

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

November 8, 2018
10:00 a.m.

Final Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Rolluda, Chair, Architect
Representative Vicki Kraft
Dennis Haskell, Urban Planner
Senator Sam Hunt
Chris Jones, Landscape Architect
Dan Miles, Architect #2
Kim Wyman, Secretary of State

Representative Beth Doglio
Senator Ann Rivers

OTHERS PRESENT:

Max DeJarnatt, City of Olympia
Debra Delzell, Department of Enterprise Services
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services
Jamie Elderkin, Schacht Aslani Architects
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Marygrace Goddu, Department of Enterprise Services
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services
Bob Jacobs, N. Cap. Camp. Heritage Pk. Dev. Assn.
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services

Jean-Claude Letourneau, Schacht Aslani Architects
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Patrick McDonald, Secretary of State
Allen Miller, N. Cap. Camp. Heritage Pk. Dev. Assn.
Mark Neary, Secretary of State
Sheri Nelson, Secretary of State
Rachel Newmann, South Cap. Neighborhood Assn
Kevin Pierce, Legislative Support Services
Ronell Witt, Department of Enterprise Services

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Alex Rolluda called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. A quorum was present.

Chair Rolluda reviewed the agenda topics: Recognize long-time outgoing member Dennis Haskell for his service to the committee; Review findings and preferred alternatives and offer a recommendation on the Library-Archives Building Predesign; receive a briefing on the status of the Newhouse Replacement Predesign, receive an update on Master Planning, and receive an update on DES Capital Projects.

Members and staff provided self-introduction.

Approval of Minutes – September 20, 2018

A correction was requested to the minutes of September 20, 2017:

On page 7, within the third paragraph, comments attributed to Mr. Miles should be corrected to reflect, “Mr. Jones.”

Secretary Wyman moved, seconded by Senator Hunt, to approve the minutes of September 20, 2018 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Honor CCDAC Member Dennis Haskell - Recognition

Chair Rolluda recognized Dennis Haskell for his service on the committee. Mr. Haskell was appointed by former Washington State Governor Gary Locke in 2004. His membership has been continuously extended since his appointment. He served the committee as Chair and Vice Chair during his tenure. His current term ends on December 31, 2018. Mr. Haskell has indicated he is departing from the committee when his term expires. Having served as a foundational member, Mr. Haskell provided support and vision during the preparation of the 2006 Master Plan, 2009 Historic Landscape Master Plan, and the 2017 State Capitol Development Study for Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6 and 12. Mr. Haskell guided the committee in deliberations over notable milestones, such as the redevelopment of the East Capitol Campus, Heritage Park, 1500 Jefferson Building site and landscape development, Campus South Edge Planning efforts, Heritage Center Executive Office Building planning, and Capitol Lake Lower Deschutes Watershed Phase Information and Planning. His distinguished professional experience and unique skills as an AIA Fellow will be missed by CCDAC, the State Capitol Committee, and the State Legislature. His exceptional experience and work in the field of architecture and urban planning will be difficult to replace on the committee. The committee extends great appreciation for his many years of dedicated service and wishes him nothing but the best after his terms ends on December 31, 2018.

Mr. Haskell expressed appreciation to members and conveyed how it has been a privilege to serve on the committee. The experience has been wonderful and he enjoyed working with everyone over the years. When he joined the committee, Representative Hunt was also serving on the committee as a member of the House of Representatives. Today, as a Senator, he continues to serve on the committee. Mr. Haskell thanked Senator Hunt for his commitment to the committee over the years.

Director Liu commented on the helpfulness of Mr. Haskell when he first arrived at DES, as well as guiding him as to the importance of the committee's work. While the CCDAC is an advisory committee, the work of the committee is important as it requires research to ensure the SCC is well-informed and has sufficient information to render decisions. Mr. Haskell, over the course of his service, led the opinions and the meetings and ensured the committee remained on track. He is appreciative of Mr. Haskell's service to the state as Mr. Haskell is exemplary of the kinds of citizens in Washington State.

Senator Hunt thanked Mr. Haskell for his 14 years of service. His even-handed service and strong leadership helped guide the committee's work over the years. Although, there were many pitfalls along the way, the committee successfully avoided many because of Mr. Haskell's leadership and understanding of issues.

Secretary Wyman thanked Mr. Haskell for his expertise and technical understanding of issues over the many years. Mr. Haskell served as a voice of reason and calm and helped members navigate through many issues.

Chair Rolluda presented Mr. Haskell with a Letter of Acknowledgement and Appreciation, a framed picture of the State Capitol Building, and a small piece of the building's cupola that fell during the 1949 earthquake.

Library-Archives Building Predesign Update - Action

Chair Rolluda introduced Mark Neary, Assistant Secretary of State, and Patrick McDonald, Office of the Secretary of State. They briefed the committee on the proposed predesign for a new Library-Archives Building.

Mr. Neary reported that in the early 2000s, the capacity of the Archives Building was nearly full. Planning efforts began on a project to ensure the state's history was preserved and protected. In 2001, the State Library moved from the Pritchard Building on Capitol Campus to an office building in Tumwater. That building was modified to some degree but it was not designed to house the collection and provide accessibility to the public. Upon Kim Wyman's election as Secretary of State, efforts began to create a vision for protection of the state's special collections and records. In 2013, following the recession and a lack of funds, the proposed Heritage Center failed to move forward. However, the amount of work, time, and effort on the design of the Heritage Center serves as the basis today for a new Library-Archives Building. The new plan is different and lacks some components the Heritage Center proposal offered. The proposed site is also not located on Capitol Campus.

A number of different sites were considered for the project to include on and off campus. Legislative action in 2015 authorized the construction of a new Library-Archives Building next to an existing modular building in Tumwater. The intent was to relocate the State Printer to afford space for the new building and expand into an existing records space. As state agencies are required to retain records, storage will transition to electronic means reducing the need for physical storage space. Existing space could be used for archival storage. The proposal was unsuccessful for a number of reasons requiring a revamped proposal to the Legislature to re-do the predesign for a Library-Archives Building for siting the building on one of three possible sites. The selected site is located at the corner of Tumwater Boulevard and Linderson Way. The area is considered the South Capitol Campus because it is located next to several state agencies that are also major customers of the Office of the Secretary of State. They include the Department of Corrections, Department of Labor and Industries (L&I), and the Department of Revenue.

As the sites were evaluated, staff met with a number of officials from the City of Tumwater, Port of Olympia, legislative staff, and DES. The Legislature approved an allocation of \$500 million in the capital budget last year to move forward on a design following the selection of a site. Staff is seeking approval to move forward with the design. The Legislature also stipulated that the Secretary of State (SOS) would be required to secure funding for the project because of the lack of capacity for general obligation debt. SOS plans to secure funding through the issuance of a Certificate of Participation. The proposed funding plan will be presented to the Legislature. SOS intends to utilize all existing rents and lease of spaces with a request for assessment of additional fees to fund payments for the Certificate of Participation for construction of the facility.

The proposed project is a 175,000 square-foot facility that would include the State Library, State Archives, Elections Division, and Corporations Division. The building would house the Washington State Archives and special collections in the State Library, as well as the collections available for public viewing. The site is located adjacent to Interstate 5 and is accessible to the public. Consolidating other divisions will benefit the SOS financially by providing a funding source.

Mr. McDonald added that approximately 22 states have combined state libraries and archives in one facility. The State of Alaska's SOS facility is serving as the model for this project. The facility includes space for a research room.

In 1961 when the current Archives Building was constructed, it was considered a cutting-edge design. Today, the building is the most archaic archives building in the nation. The proposed plan required a site sufficient in size to maintain archival storage on a single floor moving away from the current configuration of overhead sewer lines within the storage rooms. The briefing is important to ensure the committee is aware that a new site was selected. Both the City of Tumwater and the Port of Olympia are supportive of efforts by SOS. The last step in the process is to present the proposal to the SCC with a goal to present the proposal to the Legislature in January 2019.

Secretary Wyman advised that she would abstain from voting on the proposal. However, it is important to note the difference between records and archives. Archives are the permanent records representing the history of the state. Today, those records are located across from the Capitol in a building originally used as a bomb shelter. The building is literally under water with the presence of overhead water and sewer lines. Several accidental close calls have occurred putting the archives at risk. Paper and microfilm continue to serve as the archival standard because electronic methods continue to evolve and change.

Senator Hunt commented that the preferred new site previously was used as an oil storage facility. He asked whether soil on the site had been tested. Mr. McDonald advised of the site's completed mitigation. The SOS has retained a copy of the SEPA mitigation document.

Senator Hunt inquired about several historic buildings located near the site. Mr. McDonald replied that adjacent to the site are two buildings. One is a 1920s grange hall and the second is an 1897 school building. Both buildings were moved to the site in 1942 at the request of the Army Air Corps because of the proximity of the buildings to the airport runway. Both buildings are in disrepair but usable. Construction trailers for the project are estimated to cost approximately \$200,000. Rather than renting construction trailers, staff proposes to upgrade the grange building and use the building as the construction trailer. The proposal is to enter into a long-term lease with the Grange Association to provide the building for grange meetings, as well as providing space in the historic building to feature archival or legacy collections. Additionally, the Port of Olympia asked SOS to include the forested area to the north, which was planted in the 1890s.

Chair Rolluda asked about the schedule for the project. Mr. McDonald said that following approval by the SCC and the Legislature, the intent is to schedule a ceremonial groundbreaking for November 10, 2019, which represents the 130th anniversary of statehood. Selection of the predesign would enable construction to begin in January 2020 with completion by mid-2021. The facility, a two-story structure, would only house the SOS with no other state agency tenants.

Mr. Jones asked whether the proposal includes a museum component similar to the Alaska model. Mr. McDonald said that several of the state's Library employees worked on the Alaska project. Although the project does not include a museum component, a reading room is proposed.

Mr. Neary added that many displays are featured in the Secretary of State's Office in the Legislative Building. The legacy division has several creative employees who have documented Washington State history. The employees also work closely with teachers to develop curriculum as the campus hosts many students throughout the year. The intent is to feature some similar displays in the new facility documenting some of the special archives and library collections.

Mr. McDonald noted that approximately 70% of the books Governor Stevens brought with him are included in the library collection and would be displayed in the new building. Many of the collections are in storage lacking facilities for displaying the materials.

Chair Rolluda asked whether SRG is serving as the project architect. Mr. McDonald advised that SRG is the consultant for the predesign. Guidance from DES includes pursuing a GC/CM project delivery with the contractor hired at the same time as the architect to work together as a team.

Mr. Miles asked about transportation access other than single-occupancy vehicles to the site. Mr. McDonald said the site is served by major bus lines serving Thurston, Pierce, Lewis, and Grays Harbor Counties. The site is located near a freeway entrance. Plans are included to add electric vehicle infrastructure and transit facilities. The site is also served by the State Motor Pool. The site takes advantage of all available transportation modes.

Secretary Wyman noted that because the site would enable consolidation of all SOS divisions, customers would be able to complete multiple transactions, as well as having nearby access to the Department of Revenue and the Department of Labor and Industries.

Chair Rolluda reminded members that the committee reviewed site selection for the new Library-Archives Building at the modular building site in Tumwater in November 2016. A recommendation was forwarded to the State Capitol Committee, which acted in December 2017 to approve the preferred site and approve the findings and recommendations offered in the predesign report. He asked for a motion to forward a recommendation to the SCC for the approval of the updated predesign report, which amends the preferred development site for the Washington State Library-Archives Building as a parcel of land located at the corner of Linderson Way and Tumwater Boulevard in Tumwater.

Dan Miles moved, seconded by Senator Hunt, to recommend approval to the State Capitol Committee of the updated Predesign Report, which amends the preferred development site for the Washington State Library-Archives Building as a parcel of land located at the corner of Linderson Way and Tumwater Boulevard in Tumwater, Washington. Motion carried. Secretary Wyman and Dennis Haskell abstained.

Representative Vicki Kraft arrived at the meeting at 10:38 a.m.

Newhouse Replacement Predesign – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Bill Frare, Facilities Professional Services Assistant Director, DES, and Jean-Claude Letourneau, Schacht Aslani Architects. The presenters will review the purpose and predesign effort and outline the findings of the design workshops held in connection with the Newhouse Replacement Predesign Report.

Assistant Director Frare reported that at the time of the last update, the predesign had recently been initiated. Since then, five workshops have been conducted to solicit information from stakeholders.

Mr. Letourneau introduced Jamie Elderkin with Schacht Aslani Architects. Ms. Elderkin is assigned to the project.

Mr. Letourneau reported the project has been organized into two phases and is currently in the first phase. The last workshop was held earlier in the week. During the workshop, some of the site development options were presented. The goal is to prepare a briefing document by the end of November with a set of alternative development options and costs to assist decision-makers in narrowing the scope and development options to move forward to Phase 2. At that time, the committee will receive a presentation on the selected alternative development options. By spring 2019, the team anticipates

completing detailed analysis of the preferred alternative, the project budget analysis, and development of the predesign document for review by the Office of Financial Management (OFM).

The scope of the project considers the office and support needs for both the Senate and the House and associated parking implications. The initial needs assessment for House, Senate, and support space identified a space need of 90,000 gross square feet to include additional hearing rooms for the House and the Pritchard Building cafeteria. Mr. Letourneau shared a graphic depicting the spaces break down between the House and the Senate and the legislative agencies (Code Reviser, Support Services, Legislative Tech, and Public Space (cafeteria/kitchen). Parking requirements identify a need of between 220 and 270 parking spaces dependent upon City of Olympia parking requirements and commute trip reduction calculations.

Jamie Elderkin reviewed three development options to accommodate program needs. The first option includes separate buildings for the House, Senate, and respective support services. The second option would locate all users in one building. The third option would consider a new program within the existing site of the Newhouse Building. The first two options include underground parking. The third option includes no changes to current parking. As one of the three options includes more square footage, the team's calculations for all three options are based on the same amount of required space.

The first option would replace the Newhouse Building for the Senate within the current location with a new building for the House constructed on the Pritchard Building parking lot site. Legislative agencies supporting the House and Senate are currently located in the Pritchard Building in less desired functional space because of the library stacks. The proposal would remove the stacks and replace them with four stories of office space. The House and Senate buildings would both be two-story buildings with underground parking.

The second option of one building housing all programs includes three sub-options. The first sub-option would demolish the current Pritchard Building and replace it with a four-story/basement building on axis with the Legislative Building to accommodate all programs. Two parking options include underground parking of 270-280 stalls or removal of the Newhouse Building and the Press Houses for surface parking of 233 parking spaces. The second sub-option retains the historic character of the Pritchard Building by preserving the front façade of the building with the stacks demolished and replaced with a four-story building for Senate, House, and support agencies. Parking could be accommodated by an underground garage or removal of the Press Houses and the Newhouse Building for surface parking providing fewer spaces. The third sub-option renovates the Pritchard Building for the legislative agencies with a new three-story building for Senate and House offices on the Pritchard parking lot with an underground parking lot.

The third option to replace the Newhouse Building requires some logistical strategies during construction to relocate tenants. No additional parking would be required for the third option.

All the options are continually evolving based on feedback during each workshop. The briefing document will include a narrowed list of options.

Mr. Letourneau reported the team is examining options to achieve net-zero energy standards. The team is directed by Executive Order 18-01. The project would be procured through a competitive Design-Build selection process requiring an energy performance guarantee. It is important to balance on-site solar panel installation on the roof of the building dependent upon development options, square footage, and the footprint of the building. Solar panels located on the site or on the roof would result in some

architectural implications. The issue continues to be discussed. Structured parking also impacts energy use intensity of the building from ventilation, exhaust, lighting, and elevators, which increase the output of energy to some degree. The team is identifying impacts of the net-zero energy equation and whether a connection to the central plant would produce a net-zero energy project. Options include connecting to the central plant or pursuing a stand-alone option. Occupant behavior will also be a factor in the consideration.

Representative Kraft asked about the extra cost to the project to achieve net-zero energy goals. Mr. Letourneau said reducing energy costs do not typically add cost to the level where the building is able to achieve net-zero ready standards. The additional costs are the solar panels. A EUI target of 25 is approximately 25% better than the energy code. The intent is to reduce the cost of solar by achieving energy savings.

Senator Hunt asked whether the team had the option of considering the entire block of the Newhouse Building along with the Press Houses. Ms. Elderkin confirmed that the option was considered; however, the main issue was the proximity of House offices because most of the work by employees occurs at the O'Brien Building or the Legislative Building.

Mr. Haskell questioned why the third option did not include the other uses by locating all programs on one site. Ms. Elderkin said the third option was directed by the proviso. Assistant Director Frare added that the three options were included in the proviso. Option C within the proviso directed a review of replacing the Newhouse Building only but with no parking.

Mr. Haskell questioned the lack of an option to consider placement of all programs on the Newhouse Building site. Ms. Elderkin advised that an earlier workshop included that option.

Assistant Director Frare shared that during discussions with each program designated to occupy the new building, stakeholders clearly articulated that the proximity between the Newhouse block and the O'Brien Building was too far. The concern was ensuring individuals would be able to access hearings on time.

Master Planner Dragon pointed out that as part of the workshop reviews, all the functions involving Legislative Support Services, Code Revisers Office, Leg Tech, and public spaces in one facility appeared to transition away from the nucleolus of the O'Brien, Cherberg, and the Legislative Buildings. The stakeholder committee conveyed that it would be too much of a burden to locate too far away.

Mr. Haskell offered that extra minutes of walking would not be detrimental to anyone and it appears that an opportunity has been lost.

Assistant Director Frare said the proviso speaks to the House and Senate on one site with square footage of 120,000 to 140,000. After reviewing programming needs, the true space need is 85,000 square feet. That programming need also was a factor in the configurations presented. Mr. Haskell noted that Option B1 includes all programs in one building, which could be on the Newhouse site.

Master Planner Dragon indicated that the comments by the committee would be shared with the stakeholder group.

Secretary Wyman pointed out that Option C does not include the House or other support services.

Mr. Haskell commented on the importance of preserving the front of the Pritchard Building because demolishing the entire building would not be in the best interests of the campus. Secondly, the study completed many years ago concerning the south edge of the campus and protecting the neighborhood from future development is an important consideration as well. The results of that study should be considered in terms of any new development buffering the south edge of the campus.

Representative Kraft conveyed appreciation for the presentation of the various options. She asked about any cost comparisons between the options. Mr. Letourneau said the intent of the final report is to include cost information with the final options.

Mr. Miles asked whether stakeholder priorities were clear because it appears during the workshops some issues were identified, such as the functional issue of distance for the House from its current location and the importance of the legislative activities within the campus nucleolus. Ms. Elderkin responded that the main concern was the proximity of House offices to hearing rooms and the Legislative Building.

Master Planner Dragon added that additionally, decision-maker priorities for the proposal are important for the team to understand to ensure the proposal satisfies those visions.

Mr. Haskell stressed the importance of addressing urban design of the campus and what is best for the campus, which is the role of the CCDAC moving forward in terms of development, opportunity sites, framing the west lawn, and other visions in plans for the design of the campus.

Chair Rolluda agreed with recommendations to preserve the front façade of the Pritchard Building, consider the campus holistically, and consider future uses on the campus.

Master Planning Update – Informational

Chair Rolluda recognized Assistant Director Frare and Master Planner Dragon. The informational briefing includes two budget requests for master planning efforts.

Assistant Director Frare reported DES submitted a capital budget request and an operating budget request. Several previous projects have tested the importance of urban design for the campus and consideration of the campus holistically. Many pending issues need to be addressed on the campus involving sequencing, swing space, protection of view corridors, and the importance of ensuring planning principles for the campus are recognized and acknowledged through the design process for new development. One major concern for the campus is the Power Plant. The plant is no longer efficient with boilers over 50 years of age. At some point, the boilers will fail. It will be important for the campus to move effectively to a new energy source to meet carbon goals and achieve energy efficiency while maintaining a campus heating system. When the 1063 Block project was completed, the building could have been added to the district heating system. When the 1500 Jefferson Building was completed, it also could have been added to the district heating system. Pending the redevelopment of the Newhouse site, the issue is whether the new building should be connected to the district heating system or should it be a stand-alone system. The process for analyzing those situations falls under Executive Order 18.01 and the desire for net-zero and carbon neutrality. Because of the multitude of needs and issues, DES cannot adequately analyze all considerations on a project-by-project basis. It requires a process within the confines of a master plan whereby the campus is considered as a whole.

The first budget request is supporting Master Plan planning efforts totaling \$1.3 million to establish a vision, common goals, and objectives to attain the goals for the campus, while acknowledging and understanding needs, current building conditions, and planning needs over a minimum 10-year horizon.

The operating budget request is to add staff capacity of four positions to work with consultants responsible for updating the Master Plan and to assist in guiding the process and stakeholder facilitation with campus neighbors, City of Olympia, and other stakeholders. Two positions would be responsible for GIS analysis as GIS Analysts. GIS is the acronym for “Geographic Information Systems,” a technology enabling DES to produce all information pertinent to the campus in a spatial format. The technology enables different layers of overlapping information to conduct analysis on various aspects of the built environment. DES currently lacks GIS capabilities as the department relies on construction drawings. Many of the drawings have not been converted electronically. DES needs to move to a GIS system to respond to questions and complete analyses on different requests and projects. The two budget requests complement one another. The lack of approval of one of the requests would still enable some progress although not as quickly. Compiling the information for the Master Plan could be delayed creating more burdens on resources. The briefing is intended to convey the vision of DES for developing a common vision for Capitol Campus.

Director Liu added that the committee has discussed the lack of cohesive planning for the campus for many years. Some progress has occurred with some starts over the years but those efforts have not advanced beyond discussions. The Newhouse Building is a good example in terms of how to plan for the highest and best use in development occurring on the campus without the benefit of a current Master Plan. The intent is to move to a modern format to afford easy access to records to respond to questions. Ongoing work has been under the guidance of the CCDAC and it is important that staff acknowledges the committee’s desire to improve the planning process.

Mr. Jones asked about existing staffing for planning and additional support staff. Assistant Director Frare said DES made some changes that happened to occur during the delay in the passage of the state capital budget. The intent was segregating daily operations from the planning team. At that time, staff served in many different capacities with planning deferred because of immediate needs. The majority of planning staff have been assigned to address day-to-day operations of buildings and structures leaving only 1.5 FTEs to focus on planning. One Program Manager position is included that originally was funded equally between the operating and capital budgets. The position was in charge of planning and project delivery. That position is assumed by Kevin Dragon, who manages the project management team and staff for future planning efforts. Chris Gizzi and Mr. Dragon occupied the same position for approximately 18 months in an attempt to retain well-qualified staff members. Mr. Gizzi has returned to a Project Management position. A second position that is being reestablished is a Facilities Senior Planner position responsible to assist in the planning process. The budget request is for two additional Planners to augment that group and two GIS staff positions to provide data.

Assistant Director Frare added that within the department’s 10-year capital plan, approximately \$680 million is requested for projects. The budget request is for \$1.3 million to guarantee the budget of \$680 million is appropriately expended.

Representative Kraft asked about the ideal timeframe for consultant services to assist in scoping the master plan update effort. Assistant Director Frare replied that if funding is provided in the next capital budget, the funds would be available on July 1, 2019 and the consultant would be hired immediately thereafter. The consultant would likely be available between September 1 and November 1, 2019. Representative Kraft asked about the term of the consultant services for a \$1.3 million budget.

Master Planner Dragon said much of the work would be dependent upon stakeholder involvement. The scope of the project at this time is over the course of the biennium. The effort would produce a roadmap

for DES, CCDAC, and the SCC to apply to all new projects slated to move forward to determine how the projects fit within the program for the campus.

Representative Kraft said the timeframe appears to be reasonable but she would rather not see \$1.3 million used for six to 12 months of consulting services that did result in a plan.

Master Planner Dragon shared information on planned stakeholder participation by different agencies on the East and West Campus, which will address mutual campus issues of security, parking, traffic flow, open campus, and potential impacts created by new development on the City of Olympia. Other stakeholders include the public with ongoing interest in the campus by the South Capitol Neighborhood, park committees, and others. The stakeholder effort will be intense as stakeholders meet, discuss, and offer input on defining the vision of the campus for the next 10 to 20 years.

Mr. Jones asked whether Capital Campus project requests include funds for a project manager to support the project. Assistant Director Frare advised that most project management is funded separately. The project budget often includes some administrative funds. The Engineering and Architectural sections in DES manage all projects for Executive Branch agencies and for Community and Technical Colleges. DES negotiates with OFM and with legislative staff on the amount of the appropriation.

Capital Projects Update – Informational

Chair Rolluda invited Assistant Director Frare and Master Planner Dragon to provide an update on several key capital projects. Assistant Director reviewed the projects:

- ***Conservatory Demolition*** – The ground under the Conservatory is moving causing the structure to lean at a 15° angle. The structure is experiencing loss of glass and pieces of metal loosening and deteriorating. DES received an appropriation to demolish the structure. The design process has been initiated. However, because of budgetary constraints, DES is exploring options to pursue actions within the authorized appropriation. Those efforts should be completed by January 2019 with an update to the committee at its February meeting.
- ***East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B)*** – This phase of a large project was conceived nearly 20 years ago when the Plaza Garage experienced some leaks. Phases 1-4 completed the roof north of 14th Avenue. Phase 5 is located south of 14th Avenue and is segregated into sub phases of A, B, C, D, & E. Phase 5B is located at the east end of the Plaza Garage and north of 14th Avenue. The project initially was two projects for water infiltration and water infiltration into an electrical room. The project delivery is General Contractor-Construction Manager (GC/CM) to enable both the architect and the contractor to work together to stage some constructive investigation that must occur prior to finalizing the design. A maximum allowable construction cost should be established by the end of December with a contract negotiated soon after. Half of the project is funded through a COP. Because COPs are only sold twice a year, DES must meet the end of December timeline to secure the second half of funding for the project.
- ***Relocate Mural from GA to 1063*** – When the initial bid was released, no bids were received. DES engaged in some marketing efforts and released a second bid. DES received seven bids. After resolving some confusion over insuring the artwork, the contractor has initiated work and DES anticipates the work to be completed by January 2019. The committee will receive an update on the status of the project at the February meeting. Senator Hunt inquired about whether DES plans to record the process of transfer. Assistant Frare said the project scope did not anticipate any video of

the process. However, some videos have been completed, such as the construction of the 1063 Building that involved a time lapse video from beginning to end, as well as videos on cleaning the dome. It is possible to include recording of the transfer. The artwork will be transferred as one piece with adequate protections in place. The front of the GA Building will be removed to create an opening with transference of the artwork to Union Avenue for placement in the 1063 Building to an area designed to display the mural.

- ***Legislative Building Exterior Preservation (Dome Cleaning)*** – DES received a \$3.4 million appropriation to clean and preserve the Legislative Building dome. The project budget request was initially for \$7 million. The Legislature inquired about what could be accomplished with a reduced budget of \$3.4 million. DES advised that the scope could include all of the cleaning from the mini domes to the top of the dome. Because of the importance of the building to the Legislature, DES developed a package to clean from the mini domes to the top of the dome with alternatives to clean floors 1 through 4 and the plaza. DES received several favorable bids for the project. A contract was negotiated to clean the entire building from the top of the dome to the ground level. Most of the work has been completed. DES worked with the conservatory designer to develop a cleaning method utilizing a biocide product applied by a soft bristle brush to scrub the product into the stone and then using heated water to remove the product and dirt. All mortar joints are being checked and where applicable, joints will be mortared to preserve the integrity of the structure. The original budget scope included more than cleaning the dome and preserving the exterior, it included funds for brass windows and brass doors to address a previous incident where a 16-foot tall brass window dislodged and fell from the dome landing on the roof with no one injured. It is imperative DES repair brass fixtures and address the remaining windows and doors, as well as some skylights. A budget request was submitted to reappropriate funds of only \$1 million rather than the full amount because of the favorable bid environment.

Senator Hunt inquired about the status of skylights located over the House and Senate Chambers. Assistant Director Frare advised that those skylights are part of a different project.

Representative Kraft asked about the timeline for the next cleaning. Assistant Director Frare replied that historically, the intent has been to clean the building every six to eight years. DES has explored the possibility of including the budget for cleaning within the operational budget. That option was not explored in time to include in this year's budget. However, DES plans to prioritize the project for inclusion within the operating budget for future budgets.

- ***Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Long-Term Management/EIS*** –DES began engaging in scoping the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process in September. That process is scheduled to close on Thursday, November 13, 2018. Two public forums were conducted. The scoping process is seeking feedback from the community on what the EIS should consider. Some great comments were received about salmon runs, Orcas, sediment management, and upstream influences to the watershed. The process to date has been very positive. Additionally, the consultants have established an online town hall for public comment submittals. Following the close of the public comment period, DES and the consultant team will prepare a scoping report in January 2019. The technical analysis portion of the project will encompass more than a year followed by publication of a draft EIS for public review and comments. The draft EIS would likely be produced by early 2020. Director Liu added that all comments received to date would be published online at the DES website.

- **Capitol Child Care Center (SCC Action Update)** – The committee received a presentation on the project at its last meeting. The recommendation included a site selection recommendation and additional study on ways to expand the building size to accommodate more tenants. Following additional work with the consultant, the costs for staging and increasing the size of the building were prohibitive and consequently DES did not move forward with the recommendation to the SCC other than providing information on the intent by the CCDAC to expand the scope. The SCC recommended selection of the ProArts site for a one-story child care facility.

Representative Kraft asked about the process DES pursues to determine whether to build versus lease a facility. Assistant Director Frare referred to the proviso, which dictated a building owned by the state. DES did not complete any analysis between owning and leasing because of the directive in the proviso. However, six sites were examined on the campus, which were reduced to two viable locations. An analysis was completed on those two locations. Representative Kraft emphasized the importance of the master planning process to consider building versus leasing. She understands from a developer that the 1063 Building was originally projected to cost \$26 per square foot. Today, the cost is \$38 per square foot. She asked about the status of a Request for Proposal for the project. Assistant Director Frare reported the predesign report was approved in the last budget. DES expedited the predesign over the summer. A final draft was submitted to OFM. The project will likely be included in the Governor's Budget and would be submitted to the Legislature for legislator consideration. At that point, the project is pending the outcome of the legislative process. If approved, DES would then release a bid for the design firm.

Mr. Miles asked whether the delivery method for the child care facility has been determined. Assistant Director Frare said the delivery method was not addressed as part of the predesign. However, there is strong interest to complete the center by December 2020. To accomplish that timeline, the project delivery method would likely be Design-Build.

Public Comments and Closing Remarks - Informational

Allen Miller updated the committee on the status of a case before the Washington State Supreme Court that would affect the Capitol Campus view corridor. He displayed some pictures and provided information to the committee. He is President of the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association. The Association has worked with CCDAC, SCC, and the Legislature since 1987 on the north Capitol Campus. He shared a photo of the north campus in 1954 with Capitol Lake surrounded by the railroad yard and the warehouses. That configuration was not part of the Wilder and White and the Olmsted Brothers plans for the State Capitol Campus. In 1987, the Association formed and worked with various entities to improve the campus as envisioned within those plans. The Capitol Center Building (Mistake by the Lake) was constructed in 1965. The building's siding was recently removed as part of a renovation project, which provides a better view of Budd Inlet from the campus. The City has a 35-foot height limit that applies to that area. The Association is seeking legal action through the Washington State Supreme Court to apply the height limit. He cited a number of former elected and appointed members supporting the legal case. He asked the committee to consider working with the Attorney General to advise the SCC that it would be appropriate for the State of Washington to become involved in the case as it is the state's view corridor that would be impacted by the building. The building is owned by several Russia citizens who live in California. Mr. Miller provided his contact information and volunteered to answer any questions. The Supreme Court is considering whether to include the case on the docket or forward the case to the Court of Appeals in Tacoma. He asked members to consider working with the Attorney General. The committee serves as the protector of the Olmsted Brothers and the Wilder and White vision for the State Capitol Campus. The building is an important element of that architectural masterpiece.

Bob Jacobs said he is long-term resident of Olympia and former Olympia Councilmember and Mayor. He monitors the actions of the CCDAC because he considers the campus, especially the West Campus, to be a treasure for the local area and for the entire state. He urged the committee not to forget the area surrounding the Capitol Campus. He is pleased to hear about concerns regarding the South Capitol Neighborhood. The Capitol Center Building on the isthmus is a design tragedy that does not belong in the view corridor because it destroys views to the north. Additionally, the green slopes around Capitol Lake are important as well regardless of the future of the lake. The area is a treasure; however, if the hillsides are developed rather than maintained as natural, the lake basin will lose its value. He urged the committee to pursue any actions possible, as local ordinances addressing the protection of steep slopes are not fully effective. The state should consider acquiring the land or the development rights on the slopes so they can never be developed. He urged the committee to consider future action with the SCC and the Legislature to pursue options.

Senator Hunt requested including the request for involvement in the legal case on the next meeting agenda. He supported Mr. Jacobs' comments especially as it relates to the slippage occurring with the conservatory. During the discussion involving the Heritage Center site proposal, much of the conversation addressed how the hillside is reinforced with logs. The future of the hillside below the GA Building could be a future topic for the committee to consider. Mr. Haskell agreed with the comments.

Chair Rolluda commented on the master plan. Some good work has been completed involving the committee and staff on the master plan. He is hopeful that the prior efforts are included in the conversation moving forward. He asked whether the review of assets would include off-campus assets. Assistant Director Frare advised that the process would primarily consider the campus, but it would be preferable to address satellite campuses as well.

Next Meetings - Informational

Chair Rolluda reported the next meeting of the State Capitol Committee is scheduled on Thursday, December 6, 2018 between 10 a.m. and 12 p.m. at the State Legislative Building. The next meeting of the CCDAC is scheduled on Thursday, February 21, 2019 at the Jefferson Building beginning at 9 a.m.

Adjournment - Action

Dennis Haskell moved, seconded by Chris Jones, to adjourn the meeting at 11:54 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Approved with corrections by CCDAC at its regularly-scheduled meeting held on 02/21/2019.