 Jefferson Street
Conference Room 2208
Olympia, Washington 98504

May 16, 2019
9:00 a.m.

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

Draft Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Rolluda, Chair, Architect
Representative Beth Doglio
Chris Jones, Landscape Architect
Dan Miles, Vice Chair, Architect #2
Mark Neary(for Secretary of State Kim Wyman)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dr. Rueben Amamilo, Dept. of Labor & Industries
Pete Andersen, Cornerstone Architectural Group
Mark Beardemphl, KMB Architects
Sharon Case, South Capitol Neighborhood
Max DeJarnatt, City of Olympia
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Ecker, KMB Architects
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Mark Fromme, Department of Enterprise Services
Rory Godinez, Washington Patriot Construction
Jeff Gonzalez, Department of Enterprise Services
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Zach Green, Department of Labor & Industries
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services
Ashley Howard, Department of Enterprise Services
Bob Jacobs, N. Cap. Camp. Heritage Pk. Dev. Assn.
Hamed Khalili, Department of Enterprise Services
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Sam Hunt
Representative Vicki Kraft
Senator Ann Rivers

Cara McClarty, Department of Enterprise Services
Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services
Matt Miskovic, KPFF
Allen Miller, N. Cap. Camp. Heritage Pk. Dev. Assn.
Sheri Nelson, Office of the Secretary of State
Ruben Nuñez, KMB Architects
Rachel Newmann, S. Capitol Neighborhood Assn.
Maurice Perigo, Department of Labor & Industries
Phillip Person, Department of Enterprise Services
Steve Reinmuth, Department of Labor & Industries
Jennifer Reynolds, Department of Enterprise Services
Jairus Rice, Employment Security Department
Shelley Sadie-Hill, Department of Enterprise Services
Sarian Scott, Senate
Neil Shaw, Washington Patriot Construction
Wayne Skill Department of Natural Resources
Bill Valdez, KMB Architects
Michael Van Gelder, Department of Enterprise Services
Oliver Wu, Department of Enterprise Services

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. A quorum was present.

Members and staff provided self-introduction.

Chair Rolluda reviewed the agenda topics: A summary of the predesign reports prepared for the Employment Security Building and L&I/Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) Safety & Health Lab and Training Center; an update on the East Plaza Water Infiltration Repairs (Phase 5B) and

Capitol Campus Eastern Washington Butte projects; and informational updates on the DES 2019-2021 Capital Budget.

Approval of Minutes – February 21, 2019

Mark Neary moved, seconded by Dan Miles, to approve the minutes of February 21, 2019 as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Employment Security Building Predesign - Action

Chair Rolluda recognized Bill Frare, DES Assistant Director; Hamed Khalili, DES Project Manager; and Jairus Rice, Director of Office Services for Employment Security Department. The presentation will include the purpose of the Employment Security Building predesign and an outline of preliminary findings and the alternatives considered.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Jairus Rice, Director of Office Services, Employment Security Department. Mr. Rice presented the predesign.

Mr. Rice introduced Bill Ecker, Project Manager, KMB Architects. Mr. Ecker led the predesign effort on behalf of ESD.

Mr. Rice reported the ESD Headquarters Building was constructed in 1961 and has had no major renovations since the original opening. The building was financed with federal funds with the state obligated to maintain the building. Several years ago, efforts were initiated on the project but ceased during the economic recession.

The project is required because most of the building infrastructure is failing or has failed. The building lacks the ability to control hot and cold temperatures with most efforts spent moving staff or using alternative and less energy efficient space heaters to keep a healthy and safe environment for employees. The building envelope has never been renovated with single pane windows never replaced providing no energy efficiency or thermal protection. The mechanical systems are obsolete and inefficient. ESD cannot meet the Governor's Directive for building energy. Earlier in the year, ESD used a Department of Commerce grant to add solar to the building to meet some of the energy objectives. However, without a major renovation, ESD would be unable to achieve energy objectives. The building is significantly deficit in ADA compliance and lacks ADA restrooms and egress. Workspaces are not configured to standards established by Executive Order 36-07 for "Modern Work Environments."

Two years ago, ESD self-funded an investment grade energy audit consisting of a thorough analysis of the building's energy systems. The audit served as the basis for KMB Architects to evaluate the building from a predesign aspect. The predesign would not have significant exterior impacts to the architecture and design of the building. Some review was completed with historic preservation staff to ensure any improvements would not have any historical impacts on the campus.

Mr. Ecker reported previous building assessments were completed in anticipation of the work to be completed in 2006. That assessment provided the team with a good roadmap of deficiencies identified 10 years ago. Those deficiencies were never addressed. The recommended alternative combined with the energy audit identified that every major system within the building should be removed and replaced including some of the exterior envelope. Shutting down major electrical and mechanical systems and removing the exterior envelope of the building during the upgrade would require relocation of the building's tenants, which would create two major impacts. The first is ensuring continuity of operations. Secondly, relocation of tenants would enable the contractor to complete the work efficiently and quickly saving additional costs. The team recommends a major renovation of the building beginning with the

mechanical systems in the basement to the roof. The analysis of the structural system of the building revealed the need for a seismic upgrade while the building is empty and all systems are exposed.

Project goals based on the team's collaboration with ESD include:

- Create a co-located, shared use efficient space including offices, conference spaces, and core building functions
- Ensure facility compliance with Governor's Executive Order 18-01 for "Net Zero Ready"
- Achieve high efficiency LEED Silver Certification in accordance with Executive Order 05-01
- Create modern, accessible workplace in accordance with Executive Order 16-07 – Building A Modern Work Environment
- Improve facilities to meet agency mission, goals, and RCW obligations
- Maintain historic character of Capitol Campus architecture
- Enhance safety and building longevity in the event of a major earthquake

As part of the predesign, a number of options were examined. The first option was a targeted renovation of only those components necessary to meet some of the energy and functional goals. The option requires a multi-phased, multi-level renovation from floor to ceiling and was deemed not practical. The second option is a major building renovation with seismic upgrades. The third option was no action. As part of the analysis for the no action option, future costs calculated through life cycle analysis and other forecasting tools determined it would be increasingly expensive to maintain the building over the long-term and eventually the building would become a detriment to the campus.

The team scoped project costs for each option to include relocation of building tenants to another facility. Relocation of tenants shortens the construction schedule and enables seismic upgrades and installation of new building systems. The preferred option would cost approximately \$32 million. The project would be competitively bid for GC/CM delivery because of the project's scale, complexity, and scope. The risk contingency is minimal at 3% because the building would be empty.

A high-level analysis of the project schedule identified DES working with ESD over the next year to confirm predesign recommendations, vet completed analysis, and assist in advocating for funding by December 2019. A supplemental budget proposal would be submitted in coordination with DES by April 2020. If the supplemental budget request was approved the process of design selection and confirmation would be initiated followed by construction in the summer of 2021. Tenants would move into the building by the end of 2023.

Assistant Director Frare asked for clarification on the timing associated with the selection of the design team. Mr. Rice said design selection efforts would begin in the summer 2019 and continue in conjunction with the supplemental budget request. The timing associated with selection of the design team would be in consultation with DES.

Assistant Director Frare asked about the depth of investigation completed for asbestos abatement. Mr. Ecker advised that as part of the 2006 building assessment, a full asbestos survey was completed. The survey was provided to the KMB team. Most asbestos in the building had been abated. Remaining asbestos in the building is minimal. Details in the budget include an estimate for asbestos abatement.

Assistant Director Frare asked about the likelihood of receiving approval for a \$31 million supplemental budget request. Mr. Rice replied that when ESD originally requested funding, the primary focus of the project was to achieve restroom ADA compliance and some repairs to the building envelope based on

the results of the investment grade audit. At that time, the budget estimate for the total scope of the project was between \$30 and \$34 million. When funds were allocated for the predesign work, follow up communications conveyed intent to submit another supplemental budget request. The next supplemental budget request will focus primarily on only the funding needed in the final fiscal year of the biennium to complete the design work, which will provide better information to the Legislature for future supplemental budget requests to complete the project. Assistant Director Frare asked whether the supplemental budget request for design would be in the realm of approximately \$3 million. Mr. Rice affirmed that it likely would be in the realm of \$3 million.

Chair Rolluda asked whether ESD considered a Design-Build delivery method versus GC/CM because of the tight schedule as it might be preferable to reduce the schedule at the back end of the project. Mr. Ecker advised that the team considered Design-Build as an option; however, the advantage of a vacated building can advance the design work prior to securing a contract with a contractor especially in terms of the funding allocation schedule, as final cost is often necessary when negotiating a final Design-Build contract. Because of the funding availability in the second half of the biennium, it would not be possible to obligate those funds sooner.

Dan Miles inquired about the square footage of the ESD building. Mr. Rice said the building is approximately 86,000 square feet. Mr. Miles asked about the square footage dollar amount for the construction component of the project. Mr. Ecker replied that the cost per square foot for construction is budgeted at \$280. Mr. Miles commented that it appears some escalation has been included between the estimate and the proposed construction date. He asked about the amount factored for escalation within the \$31.8 million budget.

Assistant Director Frare advised that the escalation amount is a formula calculated by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) of approximately 3.12%.

Acting Campus Architect Kevin Dragon added that the amount is “hard coded” by OFM based on economic analysis. The escalation percentage is applied in the future regardless of changes. Mr. Miles asked whether the escalation rate provided by OFM has been accurate over time as the market is currently in an inflationary mode and it would be important to consider the overall potential escalation of the project. Acting Campus Architect Dragon replied that the rate has generally been sufficient because the rate addresses lows and highs over a period of time. A multi-year project would result in a balance of lows and highs. For short-term projects delayed because of the timing of funding, DES adjusts the dates but retains the current year of the estimate to ensure escalation has been included.

Chair Rolluda inquired as to whether technology was factored within the system upgrades. Mr. Rice said the budget factored the same methodology used to calculate for new space; however, the budget does not include any significant technological advancements of the current system. The budget calculates costs to meet current standards.

Mr. Ecker added that according to a prior project list the team received, cabling and infrastructure improvements have been completed to meet the needs for the next five years.

Dan Miles moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to recommend the State Capitol Committee (SCC) approve the findings and recommendations as outlined in the Employment Security Department, Building Renovation-Predesign prepared by KMB Architects. Motion carried unanimously.

L&I/WSDA Safety & Health Lab and Training Center – Pre-design - Action

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and Dr. Reuben Amamilo, Capital Projects Director, Department of Labor and Industries (L&I).

Assistant Director Frare introduced Oliver Wu as the DES Construction Project Coordinator and Dr. Reuben Amamilo.

Dr. Amamilo reported the project is a joint venture between the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) and L&I. He introduced team members Steve Reinmuth, L&I Assistant Director, Administrative Services Division; Maurice Perigo, Facilities Program Director, L&I; Zack Green, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH), L&I; and Mark Beardemphl with KMB Architects.

Mr. Beardemphl reported KMB Architects is serving as part of the leadership team for development of the pre-design for the project. He commented on the importance of working closely with L&I and WSDA on the programming of the critical functions of the Health Lab and Training Center for workplace and food safety. KMB Architects was tasked to develop a pre-design for a facility that matches the quality of work completed by the lab and the dedication of the employees performing the work.

Currently, L&I's DOSH and WSDA reside in leased space. Initially, the lease space was intended as a temporary space but has become a permanent location for both operations. From a lab perspective the facility located off Plum Street in Olympia is inadequate and deficit from a systems perspective with vibrations affecting the work completed by employees. From a training perspective, training is conducted within inadequate office space. When programming was identified, the team studied several different development alternatives. The preferred alternative is Option 2, which meets 100% of the space needs for both agencies.

The team identified the following project goals:

- Create a co-located, shared use efficient space including offices, conference spaces, and core building functions for two different agencies
- Develop a facility that is compliant with Governors Executive Order 18-01 for “Net Zero Ready”
- Provide a high efficiency LEED Silver Certification in accordance with Executive Order 05-01
- Provide a modern, accessible workplace in accordance with Executive Order 16-07 – Building a Modern Work Environment
- Provide adequate facilities to meet agency mission, goals, and RCW obligations
- Provide modern laboratories that are reliable and produce expeditious results to better serve stakeholders
- Increase availability of critical training programs for workplace safety

Six alternative development scenarios were studied. Option 2 consists of a 53,154 square-foot facility. Option 1 considered an agency-wide training center with increased square footage. The preferred alternative (Option 2) is a DOSH-focused training center. Other options included phasing, reducing the square footage of the building to save costs, and a required no action alternative.

The evaluation considered three state-owned sites for the project. The recommended alternative is located within the South Capitol Campus in Tumwater. Advantages of the site include its location to the L&I Headquarters Building, close proximity to Interstate 5, no latecomer fees, and nearby surface parking for overflow parking. Another site assessed is near the Department of Ecology in Lacey that

would require extensive frontage improvements. The third site was near the Olympia Regional Airport. That site was limited in size and would be impacted because of gopher issues.

Bill Valdez, KMB Architects, reported a comprehensive cost model was completed for each alternative. The basis for design and delivery for the cost model was a GC/CM delivery method. The building is a complicated Class A office building with an extensive training component incorporating training elements in addition to a laboratory component. Cost models were developed by researching comparative buildings and costs within the region and of other state agency laboratories either currently in construction or recently completed to produce an accurate analysis. Some of the facilities evaluated included lab facilities at the University of Washington and Washington State University to ensure the cost models were in line with the expected costs for the project. Because the site is a green field development, a GC/CM risk factor (contingency) was included of 3%, as well as a standard general conditions contingency of 13%.

The predesign explored multiple project delivery models of Design-Bid-Build, Design-Build, and GC/CM. The GC/CM delivery model was selected based on benefits of speed and efficiencies and completing the project successfully. The schedule is aggressive and takes advantage of early work packages. Having a contractor involved early enables early release of work packages to include site clearing, site utility work, and below ground structural packages, which benefits the project by a reducing scope and schedule while ensuring industry standards for the GC/CM delivery model are achieved.

Dr. Amamilo invited questions from members.

Mr. Jones asked for additional information on building massing, site plan, and site circulation. Mr. Beardemphl referred to an illustration of a massing model placed over the preferred site. The illustration depicts the location of the property in relationship to Tumwater Boulevard and the Interstate 5 on-ramp. The team considered issues of high groundwater, retention of tree buffers, and future widening of the on-ramp. Those issues were considered in conjunction with how the building might address its neighbors as part of the overall campus and the orientation of the building from a functionality standpoint, as well as for energy and solar orientation. Those results drove the site design. The predesign includes a public plaza facing the approach to the building. The team focused on the program and considered shared space to the extent possible because building efficiencies are based on the site housing two agencies sharing common space with separate laboratory and training functions serving as the main program components of the building.

Mr. Jones asked whether the project would be sited on the undeveloped eastern area of the property. Mr. Beardemphl referred to an aerial photo of the site. The green area on the illustration represents most of the development site.

Mr. Valdez added that the site concept served as a test fit to determine how much of a building footprint could fit on the site. Another illustration reflects implementation of parking, access, and pedestrian flow through the site and to the building. Civil drawings earlier in the design process reflect conceptual placement of the building to determine if it could fit and if it had a good proximity to the area. Site plans presented to the committee reflect follow-on generations of how the site could be best utilized to meet both programming and development requirements. The majority of the building is one story with some of the lab spaces and training areas a half story taller because of high density storage and other systems. The building would not include an elevator.

Mr. Miles asked whether the preferred alternative was based on design or cost reasons. Mr. Beardemphl said the alternative was based on both design and cost. In terms of the training component, equipment deliveries would be necessary and is why the design reflects the placement in the rear of the site. There is also a necessity for a high bay in the space to meet program requirements. The current location is inadequate with low ceilings creating some problems in delivering some workplace safety training because of the lack of equipment. The vision for that program was to meet those requirements with a space that was adequate but required a higher bay. It also might involve a pre-engineered component attached to the building.

Mr. Valdez said the team also explored the laboratory side and the sensitivity of equipment and processes to locate those uses on grade because it would benefit many of the processes versus having it located on a second level and possibility encountering more difficulty in ensuring no vibration that would affect the calibration and functions of some equipment. Early in the design, it was recognized that it would be more ideal to keep all those functions at-grade from a performance standpoint.

Representative Doglio asked the team to identify the building labels on the illustration. Mr. Valdez identified the location of the lab facility, consolidated areas (meeting spaces, lobbies, and shared office functions), L&I laboratory, and a high bay for the L&I training component. Mr. Beardemphl added that the gridded portion in the illustration is an outdoor training area for L&I.

Chair Rolluda asked whether future growth was factored in the square footage. Mr. Beardemphl said the programming includes a growth factor for each department within the building.

Mr. Miles inquired about the consistency of the predesign with any master plan for the campus that has been developed over the years. Acting Campus Architect Dragon replied that the Edna Goodrich Building is located to the right of the proposed site. When that property was purchased by the state, it was divided into three parcels with the intent to develop all three parcels. The proposal would fit on Parcel K, one of the undeveloped parcels. In terms of the larger campus with respect to the proposed Secretary of State Library/Archives building, that building would be located across the street off Linderson Way. There is a need for a concurrency discussion with the Secretary of State and L&I about how to interact with the City of Tumwater to meet concurrency requirements. Each proposal recognizes the impact to the entire area. WSDOT has some future ramp widening plans for the I-5 corridor, which is being monitored.

Mr. Miles commented that as an architect, he would prefer that the building is designed with respect to a future building next door and that each one is treated from a site plan perspective as part of the overall campus. Acting Campus Architect Dragon responded that the proposal is a concept and vetted during the design process. Access is provided through the L&I entrance providing a dedicated service entrance to the L&I facility. The new site would be concurrent with L&I's existing operation. Any congestion would be minimal to the Edna Goodrich site, which is experiencing some parking pressure and other site issues. The proposal is consistent with the vision for development of the area as it relates to the master plan.

Dr. Amamilo commented that some of the expectations of the project include consideration of a comprehensive campus environment of existing buildings and the importance of the new development complementing the exteriors and circulation pattern of the area. Not only would the design focus on the building components, it would also focus on the surrounding area and how it fits within the campus.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon noted that as the process advances through predesign, the committee would receive updates on progress to provide feedback and advice.

Mr. Miles pointed out the aspect of proceeding through pre-design as a stand-alone project while also considering the proposed Secretary of State Library/Archives building and how the two projects relate to the larger campus design discussion. It might also be possible to consider opportunities for shared facilities for added economy. Acting Campus Architect Dragon pointed out that the two projects serve different and separate functions, as well as each having different programmatic goals. Sharing those activities would likely not be a good fit.

Mr. Jones asked whether the entry for the proposed Secretary of State project would serve the proposed eastern project as well. Mark Neary replied that the library/archives building would be located across the street off Linderson Way with the building sitting adjacent to Tumwater Boulevard. The project includes two proposed entryways with public access off Linderson Way and employee access along a road to the rear of the building near the parking area.

Mr. Neary asked about the source of financing for the project. Mr. Reinmuth explained that funding for the project would be from the State's Medical Aid and Accident Accounts and cash on hand. Additionally, WSDA would be a tenant and lease space.

Mr. Neary asked about the potential of sharing laboratory functions between L&I and WSDA. Dr. Amamilo explained that the requirements for each agency are distinctly different.

Mr. Jones asked whether the team considered two-story massing as an alternative. Mr. Beardemphl replied that the training functions and the laboratory need to be on the first floor. Office and conference spaces supporting the labs drove the one-story design.

Representative Doglio offered that the orange diagram could be a two-story structure to save some site development space. She asked whether that option was explored. Mr. Beardemphl replied that from a massing standpoint, that option was not explored. The orange designated space is the consolidated space of meeting spaces and offices. Mr. Beardemphl added that during design, the option could be explored. Representative Doglio added that from her perspective, the space might benefit as a two-story structure.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the proposal includes a joint entry point for both agencies. Mr. Valdez said one main entry would serve both agencies.

Dr. Amamilo responded to questions surrounding security components associated with the labs. The main entry will serve staff and visitors with a second entry for equipment and supplies located on the west side of the building.

Representative Beth Doglio moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to recommend the State Capitol Committee approve the findings and recommendations as outlined in the L&I/WSDA Safety & Health Lab and Training Center Predesign Report prepared by KMB Architects dated October 11, 2018 with an additional requirement to explore the option of a two-story structure housing offices and conference space during the design process. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Rolluda recessed the meeting from 10:00 a.m. to 10:04 a.m. for a break.

East Plaza Water Infiltration Repairs – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and DES Project Manager Jeff Gonzalez. At the February 21, 2019 meeting, the committee conveyed interest in learning more about the East Capitol Campus Plaza – Plaza Program & Schematic Design predesign completed by EDAW Inc. The plan was

finalized with concurrence from the committee and was subsequently approved by the SCC as the East Plaza Sub-Campus Plan. The plan along with the 2007 construction documents prepared by EDAW Inc. were used during the development of the current East Plaza Water Infiltration Repairs project. The presenters will provide an overview of the EDAW Plan and a project status update.

Assistant Director Frare reported the project is a multi-decade, multi-phased project to repair the waterproof membrane over the parking garage, as well as adding some additional landscaping. All areas north of 14th Avenue were completed several years ago. Because of the recession, work to the south of 14th Avenue was delayed by several years. That work is included in Phase 5, which has been separated into several projects because of funding purposes. Phase 5A included the stair towers and was completed several years ago. Phase 5B encompasses approximately one-third of the plaza that would be replaced. He introduced Project Manager Gonzalez, who provided an overview of the project.

Project Manager Gonzalez introduced Peter Andersen with Cornerstone Architecture Group. He recognized Jennifer Reynolds, Communications Manager, DES; Shelley Sadie-Hill, Property Manager, DES; and Mark Fromme, Site Representative, DES. Neil Shaw serves as the Project Manager and is with Washington Patriot Construction. Rory Godinez serves as the Superintendent with Washington Patriot Construction. He recognized Washington Patriot Construction Project Engineer Bogdan Tishchenko, who was not present.

Because of failures encountered in the Plaza Garage over the years, water proofing systems have failed creating water infiltration compromising structural integrity and electrical systems. The East Plaza area is bordered to the east by the Washington State Department of Transportation Building (DOT) and to the south by the Employment Security Department (ESD) Building. Construction began on May 1, 2019 and will continue through December 2019.

The first series of repairs began in 1996 with a phased approach. In 2005-2007, seismic improvements and roof replacements were completed in the north half of East Plaza (Phase 4). The current phase is a multi-phased plan developed in 2006 to implement a master plan approved by the SCC in 1997. No further work was funded or performed between 2008 and 2014. Because of funding constraints, the team was asked to review Phase 5 to determine if it could be reorganized into sub-phases.

Phase 5A was completed in the 2015-2017 biennium and includes stair towers #1 and #8. Phase 5B was funded in the 2017-2019 biennium and was split between the Capital Budget and a COP. The remainder of the parking garage will be completed with future funding requests.

Project Manager Gonzalez displayed an aerial illustration of the project area and described the location of the two laydown areas with the main laydown area for construction located off Maple Avenue in the Maple Park Annex Lot near Capitol Way and the ESD Building.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon said the area is the location of the old IBM site, which is the preferred site for the Campus Childcare Center. Staff is working with the project team collaboratively on project sequencing and scheduling. Both teams believe the projects can proceed without too much disruption to either project.

Mr. Andersen provided an overview of the Plaza Garage. The garage is a reinforced concrete structure constructed in 1969. Approximately 40,000 square feet of outdoor space is located in the area of the Phase 5B project equating to approximately one acre. That area serves as the roof of the garage. Waterproofing a garage roof with trees, shrubs, ramps, walkways, and stairs requires removal of those

elements. The project scope includes removal of all objects on the surface to reach the plaza deck with installation of a water proofing system from the bottom. Testing will be completed to ensure the new membrane does not leak. Following installation and testing, installation of new planter walls, trees, shrubs, walkways, and light fixtures will be completed.

Project Manager Gonzalez reported that during the completion of the design for Phase 5B, the team reviewed the 1997 Master Plan of the East Plaza and construction drawings previously prepared as part of Phase 5B in 2006. In 1997, when the East Plaza project was under review, many meetings, workshops, and charrettes had been held. It was important as the team moved forward with the project that the design was consistent with all previous plans and documents.

Mr. Andersen reviewed the proposed landscaping plan. The task was implementing the earlier landscaping design, which was approved in the 1990s. A few areas included some grade adjustments to ensure good coverage over the below grade concrete. Several other areas lacked sufficient depth of soil for trees. Those trees were relocated within the landscaping plan. However, the basic plan remains the same with the walkways as originally designed.

Other aspects of the project include addressing some cracks in the ceiling of the garage to prevent future damage. Most of the cracks are minor and will be repaired with an epoxy application. Additionally, some electrical work was included in the phase to include plaza lights with new lamps and upgrades to switch gear and replacement of electrical panels in the garage.

Project Manager Gonzalez reviewed the construction schedule. During construction, ESD, DOT, and other employees will be encouraged to access the garage through level A. That entrance will not be ADA accessible and employees requiring assistance have been encouraged to request reasonable accommodations.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon noted that existing ADA routes within the parking garage would be preserved.

Project Manager Gonzalez noted that portions of the Maple Park Annex Lot would be occupied as the staging area with some reserved stalls and two ADA stalls remaining for ESD employees. The area near the garage entrance will be occupied as a staging area because of the need to be mindful of loads on the plaza deck. An existing smoking shelter and Conex (emergency supply storage) will be relocated for ESD. Project Manager Gonzalez displayed an aerial view of the Plaza Garage ramp near the stair tower by the ESD Building as the area to be used for transporting materials.

Construction activities will generate noise and vibration; however, no impacts would occur to the structural integrity of existing structures. Construction noise will be allowed from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. and will be monitored by Washington Patriot Construction. Ear protection is available at ID stations surrounding the project site.

Construction safety is a high priority and the contractor will provide spotters during equipment moves and concrete pours. The entire project will be fenced with safety screens and signage and detour maps will be provided for pedestrian use.

Project Manager Gonzalez shared an aerial illustration of the entire project site and laydown area. A town hall meeting was held on April 18, 2019 for the community to learn about the project. DES staff attended the town hall meeting to answer questions. DES is providing regular communications and outreach to the community. Any unusual events occurring throughout the project will be communicated

to employees in the event it affects the parking area. Parking will be available under the project area with minimal disruption.

Chair Rolluda asked about the completion date for Phase 5B. Project Manager Gonzalez said the schedule targets December 2019 for final completion because the work is weather sensitive.

Mr. Neary asked about the type of material used for waterproofing. Mr. Andersen said the material is a fleeced-back single-ply membrane. The team explored a variety of membranes for the project and selected the specific membrane as the bullet proof solution. The design includes belts and suspenders extending to the top. The cost of the project is significant and DES is requiring a significant warranty from the manufacturer and subcontractors. The product provides the longest lifespan for any similar waterproofing product. The only negative aspect of the membrane is sensitivity to ultraviolet rays, which is why the proposal includes four to eight feet of soil on the membrane to prevent any exposure to ultraviolet rays.

Mr. Jones asked about the buildout schedule to the west of the project. Acting Campus Architect Dragon said the intent is to continue working through the phasing of the project. However, the phases are subject to budget appropriations. The project was not funded during the next biennium; however, some work remains under the current biennium. Staff plans to pursue conversations on the appropriate timeline to complete the projects. Mr. Jones said his questions pertained to some remaining elements, such as maintenance and legibility of space.

Mr. Miles questioned the process staff intends to employ to mark the end of the project with respect to the start-up of the next phase of work. He assumes that the end of the project would be surveyed to identify the starting location when the next phase of work is funded, as well as whether there are any provisions for overlap of where the work stops. Mr. Andersen replied that stoppage on one side of the garage would be at the edge of the garage. Stoppage on the DOT side is at a previous water proofing project at the control joint. The project to the north ends at a specific wall. To the west, the project meets a specific beam line in the garage providing a straightforward ending point. The team considered overlap and interfacing and will provide a temporary edge on this phase of the project to meet future phases.

Mr. Jones asked whether the edge of the lawn would be determined by an expansion joint or some structure below. Mr. Andersen affirmed that the edge would be along a beam line that connects to a raised planter wall, which is scheduled for demolition as part of the next phase. Several areas of overlap are included in the plan to include some temporary paving to match the new grade to the old grade.

Mr. Miles referred to the prior EDAW Plan that connected two grass spaces into one contiguous lawn space. The current plan appears to separate the grass spaces. Mr. Andersen said an earlier EDAW Plan matches the current plan as the original plan by EDAW evolved through that prior process. The team used the most recent EDAW Plan.

Assistant Director Frare commented that DES included some electrical work in Phase 5B because of the significant amount of water infiltration causing damage to electrical panel rooms and vaults, as well as damage to electrical conduits and conductors in several levels of the garage. During the funding appropriation process, DES requested another \$2 million to address those electrical issues, which was approved and has been incorporated within Phase 5B.

Capital Campus Eastern Washington Butte – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and Michael Van Gelder, DES Property Manager. The presentation is a status update of planning efforts for the Eastern Washington Butte project at Heritage Park and next steps.

Assistant Director Frare reported DES received a grant from the Department of Commerce to complete an evaluation and begin some design work on a monument in Heritage Park to represent eastern Washington. He introduced Michael Van Gelder.

Mr. Van Gelder introduced Ruben Nuñez, KMB Architects, who presented the design. The project was generated from the original concepts for Heritage Park developed by Wilder and White in 1911 and the Olmsted Brothers in 1912. A master plan was completed in 2004. The master plan included an Arc of Statehood anchored by the western Washington inlet at one end and some feature representing eastern Washington at the other end. Over time, the Western Washington inlet feature was developed. At this time, the process is considering the Eastern Washington Butte. The 2017-2019 biennium budget included an appropriation from Congress with support from the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association (NCCHPDA). DES retained KMB Architects to complete a conceptual design with some cost estimates.

Mr. Nuñez cautioned that some of the images are preliminary design studies based on representations of eastern Washington landscapes. The KMB team has been working with the Allen Miller and Bob Jacobs with NCCHPDA.

The original campus architecture by Wilder and White and the Olmsted Brothers was based on the axis connecting the Capitol Dome to Budd Inlet. In 1994, the master plan incorporated Heritage Park and eastern and western Washington with the Arc of Statehood to connect all the elements. The Eastern Washington Butte remains one of the Park's final elements to be fully constructed. The Arch of Statehood and the Western Washington element were constructed in 1994.

A berm along the edge is part of a sea level rise measure for the downtown area. The design team considered the berm and incorporated the berm within some of the design concepts. The surrounding area is an area of many activities. A bench is placed on top of the node offering limited space for other individuals. The design narrative represents the axis of Wilder and White and the Olmsted Brothers connection of the Capitol Dome to Budd Inlet. The concept was derived from that connection using three elements of Wheat, Basalt, and Apple Trees representing the landscape of eastern Washington.

Mr. Nuñez displayed an illustration incorporating Basalt, which is a prominent landscape feature in some areas of eastern Washington. The team believes Basalt should be a prominent feature as part of the eastern Washington edge. Another illustration was a rolling hill with planted wheat. Another image featured a windmill representing power generation to emphasize the environmental aspect of what eastern Washington provides to the state. Many of the illustrations are graphic representations of conceptual ideas as a way to determine the driving design of the project. Apples represent the third element and are graphically represented by placement of apple trees on the landscape.

Mr. Nuñez displayed an illustration of the site plan with the plaza on the axis with ramps for eastern and western Washington and basalt forming an elevated plaza area. The plaza area could accommodate 100 people with a seating area near the water for up to 80 people. He displayed another illustration with a view from the Capitol Dome to Budd Inlet reflecting a wheat sculpture of approximately 10-11 feet tall fashioned from a double-walled acrylic tube reinforced with a steel baseplate and illuminated. The illumination could serve as a beacon for both the City and the Capitol Campus. Apple trees would be

planted to afford an opportunity for the community to pick apples. Another top view of the plaza highlights the scale of the project. A centerpiece located on the axis is an existing time capsule.

Mr. Miles asked whether the team solicited any public input from eastern Washington on the design concepts. Mr. Nuñez replied that public presentations were not provided other than the team meeting with NCCHPDA several times. However, during the next level of design, he anticipates some public meetings. Mr. Van Gelder said the team also met with the Legislative Heritage Caucus to include legislators from eastern Washington to receive feedback. As the project moves forward, the team anticipates seeking feedback from eastern Washington residents and legislators.

Allen Miller added that NCCHPDA continues to meet with eastern Washington legislators and would consider obtaining more feedback from eastern Washington residents.

Mr. Jones asked to receive a copy of the master plan element that defines the monument. Staff affirmed the request. Mr. Jones asked for additional information in terms of what is driving the program and how the design concepts were developed to create a plaza and whether the plaza was part of the master plan for Heritage Park. He questioned how the space would be programmed and how the perimeters of the space were defined. He is somewhat skeptical of the significance of the development given the Wilder and White and the Olmsted Brothers vision of simplicity and elegance and celebrating a pastoral landscape. The renderings reflect a highly constructed landscape with different materials and components. Many people have responded negatively to the building that was previously constructed in the viewshed. Adding more constructed objects in the viewshed might be as detrimental because he views the space as respectful of the Olmsted vision of creating a pastoral landscape and a place for respite. His intent is to gain a better understanding of the program compared to the Wilder and White and Olmsted Brothers vision. He acknowledged the importance of celebrating all elements of the state, but there are other elegant ways to incorporate basalt. Creating a highly constructed landscape in a significant viewshed should be considered as the process moves forward in terms of how the space is programmed.

Mr. Nuñez said the concerns would be considered as part of the next stage of design in terms of the scope, sizing, and other elements.

Mr. Miles said another consideration is texturally understanding circulation and how people would move through the space and how the design proposal might change that circulation.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the team is scheduled to present the design to the City of Olympia's Design Review Committee. Mr. Van Gelder said no presentations have occurred to the City of Olympia other than there have been some discussions. The City of Olympia is focused on several other issues to include sea level rise. As the design progresses, the team will contact the City to engage in more formal discussions.

Acting Campus Architect Dragon noted that the City of Olympia's relationship with the state is more of an advisory role as the City does not have any land use jurisdiction over state projects. DES works closely with the City to solicit feedback.

Update on 2019-2021 Capital Budget – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and Acting Campus Architect Dragon. The update is on the status of the 2019-2021 Capital Budget and next steps for project implementation.

Assistant Director Frare update included:

- **Legislative Building Exterior Preservation (Dome Cleaning)** – Cleaning of the dome was completed last summer. This summer, roof repairs, repairs to the skylights, and repairs to the doors and windows are scheduled.
- **Insurance Building** – The Legislature appropriated \$1.5 million to clean the Insurance Building. The proviso directed DES to clean the exterior, tuck pointing, roof repairs, and sky lights, as well as repair any water damage from roof leaks.
- **Cherberg and Insurance Buildings** – Both buildings are scheduled for new roofs. DES completed the design and the projects are ready to release for bid. Both roofs will be completed by summer 2019.
- **Elevator Repairs** – Three elevators are scheduled for repair in the next biennium. The elevators are located in the Plaza Garage, Capitol Court Building, and the third will be selected later based on criteria.
- **Elevator Comprehensive Review** – DES completed a comprehensive review of all elevators to include estimates for the cost for each elevator to develop a prioritized list for funding. The campus has been experiencing a high level of elevator failures and inspection findings by L&I. Many of the elevators need to be upgraded and modernized.
- **Campus Security** – The Legislature appropriated funds to design and install distributed antenna systems in the Natural Resources Garage, DOT Garage, and the Columbia Garage. The design for the Plaza Garage has been completed. The distributed antenna system enables cell phone connection to the network when located inside an underground concrete structure.
- **Child Care Center** – The project was approved and will be located on the old IBM site. The committee reviewed the project at its November 2018 meeting. The facility will be a one-story building to accommodate up to 75 children. Significant coordination is underway between the two projects to ensure the East Plaza Phase 5B project is completed before the Child Care Center project. Oliver Wu is serving as the DES Project Manager.
- **Newhouse Replacement Predesign** – An alternatives analysis was completed for the Newhouse Building. The preferred option is pending selection to enable the project to move forward.
- **Office of Insurance Commissioner Predesign** – A new appropriation for a predesign to meet the needs of the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. The original concept was to house the Insurance Commissioner and Auditor in one facility. However, the Auditor has reconsidered participation, and has opted out of relocation. The proviso language addresses the Insurance Commissioner only. DES is required to follow the language within the proviso and understands another agency may want to co-locate with the Office of Insurance Commissioner.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the committee would have an opportunity to review the preferred option for the Newhouse Building. Assistant Director Frare advised that he would follow-up with OFM and legislative representatives for the project to determine next steps. The project is important to the Senate and the House and DES prefers to seek some concurrence on next steps for completing the predesign.

Public Comments and Closing Comments – Informational

There were no public comments.

Chair Rolluda reported the next regularly scheduled SCC meeting is on Thursday, June 20, 2019 in the Senate Rules Room, State Legislative Building between 10 a.m. and 12 p.m.

The next CCDAC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, September 19, 2019 at the 1500 Jefferson Building between 9 a.m. and 11 a.m.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Rolluda adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

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

DRAFT

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT