

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**1500 Jefferson Street, Conference Room 2208**  
**Olympia, Washington 98504**

**May 17, 2018**  
**10:00 AM**

**Final Minutes**

---

**CCDAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**CCDAC MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Dennis Haskell, Urban Planner  
Senator Ann Rivers

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services	Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services	Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Chris Gizzi, Department of Enterprise Services	Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Scott Perkins, Office of Financial Management
Ashley Howard, Department of Enterprise Services	Richard Ramsey, Legislature

**Welcome and Introductions**

CCDAC Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) to order at 10:04 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The date and time of the meeting was published in the State Registry along with the committee's other regularly-scheduled meeting dates and time. The meeting, date, time and agenda was published in *The Olympia* newspaper prior to the meeting.

During the meeting, members will receive information on the State Capitol Development Study on Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6, & 12, an update on the Capital Budget and the Capital Project Work Plan, an update on the Operation and Capital Budget Development process for FY 2019-21, and an update on the status of Master Planning efforts.

Members and staff provided self-introduction.

**Approval of Joint SCC & CCDAC February 15, 2018 Meeting Minutes - Action**

**Dan Miles moved, seconded by Mark Neary, to approve the Joint SCC & CCDAC February 15, 2018 meeting minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Pre-Approval of Capitol Campus, Development Opportunity Sites - Action**

Chair Rolluda reported the committee was previously briefed on the study completed by Schacht-Aslani Architects. At that time, the committee was unable to act because the meeting lacked a quorum. Minutes of the previous discussion were provided to members.

Chair Rolluda recognized Director Chris Liu, DES, Assistant Director Bill Frare, Facility Professional Services, DES, and Master Planner Kevin Dragon, DES.

Director Liu explained that since the committee was unable to approve the report from Schacht-Aslani Architects, the briefing is a review of the report for the committee's consideration, as well as for approval of the opportunity sites. Approval of the sites does signify automatic approval of pre-designs or a future building. DES is seeking only approval to designate the opportunity sites for future development approved by the Legislature. Designation of the opportunity sites only conveys that the sites are available, DES has thoroughly evaluated the sites, the sites comply with the Schacht-Aslani Report, and the sites are recommended by the CCDAC to the SCC. Recommendations for pre-design will occur at the time a site is identified for development.

Planner Dragon provided an overview of the Schacht-Aslani Report. He identified the project team and individuals involved in preparation of the report. Opportunity sites were identified in the 2006 Master Plan and carried forward. In 2015, Engrossed House Bill 1115 authorized DES to move forward on two studies. The first study was a pre-design of the General Administration (GA) Building, Pritchard Building, Newhouse Building, and ProArts Building identified as Opportunity Sites #1, #5, #6, and #12, respectively. The second directive was preparation of a State Capitol Master Plan. At that time, DES elected to combine the two efforts and produced the Schacht-Aslani Report for the development opportunities study.

The study included an assessment of program needs centering on the House, Senate, and the Legislature. The study identified current FTEs, future FTEs, and current and future net and square footage needs. The study also included information on Visitor Services with several programmatic issues identified of student tours to the campus, limited restrooms, and the lack of swing space for temporary placement of employees during building renovations.

Planner Dragon displayed an aerial view of the development opportunity sites. Uses for opportunity sites #5 and #6 were identified for legislative purposes with sites #1 and #12 identified for agency operations and possibly co-location of functions. As part of the 2006 Master Plan, heights were established for guiding future development with no building height higher than the Legislative Building as the Legislative Building is the prominent feature of the landscape. For West Campus, the O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings were identified as the baseline for height parameters. On East Campus, existing buildings surrounding East Plaza served as the baseline for height parameters.

Protection of views to the Legislative Building was identified as important, as well as the views to Capitol Lake, Olympic Mountains, and Mount Rainier. The study addressed neighborhood connections for future improvements and parking management issues.

In 2014, a parking study identified the campus as reaching parking capacity during legislative sessions. Parking capacity is available during other times of the year. Part of the decision-making for the construction of the 1063 Block Replacement project included no parking with mitigation fees assessed. Subsequently, parking capacity is not adequate during legislative sessions. Parking costs associated with some of the development scenarios were also examined in the study.

Planner Dragon reviewed the spatial order of the campus. The study referred to a previous campus landscape study and its connection to the guiding principles within the Olmsted Brothers historic landscape plan. Axis points on campus were specifically designed in the historic landscape plan with the corridors identified for pedestrian and vehicles.

Opportunity site #1 is the site of the GA Building constructed in 1956. The building has been the object of numerous studies. Today, the building is not occupied and has been mothballed.

Assistant Director Frare noted some additional mechanical work on the building remains to be completed, but otherwise the building has been mothballed.

Planner Dragon said the study reviewed several alternatives of renovation and demolition of the building. However, significant improvements required in the building for occupancy are a key consideration.

The Pritchard Building occupies opportunity site #5. The building, constructed in 1958, is partially vacant. Documented existing conditions speak to some parameters required for redesign of the building because of the building's stacks and a relatively small footprint with ceiling height restrictions challenging redevelopment of the building.

The Newhouse Building is opportunity site #6. The building, constructed in 1934, was built as a temporary facility. The building is fully occupied with many redevelopment issues.

Assistant Director Frare noted DES is working on a pre-design study for replacement of the Newhouse Building as authorized in the capital budget.

Director Liu added that although DES is completing a pre-design, there is no authorization to move forward with a new building. The Legislature will review the pre-design and determine next steps, if any.

Planner Dragon reported the ProArts site is opportunity site #12. The smaller facility was acquired for redevelopment potential. The building was constructed in 1959. A portion of the building is leased and some DES employees are housed in the building.

Director Liu said the ProArts site also includes a park containing an historic tree. The state park is included within the block.

Mr. Neary asked whether the park was designated as a boys scout park on the north side of the property near the site of the historic tree. Assistant Director Frare affirmed the boy scouts originally constructed the park, which is owned by the state today.

Planner Dragon reported the study was somewhat challenged because of the lack of programming for each opportunity site. Alternatively, the study architect considered the development capacity of each site in terms of size of building and parking capacity. The study identified several development capacity scenarios for each opportunity site. Alternatives analysis was conducted on each of the scenarios using some project budget information. Costs were factored on 2016/2017 dollars, which should be escalated to account for costs today.

Development alternatives for the GA Building included mothballing, replacement with a surface parking lot, renovation of the building for state agency offices, or replacement of the structure with a new building.

The alternatives analysis for the Pritchard Building considered similar options of pursuing no redevelopment, renovating and adding to the building to obtain additional square footage, renovating the

facility for major events and receptions in support of the Legislature, constructing building office space on the parking lot adjacent to the building, or redesign and construction of a new facility.

Alternatives analysis for the Newhouse Building included replacement of the building, conversion to a joint office space for the House and Senate, or demolishing the building for construction of a surface parking lot.

The ProArts analysis included no action, replacing only the half-block, replacing the full-block, and additional inclusion of information on the size of the buildings and the layout within the landscape.

Within the development alternatives analysis, other observations included integrating solutions to maximize benefits across the campus, consider the possibility of addressing parking demand, identification of programmatic needs of the House and Senate, and acknowledgement that costs are a development constraint. The last major development prior to the Pritchard Building and the 1063 Block Building occurred 60 years ago.

The study summarized costs for existing buildings. The cost for the GA Building is \$500,000 a year to maintain minimal systems with those costs escalating over time. The study estimates the cost of \$140 million to \$150 million to renovate the GA Building. For the Newhouse Building, the study identified the building as past its lifecycle. The building should be replaced because the building is unsafe for occupancy. The Pritchard Building was identified as having cultural and historic values while acknowledging that the conversion of the building for other uses would require a significant effort.

Chair Rolluda asked whether the alternatives analysis also considered renovation of the Pritchard Building as well as development of a new building on the adjacent parking lot. Planner Dragon replied that the study did not explore that option; however, the pre-design effort could include the option.

The report also includes project budget scenarios comprised of sequenced actions with projected costs for each opportunity site. Scenario #1 includes mothballing the GA Building, no action for the Pritchard Building, developing state offices on the Pritchard parking lot with below grade parking for 210 vehicles, replacement of the Newhouse Building with Senate offices with below-grade parking for 210 vehicles, and no action on the ProArts site.

Scenario #2 mothballs the GA Building, no action for the Pritchard Building, replacement of the Newhouse Building with co-located legislative offices with below-grade parking for 420 vehicles, and no action on the ProArts site.

Scenario #3 replaces the GA Building with surface parking for 305 vehicles, expanding or replacing Pritchard Building to co-locate legislative offices, replacing Newhouse Building with surface parking for 350 vehicles, and no action on the ProArts site.

Mr. Jones questioned whether the requested action by the committee is to consider selection or approval of four sites with DES working with the design teams on pre-designs as needs are identified for specific buildings with the design team identifying the appropriate site for the program. Director Frare cited an example of the Newhouse Building. The Legislature provided \$450,000 for pre-design of the Newhouse Building site with several additional specifications to consider. Those specifications included replacement of the Newhouse Building, replacement of the building with a parking lot, and development of a proposal to accommodate Senate and House needs. That direction affords some latitude for DES to examine the Pritchard Building site to include the parking lot, as well as the Newhouse site. As the pre-

design proceeds, the committee will receive updates on progress. Another example is the childcare study and the pre-design appropriation to study a facility for campus childcare. No location was specified for the study enabling DES to explore options. The committee would also receive regular updates.

Assistant Director Frare said the request is to approve the Schacht-Aslani Report and the opportunity sites for future development without constraints as to the pre-design or final designation recognizing the committee's involvement throughout the process when projects have been identified.

Director Liu added that DES functions according to legislative direction and while the committee might approve the sites, when the Legislature directs action for a particular site it signals a pre-design process. However, a completed pre-design does not authorize the development to proceed. The next step is approval of the pre-design by the Legislature and capital budget appropriation to construct the project.

Assistant Director Frare cited several examples of the Heritage Center project for redevelopment of the GA site. DES completed a pre-design for the program but construction was never authorized. A pre-design was also completed for the Newhouse Building in 2007/2008. However, no action followed. There are many examples of initial work completed with no project completed.

Director Liu said DES has completed several pre-designs for the ProArts site without any funding authorized to construct a project.

Senator Hunt remarked that the 1063 Block Replacement project was not even included in the Master Plan.

Chair Rolluda asked about the status of the childcare facility. Assistant Director Frare explained that DES is currently working on both the Newhouse Building and the Childcare Study with different consultants for each study.

Mr. Miles commented that three of the four sites include historic resources. He asked whether the approval of the development sites also includes agreement by the committee that one of the potential alternatives could be the removal of one of the buildings despite being listed on the register. Planner Dragon affirmed that is the intent. Director Liu clarified that the committee's approval signifies its approval for future development of a site. Approval of the request does not imply that the committee approves removal of the building, as that action would be a future determination. For example, the Capitol Court Building is one example where the exterior integrity of the building was preserved while the interior was repurposed to modern standards. Several state agencies occupy that building.

Planner Dragon assured the committee that approval of the development sites does not direct DES to pursue development, as all projects require a study and a review by the CCDAC, as well as legislative authorization prior to moving forward.

Mr. Neary affirmed his understanding of the request authorizing DES to consider potential uses for the sites but not moving forward with any pre-design or construction until approved by the Legislature.

Representative Kraft commented on the historical nature of some of the sites and the importance of considering the overall objectives/priorities, such as more buildings or parking spaces, as it would drive redevelopment activities for each site.

**Senator Hunt moved, seconded by Dan Miles, to approve the capacity findings and recommended scenarios as outlined in the State Capitol, Development Study, Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6 & 12 prepared by Schacht-Aslani Architects and dated March 2016. Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Rolluda reported the second request is pre-approval of the opportunity sites as identified in the study.

Director Liu explained the committee is not acting on any proposal for any building. The request is to approve the opportunity sites with future uses determined later. Representative Kraft's comment of considering all priorities is important because DES would consult with all stakeholders as well as with the Legislature to ensure all options were reviewed and considered. The proposal also does not include any pre-designs previously completed.

**Dan Miles moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to pre-approve the development opportunity sites as outlined in the State Capitol, Development Study, Opportunity Sites #1, #5, #6, & #12 as prepared by Schacht-Aslani Architects and dated March 2016. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **FY2017-19 Enacted Capital Budget and DES Work Plan - Information**

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and Chris Gizzi, DES Capitol Campus Architect, to present the DES work plan for FY 2017-19 Capital Projects.

Assistant Director Frare reported the House and Senate approved Senate Bills 6090 and 6095 during the 2018 legislative session authorizing \$43 million in new construction for DES for improvements on Capitol Campus and for other facilities. He introduced Architect Gizzi, who provided a report on the work plan and the role of CCDAC for approval of future projects.

Architect Gizzi referred to the 2017-19 Capital Budget Projects list. The projects are organized by the level of funding with some exceptions. Architect Gizzi reviewed several of the larger projects.

- ***East Plaza-Water Infiltration & Elevator Repairs*** – This project is a continuation of a multi-phased project initiated by a study completed several years ago. The project has been underway across the Plaza with most of the north area of the Plaza (Central Garage) completed. Phase 5B continues the work to the east portion of the South Plaza located between the Washington State Department of Transportation Building and the Employment Security Building. Additionally, DES identified some electrical deficiencies and hazards and added that scope of work as a separate project, which has since been combined into the overall scope of one project. Funding for the project is comprised of a split between regular capital funding and a COP. Because of the compressed schedule for the biennium, the work will be challenging, as the COP requires a construction contract prior to the purchase of the COP, as well as a limited number of windows for purchasing the COP. DES is pursuing a General Construction/Construction Manager (GC/CM) delivery method for the project and has initiated the selection process to meet schedule requirements for COP funding.

*Representative Kraft left the meeting at 10:50 a.m. (teleconference).*

- ***Building Envelope Repairs*** – The project focuses on cleaning and tuckpointing of several buildings beginning with the Capitol Court Building, which includes an additional component because of some movement of building stones, as well as some stone damage.

*Representative Beth Doglio arrived at the meeting at 10:51 a.m.*

The scope of work also includes a review of the seismic attachment of cladding over building entries that could entail removal of the stone in those locations and reinstalling the stone with seismic clips for improved attachment to the building. The Cherberg and the Insurance Buildings are included in the scope as design work for future construction slated for the 2021 biennium. The consultant selection for the project was combined with the roof replacement project for the Cherberg and Insurance Buildings. For masonry buildings, details are often overlooked specific to the masonry elements meeting roof elements when the project is only specific to one of the elements. Subsequently, the project is an opportunity to examine areas where the two systems meet and develop some corrective actions to address existing deficiencies. DES is currently in the consultant selection process for the project and anticipates selection by the end of the month.

Mr. Jones asked whether the East Plaza project was caused by deterioration of the waterproofing membrane creating potential site design implications. Architect Gizzi replied that a prior study examined a similar product. The project is being driven by long-term issues with the waterproofing system. The challenge is that portions of the garage are failing at different rates with more problems occurring on the west side of the garage than on the east side of the garage, which is why the electrical components were included in the project scope because many of the electrical issues are occurring in the west area. The committee has an opportunity to review the proposals to provide input on replacement of the existing products or consider the prior plan's recommendation of changing the landscaping. An opportunity exists for committee involvement in that design process.

- ***Capitol Lake Long-Term Management Planning Tool*** – Currently, DES is selecting a consultant with interviews scheduled on May 30. The consultant will lead development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The effort involves outreach to the community and numerous public and private stakeholders. EIS is managing the process. The timeline for completion of the EIS is targeted by the end of the biennium. However, the target might be too optimistic as an EIS typically requires a three-year process.

Representative Doglio commented that the capital budget allocated \$4 million of the \$5 million requested by DES. The House Chair indicated that the \$1 million gap would apply to the public process. She asked how DES plans to address the gap with respect to the public process. Assistant Director Frare shared that he had an opportunity to discuss the project with the Chair of the House Capital Committee. His input reflected a desire for local government support in matching funds to support the EIS process. DES plans to contact local jurisdictions for in-kind and cash contributions, but is uncertain whether that support would reduce the overall cost of the EIS especially since escalation is occurring in the market. The DES capital budget request for 2021 would include another million dollars to complete the process. Representative Doglio offered to organize a meeting with the Chair of the House Capital Committee and local stakeholders. She asked whether DES would be interested in participating in a meeting. Assistant Director Frare acknowledged DES would certainly attend the meeting.

Director Liu added that the project is the second phase of a four-phased process. The first phase included formation of a governance committee comprised of local government representatives to include tribal governments. The second phase is completion of the EIS. The third phase would implement the recommended management alternative. The final phase focuses on development of a funding model for long-term management of the lake. The Governance Committee created a Finance Subcommittee comprised of local finance directors to include the state. Some innovative ideas were

identified. The EIS process includes an extensive amount of public input during a thorough process. DES developed a public process map for the project as well as identifying requirements for permitting. He recommended a future briefing on the EIS process as well as reviewing the public process map.

- ***Transportation Building Preservation*** – The project is a multi-biennium project beginning with a conditions assessment, space programming, and analysis of the seismic condition of the building. During the biennium, funding is designated for implementation of design, installation of a new roof, and exploring the feasibility of installing photovoltaics on the roof. Currently, selection of the project consultant is underway. The project is anticipated to extend into the next biennium.
- ***Thurston County Childcare*** – DES engaged with Schacht-Aslani Architects to begin pre-design based on a compressed schedule. A number of dates have been identified for public workshops on May 18, May 24, June 12, and several others until August 15. The committee will receive a briefing on the outcome of the study for input and direction. Multiple sites are under consideration for the childcare center. Program needs will be ascertained as part of outreach efforts.

Senator Hunt noted the project is also considering the four development opportunity sites as a possible location for the childcare center.

- ***Next Century Capitol Campus Study*** – The project is a study of the powerhouse. The energy study completed last biennium examined future options for locating a powerhouse on Capitol Campus to replace the existing powerhouse. The proposal is a third-party assessment of the investment grid audit. The current state is a mix of centralized and decentralized systems throughout buildings on campus. Over time, systems have become decentralized and likely would continue until the project is implemented. An opportunity exists to centralize systems and move away from a steam plant that serves portions of buildings to a plant providing hot and cold water, as well as electricity campus-wide. The cost analysis needs to be fully vetted for the project. The intent is to lower the costs of day-to-day energy usage on campus, as well as the costs of future development and maintenance costs.

Assistant Director Frare reported the Investment Grade Audit examined not only the power plant distribution system for cold and steam throughout the campus, but also recognized steam is an outdated delivery method. Today, the loss of energy equals two-thirds of the output between heating the water at the power plant and delivering energy into buildings. Much of the steam system was developed prior to any standard testing methodology for materials and equipment. The system routinely experiences water leaks throughout the distribution system often requiring requests for emergency funds through OFM to address repairs. The project is timely to address the aging and ineffective power plant. During the previous submission of capital funds during the last budget cycle, the proposal was for a \$125 million project, without sufficient stakeholder input external to DES. DES had recognized the problem of proposing a solution without sufficient outreach to decision-makers. The proposed study entails a third-party verification of the assumptions of the audit.

Representative Doglio inquired about the identity of the party completing the third-party verification. Planner Dragon advised that the consultant has not been selected at this time. The budget includes \$250,000 for a pre-design study. An investment grade audit is one step beyond a pre-design because it includes a maximum price and performance guarantee. In lieu of completing a

second pre-design, DES is moving forward with third-party verification and soliciting stakeholder input.

Representative Doglio questioned whether a decision has been determined on the type of system. Assistant Director Frare replied that the audit includes a number of recommendations with the preferred recommendation of a combined heat and power system with a generator supplying a portion of the electricity for Capitol Campus using natural gas. Waste heat from the generation plant would be used for heating campus buildings.

Representative Doglio asked whether alternatives not using natural gas or fossil fuels were identified. Assistant Director Frare replied that the Investment Grade Audit did not consider an alternative without natural gas; however, DES conversations with both Representative Doglio and the Governor's Office have been ongoing concerning other alternatives.

Architect Gizzi pointed out that natural gas was considered because on-site generation experiences a reduction in use loss because of electricity line loss. Generating electricity on site increases the efficiency of natural gas, as well as using waste to heat buildings. In an ideal situation in the future, the use of carbon generated energy would no longer be necessary. The proposed strategy minimizes the impacts caused from coal production.

Director Liu shared that DES has had many discussions with the LOTT Clean Water Alliance, City of Olympia, and Thurston County about using purple pipe (reclaimed water) to generate necessary reductions in energy use. Each methodology has positives and benefits, as well as drawbacks. There are many advocates for purple pipe. To utilize reclaimed water, a circular pipeline would need to be installed between the LOTT Wastewater Plant and Capitol Campus. The Helen Sommers Building (1063 Building) includes ground source heat to achieve a reduction in future lifecycle costs.

Assistant Director Frare invited Representative Doglio to participate in the consultant selection process and review the alternatives.

Representative Doglio asked about the lifespan of the combined heat and power system. Assistant Director Frare replied that the design factors a 100-year lifespan. One of the project's constraints is cost. The model for the proposal includes a 50-year payback on the system. There is also recognition that technology continually changes, which would be incorporated within the plans.

- ***Legislature Building Exterior Preservation Cleaning*** – DES has engaged with the previous design firm that completed the design scope for the 2012 cleaning of the dome. The firm has the drawings of the building and the experience of scoping the project as the company is familiar with the building. Design is expected to be completed quickly. DES anticipates moving forward with the bidding process with work commencing this summer/early fall recognizing the work is weather-dependent and subject to legislative activities requiring coordination and the elimination of legislative disruption.
- ***Conservatory Demo*** – DES engaged with a firm to complete an analysis and prepare bidding documents for the project. The building has a number of utilities connecting to and crossing through the building. Additionally, the projects presents a swing place challenge as a portion of the building is used for buildings and grounds staff to maintain grounds on West Campus in addition to a storage

yard for lawn equipment. DES is identifying the location of swing space. The design should be completed quickly with demolition of the building completed during the biennium.

- ***Newhouse Replacement Pre-design*** – The project is detailed in the State Capitol Development Study. The pre-design will identify program needs and explore opportunity sites in more detail. The selection process for the study was recently initiated with selection still pending.
- ***Relocation of Mural from GA to Helen Summer Building*** – DES contracted with an architectural firm in Seattle to develop relocation plans. Draft plans were recently provided to DES, and are under review by DES. While the design concept is straightforward, construction will be challenging. The existing historic mural is attached to a concrete masonry wall within the GA Building. The consultant has indicated the storefront (or entry) of the GA Building must be removed in order to remove the mural together with the attached wall. The rear storefront of the Helen Sommers Building must also be removed to place the mural (and wall) in its preferred location within the building. . Decisions and work performed made during design and construction of the Helen Somers Building also pose challenges with installation of the new mural at its desired location. These challenges will require additional work within the building.

Representative Doglio asked whether the funding allocation is for the beginning phase of the project. Architect Gizzi replied that two separate funding amounts were identified in the funding for the project. The combination of both amounts is less than the DES request based on the assumption that the movement of the mural would have occurred prior to the completion of the 1063 Building. With completion of the 1063 Building, the cost increases because of the required removal of structural components to relocate the mural inside the building. Language in the funding package was confusing as some funds were contingent on DES fundraising.

Assistant Director Frare suggested contacting OFM to clarify the intent of the funding restriction for the additional \$120,000. The funding appropriation was \$275,000 with another \$118,000 and proviso language stipulating fundraising; however, he is uncertain as to what that would entail.

Representative Doglio inquired about the possibility of placing the mural in another building. She asked about the decision-making for placement of the mural in the Helen Sommers Building. Director Liu advised that the decision occurred during the pre-design process for the Helen Sommers Building. Initially, the intent was to move the mural into the unfinished building; however, because of concerns about costs, the cost to move the mural was removed from the budget for the building. Today, moving the mural encumbers more costs because of the removal of building elements in both buildings. Originally, placement of the mural in the new building was viewed as a replacement for the GA Building because it would reside in an historic and meaningful place within the new building. However, today's circumstances might prompt a different discussion. As DES continues to move forward based on current direction, the Legislature could agree to change direction.

Architect Gizzi added that DES has a draft of the relocation plan. The dollar value of the project places it as a minor works project, which typically does not require requests for reappropriation. DES assumes the work should be completed by this biennium. Additionally, preliminary work completed to address plaster work surrounding the mural discovered the presence of asbestos. The contractor has begun the abatement process to ensure the next step can move forward. There is an expectation to complete the project before the end of the biennium. Postponing relocation of the mural also should be considered in the context of mothballing the GA Building. DES will continue

to maintain limited heating in the building to protect the existing structure and mural. Relocation of the mural to the Helen Summer Building was centered on moving the piece to a building with active public activity. The design of the new building also included placement of the mural. DES should have sufficient information on whether the budget is adequate to complete the project within the next several weeks.

Mr. Neary asked whether DES plans to duplicate the cleaning process used for the Temple of Justice Building for the Legislative Building cleaning project. Assistant Director Frare replied the process and cleaning materials would be different. Staff has incorporated lessons learned from the Temple of Justice cleaning project.

Architect Gizzi reported on the advantage of having the same architecture firm assigned to the project. During the previous cleaning project, some testing of different biocide wash products were tested against areas with no application of wash (power washed). After a year, there was no appreciable visual difference between the areas treated with wash and those areas power washed. The project affords an opportunity for the architects to analyze the condition of the test areas to determine if there were any noticeable differences in growth patterns. The Temple of Justice project used biocide. The application was effective and resulted in minimal impact to existing stone.

Senator Hunt inquired about the status of the campus security project.

Architect Gizzi advised of the engagement of a security consultant. DES and the consultant are currently engaged in a walk-through of all locations on campus because of the difference in security operations between the buildings. Some agencies prefer direct public access while other agencies prefer less public access. The process will document all security needs and concerns of each agency and the differences in each building. He has participated in a tour of three buildings with the team. The process has been a thorough analysis of program concerns and ascertaining how each agency handles security. After the consultant team completes all building tours, a detailed report will be prepared.

Senator Hunt commented that the term “security” harks of more metal detectors on campus. Planner Dragon reported Bob Covington, Director of Security, is leading the effort, and anticipates the study to be completed by August. The study will document required comprehensive security needs on campus. The study will also challenge DES in terms of balancing public open space and campus security, campus circulation, areas of increased security, and the bigger security picture of safeguarding the campus for employees and the public. The study will feed into the Master Plan to ensure DES is on target for facility-wide planning, policies, and guidance.

Director Liu added that it is important to ensure DES has good data to help inform decisions. The next step is determining the willingness to fund any security recommendations. The discussion will likely be difficult based on current events occurring across the country. Three prior incidents point to the probability of an incident but also to the ability to respond quickly. A comprehensive security system would enable an enhanced response. Director Liu described some of the pitfalls associated with the current camera system.

Senator Hunt asked whether campus beautification is included as a project. Assistant Director Frare affirmed the beautification project is moving forward through Buildings and Grounds with planning underway by the department’s horticulturist. Additional plantings are scheduled along campus

corridors. Flower baskets were recently added to the planting circle. Staff offered to include a briefing on the project during the committee's September meeting.

Architect Gizzi noted the East Plaza project includes large planter areas used by the community for vegetable gardens. Those areas will be impacted by the project and the intent is not to impact the harvesting of crops. It is anticipated that the design phase will consider those planting areas.

Assistant Director Frare spoke to the need for swing space with respect to the Newhouse Building and the Washington State Department of Transportation Building projects. Swing space will be considerable pre-design issues requiring additional exploration.

### **Operating and Capital Budget Preparation for FY2019-21 – Informational**

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare, who provided an update on the planning process and timeline for preparing FY2019-2021 Operating and Capital Budgets.

Assistant Director Frare reported budget submittal is due to OFM by October 8. A number of other milestone dates are included as well. The intent by both the CCDAC and SCC is to keep the Master Plan actionable by development of a 10-year capital plan to meet plan goals. Last October, DES completed an organizational restructure to dedicate an FTE and other resources to master planning. Input was obtained from OFM Facility Oversight, as well as legislative staff on desired capital budget expenditures and ways to improve the overall process.

Facility representatives, agency leadership, and building tenants have provided feedback on the budget process, as well as on building conditions and recommendations for improvements to buildings.

During the winter, DES completed an assessment of all campus buildings and developed a deficiency list for each building. The process also included a review of the 10-year capital plan. Feedback from OFM and legislative staff recommended more planning of the plan to avoid major adjustments every two years. Completion of projects designated during the first biennium enables the set of second biennium projects to move forward. All new projects added to the plan should be well documented and justified. A good example of inappropriate inclusion of a project was the power plant project, which was included in the first biennium without sufficient stakeholder input. After a thorough review of the 10-year capital plan, some adjustments to the plan occurred with respect to feedback for consistency, as well as a review of successful delivery of projects over a two-year period, which informs capacity capability and what DES is able to accomplish. The review also examined the amount of legislative budget authorization relative to budget requests. Typically, the plan includes twice the volume than what the Legislature provides. Over the last 10 years, the budgeting and financial period has been difficult for the state. The lowest budget appropriation totaled \$30 million with the highest at \$60 million with an average of \$50 million. Last year, the appropriation was \$43 million with \$17 million in new appropriation.

Coordination occurs between the capital budget and the operating budget in terms of funding projects and whether the need is a reoccurring maintenance requirement or a capital improvement. Over the last several years, many operating projects were transferred to the capital budget because of the lack of capacity within the operating budget to complete the work. The intent is to reclassify a number of those projects, such as regular maintenance of buildings, painting, new carpeting, as well as cleaning of the dome and the Temple of Justice and moving the projects from the capital budget to the operating budget because the work is required every eight years. Another connection between the two budgets is the security study. DES anticipates the study will identify both operating components for management of a security system as well as capital components for security improvements across the campus. Maintenance

level increases are included in the operating budget, which will be explored in terms of the contract with Washington State Patrol for security and police enforcement on campus. The elevator contract and fire protection contracts are through the City of Olympia.

Grounds maintenance expenses are included in the Public and Historic Fund. The budget has continually operated at a deficit for a number of years with costs supplemented from the Central Services Billing Model to cover costs. The Central Services Building Model is intended for operational costs within buildings. Sufficient funds are available within the Public and Historic Fund to maintain grounds.

Finally, the last component in the connection between the operating and the capital budget is master planning. DES intends to present a capital request for an upgrade of the 2006 Master Plan. The last Master Plan was completed at the policy level and lacked visioning for the campus over the next 20 years. The update of the plan will include defining a vision of the campus over the next 20 years to assist DES in the development of a 10-year plan to achieve incrementally without the addition of projects disrupting the long-term vision, such as the 1063 Building, which was not included in the Master Plan.

Chair Rolluda stressed the importance of committee designers reviewing any future designs adopted within the plan. Director Liu agreed DES should pursue forward thinking to ensure all concepts are shared with the CCDAC. The action by the committee for approving the opportunity sites was a first step in a pre-approval process. It is important to convey to the Legislature the importance of the CCDAC as an active committee with extensive knowledge and experience. Many design considerations should be reviewed by the committee to ensure sustainability of the process. Additionally, legislative members on the committee should continually share information with other legislators and committees.

#### **Capitol Campus Master Planning Efforts Update – Informational**

Planner Dragon briefed members on the status of the master planning effort. Prior references for capital requests for master planning should also include the operational aspect of master planning by increasing resources to complete the plan and move forward with implementation.

Unfortunately, the update of the master plan has stalled. DES identified a need for a comprehensive review of the campus as a whole but has limited capacity to complete the work. The operating budget includes a request for additional FTEs and upgrading technology tools, such as GIS tools to develop different development scenarios and sequencing events in terms of future development activity on campus. Issues identified include the lack of swing space and sequencing the removal and construction of buildings to meet programmatic needs on campus. DES is working on developing a strategy and process to address those issues.

The 2006 Master Plan Update has been stalled with more focus on the operational and capital budgets planning efforts for FY2019-21 and beyond. A better job is necessary to identify overlapping needs on campus against campus priorities.

Representative Doglio questioned the steps DES plans to pursue to implement the process moving forward. Planner Dragon advised that much of the effort is transitional while acknowledging the need to work within current systems and capital and operational planning processes to ensure the decision package is developed in conjunction with adoption of the master plan. Representative Doglio questioned whether a legislative decision-making process is involved. Assistant Director Frare said improvements to the planning process will stem from two elements: a capital budget request to hire a consultant to complete an update to the master plan; and an operating budget request to hire a consultant to assist DES with the update of the Master Plan. The operating budget request intends to establish a dedicated facility

planning and policy team within FPS. Two FTEs will be added to current staff levels during the first fiscal year and an additional FTE in the second fiscal year to perform GIS analysis in support facility planning and policy development.

Director Liu added that DES has a volume of data not fully utilized to benefit the agency. Data on forecasting campus needs are available, as well as future capacity needs. For example, parking capacity has been identified as an issue. A second building block is doing the homework and pursuing the legislative process earlier rather than later to inform decision-makers of the needs and why they are important while providing the necessary information for informed decision-making. Although DES received 50% of its budget requests, the agency could have done a better job of preparing the business case for each budget request. That process can be improved by DES, OFM, and other agencies requesting funding. Earlier involvement with the Legislature is needed rather than later. Next steps for the committee include analyzing data to ascertain whether it is possible to make informed decisions and prioritizing decisions based on data. DES has the responsibility to present the business case to the Legislature to act based on all other conflicting priorities in the state.

Senator Hunt stressed the importance of also including the legislative committee chairs and not just legislative CCDAC members.

*Representative Doglio left the meeting at 12:04 p.m.*

Mr. Neary expressed appreciation for enabling his participation by telephone.

#### **Public Comments and Closing Remarks**

There were no public comments.

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled on Thursday, September 20, 2018.

#### **Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Rolluda adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.**