

# CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Remote Access Meeting  
Olympia, Washington 98504

November 18, 2021  
10:00 a.m.

## Final Minutes

---

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Rolluda, (Chair) Architect  
Dan Miles, (Vice Chair) Architect  
Marc Daily, Urban Planner  
Senator Sam Hunt  
Chris Jones, Landscape Architect  
Representative Joel McEntire  
Sheri Nelson, (Alternate - Secretary of State)  
Kim Wyman, Secretary of State

### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Representative Laurie Dolan  
Senator Phil Fortunato

### OTHERS PRESENT:

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork  
Ruth Baleiko, Miller Hull  
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services  
Clarissa Easton, Department of Enterprise Services  
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services  
Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd Snider  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Greg Griffiths, Olympia Historical Society  
Denny Heck, Lieutenant Governor

Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services  
Lana Lisitsa, Mithun Architecture  
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services  
Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services  
Rachel Newmann, S. Capitol Neighborhood Assn.  
Ray Outlaw, Floyd Snider  
Kris Tucker, S. Capitol Neighborhood Association  
Walter Schacht, Mithun Architecture

### Welcome and Introductions, Announcements & Approval of Agenda

Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) virtual meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. A quorum of the CCDAC was attained.

Members and staff provided self-introduction.

Chair Rolluda recognized Lieutenant Governor Denny Heck.

Chair Rolluda reviewed the meeting agenda: review and approve the September 16, 2021 meeting minutes; Nominations of 2022 CCDAC Chair and Vice Chair; approve 2022 CCDAC Regular Meeting Calendar; receive Public Comments; receive Legislative Campus Modernization Project Update, receive update on Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Project; and receive update on SCC Statute Update Workgroup.

### Approval of September 16, 2021 CCDAC Minutes - Action

The following corrections were requested to the September 16, 2021 meeting minutes:

- On page 3, within the first paragraph, change “Mill Hull” to reflect “Miller Hull.”
- On page 8, within the first paragraph, change, “RASIC (Responsible, Approve, Support, Inform, Consult)” to reflect “RACI (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted & Informed).”

***Sheri Nelson moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to approve the CCDAC meeting minutes of September 16, 2021 as amended. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.***

**2022 CCDAC Chair and Vice Chair Nominations – Action**

Chair Rolluda invited nominations for Chair.

Chair Rolluda nominated Dan Miles to serve as Chair during 2022. Chris Jones seconded the nomination.

No other nominations for Chair were offered.

Chair Rolluda invited nominations for Vice Chair

Dan Miles nominated Chris Jones to serve as Vice Chair during 2022. Marc Daily seconded the nomination.

No other nominations for Vice Chair were offered.

Chair Rolluda reported the nominations are subject to approval by DES Director. The Director is officially responsible for appointing the positions per RCW 43.34.080 and may elect to meet with nominees following the meeting. The appointments are for a one-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2022.

***Dan Miles moved, seconded by Marc Daily, to forward the nominations of Dan Miles as 2022 CCDAC Chair, and Chris Jones as 2022 CCDAC Vice Chair to the DES Director for consideration. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.***

*Senator Sam Hunt joined the meeting.*

**Establish 2022 CCDAC Regular-Meeting Calendar – Action**

Chair Rolluda reviewed the proposed 2022 CCDAC meeting dates:

- February 17, 2022 beginning at 10:00 AM (1st QTR)
- May 19, 2022 beginning at 10:00 AM (2nd QTR)
- September 15, 2022 beginning at 10:00 AM (3rd QTR)
- November 17, 2022 beginning at 10:00 AM (4th QTR)

***Sheri Nelson moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to approve CCDAC's 2022 meeting dates as presented. CCDAC unanimously approved the motion.***

**Public Comment Period – Informational**

Chair Rolluda invited public comments and outlined the format for providing comments during the virtual meeting. The public was invited to submit comments by email to DES no later than 4 p.m. on the day prior to the meeting. All comments submitted were copied to committee members.

Project Manager Dragon advised that DES received a letter from the South Capitol Neighborhood Association after the 4 p.m. deadline. The letter was forwarded to CCDAC members, DES project teams, and the State Capitol Committee.

**Kris Tucker, South Capitol Neighborhood Association,** said her comments reflect the association's major concerns regarding Legislative Campus Modernization (LCM) planning and the Newhouse Replacement Predesign. The glaring issue of surface parking on the campus south edge exacerbates tremendous access challenges that already exist on the campus, conflict with landscape design principles,

and are contrary to climate change considerations. It is no longer possible to ignore the negative impacts of antiquated campus parking policies and jeopardizing the beauty and legacy that were gifted to everyone by campus designers so many decades ago. CCDAC has the statutory authority to review campus planning and design and make recommendations to achieve environmental excellence in design. In that capacity, the association appeals to the CCDAC to advance a proposed proviso in the 2022 capital budget to fund a long and overdue campus access study. The fruit of that effort will finally result in solutions to parking pressures that plaque attempts by employees and the public to access the State Capitol. At this important juncture of the Newhouse Replacement Validation process, the association is appealing to CCDAC, SCC, and the Project Executive Team to take action in support of this request for more planning and analysis of campus parking policies. Simply put, campus parking policies are outdated and campus parking during legislative sessions is a major problem. The proposed elimination of visitor parking with restricted access parking exacerbates the problem and surface parking is counter to campus Master Plan principles and environmental sustainability practices. At this time in history, it is unacceptable to allow over 65% of Site 6 to be designated for parked automobiles. A detailed letter outlining the association's concerns was provided to each member. A wide range of stakeholders, many of whom are watching the meeting, have joined the association in the LCM stakeholder process to emphasize how LCM parking plans exceed both climate change sustainability requirements and campus landscape design guidelines. The budget request is viewed as a constructive step toward addressing those critical issues. The association would appreciate the committee's support.

**Rachel Newmann** asked about the possibly of the administrator of the meeting enabling the public visual access to members who are speaking.

Project Manager Dragon apologized for a technical glitch within the system.

**Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society & Bigelow House Museum**, conveyed support of the work by the SCC Statute Update Workgroup, as well as the importance of including historic preservation representative on the SCC and the CCDAC given the number of historic properties within the committee's jurisdiction. It is important to ensure the committees have an historic preservation voice with historic preservation expertise to provide that perspective during any type of decision-making that might affect those resources.

At the request of Bill Frare, Assistant Director of Facilities Professional Services, DES, the agenda was modified moving the update on the SCC Statute Update Workgroup as the next agenda item.

#### **SCC Statute Update Workgroup – Informational**

Assistant Director Frare reported on his work with a team of stakeholders and subject matter experts to update the statutes for SCC and CCDAC. The problem statement has identified how the statutes are unclear creating a disjointed approval process. In many cases, the statutes are outdated and lack a broad stakeholder long-term comprehensive plan to inform decision-making, the process lacks participation by the Legislature, and there is a desire to renew focus on stewardship and preservation. The mission of the new proposed committee is focusing more on stewardship and preservation, providing clarity to the approval process, providing an open forum for long-range comprehensive planning, and improving the process for informed decision-making. The proposed composition of the new committee would combine CCDAC and SCC membership into a single committee with representation from the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch as voting members along with subject matter experts serving as non-voting members but participating in deliberations and providing expertise relative to policy decisions under consideration by the committee. Currently, the statute assigns the Commissioner of Public Lands as the Secretary to the committee and all records are in the custody of the Department of Natural Resources. The proposal would

update the process to reflect the current process of DES supporting the committee and retaining all committee records.

Powers and duties would be focused on adopting a long-term comprehensive plan with consideration on stewardship and preservation, providing comprehensive policy direction to include direction from the Legislature and the Governor's Office, promoting informed decision-making, and ensuring concurrence with state and local plans affecting the Capitol Campus. Another duty would ensure project proposals are in alignment with the Master Plan and that predesign and design elements align with the principles outlined in the Master Plan. The committee would be responsible for approving monuments and the placement of monuments on the campus, as well as recommending building names and other duties currently under the purview of the CCDAC and SCC.

*Secretary of State Kim Wyman joined the meeting.*

Assistant Director Frare invited feedback on the proposal under consideration by the workgroup.

Assistant Director Frare acknowledged the recommendation from Mr. Griffiths for ensuring subject matter experts were included on the committee to represent historical preservation interests.

Mr. Miles asked about the timeline for enacting the revisions in statutes and restructuring the committees. Assistant Director Frare said the timeline established by the SCC was to provide a proposal for new legislation in December; however, it is uncertain if that timeline can be achieved at this time, as much coordination is required before developing a final draft recommendation.

Ann Larson, DES Director of Government Relations, added that the workgroup also requested additional time to ensure sufficient time to develop a thoughtful proposal.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the composition of the subject matter experts has been determined. Assistant Director Frare responded that subject matter experts would include the current membership positions on the CCDAC.

Mr. Daily asked whether the proposal would be considered by the Legislature during the 2022 session. Assistant Director Frare advised that it is unlikely legislation would be developed in time for the 2022 session.

Mr. Daily pointed out that the proposal includes a new committee responsible for the update of the master plan, which speaks directly to earlier public comments surrounding parking and other campus-related issues. He acknowledged the importance of connecting earlier public comments to the timing and scope for updating the master plan.

Chair Rolluda asked about the current status of the master plan. Assistant Director Frare advised that the current master plan was developed in 2006 and requires an update. DES has submitted budget proposals to update the plan with no funding allocated over the last several budget cycles. Although DES desires to update the plan, the update is not on the work program at this time.

Mr. Daily inquired as whether funding for the master plan update is included in the Department's budget proposal for the 2022 legislative session. Assistant Director Frare replied that that DES typically does not initiate new project requests during a supplemental budget year.

Ms. Nelson noted that as a member of the workgroup, the discussions have been thoughtful and the workgroup is making strides in future strategic planning, as well as ensuring all voices are considered.

Although the process has been extended, it was important to ensure extra time was afforded. She conveyed appreciation to DES for acknowledging the need for additional time.

**Acknowledgement of Secretary of State Kim Wyman – Informational**

Chair Rolluda invited Lieutenant Governor Heck to speak to the acknowledgment and thank you to Secretary Wyman pending her departure.

Lieutenant Governor Heck said his attendance provided an opportunity to acknowledge and honor the service of Secretary of State Kim Wyman on both the State Capitol Committee and CCDAC over a long period. Secretary Wyman deserves the acknowledgement and appreciation for her service to the SCC and CCDAC. Her approach to public service has been collaborative and she works cooperatively with everyone to try to achieve solutions through a constructive process. Secondly, her commitment to stewardship of the magnificent building elected officials have the privilege of serving in, as well as her commitment to the grounds that constitute the Capitol Campus should be commended. The campus is the most visited site between Seattle and Portland but it is also the sanctuary of everyone's democratic values. It is important for individuals who serve on the SCC and the CCDAC to understand that there is a stewardship responsibility for the campus.

Lieutenant Governor Heck shared a plaque he plans to present to Secretary Wyman. He conveyed his gratitude to DES staff and to Dr. Jeff McDonald for their role in constructing the plaque comprised of Tokeen Alaskan Marble. The plaque is stunningly beautiful and is inscribed with, "Presented with gratitude to Secretary of State Kim Wyman for your service to SCC and CCDAC 2012-2021." The state seal is included in gold leaf. Lieutenant Governor Heck thanked Secretary Wyman for upholding the values and for her service and conveyed deep gratitude for her service on behalf of the people of the state.

Secretary Wyman said it has been her honor to serve on the SCC and CCDAC. Her public service began 40 years ago in California. She has served the citizens of Washington State for the last 30 years. The Legislative Building and the campus are special places and everyone knows that it is the job of the committees to protect both the building and the campus. She thanked everyone for the recognition.

Chair Rolluda and Mr. Miles thanked Secretary Wyman for her many years of dedicated service to the state.

**Legislative Campus Modernization Project Update - Informational**

Chair Rolluda invited DES staff to provide an update on the status of the Legislative Campus Modernization (LCM) project.

Project Director Clarissa Easton provided a general overview on the status of the LCM project. She introduced Ruth Baleiko, Miller Hull, who has been working on the validation for the Newhouse Building Replacement project. Work continues for siting a modular building on the southeast corner of the Executive Residence parking area. Vendors are constructing the modular building offsite, which is scheduled for installation by fall 2022. The team has been working with several organizations to solicit participation by an on-call archeologist and to prepare a discovery plan in the advent of any historical findings during geotech borings on both the modular and the Newhouse sites.

Ms. Baleiko described efforts to date on the Pritchard Rehabilitation/Expansion Validation Study. Miller Hull is responsible for reviewing the predesign study to ensure all recommendations in the study are consistent with the current direction and any new information is considered to ensure schematic design begins with a good base of verified information. The concept validation phase was completed and is under review. Schematic design is scheduled after the Thanksgiving holiday. Design will follow with an understanding that all efforts are part of the larger campus modernization effort and must be sequenced

appropriately. Some elements of the validation study included validating sustainability and social equity goals, incorporating feedback, continuing stakeholder engagement, and engaging in initial conversations with the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation.

During numerous stakeholder meetings, the team received good feedback from passionate and knowledgeable voices from the South Capitol Neighborhood, City of Olympia, and stakeholders on the campus sharing information on existing landscape and other campus features.

The team is also evaluating meaningful mitigation and initiated research on the history of the campus and existing structures, obtaining geotechnical investigations, materials, and documentation for the structures, and considering different forms of mitigation in terms of the building's design, material composition, colors, detailing, textures, and human scale to ensure those elements are included in the new building.

Recent activities include ongoing site analysis, engaging in sustainability conversations, and meetings with City of Olympia staff.

Walter Schacht, Mithun Architecture, commented that when Phase 2 of the LCM Predesign was completed the team lacked a clear understanding of the feasibility of rehabilitating the Pritchard Building. The issue remained an open question. With the advent of the third phase of study and the addition of some considerations, it is now understood it is possible to rehabilitate the building; however, more efforts are required to ensure expansion is possible to accommodate program needs.

Lana Lisitsa, Mithun Architecture, updated the committee on the team's efforts over the last several months. The goals of the Pritchard Building project is to produce a high performance building meeting net-zero energy standards with an energy use intensity (EUI) no greater than 35. Sufficient program space will support House of Representatives' offices and support functions and additional office space necessary to offset House of Representatives' members and staff office space that could be eliminated during the renovation of the third and fourth floors of the O'Brien Building. The study includes an analysis of seismic, geotechnical, building codes, constructability, and costs for renovation and expansion of the Pritchard Building. DES contracted with a third-party historic preservation specialist to ensure the study is in compliance with the Secretary of Interior standards and any other applicable standards for historic rehabilitation. The study includes a public engagement process to include the CCDAC and SCC.

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork, reported primary goals developed for the rehabilitation project were based on conversations with the team. Those goals included determining an effective strategy for reuse of the Pritchard Building to serve legislative functions, address the building's life safety issues, improve accessibility, correct building code deficiencies through minimal visual and spatial impacts to the historic character-defining features of the building, restore Wilkeson sandstone façade cladding, restore the window system of the reading room with an appropriate and compatible undivided light window system, remove incompatible alterations within the reading room, and preserve significant internal and external public art.

Ms. Lisitsa reviewed the Phase 3 predesign schedule. The team completed development of rehabilitation options and is beginning work on building extension options. During the process, a strong public engagement was pursued.

The Pritchard Building's stack structures create challenges for rehabilitating the building. Current constraints include the 7'-6" clear ceiling height that is unsuitable for uses other than storage, opportunities for new windows and daylighting are limited, heavy concrete structure requires significant foundation reinforcement to mitigate risk of collapse in an earthquake, modifications are costly due to working "inside the box", and two rows of existing columns interfere with space layout.

Ms. Lisitsa reviewed several Pritchard Building rehabilitation options. The first option retains the stacks by employing a variety of reinforcements and bracing at considerable cost to reinforce the foundation. Retaining the stacks introduces significant structural modifications altering the visual character of the interior of the space. In an effort to introduce daylight into the stacks, a number of (punch) windows could be added. The analysis includes an assumption that any structural upgrades would be limited to code minimums to enable building occupants to safely exit during a seismic event but there would be a high likelihood of significant structural damage. Other benefits of the option include preserving the exterior walls cladding and select concrete waffle slab floors and improving life safety during a seismic event. Disadvantages include the high cost of improvements to the stacks and the removal of the floors, reinforcements to the foundation and the structure to resist lateral forces, and reinforcing concrete floors to accommodate new elevator and mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems. Another disadvantage is the visual and spatial impact of brace frames in the interior, limited size of new windows in the stacks, program layout limitations due to existing columns, and limited protection from permanent structural damage during a seismic event.

The second option replaces the stacks resulting in less visual impact from the lack of brace frames. The seismic joint between the north bar and the stacks would not be cut enabling a new stack structure to stabilize the north bar during a seismic event. The option introduces daylight with options to introduce daylight throughout the entire area of the south wall and adding new windows on the east and west sides. The option assumes the north wall would remain solid to respect the historic character of the stacks. The benefits of the option are reduced cost of foundations to support lighter steel structure at stacks, reduced costs for integrated slope stabilization and foundations, reduced visual/spatial impact from lateral resisting elements in north bar, increased flexibility for program layout due to fewer columns at stacks, increased opportunity for windows and daylight, increased efficiency of thermal envelope, and improving life-safety during a seismic event. A disadvantage of the option is the loss of historic fabric because of the lack of availability of new sandstone from Wilkeson or another quarry to replace existing sandstone, the cost saving and feasibility of salvaging and reusing existing sandstone, and the cost savings and visual impacts of precast concrete panels. An opportunity exists to increase the seismic upgrades to enable the reduction of damage during a significant event, which would increase the protection of the historic building from structural damage.

Ms. Lisitsa reported the team worked with the peer review panel, DES staff, and a team of contractors to help identify the concerns of the unstable slope. It appears fill was added to the top of the slope during the original construction of the building. The team analyzed three options for slope stabilization and all are at similar cost. Integrating slope stabilization with the reinforcement of the building is the most excessive option but would support damage control or enhanced seismic stabilization of the building.

Mr. Aalfs reported that of the two options to rehabilitate the Pritchard Building, the team believes Option 2 is the preferable strategy because reconstruction of the stacks can reduce the need for structural upgrades to the reading room, which is of historic significance.

Mr. Schacht said that based on the strategy of replacing the stacks as the best method for rehabilitating the building and preserving the historic character of the reading room, the team is exploring multiple ways of expanding the building to meet program needs. One possibility is adding to the stacks (replaced stacks) and moving away from the south area while overcoming the challenge of the 50-foot security setback. Another alternative is to replace the stack volume and construct an integrated addition on the south side of the reading room that would align with the 50-foot security setback and accommodates the program. A third option is a separate self-contained structure above grade creating two separate buildings with two front doors but with loss of parking while adding more elevators, stairs, restrooms, and building infrastructure. The team has just started to explore those options. He invited questions and comments from members.

Mr. Miles asked whether the team is studying any impacts caused by volumetric and the bulk of the additions. Mr. Schacht affirmed that the team is analyzing the overall scale, as it is a critical part of the analysis of the appropriate way to expand or otherwise add necessary space to meet program requirements. That analysis will be reviewed with the committee at its next meeting.

Chair Rolluda asked for review of the sustainability goals for the project. Mr. Schacht said sustainability goals are also included in the proviso to achieve net-zero ready energy goals, achieve an energy use index of less than 35, and achieve LEED Silver in addition to goals identified by the Legislature and the Governor's Office when considering ways to reduce carbon footprints by potentially electrifying the building to the extent possible. Additionally, it likely would not be possible to achieve net-zero ready with the rehabilitation portion of the project because the building is concrete with a concrete roof structure extending to create a porch essentially creating a building with a large thermal break. Changes to the historic character to improve the design standards of another era would have a negative impact. The rehabilitation portion likely would be unable to achieve a EUI under 35, but it might be possible for either expansion options of new construction to achieve energy goals. It is possible to achieve LEED silver with any of the options.

Ms. Lisitsa added that preserving the existing building would also be considered a sustainable action.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the detached expansion would be attached underground via a tunnel. Mr. Schacht replied that it might entail a tunnel; however, the option has not been fully explored, as the cost effectiveness of the option has not been determined. The team considered serving one set of building infrastructure through the historic building by connecting both buildings. The most recent conversations have spoken to how each building could have a separate service entrance with no connection between the buildings because of the high cost associated with waterproofing an underground tunnel, as well as the uncertainty of the efficacy in terms of operations. No decisions have been rendered but it likely would entail a conservative route initially with refinement possible as design proceeds.

Senator Hunt inquired as to how stabilization of the hillside aligns with the timing of the building rehabilitation. Mr. Schacht explained that the final selection for rehabilitation of the building would include stabilization of the hillside as one combined effort.

Mr. Daily referred to the earlier public comments, as well as a memo on parking, transit, and pedestrian access. He asked about the timing for the committee to discuss some of those issues in detail. Project Manager Easton acknowledged the comments and the considerable discussion within DES on parking, parking capacity, COVID impacts on parking, and legislative requirements for parking. Meetings are in progress to address parking and security issues. As formal schematic design begins on the Newhouse Building Replacement project, the issues surrounding surface parking, parking capacity, and pedestrian access will be reviewed. The team is protective of the relationship established with the South Capitol Neighborhood and the team will continue to listen and receive feedback.

Mr. Daily emphasized that his question also speaks to the need for an updated master plan for the campus to ensure all related issues are evaluated holistically. Details related to access, parking, and pedestrian should not be part of a project-by-project review but should be included in an updated master plan that guides those approaches. He stressed the importance of updating the master plan because of the importance of not piecemealing important elements that exist on a limited landscape. Project Director Easton agreed that reactive short-term solutions are not in the best interests of comprehensive planning.

Mr. Miles conveyed his appreciation for a solution developed by the study that could result in the preservation of the majority of the Pritchard Building. He thanked the team for pursuing options outside the box.

Secretary Wyman echoed similar comments because in prior meetings, the sentiment appeared to lean toward demolishing the Pritchard Building because it was not worth the time or the effort. The briefing renews hope, as the building is special both in its symbolism and in its architectural design. She thanked the team for their efforts.

**Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Project Update – Informational**

Chair Rolluda invited DES staff to provide the update.

Project Manager Carrie Martin reported the update includes the status on the Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary EIS process, themes conveyed during the recent comment period, and the focus on future efforts. She introduced members of the EIS consultant team; Tessa Gardner-Brown, Associate Principal and Project Manager of the EIS Project Team, and Ray Outlaw, Senior Engagement and Environmental Planner with Floyd Snider.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported the team was pleased with the level of interest and response to the Draft EIS. Since the close of the comment period, the project team reviewed and categorized all comments by themes. The project team initiated efforts on final EIS focus areas to develop a Final EIS with a Preferred Alternative.

Mr. Outlaw reviewed the extent of engagement during the Draft EIS comment period last summer. The team received 868 public comments via email, letter, comment form, or verbal comment. Comments were received from individuals, state resource agencies, key stakeholders, and all Executive Workgroup members. The project team hosted, briefed, or attended 25 meetings with stakeholder groups on the Draft EIS. The team answered questions and engaged in many robust conversations. Because of the pandemic, public interaction was virtual. A virtual open house attracted 1,300 visitors resulting in over 2,000 site visits that generated over 32,000 emails. The response was outstanding doubling the number of comments received during the scoping period several years ago.

Comment themes by discipline or topic included (highest to lowest):

- Water Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Funding & Governance, and Project Costs
- Fish & Wildlife
- Land Use, Shorelines, & Recreation
- Economics
- Hydrodynamics & Sediment Transport
- Aquatic Invasive Species
- Visual Resources
- Sea Level Rise & Climate Change
- Environmental Health
- Transportation
- Navigation
- Air Quality & Odor
- Public Services & Utilities

Many comments pertained to alternative preferences; however, alternative preferences would be considered during decision-making, but not tallied because voting is not part of a SEPA EIS process.

The preliminary Final EIS Focus Areas identified to date include:

- Water Quality – Evaluate potential compliance with state water quality standards and anticipated TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) allocations
- Funding and Governance – Reconvene Funding and Governance Work Group to confirm long-term funding and governance approach
- Transportation – Consider opportunities to avoid long-term closure of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Cultural Resources – Coordinate with Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation regarding historic eligibility of resources in the project area. Better describe significance of project area to tribes.
- Navigation – Discuss potential impacts to navigation if funding is not available for long-term maintenance dredging
- Public Services and Utilities – Consider potential regulatory and financial impacts to LOTT and ratepayers given additional information provided
- Inter-Agency Coordination – Coordinate with regulatory agencies as needed to confirm assumptions (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Ecology, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources)
- Alternative Design – Hybrid Alternative is likely to include a freshwater reflecting pool

The Final EIS is expected to:

- Recognize all comments received on the Draft EIS
- Provide responses to substantive comments from the public, tribes, agencies, and organizations
- Include revisions based on public comment and new information
- Identify any additional mitigation plans and measures that would avoid, minimize, or compensate for significant impacts at a high level
- Identify a preferred alternative and proposed funding and governance approach

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported efforts are in progress to identify a preferred alternative with a funding and governance approach. The Draft EIS selection criteria ensures all information considered results in a decision that is defensible and durable. The goal is to ensure a common understanding of the process as it has been a longstanding question within the community and with state for many years. The process is intended to result in a lasting decision. The Draft EIS included the criteria for the selection of the preferred alternative both for transparency and for an opportunity for the public to provide comments on the process. The team did not receive many comments on the preferred alternative identification process. Consequently, the approach will be used to identify the preferred alternative. The approach was developed to ensure that the preferred alternative is identified based on three critical factors:

- The technical analysis from the Draft EIS that discloses impacts and benefits for each alternative
- Stakeholder input
- Other important factors, such as costs

The selection criteria serves as the framework to ensure all the factors are considered as DES begins to evaluate each alternative. Each alternative will be numerically scored relative to the performance against the selection criteria. The team is sharing comment themes and the final EIS focus areas to stakeholders to ensure an understanding of what may change from the Draft EIS as the Final EIS is completed and an alternative is selected. Some relevant changes include the change in the water type of the Hybrid Reflecting Pool or whether it is possible to avoid a long-term closure of the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge. The team reviewed the selection criteria with the work groups. The selection criteria has been finalized with an update to include tribal resources or tribal treaty rights as part of the consideration in the process.

The team has begun the process to solicit formal input from the Executive Work Group (EWG) and the Community Sounding Board (CSB) on decision durability (which alternative is likely to achieve long-term support from local tribes, stakeholders, and the community). Following receipt of input, DES will evaluate the alternatives as the Final EIS is developed with stakeholder input included within the process. Following completion of those steps, the Funding and Governance Work Group will reconvene to confirm the approach to long-term funding and governance for the Final EIS.

A preferred alternative will be identified when DES has the following:

- The Draft EIS as the body of technical work that adequately discloses impacts and benefits.
- Comments on the Draft EIS that inform whether additional technical work is needed, and an understanding of whether additional technical work may substantively change findings in the EIS.
- Input from engaged stakeholders on which alternative could be supported as the preferred.

The SEPA process affords the lead agency wide discretion when and how a preferred alternative is identified.

Decision durability entails working with the EWG and the CSB to solicit input on decision durability by numerically scoring answers to the following questions:

- Please identify the level of support by you/the constituents that you represent for each alternative and why.
- What about each alternative increases your/your constituencies; support of each alternative?
- What about each alternative decreases your/your constituencies' support of each alternative?

Numerical scoring of the responses affords adding the scores to the larger numerical scoring of the alternatives without interpretation. Members will also be asked to provide scoring rationale or a narrative related to the decreases or increases of support for each alternative as it will become part of the documentation provided in a Final EIS on how a preferred alternative was identified.

Next steps include ongoing agency-specific coordination to support work on the Final EIS. In December, efforts will continue on the Preferred Alternative identification process and solicitation of input from the EWG and the CSB on decision durability. In early to mid 2022, the Funding and Governance Work Group will reconvene to identify the approach for long-term funding and governance. By mid 2022, the Final EIS will be issued with the Preferred Alternative.

Mr. Jones asked whether the information on the Hybrid Alternative denoting the inclusion of a freshwater reflecting pool is intended to clarify that it is freshwater rather than brackish water. Ms. Gardner-Brown affirmed that it was the intent to call out the difference.

Chair Rolluda asked about the reason for the low rate of participation by tribal members in one of the tribal briefings. Mr. Outlaw explained that the Squaxin Island Tribe is a member of the EWG and has been engaged in the project for many years and prior to his participation on the project. A number of other tribes are included on the distribution list. The team shares information with tribes on an ongoing basis. The Squaxin Island Tribe regularly engages in the process and is represented on the chart.

Chair Rolluda asked about engagement by the Nisqually and Puyallup Tribes. Ms. Larson explained that the team has reached out to both tribes with offers to engage. Some tribes have followed up while others have not engaged. Efforts continue to outreach all the tribes.

**Future announcements and Adjournment of Meeting – Action**

For information on future meetings, visit the SCC and CCDAC website for meeting dates, minutes, and meeting agendas. The next SCC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, December 16, 2021 at 10 a.m.

**With there being no further business, Chair Rolluda adjourned the meeting at 11:57 a.m.**

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

Approved by CCDAC during a Joint SCC-CCDAC Meeting held on 01/25/2022 without modifications. All written public comments received prior to the meeting are attached in the form received.



## **Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee**

*Alex Rolluda (2021 Chair, Architect-1), Dan Miles (2021 Vice Chair, Architect-2),  
Secretary of State Kim Wyman, Senator Sam Hunt, Senator Phil Fortunato, Representative Laurie Dolan,  
Representative Joel McEntire, Chris Jones (Landscape Architect) and Marc Daily (Urban Planner)*

**NOVEMBER 18, 2021**

(REMOTE ACCESS MEETING)

### **Public Comments Received**

There were no public comments received by 4:00 PM on November 16, 2021.

November 17, 2021

To: LCM Project Executive Team  
State Capitol Committee  
Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee

**NOTE:** The following public comments were received after 4 PM on November 16, 2021, and provided to CCDAC Members prior to start of the meeting.

Dear Members:

The LCM is an exciting opportunity to meet changing office needs for the Legislature and to transform the Campus south-edge into an effective transition between government and residential activity in the adjoining historic neighborhood. We want to work cooperatively with you in that effort.

However, at this critical juncture of the Newhouse Replacement validation process and Pritchard renovation planning we urgently ask for your help to address a serious concern: **the prevalence of excessive surface parking proposed for Opportunity Site 6 and that same potential for Opportunity Site 5.**

Simply put:

- Campus parking policies are out of step with the times;
- Campus access during legislative sessions is a major problem---for the public, legislative staff, and state agencies;
- Eliminating Visitor Parking in the “restricted access” parking areas, as proposed, will not only exacerbate the shortage of spaces for public use but heighten traffic and related emissions on the Campus; and
- Expansion of surface parking conflicts with the Campus master plan guidelines and the urgent need to address climate change.

Representatives of Olmsted Parks, the heritage and arts communities, community groups, the City of Olympia, as well as individual planners, architects and other interested citizens also voiced this concern throughout the LCM stakeholder process. **We need your leadership now to solve these long-standing parking problems.**

As a constructive step forward, **we urge support for a LCM proviso in the 2022 Capital Budget that directs the Director of the Department of Enterprise Services to oversee a Campus Access Study that (1) provides short- and long-term solutions to parking and transportation obstacles that interfere with access to Capitol Campus buildings and the surrounding grounds; (2) recommends parking policies, including off-site parking alternatives, that support Campus planning and design principles, including the minimization of surface parking on the south-edge Campus; and (3) provides adequate funding for the Director to contract with a consultant to conduct the study and complete recommendations to DES and PET by September 30, 2022.**

The focus of the study should include: current data and analysis and future informed projections relating to Campus parking capacity and usage; parking needs of legislators

and legislative staff when on Campus; post-pandemic employee telework patterns; strategies for reducing parking needs, including pilot projects; climate change sustainability requirements; off-site parking opportunities, including the potential for repurposing nearby state-owned properties to help meet needs; neighborhood circulation needs; and local and regional public transportation improvements.

In addition, we recommend the Director convene a Campus Access Workgroup to serve in an advisory capacity throughout the duration of this study. Membership should include representatives of the Legislature, SCC and CCDAC, DES, OFM and DOT with consultation at the local level from the City of Olympia, Intercity Transit, the Thurston Regional Planning Council, and the South Capitol Neighborhood; and Pierce Transit and Metro-Transit at the regional level.

A collaborative, solution-oriented process is timely and urgently needed to inform (1) design processes for areas designated for surface parking in the Newhouse Replacement pre-design; (2) future planning for the Pritchard lot; and (3) mitigations to address unwelcomed pressures that have long plagued the Capitol Campus and surrounding community and respond to the urgency of climate change.

**We ask that you take action to support this proposed LCM Capital Budget Proviso** to fund a long overdue study of Campus access barriers and proposed solutions. This effort will not delay the construction timeline. Its findings and recommendations are vital to a successful transformation of the Campus south edge that meets the needs of the Legislature, embraces the Olmsted legacy, and plans for the future.

Thank you for your commitment to the State's stewardship of our Capitol Campus.

Sincerely,

South Capitol Neighborhood Workgroup

Sharon Case	Rachel Newmann
Holly Davies	John Saunders
Holly Gadbow	Kris Tucker
Greg Klein	

Cc: Tara Smith, Director, Department of Enterprise Services  
Senator Sam Hunt  
Representative Laurie Dolan  
Representative Jessica Bateman